THE POPULAR

HISTORY OF ENGLAND:

OF

SOCIETY AND GOVERNMENT FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO OUR OWN TIMES.

BY CHARLES KNIGHT.

WITH TABLES, APPENDIX AND INDEX COMPLETE.

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
OV DA 30
15945 K654
1880
v.8.

LETTERPRESS WHOLLY UNABRIDGED.

NEW YORK:
I. K. FUNK & CO., PUBLISHERS.
1880.

STANDARD SERIES EDITION.

CONTENTS OF THE SECOND FOUR VOLUMES.

CHAPTER CXXIV.—A.D. 1689 to A.D. 1690.

PAGE

Close of the first session of the English Parliament—The Irish Parliament—Second session of the English Parliament—The Bill of Rights—The Princess Anne—Whig and Tory factions—Parliament dissolved—State of the army in Ireland—Abuses in government departments—Opening of the new parliament—Corruption—Jealousy in settling the revenue—Act of Recognition—Act of Grace—William goes to Ireland—Landing and march of William—The Boyne—William slightly wounded—Battle of the Boyne—Flight of James—His speech at Dublin—Naval defeat at Beachy Head—Energetic conduct of the queen.....633–639

CHAPTER CXXV.—A.D. 1690.

James embarks for France—William enters Dublin—The French devastate Teignmouth—William's march to Limerick—Siege of Limerick—The siege raised—William goes to England—Parliament—War supply—England and continental politics—William leaves for Holland—Congress at the Hague—Mons capitulates to the French—Vacant sees in England filled up—Plot of Preston and Ashton—Treason laws—Marlborough in Flanders—Ireland—Limerick surrenders to Ginkell—Treaty of Limerick.....639–645

CHAPTER CXXVI.—A.D. 1690 to A.D. 1695.

Scotland—Affairs of religion—Plots—The Highland clans dispersed—State of the Highlands in 1691—Breadalbane—Proclamation of the government—The Master of Stair—Tardy submission of Mac Ian—Order as to rebels not submitted—Order for Mac Ian of Glencoe, and his tribe—Letters of the Master of Stair—Highland troops arrive in Glencoe—The massacre of the MacDonalds—Inquiry into the massacre in 1695—Resolutions of the Scottish Parliament—Master of Stair dismissed—The other persons implicated—Breadalbane—Misconceptions connected with the massacre—Character of William unjustly assailed.....645–650

CHAPTER CXXVII.—A.D. 1692 to A.D. 1693.

Marlborough dismissed from office—Parliamentary debates—Independence of the judges—The king leaves for Holland—Threatened invasion—Declaration of James—Battle of La Hogue—Siege of Namur—Grandval's plot to assassinate William—Battle of Steinkirk—Parliament—Debate on the battle of Steinkirk—Court-martial on Grandval—Crime and public distress—Commencement of the national debt—The Licensing Act expires—Parliamentary reform—Place Bill—Bill for triennial parliaments—The king's veto—Murder of Mountfort, the player—Trial of Lord Mohun.....650–655

CHAPTER CXXVIII.—A.D. 1693 to A.D. 1694.

Ministerial changes—Preparations for the campaign—Louis and William with their armies—Louis returns to Versailles—Battle of Landen—Naval miscarriages—A ministry formed—Government by party—Preponderance of the Whigs—Financial difficulties—Establishment of the Bank of England—Expedition against Brest—Illness of the queen—Her death.....655–660

CHAPTER CXXIX.—A.D. 1694 to A.D. 1696.

Extreme grief of William—Parliamentary corruption—War in the Netherlands—Siege of Namur by the allies—Namur taken—William's reception in England—State of the currency—A new parliament—Measures for a new coinage—Trials for treason regulated by law—The assassination plot.....660–666

CHAPTER CXXX.—A.D. 1696 to A.D. 1698.

William in the Netherlands—His financial embarrassments—Great crisis of commercial difficulty—Revival of credit—The new currency established—Attainder of Sir John Fenwick—Negotiations for peace—The Peace of Ryswick—Opening of St. Paul's Cathedral—Parliament—Reduction of the army—Danger of an insufficient force—The East India Company—Statute against Socinians—Reformation of manners—Societies for promoting Christian knowledge, and for the propagation of the gospel—Licentiousness of the stage—Embassy to France—French embassy to England—Czar of Muscovy in England.....666–672

CHAPTER CXXXI.—A.D. 1698 to A.D. 1700.

Commercial policy of England—System of prohibition—Restrictions upon the trade of Ireland—Restrictions upon the trade of Scotland—Scotch spirit of commercial adventure—African and Indian Company—Scotch colony at Darien.....672–677

CHAPTER CXXXII.—A.D. 1698 to A.D. 1699.

Question of the succession to the crown of Spain—The Partition Treaties—Negotiations at Loo—Correspondence of the king with his ministers—First partition treaty signed—The new parliament—The troops disbanded—William's mortification—A rash resolve and a calmer judgment—The Dutch guards dismissed—Irish forfeitures resumed—Penal law against Catholics—Portland and Albemarle—Admiral Rooke in the Baltic—Policy of Louis the Fourteenth....677–682

CHAPTER CXXXIII.—A.D. 1700 to A.D. 1702.

A Tory administration—Death of the Duke of Gloucester—The Electress Sophia of Hanover—Death of the King of Spain—Will of Charles, which Louis accepts—The new parliament—The king asks assistance for the States-General—The Act of Settlement—Impeachment of Somers and other Whigs—The Kentish petition—The Legion Memorial—The great alliance formed by William—Death of King James—Louis declares the son of James King of England—William opens his last parliament—His accident—His message on the union—Death of William the Third—Note: the Act of Settlement.....682–688

CHAPTER CXXXIV.—A.D. 1702 to A.D. 1703.

Accession of Queen Anne—Her declaration to the privy council—Parliament continues sitting—Preponderance of Tories—Marlborough sent as envoy to the States-General—War declared—Marlborough's first campaign—Expedition to Cadiz—Vigo—New parliament—Tory majority—Bill against occasional conformity—Defoe's "Shortest Way with the Dissenters"—Marlborough created a duke—Revolt in the Cévennes—Marlborough's second campaign—The Methuen Treaty with Portugal—Occasional Conformity Bill again rejected by the Lords—Aylesbury election case—The great storm—Oaths of witnesses—Queen Anne's bounty—Touching for the evil—May poles.....688–694

CHAPTER CXXXV.—A.D. 1704.

Difficulties of recruiting the English army—The campaign of 1704—Marlborough's secret plan of operations—His march along the Rhine—Arrives at the Danube—Battle of the Shellenberg—Devastation of Bavaria—Junction of the French and Bavarian armies—The battle of Blenheim—Results of the victory—Subsequent operations of the campaign—Marlborough returns to England—Honors and rewards—Party conflicts—Parliament dissolved.....694–700

CHAPTER CXXXVI.—A.D. 1704 to A.D. 1706.

The war in Spain—Expedition to Catalonia—Gibraltar taken by Sir George Rooke and the Prince of Darmstadt—Sea-fight off Malaga—Siege of Gibraltar by the Spaniards—Expedition to Spain under Peterborough—Siege of Barcelona—Peterborough surprises Montjouich—Barcelona taken—Peterborough's rapid successes in Valencia—Philip V. besieges Barcelona—It is relieved—The allies enter Madrid—Supineness of the Austrian king—Disgust of Peterborough—He leaves Spain—Prince Eugene drives the French out of Italy...700–703

CHAPTER CXXXVII.—A.D. 1705 to A.D. 1706.

Marlborough's campaign of 1705—His disappointments and anxieties—He forces the French lines—Retreat of the

PAGE

French under Villeroy—New parliament—State of parties—The Regency Bill—Cry of the Church in danger—Marlborough's campaign of 1706 in the Netherlands—The French and Bavarian armies under Villeroy pass the Dyle—The battle of Ramilies—Results of the victory.....703–707

CHAPTER CXXXVIII.—A.D. 1703 to A.D. 1707.

Scotland—New parliament assembled in 1703—Irritation against England—Proposal for a treaty of union—Meeting of commissioners of each nation—Articles agreed upon by the commissioners—Charges of corruption—Demonstrations against the union—Debates in the Scottish Parliament—Lord Belhaven's oration—Material interests of Scotland—Views of the union by Seton of Pitmedden—Provision for the Church of Scotland—Riots—Demonstration of the Cameronians—The Act of Union passed in Scotland—The act passed in England.....707–712

CHAPTER CXXXIX.—A.D. 1707 to A.D. 1709.

Warlike addresses of parliament—Reverses—Battle of Almanza—Marlborough's visit to Charles XII. of Sweden—Indecisive campaign of 1707—Siege of Toulon—Wreck of Sir Cloudesley Shovel—Naval miscarriages—Complaints in parliament—Discontents in Scotland—Jacobite plots—Attempted invasion—Dismissal of Harley and St. John from the ministry—Campaign of 1708—Ghent surrendered to the French—Battle of Oudenarde—Sardinia and Minorca surrendered—Death of Prince George of Denmark—Surrender of Lille—Meeting of parliament—Proposals of France for peace—Campaign of 1709—Surrender of Tournay—Battle of Malplaquet—Battle of Pultowa.....712–718

CHAPTER CXL.—A.D. 1709 to A.D. 1710.

Impeachment of Dr. Sacheverel—Proceedings in Westminster Hall—Articles of the Impeachment—Passages from the speeches of the managers—Popular manifestations—Sentence upon Sacheverel—Sentence regarded as a triumph of the High Church—Prosecution of rioters for high treason—Trials of rioters—Progress of Sacheverel through the country—His character.....718–723

CHAPTER CXLI.—A.D. 1710 to A.D. 1712.

Conferences at Gertruydenberg—Negotiations for peace broken off—Despotism and limited monarchy—The Whigs dismissed from office—New parliament—Duchess of Marlborough dismissed from her offices—Disasters in Spain—Surrender of General Stanhope—Hostility to Marlborough—Party use of the press—Swift, the great party writer—Property qualification for members of parliament—Harley stabbed by Guiscard—Marlborough's last campaign—Parliament—Prospect of peace—The ministry defeated in the House of Lords—Marlborough dismissed from all his offices—New peers created—Negotiations at Utrecht—Note to Chapter CXLI.—Table of treaties.....723–733

CHAPTER CLXII.—A.D. 1712 to A.D. 1714.

Prince Eugene in London—Opening of the campaign under Ormond and Eugene—Ormond's secret instructions—The allied army deserted by the British forces—Subsequent disasters of the allies—The Lords' protest published—Laws proposed against the press—The first stamp duty on periodical works—Terms of peace announced to parliament—Bolingbroke's embassy to Paris—Treaty of Utrecht completed—Treaty of commerce with France rejected by parliament—Dissolution of parliament—Jacobite intrigues—The new parliament—Libels—Swift—Steele—Death of the Princess Sophia of Hanover—The Schism Act—Oxford dismissed from office—Death of the queen.....733–736

CHAPTER CXLIII.—A.D. 1709 to A.D. 1742.

Literature and manners of the earlier part of the eighteenth century—The "Tatler"—News-writers and pamphleteers—Dunton's "Athenian Gazette"—Defoe's "Review"—The "Spectator" and the "Guardian"—Influence and object of the essayists—Low state of education—The essayists diffusers of knowledge—Joint labors of Steele and Addison—The Spectator's Club—Fiction—Reading for females—Literary piracy—Copyright Act—Literature as a profession—The poets—Alexander Pope.....736–742

CHAPTER CXLIV.—A.D. 1709 to A.D. 1742.

Female politicians—Female employments—Dress—The hoop petticoat—Literary estimate of the female character—The stage estimate—Congreve—Swift's polite conversation—Pope—The Rape of the Lock—Prude and coquette—Puppet plays—The opera—The masquerade—Young—Fashionable vices—Drinking—Extravagant dinners—Duelling—The club life of London—Gaming—The bear-garden—Popular superstitions—Witchcraft—Ignorance of the lower classes—Sports—National taste for music gone out—The small-coal man..742–747

CHAPTER CXLV.—A.D. 1709 to A.D. 1742.

PAGE

Intellectual activity in every department of knowledge—A reading public—Poetical translations of classical authors—Pope's Homer—The popular element shown in the attacks of the wits upon some pursuits of learning—Battle of the Books—Pope's ridicule of Dennis—Martinus Scriblerus—Small poets—The Dunciad—Commentators—Public schools—Universities—Travelling—Entomologists and florists—The abuses of knowledge only deserving the poet's ridicule—The popular element in the mental philosophy of the age—Locke—Character of Swift's genius—Tale of a Tub—Gulliver's Travels—Robinson Crusoe—Defoe.....747–751

CHAPTER CXLVI.—A.D. 1709 to A.D. 1742.

View of the state of the arts from the Revolution of 1688 to the accession of the House of Brunswick—Wren—Rebuilding of London—St. Paul's—Wren's parish churches—Wren's miscellaneous buildings—Vanbrugh—Character of, as an architect—Hawksmoor and Gibbs—Burlington—Sculpture—Gibbons—Cibber—Roubiliac—Painting—Portrait painting in England—Kneller—Jervas—Verrio and Laguerre—Thornhill—Other painters—Hogarth.....751–757

CHAPTER CXLVII.—A.D. 1709 to A.D. 1742.

Hogarth as the historian of manners in the transition time between Anne and George III.—His art essentially dramatic—Society, in Hogarth's pictures, appears a sort of chaos—The life of the streets—The anarchy out-doors a type of the disorder in houses of public resort—Genteel debauchery—Low profligacy and crime—The Cockpit—The gaming-house—The prison—Bedlam—The Rake's Levée—The Lady's Public Toilette—Marriage à-la-mode—The election prints—The Sleeping Congregation—Fanaticism.....757–760

CHAPTER CXLVIII.—A.D. 1714 to A.D. 1716.

Proceedings on the death of Queen Anne—George I. proclaimed king—His arrival in England—Sophia, Princess of Zell—Ministerial arrangements—Parliament—Impeachment of Queen Anne's late ministers—Riots in England—Insurrection in Scotland—Insurrection in England—The march to Preston—Surrender of the rebels at Preston—Battle of Sheriffmuir—The pretender in Scotland—His flight to France—Impeachments of the rebel lords—Executions and escapes of leaders—Fate of the humbler insurgents.....760–767

CHAPTER CXLIX.—A.D. 1716 to A.D. 1719.

The pretender in Paris—He discards Bolingbroke—The Septennial Act—The king leaves for Germany—His foreign predilections—Negotiations at Hanover for a French alliance—The king's jealousy of the Prince of Wales—Lord Townshend dismissed from his office of secretary of state—Arrest of the Swedish Ambassador—Schism in the ministry—Trial of the Earl of Oxford—Stanhope, prime minister—Alberoni—The Quadruple Alliance—Open quarrel between the king and the Prince of Wales—Byng's destruction of the Spanish fleet—Measures of toleration proposed by Stanhope—Spanish expedition to Scotland—Successes of France and England in Spain—Alberoni disgraced—Spain accedes to the Quadruple Alliance—The Peerage Bill....767–773

CHAPTER CL.—A.D. 1719 to A.D. 1727.

The South Sea Scheme—Public infatuation—The bubble bursts—Parliamentary measures—Session of 1722—Plot for invasion and insurrection—Trial of Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester—His banishment—Wood's patent for a copper coinage in Ireland—The Drapier's letters—The ale duty in Scotland—Riot at Glasgow—Impeachment of Lord Chancellor Macclesfield—Foreign affairs—Treaty of Hanover—Siege of Gibraltar—Peace—Death of George I.....773–779

CHAPTER CLI.—A.D. 1727 to A.D. 1734.

Accession of George II.—Walpole confirmed in power—Frederick, the heir-apparent—Course of foreign policy—The Stuarts—Arrival in England of Prince Frederick—Townshend leaves office—What is history?—The Dissenters—Inquiry into the state of the jails—Law proceedings in English—Party quarrels and libels—Parliamentary opposition—The salt tax—The excise scheme—Wars in Europe—Neutrality of Great Britain—Motion for the repeal of the Septennial Act—Wyndham's character of Walpole—Walpole's character of Bolingbroke—Bolingbroke quits England...779–785

CHAPTER CLII.—A.D. 1735 to A.D. 1737.

New parliament of 1735—Peace of Vienna—The Gin Act—The Porteous riots—Parliamentary proceedings on these riots—Unpopularity of the king—Marriage of the Prince of Wales—Royal animosities—Birth of a princess—Illness of Queen Caroline—Death of Queen Caroline.....785–79

CHAPTER CLIII.—A.D. 1737 to A.D. 1742.

PAGE

Act for licensing plays—Birth of a prince, afterward George III.—Commercial disputes with Spain—Popular war cry—Jenkins's ear—A convention with Spain denounced in parliament—Walpole is driven into war—His struggle to retain power—Newcastle's jealousy of Walpole—Capture of Porto Bello—Attack upon Carthagena—Anson's expedition—Byron—Extension of the field of war—Motion to remove Walpole from the king's council—Walpole resigns—He is created Earl of Orford—Parliamentary inquiry into his administration.....790–795

CHAPTER CLIV.—A.D. 1741 to A.D. 1745.

Maria Theresa—Her succession disputed—Claim of Frederick II. upon Silesia—He invades Silesia—Battle of Molwitz—The French in Bavaria—Maria Theresa in Hungary—Elector of Bavaria chosen emperor—Prussia obtains Silesia—Change in the English ministry—Ascendency of Carteret—Hanoverian troops in English pay—The Stuarts—Projected descent on the British coasts—Battle of Dettingen—Administration of the Pelhams—Battle of Fontenoy—Statute against the sons of the pretender—Jacobitism of England and Scotland—Charles Edward in France—Note on the battle of Dettingen—Table of treaties.....795–801

CHAPTER CLV.—A.D. 1745.

Prince Charles Edward arrives at Eriska—Lands at Borodale—His interview with the chiefs of clans—The gathering at Glenfinnan—Military resources of the government—Sir John Cope—Highland army marches to Perth—Preparations for defence at Edinburgh—Charles Edward at Holyrood House—Cope's army lands at Dunbar—Battle of Prestonpans—Charles Edward's sojourn at Edinburgh—Siege of the castle—English opinions of the rebellion—Note on the Highland costume.....801–805

CHAPTER CLVI.—A.D. 1745.

Meeting of the British Parliament—New regiments to be raised by peers—Divided counsels in the cabinet and in parliament—The insurgent army crosses the border—Siege of Carlisle—State of public intelligence—The continued march into England—Manchester recruits—Roman Catholic families in Manchester—The rebel army reaches Derby—The Duke of Cumberland's army close at hand—The retreat of the rebels resolved upon—Public feeling in London—The populace—The commercial and moneyed classes—Suspicions attached to Scotsmen in London—Andrew Drummond, the banker—Proceedings against Popish priests.....805–811

CHAPTER CLVII.—A.D. 1745 to A.D. 1746.

Charles Edward retreats from Derby—The retreating army pursued—Skirmish at Clifton—Bombardment and capitulation of Carlisle—Charles Edward in Scotland—General Hawley takes the command of the king's troops—Battle of Falkirk—Retreat of Hawley to Edinburgh—Lord Lovat—The Duke of Cumberland in Scotland—Flight of the Highland army from Stirling.....811–815

CHAPTER CLVIII.—A.D. 1746.

Charles Edward at Inverness—The Duke of Cumberland at Aberdeen—The passage of the Spey—The duke at Nairn—The prince at Culloden—Projected night attack on the king's camp—The victory of Culloden—Barbarities after Culloden—Impolicy of the treatment of the rebels—Trials and executions—Trials of the rebel lords—Their demeanor—Balmerino, Kilmarnock, and Lovat—Hidings of Charles Edward—His return to France..... 815–818

CHAPTER CLIX.—A.D. 1747 to A.D. 1753.

Parliamentary calm—Mr. Pelham and the Duke of Newcastle—Mr. Pitt—Naval successes—Defeats by land—Battle of Lauffeld—Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle—Charles Edward sent out of France—Measures for pacification of the Highlands—The peace regarded as a hard necessity for Britain—Measures of the parliament—Reduction of interest on the national debt—Combination laws—Parliamentary privilege—Reform of the calendar—Death of Frederick, Prince of Wales—Official changes—Act for dissection in cases of murder—Act for preventing thefts and robberies, and for regulating places of public entertainment—Gin Act—Increase of robberies—The Jew Bill—The Marriage Act—Note on the Stuart family.....818–825

CHAPTER CLX.—A.D. 1754 to A.D. 1755.

Death of Mr. Pelham—Newcastle's ministry—Negotiations with Fox—Pitt passed over—Parliament meets—Fox a cabinet minister—Retrospect of Indian affairs—Clive—Capture and defence of Arcot—North American colonies—Contests on the Ohio—Naval victories—Subsidies agreed upon by the king—Parliament—Great debate—Single-speech Hamilton—Pitt—Fox, secretary of state—Pitt dismissed from his office of paymaster—Earthquake at Lisbon.....825–829

CHAPTER CLXI.—A.D. 1755 to A.D. 1757.

Dread of invasion—Defence of the country by foreign troops—French fleet at Minorca—Admiral Byng—Surrender of St. Philip, in Minorca—Popular rage against Byng—Commencement of the Seven Years War—Successes of Frederick of Prussia—Household of George, Prince of Wales—Changes of ministry—Newcastle retires—Administration of the Duke of Devonshire and Mr. Pitt—Altered tone of the king's speech—Militia Bill—Foreign troops sent home—Subsidy to the King of Prussia—Trial of Byng—His execution—Pitt and Legge dismissed from their employments—National feeling—Coalition of Newcastle and Pitt—Affairs of India—Black Hole at Calcutta—Surajah Dowlah occupies Calcutta—It is retaken by Clive and Watson—The battle of Plassey—Surajah Dowlah deposed and killed—Meer Jaffier, Subahdar of Bengal—Establishment of the British ascendency in India.....829–835

CHAPTER CLXII.—A.D. 1757 to A.D. 1760.

The administration—Pitt's sole conduct of the war and of foreign affairs—Frederick's second campaign—Victory of Prague—Defeat at Kolin—Failure at Rochefort—Convention of Closter-Severn—Failure of expedition against Louisbourg—Riots about the Militia Act—Frederick's victory of Rosbach—Subsidy to Prussia—Cherbourg taken, and its works demolished—St. Maloes—Operations on the African coast—Successful expedition against Louisbourg—The turning point in Pitt's administration—Frederick's third campaign—Zorndorf—Hochkirchen—Wolfe appointed to command an expedition to Quebec—The battle of Minden—Canada—Operations in North America—Wolfe in the St. Lawrence—His desponding letter—Heights of Abraham—Death of Wolfe—Quebec surrendered—Hawke's victory in Quiberon Bay—Death of George II.....835–840

CHAPTER CLXIII.—A.D. 1760 to A.D. 1763.

Accession of George III.—His education and character—Lord Bute—The king's first speech—Policy of the new reign—Independence of the judges—The new parliament—The king's marriage—Coronation—Negotiations for peace—Warlike operations—Affairs of the continent—Frederick of Prussia—Negotiations broken off—The Family Compact—Resignation of Mr. Pitt—His pension—Debates in parliament—War declared against Spain—Conquest of the Havana, and other successes—Preliminaries of peace signed—The Peace of Paris—Conclusion of the Seven Years War—The cost of the war, and its uses.....840–845

CHAPTER CLXIV.—A.D. 1763 to A.D. 1765.

Lord Bute prime minister—Policy of the favorite—John Wilkes—Lord Bute resigns—George Grenville's ministry—"North Britain," No. 45—Arrest of Wilkes—Negotiation for Mr. Pitt's return to power—The king's desire to govern—The Wilkite agitation—Hogarth, Wilkes, and Churchill—Wilkes ordered to be prosecuted—Expelled the House of Commons—Great debates on general warrants—Officers dismissed for votes in parliament—Restrictions on the American colonies—Grenville's resolutions on American taxation—The Stamp Act passed—Resistance in America—Motives for passing the Stamp Act.....845–850

CHAPTER CLXV.—A.D. 1765 to A.D. 1768.

Illness of the king—The Regency Bill—Overtures to Pitt—He declines office—Grenville and Bedford—The Rockingham administration—Disturbances in America—Parliament—Debates on the Stamp Act—Pitt contends for its repeal—Examination of Dr. Franklin—Declaratory Bill as to rights over the colonies—Repeal of the Stamp Act—Weakness of the Rockingham administration—They quit office—Pitt created Earl of Chatham—His loss of popularity—His plans for great measures—Embargo on corn—Chatham's illness—Disorganization of his ministry—Parliament dissolved.....850–855

CHAPTER CLXVI.—A.D. 1768 to A.D. 1770.

New parliament—Non-publication of debates—Wilkes returned for Middlesex—Riots—Sentence upon Wilkes—His expulsions from parliament and re-elections—Debates on the privileges of the Commons—The letters of Junius—Personalities of Junius—His attacks on the Duke of Grafton—Private letters of Junius—His attack on the Duke of Bedford—Address of Junius to the king—Opening of parliament—Lord Chatham—Chatham's speech on the address—Schism in the ministry—Lord Camden disclaims their measures—Resignation of the Duke of Grafton.....855–861

CHAPTER CLXVII.—A.D. 1768 to A.D. 1771.

PAGE

Lord North's administration—Retrospect of colonial affairs—Opposition to the Revenue Act—Debates in parliament on American proceedings—Measures of coercion proposed—Lord Hillsborough—Virginia—Outrages in Boston—Repeal of duties, except that on teas—Encounter with the military at Boston—Renewal of the conflict regarding Wilkes—Remonstrance of the city of London—Beckford's address to the king—Printers arrested for publishing debates—Released by the city authorities—Riots—The lord mayor and an alderman committed—Officers of state.....861–865

CHAPTER CLXVIII.—A.D. 1770 to A.D. 1773.

Foreign affairs—Cession of Corsica to France—The Falkland Islands—First partition of Poland—War between Turkey and Russia—Acquisitions of Russia—Suppression of the Jesuits—Home politics—Subscription to Thirty-nine Articles—Test Act—Thirtieth of January—Repeal of laws against forestalling—The Queen of Denmark—Death of the Princess Dowager—The Royal Marriage Act—Retrospect of Indian affairs—East India Company's Regulation Act—Teas, duty free, to the colonies.....865–869

CHAPTER CLXIX.—A.D. 1773 to A.D. 1775.

Destruction of tea in Boston harbor—Franklin before the council—Boston Port Bill—Burke's speech against taxing America—Chatham's speech—Sentiments of the Americans—State of parties in America—Leaders of the House of Commons—Reception of the Boston Port Bill—Military preparations—Chatham's and Burke's efforts for conciliation—Rapid growth of America—English feelings on the American question—Hostilities commenced at Lexington—Ticonderoga and Crown Point taken—Washington's view of civil war—Principles involved in the struggle.....869–874

CHAPTER CLXX.—A.D. 1775 to A.D. 1776.

Franklin's return to America—Meeting of Congress at Philadelphia—Washington elected commander-in-chief—Events at Boston—Battle of Bunker's Hill—Washington blockades Boston—Public opinion in England—Petition from Congress to the king—Mr. Penn, the bearer of the petition, examined in the House of Lords—Nord North's prohibitory bill—Invasion of Canada—Evacuation of Boston—Slias Deane sent to Paris—Declaration of Independence adopted by Congress—Note: The Declaration.....874–879

CHAPTER CLXXI.—A.D. 1776 to A.D. 1777.

Lord Howe, as the British commissioner, addresses a letter to Washington—The letter refused—The British on Long Island—Battle of Brooklyn—Washington retreats—His exploit at Trenton—His success at Princeton—Franklin dispatched by the Congress to Paris—Underhand proceedings of France—John the Painter, the incendiary—Manning the navy—Defences of the country—Chatham appears again in parliament—Steuben—La Fayette—Kosciusko—Battle of the Brandywine—The British in Philadelphia—Burgoyne's army enters the United States from Canada—The convention of Saratoga—Parliament meets—Chatham's speech on the address—On the employment of Indians—Washington in winter quarters at Valley Forge—Steuben reorganizes the army.....879–884

CHAPTER CLXXII.—A.D. 1777 to A.D. 1779.

Public opinion on the American war—Measures of conciliation proposed by Lord North—France concludes a treaty of amity with America—Chatham's last speech in parliament—His sudden illness in the House of Lords—His death—Propositions of Lord North rejected by Congress—French fleet under D'Estaing arrives in America—Attack on Rhode Island impeded by fleet under Lord Howe—Admiral Keppel takes the command of the Channel fleet—Engagement off Ushant—Court-martial on Keppel—Burgoyne's defence of himself in parliament—Destruction of Wyoming—Spain declares war against Great Britain—Apprehensions of invasion—The national spirit roused—Enterprises of Paul Jones—Military operations in America in 1779.....884–888

CHAPTER CLXXIII.—A.D. 1780.

Associations for redress of grievances—Meetings in Yorkshire and other counties—Burke's proposals for economical reform—Dunning's motion on the influence of the crown—Decreasing strength of the opposition—Protestant associations in Scotland—They extend to England—Lord George Gordon—Procession to parliament—Roman Catholic chapels burned—Newgate set on fire—Lord Mansfield's house sacked—The library burned—Continued riots—A council called—Wedderburn's opinion on the employment of military—The riots stopped by military force—Naval affairs—The war in America—Charleston taken by the British—Lord Cornwallis—His severities—French armament under Rochambeau—

PAGE

Treachery of Benedict Arnold—Major André seized—Verdict of a council of officers—His execution.....888–893

CHAPTER CLXXIV.—A.D. 1780 to A.D. 1781.

Elections of 1780—Burke rejected for Bristol—War with Holland—French attack upon Jersey—Capture of St. Eustatius by Rodney—Privateering—Action off the Dogger Bank—Difficulties of Washington's army—Mutinies—Cornwallis in the Carolinas—He is defeated at Cowpens—His victory at Guilford—Cornwallis marches into Virginia—Fleet of De Grasse arrives in the Chesapeake—Washington's march to Virginia—Cornwallis fortifies Yorktown—Cornwallis is besieged—He capitulates—Surrender of the British army—The disastrous news received in London.....893–898

CHAPTER CLXXV.—A.D. 1781 to A.D. 1782.

The king announces to parliament the capitulation of Cornwallis—Debates on the address very hostile to the ministry—Strong expressions of Fox—More prudent language of Pitt—Differences in the cabinet—Lord G. Germaine retires—Losses of West India Islands and of Minorca—The government in a minority—Lord North announces that his administration is at an end—The Rockingham ministry—Rodney's victory over De Grasse—Breaking the line—Capture of the Ville de Paris—Change of costume in the House of Commons—Burke's bill for the economical reform—Bills on revenue officers and contractors—Pitt's motion for parliamentary reform—Arming the people—Retrospect of the state of Ireland—Irish parliament—Henry Grattan—His efforts for legislative independence—The volunteers of Ireland—The king's message to the British and Irish parliaments—The statute of George I. asserting the dependence of Ireland repealed...898–904

CHAPTER CLXXVI.—A.D. 1782.

Overtures for peace between Franklin and Shelburne—Rival negotiators from England—Death of Lord Rockingham—Resignation of Mr. Fox—Siege of Gibraltar from 1779 to May, 1782. Naval affairs—Lord Hood—Loss of the Royal George—Siege of Gibraltar to its termination—Preliminaries of peace signed between Great Britain and United States—With France and Spain—Parliamentary censures of the terms of peace—Lord Shelburne, being defeated, resigns—The king and the American minister—Washington's farewell to his army—He retires to private life.....904–909

CHAPTER CLXXVII.—A.D. 1760 to A.D. 1783.

Political despondency at the close of the American war—Supposed decay of population—Its real increase—Development of the productive power of the country—Agriculture extended and improved—Agriculture of the East of England—Norfolk—Mr. Coke—Suffolk—Laborers of Suffolk—Husbandry implements—Essex—Buckinghamshire—Oxfordshire—Northamptonshire—Bedfordshire—Francis, Duke of Bedford—Improved breeds of sheep and oxen—Robert Bakewell—Consumption of animal food in England—Cambridgeshire—Lincolnshire—The great level of the fens—Lincoln Heath and the Wolds—Nottinghamshire—Sherwood—Derbyshire—Surrey—Middlesex—Kent—Sussex—Hants—Berkshire—Windsor Forest.....909–916

CHAPTER CLXXVIII.—A.D. 1760 to A.D. 1783.

Agricultural condition of Wiltshire—Dorsetshire—The peasantry—Devonshire—Somersetshire—Exmoor—Cornwall—Wales—West Midland counties—North Midland counties—Warwickshire—Lancashire—Cheshire—Yorkshire—Improvers of the Moors—James Croft, the agricultural collier—The Craven dialect—Durham—Northumberland—Westmoreland—The Lake District—Scotland—The Lothians—Scotch sheep flocks—Ayrshire—Burns—Lanarkshire—Renfrewshire—Northwestern districts—Agricultural state of Ireland—The potato cultivation.....916–922

CHAPTER CLXXIX.—A.D. 1760 to A.D. 1783.

Revolution in the peaceful arts—Captains of modern industry—Duke of Bridgewater—James Brindley—His first great works—The canal system—The cotton manufacture—Kay's fly-shuttle—Cotton-spinning machines—The spinning-jenny of Hargreaves—Cotton spinning ceasing to be a domestic employment—Richard Arkwright—His water-frame spinning machine—The first water spinning mill—Samuel Crompton—His Hall-in-the-Wood wheel, known as the mule—General rush to engage in spinning cotton—Rapid increase of Lancashire towns—Dr. Edmund Cartwright—His power-loom—Dr. John Roebuck—First furnace at Carron for smelting iron by pit-coal—The Staffordshire potteries—Josiah Wedgwood—Commercial treaty of 1787 with France—Dread of foreign rivalry—Watt, mathematical instrument maker—Watt, the inventor of the steam-engine—Watt, the partner in the Soho Works—Watt, the world's benefactor—The sword and the steam-engine.....922–929

CHAPTER CLXXX.—A.D. 1760 to A.D. 1783.

PAGE

Connection between the useful arts and the fine arts—Low state of art in the reign of George II.—Formation of an English school of painting—Academies—St. Martin's Lane Academy—First exhibition of works of English artists—Exhibition of sign paintings—Royal Academy founded—First exhibition—Exhibition in Somerset House—Reynolds—Gainsborough—Wilson—West—Barry—Minor painters—Engraving—Strange—Woollett—Mezzotint—MacArdell, &c.—Boydell, and commerce in English engravings—Sculpture—Banks — Bacon — Flaxman — Architecture — Taylor—Chambers—Stuart—Revett—Wyatt—Bridge-building....929–935

CHAPTER CLXXXI.—A.D. 1737 to A.D. 1783.

Manners as depicted in the literature of the period—Changes in the commerce of literature—Samuel Johnson, the link between two periods—Literature of George II.'s time—The novelists — Samuel Richardson—Henry Fielding — Tobias Smollett—Laurence Sterne—Oliver Goldsmith—Literature of a quarter of a century of George III.—Stage-coaches—Highwaymen—The post—Inns—Public refreshment places in London—Ranelagh—Vauxhall—The Pantheon—The theatre—Garrick—Bath—Gaming-tables.....935–940

CHAPTER CLXXXII.—A.D. 1737 to A.D. 1783.

The Duke of Queensberry—Club-life—Excessive gaming—Excesses of Charles Fox—Dress—Conversation—The squires of England—The country justice—The clergy of England—The universities—Professional classes—The mercantile class—The lower orders—The rabble—Mobs—The London police—The prisons—Social reformers—John Howard—Thomas Coram—Jonas Hanway—Hospitals—Robert Raikes—Sunday-schools—Rise and growth of Methodism.....940–947

CHAPTER CLXXXIII.—A.D. 1773 to A.D. 1784.

Retrospect of Indian affairs—Hastings, governor-general—Rohilla War—New council at Calcutta—Hastings and the council at enmity—Maharajah Nuncomar—His execution—Opposition between Hastings and Francis—Dissensions at Madras—Mahratta War—Capture of Gwalior—Hyder Ali—The Carnatic ravaged—Hyder defeated by Coote—The Rajah of Benares arrested—Oude—The Begums—Hastings the preserver of India—Death of Hyder—Peace with his son and successor Tippoo.....947–951

CHAPTER CLXXXIV.—A.D. 1783 to A.D. 1788.

Coalition of Lord North and Mr. Fox—Pitt's second Reform Bill—Affairs of India—Fox brings forward his India Bill—The bill carried in the House of Commons—Rejected in the House of Lords—The Coalition dismissed from office—Pitt, the head of the government—His struggle against a majority of the Commons—He finally triumphs—Parliament dissolved—Result of the elections—The Westminster election—Pitt's financial measures—Commercial intercourse between Great Britain and Ireland—Pitt's third Reform Bill—Disputes between Holland and Austria—Pitt's sinking fund scheme—Commercial treaty with France—Consolidation of taxes—War with France averted—The Prince of Wales' debts—Mrs. Fitzherbert—The king becomes insane—Parliamentary conflict on the Regency Bill—The King's recovery.....951–958

CHAPTER CLXXXV.—A.D. 1776 to A.D. 1787.

Symptoms of great changes in France—Constant financial difficulties—General view of the French social system—Expectations of a revolution—The Parlement of Paris—Recall of Necker—Meeting of the States-General—The three orders—The Tiers État demand that all the orders shall unite—Mode of procedure in the Tiers État—The Tiers État assume the title of the National Assembly—Their meeting in a tennis court—The royal sitting—Open resistance of the Tiers État to the king's orders—The king yields—Union of the three orders as the National Assembly—Dismissal of Necker—Attack on the Bastille—The king yields to the popular demands—Murder of Foulon and Berthier—Feudal rights abolished—Provincial anarchy—Want of bread—March of a Parisian mob to Versailles—Outrages of the mob—Royal family removed to Paris.....958–965

CHAPTER CLXXXVI.—A.D. 1789 to A.D. 1791.

Connection of the French Revolution with English history—The public opinion of England on the revolution—Opinions of eminent men—Fluctuations of English opinion—The King of France visits the National Assembly—Session of the British Parliament—Divisions of the Whig party—The Test Act—Nootka Sound—War with Spain averted—Fête of the Federation in Paris—Burke publishes his "Reflections on the Revolution"—Russia and Turkey—Siege of Ismaïl—Mirabeau, President of the National Assembly—His negotiations with the court—Death of Mirabeau—Parliament—Breach of

PAGE

the friendship between Burke and Fox—Clamor against the Dissenters—The Birmingham riots.....965–971

CHAPTER CLXXXVII.—A.D. 1791 to A.D. 1792.

Flight of the king and his family from Paris—The National Assembly after the discovery of the flight—Capture of the royal family at Varennes—Hatred of royalty—Thomas Paine—Establishment of the constitution—National or Constituent Assembly at an end—Meeting of the Legislative Assembly—The Declaration of Pilnitz—French princes and emigrants at Coblenz—Talleyrand's visit to London—Opening of parliament—Pacific speech—Pitt's display of British prosperity—The slave trade—Pitt's eloquence—The Libel Law—Attempts to form a coalition — Parliamentary reform — Proclamation against seditious writings—Chauvelin and Lord Grenville—The revolution of Poland.....971–977

CHAPTER CLXXXVIII.—A.D. 1792.

Deaths of the Emperor Leopold and the King of Sweden—The Girondin Ministry—French declaration of war against the King of Hungary and Bohemia—The veto—Roland and two other ministers dismissed—Insurrection of the 20th of June—The country in danger—Arrival of the Marseillais—Proclamation of the Duke of Brunswick—Petition for the king's deposition—Insurrection of the 10th of August—Attack on the Tuileries—Royal family removed to the Temple—British ambassador recalled—Longwy taken by the Prussians—The massacres of September.....977–981

CHAPTER CLXXXIX.—A.D. 1792 to A.D. 1793.

Opening of the French National Convention—The Prussian army enters France—Battle of Valmy—Retreat of the Prussians—Battle of Jemappes—Opening of the British Parliament—Disposition of the British government—Aggressive decrees of the French Convention—Mr. Pitt's continued desire for non-intervention—Louis XVI. and his family prisoners in the Temple—Louis brought to the bar of the convention—Anxiety for his fate in the British Parliament—Political manœuvres of Lord Loughborough—The Whig party broken up—Lord Loughborough made chancellor—Influence on Mr. Pitt's policy—State of public opinion in England—Trial of Thomas Paine for libel, as the author of "The Rights of Man"—The Alien Bill—Correspondence with Chauvelin—Trial of the King of France—Votes of the convention—Execution of the king—Proceedings of the British Parliament—Note on the dagger-scene in the House of Commons.....981–988

CHAPTER CXC.—A.D. 1785 to A.D. 1793.

Retrospect of Indian affairs from 1785—Lord Cornwallis, Governor-General—Declaratory Bill—War with Tippoo—Retreat of Cornwallis—Capture of Seringapatam—Peace with Tippoo—The French West India Islands—Retrospect of discoveries in the Pacific—Otaheite—New Zealand—New South Wales—Canada—Military and naval establishments of Great Britain—France declares war.....988–991

CHAPTER CXCI.—A.D. 1793.

Resolutions proposed by Mr. Fox against war with France—Commercial distress—Parliamentary reform opposed by Mr. Pitt—Traitorous Correspondence Bill—Pitt, Burke, and Fox—The diversity of their views of England's policy—Sanguine expectations of warlike success—Dumouriez in Holland—Battle of Neerwinden—Defection of Dumouriez—Measures of the Jacobins—Revolutionary tribunal—Committee of Public Salvation—Excessive prices of commodities in Paris—Produced by the depreciation of assignats—Plunder of the shops—Law of maximum—Forced levy of troops—La Vendée in insurrection—Mr. Fox's motion for peace—Insurrection against the Girondin deputies—Their arrest and flight—Assassination of Marat by Charlotte Corday—Note on the French revolutionary calendar.....991–996

CHAPTER CXCII.—A.D. 1793.

Campaign of 1793—Valenciennes and Condé taken by the allies—Mayence surrendered to Prussia—Duke of York besieges Dunkirk—The siege raised—Insurrection at Lyon against the convention—Lyon surrenders to the Republicans—Doom of the city—Toulon—The royalists negotiate with Admiral Lord Hood—The fleet and harbor surrendered to the combined forces—Declaration of the British government—Napoleon Bonaparte—Toulon besieged by Republican armies—Bonaparte's plan for taking Toulon—Evacuation of Toulon—Destruction of the French fleet and arsenals—Energy and atrocities of the Jacobin government—War in La Vendée—The British aid to the Vendeans arrives too late.....996–1001

CHAPTER CXCIII.—A.D. 1794.

The Reign of Terror in France—Sentence upon Muir and Palmer in Scotland—Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act—Trials

PAGE

for high treason of Hardy, Tooke, and Thelwall—Invasion threatened—National defence—State of the navy—Admiral Howe—His naval victory of the 1st of June—French decree of no quarter for Englishmen and Hanoverians—Jacobinism recognizes the Supreme Being—The fall of Robespierre—Rottenness of the coalition against France—Successes of the French—Recall of the Duke of York—Holland lost—Remnant of the British army leaves the Continent—Invasion of Poland by Russia and Prussia—Poland finally enslaved when Kosciusko fell—Corsica—Siege of Bastia.....1001–1007

CHAPTER CXCIV.—A.D. 1794 to A.D. 1796.

Accessions to the ministry—Opening of the session—Mr. Canning—Opposition to the address by Mr. Wilberforce—Acquittal of Warren Hastings—Marriage of the Prince of Wales—Session closed—Expedition to Quiberon—Insurrections in Paris—Revolt of the sections suppressed by Bonaparte—Opening of parliament—Attack upon the king—Coercive policy of the government—Dread of absolutism—Bonaparte chief of the army in Italy—Territorial divisions of Italy—Bonaparte's first Italian campaign—Austrian successes in Germany—Lord Malmesbury negotiates for peace at Paris—Death of Catharine II., Empress of Russia—Retirement of Washington—French fleet in Bantry Bay.....1007–1013

CHAPTER CXCV.—A.D. 1797.

Landing of the French in Pembrokeshire—Commercial distrust—Run upon the banks—Suspension of cash payments by the Bank of England—Extension of the national industry—War with Spain—Battle of St. Vincent—Nelson boards and takes two ships—Discontent in the navy—Mutiny at Spithead—Mutiny at the Nore—Proceedings in parliament—Negotiations at Lisle for peace—Bonaparte's triumphs in Italy—Revolution in Paris of the Eighteenth Fructidor—End of the negotiations at Lisle—The "Anti-Jacobin".....1013–1018

CHAPTER CXCVI.—A.D. 1797 to A.D. 1798.

Preliminaries of Leoben—Transfer of Venice to Austria—Peace of Campo Formio—Victory of Admiral Duncan off Camperdown—Bonaparte arrives in Paris—He is appointed to the command of the Army of England—Projected invasion of England—The scheme postponed—An expedition to Egypt prepared at Toulon—Nelson appointed to command a squadron in the Mediterranean—Seizure of Malta by Bonaparte—Bonaparte lands at Alexandria—Nelson had returned to Sicily—Alexandria taken by assault—Battle of the Pyramids—The French at Cairo—Nelson returns to Alexandria—The battle of the Nile—Rejoicings in England and new hopes—The income-tax first imposed—Volunteers—Ireland.....1018–1023

CHAPTER CXCVII.—A.D. 1783 to A.D. 1800.

Comparative tranquillity of Ireland after 1783—Recall of Lord Fitzwilliam—United Irishmen—Irish Directory—Commencement of the rebellion—Suppression of the rebellion—Marquis Cornwallis lord-lieutenant—Landing of a French force under Humbert—Surrender of the French—Napper Tandy—End of the rebellion—The union proposed—Desire of government for the relief of the Catholics—Debates on the union of the British and Irish parliaments—Lord Castlereagh—Corruption of the Irish Parliament—Grattan returns to his seat in the Irish House of Commons—Articles of the union proposed—Arguments for and against the union—The union completed.....1023–1028

CHAPTER CXCVIII.—A.D. 1799 to A.D. 1800.

India—Lord Mornington, governor-general—Arthur Wellesley—War with Tippoo—Capture of Seringapatam—Bonaparte in Egypt—March to Syria—Jaffa—Siege of Acre—Battle of Aboukir—Bonaparte hears of the defeats of the French—He leaves Egpyt and arrives in Paris—The French Directory—Revolution of the Eighteenth Brumaire—Overthrow of the Directory by Bonaparte—British Expedition to Holland—New constitution in France—Bonaparte first Consul—Bonaparte's letter to the king—Lord Grenville's hostile answer—High price of corn in England—Distress and riots—Attempt to regulate prices—Bonaparte's civil administration—He assumes the state of a sovereign—Italy—Bonaparte takes the command of the army—The campaign—Battle of Marengo—Campaign under Moreau in Germany—Peace of Luneville.....1028–1035

CHAPTER CXCIX.—A.D. 1801 to A.D. 1802.

Commencement of the nineteenth century—Parliament opened—The king's opposition to concessions to the Catholics of Ireland—Resignation of Mr. Pitt—Mr. Addington prime minister—The king again becomes insane—The northern powers form a treaty of armed neutrality—Expedition against Denmark—The naval battle of Copenhagen—Nelson's victory—An armistice concluded—Assassination of the Emperor Paul—Expedition to Egypt—Battle of Alexandria and death of Abercrombie—The French evacuate Egypt—Preliminaries of peace with France—negotiations of Lord Cornwallis at Amiens—Diplomatic disputes and difficulties—The Peace of Amiens concluded—Chronological table of treaties—Population of Great Britain.....1035–1040

CHAPTER CC.—A.D. 1802 to A.D. 1804.

The peace a precarious armistice—demands of Bonaparte—Rush of the English to France—French encroachments—The king's allusion to them in his speech—French expedition to St. Domingo—Toussaint L'Ouverture—Mr. Addington's policy—Bonaparte and Lord Whitworth—Trial of Peltier—Speech of Mackintosh—Despard's conspiracy—Militia called out—Violence of Bonaparte toward the British ambassador—Malta—War declared—Negotiation for Mr. Pitt's return to power—Detention in France of English travellers—Great Britain roused—Preparations for invasion—Emmet's insurrection—Rapid enrolment of volunteers—Bonaparte at Boulogne—Pitt at Walmer—Review of volunteers—Weakness of the Addington ministry—The king's illness—Negotiations for a change of ministry—Pitt presses for an administration on a broad basis—His failure—Pitt pime minister—Conspiracy against the first consul—Murder of the Duc d'Enghien—Abstract of a list of volunteers in 1803.....1040–1047

CHAPTER CCI.—A.D. 1804 to A.D. 1806.

Parties opposed to Mr. Pitt's government—Indications of a new grand alliance—Napoleon and the army at Boulogne—Coronation of Napoleon—His letter to the king—Addington joins the ministry—War with Spain—Charges against Lord Melville—Impeachment—Treaty with Russia—Annexation of Genoa—Nelson's chase after the French and Spanish fleets—Sir Robert Calder's naval action—Napoleon's anxiety at Boulogne—He breaks up the camp—March of Napoleon into Germany—Surrender of the Austrian army at Ulm—Nelson takes the command of the fleet off Cadiz—Victory of Trafalgar—Death of Nelson—His funeral—The French enter Vienna—Battle of Austerlitz—Peace of Presburg—Pitt's failing health—Death of Pitt.....1047–1053

CHAPTER CCII.—A.D. 1799 to A.D. 1806.

India—Attacks in parliament upon Marquis Wellesley—The subsidiary system—The Mahratta chiefs—The Mahratta War—General Lake—General Wellesley—Battle of Assye—End of the campaign—Holkar—Famine in India—Mutiny at Vellore—Administration of Grenville and Fox—Financial measures—Volunteers—Acquittal of Lord Melville—The Princess of Wales—Mr. Fox and the king—Declining health of Mr. Fox—Slave trade—Progress of the cause of abolition—Thomas Clarkson—Negotiations for peace—End of the negotiations—Death of Fox—Confederation of the Rhine—Prussia—Aggressions of Napoleon—Murder of Palm—Joseph Bonaparte, King of Naples—British army in Calabria—Battle of Maida—Capture of Buenos Ayres by Sir Home Popham—Its recapture.....1053–1060

CHAPTER CCIII.—A.D. 1806 to A.D. 1807.

Napoleon takes the field against Prussia—Positions of the Prussian and French armies—Battle of Jena—The French enter Berlin—The new parliament meets—Bill passed for the abolition of the slave trade—Proceedings which resulted in a change of ministry—A great constitutional question—The new administration—Parliament dissolved—Battle of Eylau—Cold encouragement of England to the allies—Expeditions to various points—Whig policy—Expedition to the Dardanelles—Its failure, and that of other Turkish expeditions—Expedition against Buenos Ayres—Its lamentable results—General Whitelock—Meeting of the new parliament—Battle of Friedland—Peace between Russia and France—Treaty of Tilsit—Secret aticles of the treaty become known to the British government—The Danish fleet—Expedition to Copenhagen—Bombardment of Copenhagen—Surrender of the fleet.....1060–1066

CHAPTER CCIV.—A.D. 1808 to A.D. 1809.

Isolation of Great Britain—Hostility of European powers—Bonaparte's continental system—His plans for becoming master of the Peninsula—French invasion of Portugal—The Regent of Portugal flies to the Brazils—Abdication of Charles IV. of Spain—Charles IV. and his son Ferdinand entrapped by Napoleon at Bayonne—Insurrection at Madrid—The Spanish Juntas ask aid from England—Sympathy of the English people—Sir Arthur Wellesley sent with troops to Portugal—Successes of the Spaniards—Zaragoza—Victory of Wellesley at Vimiero—Convention of Cintra—Sir John Moore marches into Spain—Napoleon takes the command of his army in

PAGE

Spain—Moore's retreat—Battle of Corunna—Death of Sir John Moore—Sufferings of his army—National gloom—Charges against the Duke of York—Parliamentary inquiry—The duke resigns—Lord Cochrane's enterprise in Aix Roads—Austria declares war against France—Sir Arthur Wellesley takes the command at Lisbon—Passage of the Douro—Intelligence of important events.....1066–1073

CHAPTER CCV.—A.D. 1809.

The nations of Europe roused to resistance against France—Battle of Eckmuhl—Napoleon retires to the island of Lobau—Insurrection of the Tyrolese—Battle of Wagram—Austria concludes a peace—The Tyrolese subdued—Expedition to the Scheldt—The British land in Walcheren—Flushing bombarded—Its surrender—The marsh fever breaks out—Fatal termination of the expedition—Battle of Talavera—Alarm in England—Disquiet of ministers—Duel between Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning—The jubilee—Question of parliamentary privilege—Committal to the Tower of Sir F. Burdett—Portugal—Lines of Torres Vedras—The campaign of 1810—Almeida—Battle of Busaco—Wellington retires within his lines.....1073–1080

CHAPTER CCVI.—A.D. 1810 to A.D. 1812.

Illness of the king—Interruption to the proceedings in parliament—The Regency Bill passed—The king's ministers continued in office—State of Europe at the commencement of the regency—Wellington and the ministry—The battle of Barrosa—Massena evacuates Portugal—The British army pursues—The battle of Fuentes de Onoro—The battle of Albuera—Restrictions on the prince-regent about to expire—His letter as to his choice of a ministry—The administration not altered—Resignation of the Marquis Wellesley—Character of the regent—Assassination of Mr. Perceval—Attempts to form a cabinet, of which Lord Grey and Lord Grenville should be the heads—The Earl of Liverpool prime minister—Luddism—Repeal of the orders in council—The United States declare war against Great Britain.....1080–1084

CHAPTER CCVII.—A.D. 1812.

Campaign of 1812 in the Peninsula—Siege of Ciudad Rodrigo—Siege of Badajoz—Difficulties of Lord Wellington—Advance into Spain—Battle of Salamanca—Siege of Burgos—Retreat from Burgos—Invasion of Russia—Smolensk and Borodino—Conflagration of Moscow—Retreat of the French—Pursued by the Russians—Continual battles—Horrors of the retreat—Destruction of the French army—Napoleon's flight.....1084–1089

CHAPTER CCVIII.—A.D. 1813 to A.D. 1814.

German spirit—The campaign—Armistice—Battle of Vittoria—Battle of Dresden—Death of Moreau—Battle of Leipzig—Napoleon's retreat—Wellington in the Pyrenees—San Sebastian—The British army in France—Battles of Wellington and Soult—Napoleon prepares for a campaign in France—Battles with Blücher and Schwarzenberg—Paris capitulated to the allies—Toulouse—Abdication of Napoleon—Peace of Paris—Public joy in England—The allied sovereigns—Wellington thanked by parliament—The speaker's harangue....1089–1094

CHAPTER CCIX.—A.D. 1812 to A.D. 1815.

War with the United States—Federal government—States composing the Federal Union—The Democratic party—War declared—Remonstrance of the State of Massachusetts—Popular violence—Extravagant hopes—Taxes—Effects of the war upon American commerce—Cotton—Two invasions of Canada defeated—Employment of Indians by the British—Naval successes of the Americans—Larger build of the American frigates—The single combat of the Shannon and the Chesapeake—Campaigns in Canada—Barbarous system of warfare—American difficulties—Threats of secession by New England States—Prophetic fears of Jefferson—Peninsular troops sent to America—Attack upon Washington—Non-warlike buildings destroyed—Failure of Sir John Prevost at Plattsburg—Armament sent against New Orleans—Sir Edward Pakenham's attack on New Orleans—His defeat and death—Retreat of the British—The war ended by the news of the Peace of Ghent.....1094–1101

CHAPTER CCX.—A.D. 1815.

The hundred days—Landing of Napoleon near Cannes—Retrospect of the restoration of the Bourbons—The charter—The French army—The Treaty of Paris published—The escape of Napoleon from Elba—Declaration of the powers assembled in congress—Advance of Napoleon—He is joined by Labedoyère and Ney—Flight of Louis XVIII.—Napoleon at the Tuileries—British Parliament declares for war—Napoleon

PAGE

organizes his army—Crosses the frontier—Joins his army at Charleroi—Wellington's position—He marches from Brussels—Battle of Ligny—Battle of Quatre Bras—The field of Waterloo—Positions of the two armies on the night of the 17th and morning of the 18th of June—The battle of Waterloo.....1101–1107

CHAPTER CCXI.—A.D. 1815 to A.D. 1816.

Napoleon's return to Paris—His abdication—On board the Bellerophon, at Plymouth—Sails for St. Helena—Specimens of the truth of history—The allies take possession of Paris—Return of Louis XVIII.—Definitive treaty with France—Settlement of Europe previously arranged by the Congress of Vienna—Holy Alliance—Treaty for the abolition of the slave trade—Execution of Labedoyère—Escape of Lavalette—Execution of Ney—The battle of Algiers.....1107–1112

CHAPTER CCXII.—A.D. 1816.

Meeting of parliament—Reception of Lord Castlereagh—Debates on the address—Government defeated on the proposed renewal of the property tax—Marriage of the Princess Charlotte—Unpopularity of the prince-regent—Complaints of agricultural distress—Depression of commerce and manufactures—Causes assigned for the depression of industry—Reduction of the circulating medium—Unfavorable season—Riots and outrages in agricultural districts—Renewal of Luddism—Private benevolence—Progress of legislation for social improvement—Criminal laws—Forgeries of banknotes—Police of London—Gas light—Mendicity and vagrancy—Law of Settlement—General administration of Poor Laws—Inquiry into the state of education—Savings banks—Game Laws.....1113–1120

CHAPTER CCXIII.—A.D. 1816 to A.D. 1817.

Parliamentary reform taken up by the ignorant and uneducated—Extended circulation of the writings of Cobbett—The Hampden clubs—The Spenceans—Orator Hunt and the Spa-Fields meeting—Riot in the city—Meeting of parliament—Outrage on the prince-regent—Secret committees—Habeas Corpus Act suspended, and other stringent measures—The blanket meeting at Manchester—Oliver, the spy—The Derbyshire insurrection—Lord Sidmouth's circular letter—Prosecutions for libel—The three trials of William Hone—The government and the people—Eulogies on Francis Horner in the House of Commons.....1120–1128

CHAPTER CCXIV.—A.D. 1817 to A.D. 1819.

Death of the Princess Charlotte—Illness of the regent—Causes of his gloom and irritation—Opening of parliament—Bill of Indemnity—The petition of Ogden—Mr. Canning—Sir F. Burdett proposes a plan of parliamentary reform—Royal marriages—Parliament dissolved—Death of Sir S. Romilly—Death of Queen Charlotte—Evacuation of France by the allied troops—Meeting of the new parliament—Duke of York the custos of the king—Act for resumption of cash payments—Sir James Mackintosh's motion on the criminal laws—Parliamentary reform—Grampound—Last efforts of Mr. Grattan for Catholic emancipation—Revived agitation for reform—Sir Charles Wolseley—Mr. Hunt—The Manchester massacre, so called—Condemnatory addresses and resolutions—Parliament called together—The Six Acts—Death of the Duke of Kent—Death of George III....1128–1134

CHAPTER CCXV.—A.D. 1784 to A.D. 1820.

English literature in the three latter decades of the reign of George III.—The poets: Cowper, Crabbe, Burns, Darwin, Wordsworth, Southey, Coleridge, Scott, Byron, Shelley, Keats—Narrative character of poetry—Campbell, Rogers, Leigh Hunt, Moore—Crabbe's latter delineations of manners—More evangelical spirit in the body of the people—Theological literature—Writers for the stage—The novelists: Godwin, Holcroft, Dr. Moore, Burney, Scott: the Waverley Novels—The "Edinburgh Review"—The "Quarterly Review"—"Blackwood's Magazine"—Essayists: Wilson, Lamb, Hazlitt, Leigh Hunt, De Quincey—Political economists—Scientific discovery: Herschel, Davy, Dalton, Wollaston—Travellers—Two great mechanical inventions of the steamboat and the printing-machine—Chronological table of British writers.....1134–1141

CHAPTER CCXVI.—A.D. 1784 to A.D. 1820.

State of the Fine arts to the close of the regency—Architecture: imitation of Greek models—St. Pancras Church—Wyatt and Gothic restorations—Soane—Bank of England—Holland—Smirke—Wilkins—Nash—Regent Street and Regent's Park—Churches—Bridges—Telford—Rennie—Waterloo bridge—Sculpture: Banks, Bacon, Flaxman, Chantrey, Westmacott—The Townley, Phigaleian, and Elgin marbles—British In-

PAGE

stitution — Dulwich Gallery — Painting: West, Copley, Fuseli, Haydon, Lawrence, Wilkie, Turner: his early popularity—Painting in water-colors—Engraving—Line engravers —Wood engraving—Bewick—Lithography.....1142–1148

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820.

List of the king's ministers.....1148

CHAPTER CCXVII.—A.D. 1820.

Meeting of parliament on the demise of George III.—Prorogation and dissolution—The Cato Street conspiracy—Debate on the subject of Queen Caroline—Differences between the king and the cabinet regarding the queen—The ministerial propositions finally agreed to—Opening of the new parliament—Preparations for the coronation—The queen expected—Her arrival—Green bag containing papers laid before parliament —Adjournment—Conferences for averting a public proceeding—Failure of the negotiation—The Bill of Pains and Penalties—Scenes in the streets—Scenes in the House of Lords —The third reading of the bill carried by a small majority —The bill finally abandoned—Joy of the country—Prorogation—Discussions in the next session on the subject of the queen—the coronation of the king—The queen vainly endeavors to be present—Her death and funeral.....1148–1154

CHAPTER CCXVIII.—A.D. 1821 to A.D. 1826.

Death of Napoleon Bonaparte—Parliamentary strictures on the measures adopted for his secure detention—Circular of the congress at Laybach—Parliament—Irish outrages—Agricultural distress—New corn law—The king's visit to Scotland—Death of Lord Londonderry—His foreign administration—Mr. Canning secretary for foreign affairs—His instructions to the Duke of Wellington, and his mission to Verona —French invasion of Spain—Mr. Canning's remonstrances —The Spanish American separated states—Consuls appointed —Opposition to Mr. Canning's decree to recognize their independence—Their recognition by the conclusion of commercial treaties — Circumstances which give to a neutral power the right of recognizing states which have effectually asserted their independence—Discussions with the minister of the United States of North America—Spanish aggression upon Portugal—Promptitude in sending troops for her defence—Important changes in our commercial policy—Mr. Huskisson and his defamers—The transfer of England to "the camp of progress and liberty"—The present and the past.....1154–1161

CHAPTER CCXIX.—A.D. 1823 to A.D. 1827.

Negro slavery and the West Indies—The missionary case—Opening of parliament, 1825—Public prosperity—Joint-stock companies—Mining schemes—The panic in the money-market—The panic arrested—Extensive failures of commercial houses—Joint-stock banks established—State of the Catholic question—Death of the Duke of York—Illness of Lord Liverpool—Negotiations previous to the choice of a minister—Mr. Canning's administration—Violent opposition to Mr. Canning in both houses—Charge against the prime minister that he had given an unconstitutional pledge to the king on the subject of Catholic emancipation—Close of the session—Death of Mr. Canning—His last ministerial act, the conclusion of a treaty on the affairs of Greece—Principles of international law laid down by Mr. Canning—List of the cabinet of Mr. Canning—Note on the negotiations which preceded Mr. Canning's premiership.....1161–1168

CHAPTER CCXX. A.D. 1807 to A.D. 1826.

India—Retrospect from 1807 to 1826—Lord Minto governor-general—Mutiny of officers at Madras—Successes in the Eastern Archipelago—Trade of India thrown open—Government of the Marquess of Hastings—War with Nepaul—War with the Pindarees—The war terminated, and the Mahratta confederacy broken up—Conquest of Ceylon—Singapore—Malacca—Lord Amherst governor-general—War with the Birman Empire—Campaign of Sir Archibald Campbell—Peace with the Birmese—Bombardment and capture of Bhurtpore—Regulation of the press in India—The case of Mr. Buckingham—Material progress of British India..1168–1172

CHAPTER CCXXI.—A.D. 1827 to A.D. 1830.

Administration of Lord Goderich—Turkey and Greece—The battle of Navarino—Resignation of Lord Goderich—Administration of the Duke of Wellington—Parliament—The schoolmaster abroad—Progress of education—Mr. Brougham's speech on law reform—The new metropolitan police—Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts—Mr. Huskisson's retirement from the ministry—Ireland—Election for Clare of Mr. O'Connell—Ministerial views on Catholic emancipation—Opening of parliament—Emancipation referred to in

PAGE

the king's speech—The Catholic Relief Bill moved by the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel—Continued and violent debates—The Catholic Relief Bill passed—Mr. O'Connell's second return for Clare—Meeting of parliament—Motions for reform—Illness and death of George the Fourth...1172–1179

CHAPTER CCXXII.—A.D. 1830.

Oath of allegiance taken by Peers and Commoners—Business of parliament commenced—Unmeasured language in the House of Commons—Motion for a regency in the event of the king's demise—France—Retrospect of government in the reign of Charles X.—Prince Polignac appointed president of the council—Sudden prorogation of the chambers—Algiers—The royal ordinances promulgated—The three days of July —Duke of Orleans, lieutenant-general of the kingdom—Abdication of Charles X.—Duke of Orleans king—Recognition by England of the new government of France—Revolution of Belgium—The opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway—Early opposition to the railway system—The locomotive engine—George Stephenson—His son Robert—Anticipations of the triumphs of railways—Death of Mr. Huskisson—Opening of parliament—Declaration of the Duke of Wellington—The king's visit to the city postponed—Defeat of ministers on the civil list —They resign—Mr. Brougham's parliamentary position—Administration of Earl Grey completed—List of the ministry—Contemporary sovereigns and rulers, 1815–1837—Population of the United Kingdom.....1179–1187

CHAPTER CCXXIII.—A.D. 1831.

Reassembling of parliament—Reform Bill prepared by the cabinet—Lord John Russell introduces the Reform Bill—Wonder and alarm at its contemplated provisions—Fears of the aristocracy—The debates on the first reading—The debates on the second reading—Defeat of the ministry in committee —Lord Grey and Lord Brougham urge the king to dissolve parliament—The dissolution and general election—The Reform Bill carried—The bill in committee—It is passed—The bill in the House of Lords—The bill rejected upon the second reading—Resolutions of the House of Commons—Parliament prorogued.....1187–1193

CHAPTER CCXXIV.—A.D. 1831 to A.D. 1832.

Intense excitement during the prorogation—Dangers from popular ignorance—Incendiary fires and machine-breaking—The Derby, Nottingham, and Bristol riots—Destruction of property at Bristol—The cholera approaching—Cowardly alarmists—Central board of health formed—Parliament—New Reform Bill passed by the Commons—The bill in the Lords read a second time—Political unions—The Lords' committee, and the majority against ministers—The king refuses to create peers—The ministry resign—The Duke of Wellington attempts to form a government—The negotiations fail—The Reform ministry returns to power—The king's consent to a creation of peers given, but not exercised—Final passing of the Reform Bill.....1193–1198

CHAPTER CCXXV.—A.D. 1832 to A.D. 1833.

Dissolution of parliament—Proceedings for elections under the Reform Act—Effect of changes in the system of representation — Condition of the nomination boroughs — Electoral changes in close corporations—The new representation—Metropolitan boroughs—Manufacturing towns—Scotland—Ireland—Approaching meeting of the Reformed Parliament —Fears of anti-reformers—Extension of popular literature during the crisis—Parliamentary representation of the United Kingdom before the Reform Acts of 1832.....1198–1202

CHAPTER CCXXVI.—A.D. 1833.

Opening of the new parliament—Election of the speaker—The king's speech—Mr. O'Connell's amendment—Declaration of Sir Robert Peel—Coercion Bill for Ireland passed by the Lords—Public health—Observance of the Sabbath—Coercion Bill in the House of Commons—The Coercion Bill passed—Financial measures—Cobbett's motion against Sir Robert Peel—Bill for the reform of the Irish Church—Abolition of slavery in the British colonies—Effects of the abolition—Limitation of labor in factories—Bank charter—East India Company's charter—Prorogation—The ballot...1202–1209

CHAPTER CCXXVII.—A.D. 1834.

Poor Law Amendment Act—Commission for preliminary inquiry —Commissioners report striking instances of parochial reform at Cookham and Southwell—State of the southern agricultural counties—Of the manufacturing districts—Violent opposition to the measure—The bill passed—Debate on the repeal of the union with Ireland—Irish Church—Resignation of Mr. Stanley and three of his colleagues—Resigna-

PAGE

tion of Lord Grey—The Melbourne administration—The budget—Prorogation—The Grey banquet at Edinburgh—The houses of parliament destroyed by fire.....1209–1214

CHAPTER CCXXVIII.—A.D. 1834 to A.D. 1835.

e king's dismissal of the Melbourne ministry—Sir Robert Peel's narrative of his appointment to the premiership—The Peel administration formed—Parliament dissolved—The Tamworth manifesto—Strong parliamentary opposition—Mr. Abercrombie elected speaker—London University charter—Irish Church—Repeated defeats of ministers—Resignation of Sir Robert Peel—Lord Melbourne's new ministry—Exclusion of Lord Brougham—His resolutions on the subject of education—Reform of municipal corporations—Report of the commission of inquiry—Conflict between the two houses—The bill passed—Departing glories of municipal pomp.....1214–1219

CHAPTER CCXXIX.—A.D. 1836 to A.D. 1837.

liament: session of 1836—Opposition of the Lords to the Irish Corporations Bill—Lord Lyndhurst—Alleged Lichfield House Compact—Tithe Commutation Act—Act for allowing counsel to prisoners—Act for regulation of prisons and for appointing inspectors—General Registration Act—Reduction of stamp on newspapers—Reduction of paper duty—Foreign politics—Belgium—Spain—France—Conspiracies against Louis Philippe—Enterprise of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte at Strasbourg—Parliament—Illness of King William IV.—His death—His character—Accession of Queen Victoria—Ministry at her majesty's accession—Table of treaties—Table of national debt.....1219–1225

CHAPTER CCXXX.—*circa* A.D. 1837.

cial condition of Great Britain at the period of the accession of Queen Victoria—Occupations of the people—Growth of cities and towns—London—Increase of houses—Supply of food—Improved means of communication affecting that supply—Cheapening of the necessaries of life—Conveyance of mails by railway—Limited postal accommodation—Public health—Inquiry into the sanitary condition of the laboring classes—Exposure of the unfitness of many dwellings for healthful occupation—Workrooms without ventilation, such as those of tailors and milliners—Public arrangements influencing the sanitary condition of the laboring population—Neglect and ignorance universal—Want of drainage—Inadequate water supply for the preservation of cleanliness—Public baths and wash-houses unknown—Interments within the precincts of large towns—Public walks not provided—State of the factories—Number of workers in textile manufactures—Beginnings of improvement—Mining population—Employment of children and women in mines—Agricultural laborers—Operation of the new poor-law—Neglect of the laborers by the richer classes—Miserable cottage accommodation—Dorsetshire laborers—Field employment of women and children—Constabulary report—Crime in England and Wales—Juvenile delinquency—General state of education—First aid of the state to voluntary exertions—Increase of schools and scholars—Limited ability to read and write among the adult population—General aspects of English society.....1225–1232

CHAPTER CCXXXI.—A.D. 1837 to A.D. 1839.

paration of Hanover from Great Britain—Departure of the King of Hanover—The queen meets the parliament—Dissolution—Ministry at the queen's accession—The new parliament—Canada—Insurrection in Canada—Lord Durham appointed lord high commissioner—Resigns his office—His report—Coronation of the queen—Prorogation—Review of the session—Canterbury fanatics—Career of John Thom—Proclaims himself the Messiah at Boughton—The three days' march of his deluded followers—Neglect of education in the district—The tragedy of Bosenden wood—Meeting of parliament—Chartism—Condition of the laboring classes—Jamaica—Resignation of the ministry—Failure in the attempt to form a new administration—The bedchamber question—Disloyal Tories—Chartist riots—Insurrection at Newport—John Frost and others tried for high treason....1232–1239

CHAPTER CCXXXII.—A.D. 1840 to A.D. 1841.

ne system of p nny postage first comes into operation—Mr. Rowland Hill—Opposition to the proposed change—Postage stamps—Marriage of the queen to Prince Albert of Saxe Coburg—Privilege of parliament—Stockdale *v.* Hansard—Attempt upon the queen's life—Prorogation—Affairs of the Levant—Treaty of alliance—Exclusion of France—Prince Napoleon lands near Boulogne—Failure of his attempt to produce an insurrection—Differences of England and France on the affairs of the East—War threatened—M. Thiers and

PAGE

Lord Palmerston—Naval successes against Mehemet Ali—Interment at Paris of the remains of Napoleon—Session of parliament—The Anti-Corn Law League—Declarations of the ministry on questions of free-trade—Debates on the sugar duties—Ministers defeated on the question of the sugar duties—Meeting of the new parliament—Amendment to the address carried—Resignation of ministers—The ministry as formed by Sir Robert Peel.....1239–1245

CHAPTER CCXXXIII.—A.D. 1840 to A.D. 1842.

War with China and war with Afghanistan—Commercial relations with China—Beginning of the opium war—Its moral aspects—Debates in parliament—Chusan captured—Treaty made at Canton repudiated by the emperor—Canton attacked—Arrival of Sir H. Pottinger—Capture of Chin-Kiang-Foo—Treaty of Nanking—Afghanistan—Lord Auckland governor-general of India—Causes of the Afghan war—British army crosses the Indus—The Bolan Pass—Siege of Ghuznee—Cabul entered in triumph—Shah Soojah restored—False security at Cabul—Afghan plots—Massacre of Burnes—The British army in peril—Massacre of M'Naghten—Capitulation of the British—The retreat from Cabul—Ladies and children given up—Destruction of the army—One survivor arrives at Jellalabad—Sale's defence of Jallalabad—Arrival of General Pollock—Cabul retaken—Release of the prisoners—The army returns to India—Lord Ellenborough's proclamations—Gates of Somnauth.....1245–1252

CHAPTER CCXXXIV.—A.D. 1842.

Continuation of the previous notices of English literature—Law of copyright—Mr. Sergeant Talfourd's long struggle to amend the law—Mr. Carlyle's petition—Sergeant Talfourd's bill rejected—Lord Mahon's bill—Mr. Macaulay's amendments—Application of the act to copyrights about to expire—Authors recently deceased—Novelists—Theodore Hook and the silver-fork school—Ephemeral critics and writers without knowledge—Utilitarianism—Changes in the character of literature—Historians: Macaulay, Hallam, Carlyle, Lingard, Fraser Tytler, Palgrave, Kemble, Forster, Mahon, Napier, Mitford, Thirlwall, Grote, Arnold—Novelists: Bulwer Lytton, Dickens, Ainsworth, Thackeray—Serials—Prevalence of fiction—Kitchen literature—Miss Martineau's tales illustrative of political economy—Social aims of novelists—Dickens—Mrs. Gaskell—Kingsley—Thackeray's novels—Poets: Tennyson, Browning, E. Barrett Browning, Thomas Hood—Union of pen and pencil—Theology—Milman—Robertson—Political economy—Science—Criticism—Antiquarian inquiry—Travels—Book trade—Newspapers—Note on the classes of books published, 1816 to 1851—Chronological table of British writers.....1252–1261

CHAPTER CCXXXV.—A.D. 1842 to A.D. 1843.

Sir Robert Peel prime minister—Commercial distress—Birth of the Prince of Wales—Agitation against the corn-laws—Sir Robert Peel's bill for a sliding scale—Lord John Russell's proposal of a fixed duty—Income tax renewed—Reduction of the tariff—Petition for the people's charter—Assaults on the queen—Parliament prorogued—Relations with France—Treaty of Washington: Boundary question—Disturbances in the manufacturing districts—Opening the parliament, 1843—Debate on the depression of manufactures—Mr. Cobden and Sir Robert Peel—Corn-law debate—Mr. Charles Buller's speech on systematic colonization—Monster meetings for the repeal of the union—Arrest of O'Connell—The Scotch Church: Secession of ministers to constitute the Free Church—New district churches in England—The Rebecca riots—Suppression of the disturbances in Wales....1261–1266

CHAPTER CCXXXVI.—A.D. 1843 to A.D. 1845.

General Sir Charles Napier—War in Scinde—Destruction of Emaun Ghur—Battle of Meanee—Annexation of Scinde—Napier the beneficent administrator—Gwalior—Recall of Lord Ellenborough—Trial of O'Connell—Debates on corn-laws—The session of 1844—Position of Sir Robert Peel—Renewal of the bank charter—Regulation of labor in factories—Lord Ashley's ten hours' clause rejected—Debates on sugar duties—Opening letters by the secretary of state—Reports of committees—Lady Hewlet's bequest—O'Connell's sentence reversed by the House of Lords—Difference with France on the treatment of the British consul at Tahiti—Visit of King Louis Philippe to the queen—Prince de Joinville's pamphlet on the naval forces of France.....1266–1272

CHAPTER CCXXXVII.—A.D. 1845 to A.D. 1846.

Parliament opened—Improved state of the kingdom—Sir Robert Peel's new tariff—Opposition of the country party—Mr. Cobden's motion for inquiring into agricultural distress—

PAGE

Grant to Maynooth College—Queen's colleges in Ireland—Jews admitted to municipal offices—Prorogation—Apprehended failure of the potato crop in Ireland—Proposal of Sir Robert Peel to the cabinet—Lord John Russell's letter to the electors of London—Dissensions in the cabinet—Sir Robert Peel resigns—Failure of Lord John Russell to form a ministry—Sir R. Peel resumes power—Parliament opened by the queen—Sir R. Peel asserts his determination to be unshackled as minister—The new tariff and the corn-law bill introduced by Sir R. Peel—Debate of twelve nights in the Commons—The bill passed in both houses—Bill for the protection of life in Ireland rejected by a majority against the government—Resignation of Sir R. Peel—The Russell administration—The Oregon question settled—History of the controversy—British Columbia—India—War with the Sikhs—Battle of Moodkee—Sir Henry Hardinge and Sir Hugh Gough—Battle of Ferozeshah—Battles of Alliwall and Sobraon—Treaty of peace—Lord John Russell's ministry..... 1272–1281

CHAPTER CCXXXVIII.— A.D. 1846 to A.D. 1848.

The great Irish famine—The potato rot of 1845 and 1846—Modes of relief adopted by the government—Mr. O'Connell's call upon England for help—His death—Munificent subscriptions—Irish landlords and cottier tenants—Navigation laws suspended—Ten Hours' Factory Bill—Abundant harvest in England—Monetary pressure and panic—Excitement on the subject of national defences—The Duke of Wellington's letter—Proposed increase of the income tax—The House of Commons on the night of the 24th of February—News of the abdication of Louis Philippe—Real causes of the overthrow of the French monarchy—The revolution of 1848—Provisional government appointed—Chartism in England revived by the socialist revolution—The 10th of April—Preparations of the government—Physical-force Chartism at an end—The attempt at insurrection in Ireland—The French Republic established in bloodshed—Paris in a state of siege—Prince Louis Napoleon, president—Convulsions of the continent—Progress of improvement in England—The Public Health Bill—The impulse to social amelioration given by Prince Albert—Free-trade banquet at Manchester to celebrate the final extinction of the corn-laws—Meeting of parliament the next day—Tranquillity and loyalty of England contrasted in the royal speech with the condition of the continental kingdoms..... 1281–1287

POSTSCRIPT..... 1287

TABLES.

Contemporary sovereigns and rulers..... 1308–11
Population of the United Kingdom, 1700–1861..... 1316–18
Occupations of the people, 1851..... 1326
Census of religious worship, 1851..... 1319
Census of education, 1851..... 1320
Public income and expenditure, 1815–1850..... 1320
Commerce..... 1318

APPENDIX.

Annals, 1849..... 1288
" 1850..... 1289
" 1851..... 1290
" 1852..... 1291
" 1853..... 1292
" 1854..... 1293
" 1855..... 1293
" 1856..... 1294
" 1857..... 1295
" 1858..... 1296
" 1859..... 1297
" 1860..... 1297
" 1861..... 1298
" 1862..... 1299
" 1863..... 1300
" 1864..... 1301
" 1865..... 1303
" 1866..... 1304
" 1867..... 1306

INDEX to Vols. I. to VIII..... 1327

STANDARD SERIES.
I. K. Funk & Co., New York.

KNIGHT'S POPULAR HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

A HISTORY OF SOCIETY AND GOVERNMENT FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO OUR OWN TIMES.

By CHARLES KNIGHT.

VOLUME V.

CHAPTER CXXIV.

Close of the first session of the English parliament—The Irish parliament—Second session of the English parliament—The Bill of Rights—The Princess Anne—Whig and Tory factions—Parliament dissolved—State of the army in Ireland—Abuses in government departments—Opening of the new parliament—Corruption—Jealousy in settling the revenue—Act of Recognition—Act of Grace—William goes to Ireland—Landing and march of William—The Boyne—William slightly wounded—Battle of the Boyne—Flight of James—His speech at Dublin—Naval defeat at Beachy Head—Energetic conduct of the queen.

The proceedings of the English parliament, from the period when the Commons went up to the king with an address, declaring that they would support him in a war with France, to the adjournment in August, are no doubt interesting when presented with characteristic details, but are scarcely important enough to be related with minuteness in a general history. Less important is it to trace the factious disputes in which so many angry passions and so many petty jealousies were called forth during the three or four latter months of the session. It is satisfactory to know that the attainders of William Lord Russell, of Algernon Sidney, of Alice Lisle, and of Alderman Cornish, were reversed. It is not so satisfactory to trace the revival of past animosities in the discussions upon the sentence of Titus Oates, who brought that sentence before the House of Lords by a writ of error. A majority of Peers affirmed the judgment; but in the lower house a bill annulling the sentence was brought in. The majority of the Lords looked at the infamous character of Oates. In the Commons the supporters of the bill for annulling the sentence looked to the illegality of the judgment. The difference between the two houses was compromised. Oates was released from confinement, having received a pardon, and the Commons moved an address to the crown that he should be allowed a small pension for his support. In the case of Samuel Johnson, the Commons voted that his degradation from ecclesiastical functions was illegal, and the king was asked to bestow some preferment on him. William more wisely gave him a thousand pounds and a pension.

During this session an act was passed by which any Protestant clergyman of Ireland who had been forced to leave that kingdom, "for fear of the Irish rebels," should not be deprived of an Irish benefice by accepting ecclesiastical preferment in England.* Before the landing of James at Kinsale many Protestants had fled to England, in the dread of a repetition of the frightful atrocities of 1641. Many of these refugees were aided by a public subscription, and some of the clergy were appointed to lectureships and small livings.† The miseries produced "by fear of the Irish rebels" were small compared with the tyrannous proceedings of the parliament which King James opened in Dublin on the 7th of May. Of two hundred and fifty members of the Irish House of Commons only six were Protestants. James told the parliament in opening the session that he had always been for liberty of conscience, and against invading the property of any man. The next day he issued a proclamation, in which he says that, since his arrival in his kingdom of Ireland, he had made it his chief concern to satisfy his Protestant subjects "that the defence of their religion, privileges, and properties is equally our care with the recovery of our rights." It has been alleged, as an excuse for James in furnishing a very speedy proof of the futility of such professions, that he could not control the violent spirit of his parliament. They passed an Act of Toleration on one day; they passed an Act of Confiscation on the next. The one act consisted of unmeaning professions; the other transferred all the lands held by Protestants under old Acts of Settlement to their ancient proprietors before the rebellion of 1641. Another act transferred the tithe, for the most part, from the Protestant to the Roman Catholic clergy, without compensation. But the iniquity of the act which deprived the holders of property for nearly forty years, whether acquired by grant, purchase, or mortgage, was small when compared with the Act of Attainder, by which two thousand six hundred persons were declared traitors, and adjudged to suffer the pains of death and forfeiture. "The severity of this act exceeded even that of the famous proscription at Rome during the last Triumvirate."* The Act of Attainder affected the real estates of absentees thus declared to be traitors. Another act vested in the king all their goods and chattels, debts, and arrears of rent. The spirit of the parliament was universally carried out. The arms of all Protestants were seized, whatever their political opinions. The Protestant clergy, mostly preachers of divine right, were insulted and unprotected. The fellows and scholars of the University of Dublin were thrust out of their halls and chambers, and their property seized, the sole condition of their personal liberty being that no three of them should meet together, "on pain of death." This was the ready phrase of terror applicable under all circumstances. The king, with the example before him of iniquities long faded away, issued a coinage of brass money which was to pass as sixpences, shillings, and half-crowns. "Eight half-crowns of this money were not intrinsically worth twopence.'† The tradesmen of Dublin, if they refused the money, were threatened to be hanged by the provost-marshal. The government of King James, that was looking forward to the day when England and Scotland should come under the same merciful rule, decreed, by proclamation in the name of the king, that no covetous person should give by exchange of the currency, intolerable rates for gold and silver to the great disparagement of the brass and copper money, under pain of death.

Such, when King William met his parliament on the 19th of October, were the manifestations of what might be expected from the blessed rule of King James, should he be restored in England. It is recorded of William that, on the day before, he met the council, and produced a draft of his speech written by himself in French, when he thus expressed himself: "I know most of my predecessors were used to commit the drawing of such speeches to their ministers, who generally had their private aims and interests in view; to prevent which, I have thought fit to write it myself in French, because I am not so great a master of the English tongue: therefore, I desire you to look it over, and change what you may find amiss, that it may be translated into English." This was not complimentary to the king's ministers, nor accordant with our modern notions of ministerial responsibility. Yet it was an honest endeavor of William's commonsense not to be misunderstood. He said that it was a misfortune that, at the beginning of his reign, he should have to ask such large

* 1 Gul. & Mar. c. 29.
† See Journal of the very Rev. Rowland Davies, 1857.

* Harris's "Life of William III.," p. 231. † Ibid.

supplies for carrying on the wars upon which he had entered with their advice. He had not engaged in these out of a vain ambition, but from the necessity of opposing those who had so visibly discovered their designs of destroying the liberties and religion of the nation. He asked that there should be no delay in determining what should be the supply for the charges of the war, because there was to be a meeting at the Hague of all the princes and states who were engaged against France, and his own resolutions would be determined by the means at his command. This was honest language, which the Commons seconded by a vote that they would stand by the king in the reduction of Ireland and in a vigorous prosecution of the war with France. Yet there is nothing more painful to one who looks back upon the history of his country, with an earnest desire to think the best of her public men, than to trace, amid the bitter contests of factions, the slight predominance of the patriotic spirit. The second session of the Convention Parliament is a melancholy exhibition of party intrigues for power, of rivalries that were to be made enduring by mean revenges, of desperate attempts to revive the indiscriminate hatreds of the past in a frequent disregard of the necessities of the present—hateful contests, that made William seriously purpose to throw up the government, and remove himself from a scene where he was unable to make men understand that there was a duty to their country which ought to outweigh all selfish desires.

The work for which this session of parliament is to be chiefly remembered in after time was the passing of the Bill of Rights. This celebrated measure was the reduction to a statute of the Declaration of Rights.* Some important provisions were introduced. It was enacted, to prevent the kingdom being governed by a papist, that the sovereign should, in parliament and at the coronation adopt by repetition and subscription the declaration against transubstantiation. It was also enacted that if the sovereign should marry a papist the subject should be absolved from allegiance. The dispensing power of the crown—the cause of so many fierce conflicts—was absolutely taken away.† The parliament in this session left few other records of considerate legislation. They went wildly to work with impeachments. They impeached the Earl of Peterborough and the Earl of Salisbury for departing from their allegiance and being reconciled to the Church of Rome. They impeached the Earl of Castlemaine under a charge of trying to reconcile the kingdom to the Church of Rome. They raked up the accusations against those who had been accessory to the convictions of Russell and Sidney, chiefly in the hope to fasten some charge upon Halifax, who had retired from office. They carried their political hatreds so far back into the region of history as to accept a statement that "Major-General Ludlow is come into England, and is in town; and that his old accomplices do comfort, aid, and abet him;" and thereupon they carried an address that the king would issue a proclamation for apprehending General Ludlow, who stood attainted of high treason for the murder of Charles I. Old Colonel Birch, who asked for evidence of Ludlow being in London, made a sly allusion to the contrast between the present and the past: "I am in a new periwig, and pray let the house look upon me."‡ The men of the new periwigs seemed anxious that the passions of the old love-locks should never be forgotten. Ludlow returned to his asylum at Vevay; to wonder, perhaps, what sort of revolution was that of 1688, which had thus repudiated what it owed to the Puritans who had made the Bill of Rights a practicable thing.

Among the annoyances to which William and Mary were subjected by party intrigues, there were none, probably, more personally distasteful than the misunderstandings which arose out of the position of the Princess Anne. Upon her marriage with Prince George of Denmark she had a settlement of £20,000 a year. From the circumstance of Anne being the presumptive heir of the crown, it was not unnatural that she should desire a larger revenue. From the peculiarities of her character she was necessarily a fit subject for intriguing politicians to work upon. Sarah Churchill, afterward Duchess of Marlborough, had over her the most unbounded influence. The attachment of Mrs. Morley (Anne) to her dear Mrs. Freeman (Sarah)—or rather the dependence of a weak nature upon an imperious one—had an influence of long duration upon the politics of England. The correspondence of the princess and the lady of the bedchamber, under their fictitious names, would lead to the belief that real friendship was not incompatible with a court atmosphere if we did not see beneath this seeming affection the schemes of one of the most cunning and domineering of her sex. The Tories, who looked to Anne, in 1689, as one to be propitiated, had been moved to apply to parliament for a large increase of her income. Sarah tells the story herself: "Her majesty, when some steps were made in parliament toward settling a revenue on the prince and princess, taking her sister one night to task for it, she asked her, What was the meaning of these proceedings? To which the princess answered, She heard her friends had a mind to make her some settlement. The queen hastily replied, with a very imperious air, 'Pray, what friends have you but the king and me?'" The lady goes on to state how she urged the princess to persist in applying to parliament instead of depending upon the king; how Shrewsbury (she erroneously calls him "duke") came to her from the king, "who promised to give the princess £50,000 if she would desist from soliciting the settlement by parliament;" and how she, the dictatress of the princess, insinuated a doubt whether the king would keep his word; upon which the princess herself told Shrewsbury, "that she could not think herself in the wrong to desire a security for what was to support her."* The friends who had a mind to make the princess some settlement went too far. They asked for £70,000 a year, which the house would not grant; and, finally, Anne received the £50,000 which Shrewsbury was authorized to offer.

The politics of the palace were passing annoyances from the troublesome movements of a faction rather than permanent causes of uneasiness to the king. The Whigs, to whom he in a great degree owed his crown, had manifested a violence toward their political opponents that rendered it impossible that he could wear that crown in tranquillity. They sought to obtain a considerable increase of power, by a bold manœuvre which would materially strengthen them in a new parliament. Without any attempt to legislate in the spirit of party, a bill had been read twice for restoring the corporations which had surrendered their charters at the mandates of Charles II. and James II. There was a thin attendance in the house, for it was the holiday time of Christmas. But the Whigs by concert mustered in force, and engrafted upon the bill two clauses disqualifying for municipal office every person who had been instrumental in surrendering the charter of a borough. The term proposed for the duration of this disqualification was seven years. A large proportion of the parliamentary franchise was in the hands of corporations. The clause would have the effect of removing Tory electors and substituting Whig electors. This attempt at a surprise was finally defeated. The gross injustice of the clauses—their spirit of vindictiveness—produced a disgust in which the king participated as much as any man. Absent members rushed to London from every district, and the clauses were at length rejected. The Tories, now triumphant, tried to carry the bill of indemnity for political offences, which had been laid aside in the last session. So many exceptions to the measure of amnesty were introduced by the opposite faction that it became a measure of proscription. William was worn out by these contests. According to Balcarres he told the Duke of Hamilton "that he wished he were a thousand miles from England, and that he had never been king of it."† Burnet gives a circumstantial relation of the effect of these manifestations upon a mind so usually calm and imperturbable. "He was once very near a desperate resolution; he thought he could not trust the Tories, and he resolved he would not trust the Whigs; so he fancied the Tories would be true to the queen, and confide in her, though they would not in him. He therefore resolved to go over to Holland, and leave the government in the queen's hands: so he called the Marquis of Carmarthen, with the Earl of Shrewsbury and some few more, and told them he had a convoy ready, and was resolved to leave all in the queen's hands; since he did not see how he could extricate himself out of the difficulties into which the animosities of parties had brought him: they pressed him vehemently to lay aside all such desperate resolutions, and to comply with the present necessity. Much passion appeared among them: the debate was so warm that many tears were shed;

* See *ante*, vol. iv. p. 599. † 1 Gul. & Mar., Sess. 2, c. 2.
‡ "Parliamentary History," vol. v. col. 414.

* "Authentick Memoirs of the Life of the Duchess of Marlborough," p. 89. † Ralph, vol. ii., note at p. 186.

in conclusion, the king resolved to change his first design into another better resolution, of going over in person to put an end to the war in Ireland."* This last resolution came to be known, and it was determined by the Whigs to oppose it, as a step inconsistent with the health and safety of the king. William took a decisive course. He went to parliament on the 27th of January, determined to prevent any address that should interfere with his purpose. In his speech from the throne he said, "It is a very sensible affliction to me to see my good people burdened with heavy taxes; but since the speedy recovery of Ireland is, in my opinion, the only means to ease them, and to preserve the peace and honor of the nation, I am resolved to go thither in person, and, with the blessing of God Almighty, endeavor to reduce that kingdom, that it may no longer be a charge to this." The parliament was then prorogued, and, two days after, dissolved.

"There was fierce and great carousing about being elected in the new parliament." Thus writes Evelyn on the 16th of February. "There was a great struggle all England over in elections," says Burnet; "but the Corporation Bill did so highly provoke all those whom it was to have disgraced that the Tories were by far the greater number in the new parliament." A year had passed in which the foundations of civil and religious liberty had been widened and strengthened; but the constitutional legislation of the Convention Parliament was not likely to excite much popular enthusiasm. The people were heavily taxed to carry on the war. On the continent no effectual resistance had been offered to the ambition of France, and in Ireland James was dictator, at the head of a large military force. A prince with the highest reputation for courage and sagacity had come to be king over England; and yet her navy had been defeated in an encounter with the French; and the army which had gone to Ireland under Marshal Schomberg had done nothing, and was perishing in its inaction. At the dinner-table of the most influential minister, Carmarthen, "a very considerate and sober commander, going for Ireland, related to us the exceeding neglect of the English soldiers, suffering severely for want of clothes and necessaries this winter, exceedingly magnifying their courage and bravery during all their hardships."† Meagre as are the reports of debates in parliament, we may trace, in 1689, complaints of departmental neglect very similar to those which were so loudly outspoken in 1855. Mr. Waller gave an account at the bar of the House of Commons of the state of the army in Ireland. The baggage-horses were left behind at Chester; for profit was made by putting them to grass. The sickness by which Schomberg's forces were terribly reduced he imputed to the great defect of clothing; "all that were well clothed were in health." He contrasted the care bestowed upon a Dutch regiment in camp with the neglect of the English: "Their officers looked upon their soldiers as their children, and would see them make their huts, pave them, and lay fresh straw; in the whole Dutch camp scarce two died." Surgeons' medicines were very ill provided: "It was reported they had 1700*l.* worth of medicines, but I know not where they were." In that rainy season "the foreigners were warmer clothed than our own men, in great coats over their close coats; of which the English had none." Lastly, the troops "were not well furnished with shoes: some came late—they were not consigned to anybody."‡ The Commons naturally became furious at these recitals of neglect and peculation. Shales, the commissary of the stores, was the chief mark for their indignation. "If ever you have the war carried on with honor and success," said Colonel Birch, "you must hang this man." The house wanted to criminate higher men than the commissary of the stores, whose experience in what was useful as well as what was dishonest had been acquired in the army of James. The Commons resolved upon an indecent address to the king, to ask him to inform them who had recommended Shales. William consulted his higher sense of honor by refusing to be an informer. A wiser course was adopted than hanging Shales. A commission was sent to Ireland to remedy these abuses. The state of the navy was not more satisfactory than that of the army. The indefatigable secretary of the navy, Pepys, though now out of office, had his keen eye upon the abuses of that department of which he had the most intimate knowledge of any man. At a dinner at which Evelyn was present, Pepys "deplored the sad condition of our navy, as governed by inexperienced men since the revolution." He was for building frigates. He desired "they would leave off building such high decks, which were for nothing but to gratify gentleman commanders, who must have all their effeminate accommodations, and for pomp. It would be the ruin of our fleets if such persons were continued in command, they neither having experience nor being capable of learning, because they would not submit to the fatigue and inconvenience which those who were bred seamen would undergo."* The victualling of the fleet was as notoriously infamous as the commissariat of the army. The victuallers were ordered by the house into custody; but the affair seems to have evaporated in talk. "I believe the fleet is as ill victualled as if our enemies had done it," was the sense of the house, thus expressed by Mr. Hampden. "You may talk of raising money, but not of raising seamen," said another member. The seamen would not serve to be starved and poisoned. With a council in which there was far more hatred than concord; with a parliament in which the evils of party greatly outweighed its advantages; with a Church equally divided in opinion—"of whom the moderate and sober part were for a speedy reformation of divers things, which it was thought might be made in our liturgy, for the inviting of dissenters, others more stiff and rigid, for no condescension at all;"† with the dry rot of corruption in all the administrative departments of government—we can scarcely be surprised that William panted for another field of action, in which his own energies could be fairly put forth. "The going to a campaign," he said, "was naturally no unpleasant thing to him; he was sure he understood that better than how to govern England."‡ And so the sickly man advised with Sir Christopher Wren about building for him a house of wood, that should be carried with the army like a showman's booth; and though his constant cough had driven him from Whitehall to Kensington for purer air, he resolved to take no heed of those who manifested a real or pretended concern for his health. He would see with his own eyes if affairs in Ireland were irretrievable. Upon the king himself almost wholly devolved the duty of making a fit preparation for his campaign, by searching into the abuses of the military departments, and of remedying evils of such disastrous magnitude. He wrote to his friend Portland, after the prorogation of parliament, "All will depend upon success in Ireland. I must apply myself entirely to regulate everything in the best way I can. There is no small work on my hands, being so badly assisted as I am."§

At the opening of parliament on the 20th of March, 1690, some changes had been made in the ministry and in the lesser offices, "so that," says Burnet, "Whig and Tory were now pretty equally mixed; and both studied to court the king by making advances upon the money-bills."‖ The king had a tolerably equal contempt for both factions; and his sense of the baseness of some public men is recorded by the historian of his own time. Sir John Trevor, who had been master of the rolls under James, "being a Tory in principle, undertook to manage that party, provided he was furnished with such sums of money as might purchase some votes; and by him began the practice of buying off men, in which hitherto the king had kept to stricter rules. I took the liberty once to complain to the king of this method. He said he hated it as much as any man could do; but he saw it was not possible, considering the corruption of the age, to avoid it, unless he would endanger the whole."¶ The corruption of the age lasted through three generations. It had "lighter wings to fly" when paper-credit came. It grew more rampant under the second George than under the first. It flourished through half the reign of the third George. It would have lasted to our time if the people had not become fully acquainted with the proceedings of their representatives. It could not live in the light of public opinion, shed upon the nation by the free publication of the debates. We can scarcely blame King William for using the ready means of self-defence, while his enemies freely employed the subtlest arts for his overthrow. It was difficult for him to trust any one. His favorite minister was the Whig, Shrewsbury. Read his correspondence,

* "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 69.
† Evelyn, "Diary," February 19.
‡ "Parliamentary History," vol. v. col. 453.

* "Diary," March 7.
† Ibid., February 16.
‡ Burnet, vol. iv. p. 82.
§ Note in Macaulay, vol. iii. p. 587.
‖ Burnet, vol. iv. p. 71.
¶ Ibid., p. 74.

and he appears the fairest of advisers. He writes to the king, "I wish you could have established your party upon the moderate and honest-principled men of both factions; but as there be a necessity of declaring, I shall make no difficulty to own my sense, that your majesty and the government are much more safe depending upon the Whigs, whose designs, if any against, are improbable and remoter than with the Tories, who, many of them, questionless, would bring in King James; and the best of them, I doubt, have a regency still in their heads; for though I agree them to be the properest instruments to carry the prerogative high, yet I fear they have so unreasonable a veneration for monarchy, as not altogether to approve the foundation yours is built upon." * William manifested some favor to the Tories, and Shrewsbury resigned the seals as secretary of state. Burnet says, "He saw the Whigs, by using the king ill, were driving him into the Tories; and he thought these would serve the king with more zeal if he left his post." William, continues Burnet, "loved the Earl of Shrewsbury." The man represented as so sullen and so cold pressed his favorite secretary again and again to hold the seals. Shrewsbury steadily refused; and his "agitation of mind threw him into a fever that nearly cost him his life." It has been proved, beyond doubt, that this friend of William resigned the seals by the command of King James, to whom he had tendered his services. James, in a paper submitted to the French government in 1692, said, "There is the Earl of Shrewsbury, who, being secretary of state to the Prince of Orange, surrendered his charge by my order." † Shrewsbury, from weakness of character, was faithless to the master whom he admired; and his alienation was very temporary. Others were treacherous through the baseness of their natures; and, in betraying the prince whom they had contributed to raise, did not hesitate to betray their country.

Whatever may have been the amount of individual baseness, and of party violence, among the legislators of this period—however unpleasant their jealousy of arbitrary power might have been to a king who truly desired to rule over a free people—the spirit of the Long Parliament had not departed from the second parliament of the revolution. However desirous Whig or Tory might be to gain favor with the sovereign, they agreed in refusing to grant the duties of customs to the crown for life, as they had been granted to William's two predecessors. "Why should they entertain a jealousy of me," the king said to Burnet, "who came to save their religion and liberties, when they trusted King James so much, who intended to destroy them?" Wisely and boldly did the bishop answer him: "King James would never have run into those counsels that ruined him if he had obtained the revenue only for a short term." ‡ On a previous occasion, when this question of the settlement of the revenue was raised, William said to Burnet, "he understood the good of a commonwealth as well as of a kingly government; and it was not easy to determine which was best: but he was sure the worst of all governments was that of a king without treasure and without power." § We may well believe that William had no desire to use treasure or power for despotic purposes; and yet we may rejoice that the Commons of England stoutly resolved to prevent the possibility of the crown becoming dangerous by being too independent. For out of the practical working of the constitution, through many a struggle, it has come to be understood that the sovereign can have no interest separate from the public advantage; and that the representatives of the people would grossly err in any attempt to lower the personal dignity of the sovereign. The real relations of the executive and the legislative power have practically changed, without any change in the constitutional theory of their rights. Under the well understood principle that the advisers of the crown cannot exist with a minority in the House of Commons, the dignity of the crown is in no degree lessened by any opposition which may enforce a change of the servants of the crown. It was otherwise when the sovereign was in a considerable degree his own minister, and when his servants did not act under a joint responsibility. William drew a distinction between the good of a commonwealth and the good of a kingly government. Practically the distinction has almost ceased to exist in our times. But we venture to think that our constitutional historian scarcely makes allowance for the remaining influence of the traditions of the monarchy when he says of William, "He could expect to reign on no other terms than as the chief of a commonwealth." *

The statute-book contains an act of a dozen lines, which passed with little effectual opposition, although well calculated to produce a trial of strength between the two great parties. It is the act whereby the Lords and Commons recognize and acknowledge that William and Mary "were, are, and of right ought to be, by the laws of this realm, our sovereign liege lord and lady, king and queen." † This act also declares that all the acts made in the parliament assembled on the 13th of February, 1688 [1689], are laws and statutes of this kingdom. Upon this point the Lords debated long and warmly. In the Commons the question was settled in two days; for Somers put the house in a dilemma. This parliament, he said, depends entirely on the foundation of the last. "If that were not a legal parliament, they who were then met, and had taken the oaths enacted by that parliament, were guilty of high treason: the laws repealed by it were still in force, so they must presently return to King James." ‡ The Whigs had their triumph in so easily carrying this bill. It was a triumph of common-sense. They were justly defeated upon an attempt to impose a new test upon the people. A bill was introduced in the House of Commons requiring every person holding office to abjure King James. To make the proposed measure still more odious, any justice of the peace was empowered to tender the oath of abjuration at his pleasure, and to commit to prison whoever refused to take it. The bill was rejected by a small majority. The measure, with some modifications, was then tried anew in the House of Peers. "I have taken so many oaths in my time," said Lord Wharton, who looked back to the days of the Long Parliament, "that I hope God will forgive me if I have not kept them all. I should be very unwilling to charge myself with more at the end of my days." The old Puritan interpreted the real feelings of every honest man about the multiplication of political oaths. It was well known that William had no desire for such a measure as this oath; and thus, after many angry words and insinuations, the abjuration of King James was abandoned. King William strengthened his throne far more effectually than by a test arbitrarily administered, by authorizing Carmarthen to present to the Peers an Act of Grace for political offences. Bitter memories of the past had prevented the passing of indemnity bills. William resolved that the cause of the revolution should not be disgraced with forfeitures and bloodshed, as was that of the restoration. The exceptions to the Act of Grace were the surviving regicides—who had been excepted under the Act of Charles II. These were far out of the reach of such a visitation for the crime of forty years' standing. Thirty of the evil instruments of James were excepted by name; and, last of all, "George, Lord Jeffreys, deceased." This "Act for the king and queen's most gracious general and free pardon," was passed by both houses without debate. It was one of the most effectual means to prevent a recurrence of "the long and great troubles and discords that have been within this kingdom." Yet the clemency of William was sneered at by those who received its benefits, and condemned by those who were balked of their revenges. The king closed the session on the 20th of May; and an act having been passed to give the queen power to administer the government in his absence, he prepared to take the conduct of the war in Ireland.

William left London on the 4th of June. He had selected nine privy-councillors to advise the queen in the conduct of affairs. It was difficult wholly to rely upon the honesty of this council, in which there was a mixture of the leading men of the opposite factions. It was a time of great anxiety. Plots were in course of detection; invasion might be expected. The king determined to go where the necessity was most pressing. "He seemed to have a great weight upon his spirits, from the state of his affairs, which was then very cloudy. He said, for his own part, he trusted in God, and would either go through with his business, or perish in it. He only pitied the poor queen, repeating that twice with great tenderness; and wished that those who loved him would wait much on her, and

* Coxe, "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 15.
† Macaulay, vol. iii. p. 596, note.
‡ "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 75. § Ibid., p. 60.

* Hallam, "Constitutional History," chap. xv.
† 2 Gul. & Mar. c. 1.
‡ Burnet, vol. iv. p. 73.

assist her." * William had done everything in his power to insure success in his great enterprise. Schomberg had been largely reinforced. His army had grievously suffered from sickness and neglect. The pestilence which had thinned its ranks was deemed by the court of King James "a visible mark of God's judgment upon that wicked and rebellious generation." † William, "a fatalist in religion," according to Smollett, had a rational confidence that God might manifest his judgments through the industry and zeal of his creatures; and he had set about to repair all that had been amiss in the previous organization of the Irish army. He had now in Ireland thirty-six thousand troops, well fed, properly clothed, not wanting in the munitions of war, prepared by his own vigilant superintendence to take the field with those advantages without which the skill of a general and the bravery of his men may be thrown away. The English knew how carefully it had been endeavored to repair the evils of the last autumn and winter. Still the people were anxious and doubtful. There is a curious instance of the uncertainty attached by public opinion to the determination of the king to attempt the reduction of Ireland—an instance also of the gambling spirit of that age. Rowland Davies, Dean of Ross, who had been ejected from his benefices, is going with the army of William as a chaplain. He and four of his friends desire to raise money; and they borrow four hundred pounds under a bond, signed and sealed at Jonathan's coffee-house, the great resort of stock-jobbers, "for the payment of six hundred pounds within a month after King William and Queen Mary are in actual possession of Dublin and Cork." ‡ Of the condition and prospects of King James, a lamentable account is given by his official biographer. The Duke of Berwick had been beaten at Belturbet; Charlemont had surrendered; but these misfortunes "were nothing in comparison of the disappointments the king met with from the court of France." Louis would not consent to make England the seat of war instead of Ireland. He would not believe that the friends of James in England, at the head of an Irish and French army, would soon "make the English weary of resisting God and their duty." § Louis would only consent to send six thousand men into Ireland. The English were masters of Ulster. The Catholics who quitted it upon Schomberg's landing brought such prodigious flocks of cattle with them as ate up the greatest part of the grass and corn of other counties, according to the lugubrious memoir writer. The Rapparees destroyed on all sides; there was no corn nor meal to feed the army; no cloth, no leather; "and the brass money put an absolute stop to importation." We cannot have a more striking picture of the effects of an improvident and iniquitous administration of public affairs.

Ulster, at the beginning of June, was big with expectation of the arrival of King William. Absurd reports preceded him. An officer came from London to Belfast, and reported that the parliament was adjourned; that the king was speedily to set out, "and will bring with him four hundred thousand men." ‖ On the 7th the busy chaplain, preaching one day, dining jovially in the English quarters on another, saw many troops landing at Carrickfergus, and the train of artillery in the harbor. On the 10th, in the evening, on a false report that the king was landed, "all the country flamed with bonfires." ¶ On the 14th, over a bowl of punch, "we received the news of the king's landing, and being at Belfast, and spent the night jollily." On the 15th the officers of the various regiments crowded round William, and were presented to him. Troops continued to arrive, "insomuch that there was not less than five hundred sail of ships together in the Lough." William reviewed the troops on the 17th and on the 19th, and then gave orders that they should march after him. The army was composed not only of English and Englishers. There were Brandenburgers, Dutch, Danes, and French Huguenots. The spirit of the king triumphed over his feeble body. He was all animation. His eye sparkled with the exultation of hope. "I will not let the grass grow under my feet," he exclaimed. James appeared equally alert at the call of danger. He left Dublin on the 16th of June. William's army was at Loughbrickland on the 26th of June, consisting of thirty-six thousand men. The troops had manifested a very different conduct from those of James, who had ravaged the country in the preceding year; for William had issued an order that they "do so carry themselves both in garrison, quarters, and wheresoever they shall march, as persons ought to do who are under military discipline;" that they should not presume to rob or spoil, to do violence, or extort, "but that they duly pay such reasonable rates for their provisions" as shall be ordered and appointed.* The captains of King William's forces paid in a better coin than the brass money of King James. It was expected that the Irish army would have disputed the passage of William at the pass near Moyra Castle, now known as Ravensdale; but they left it open, and on the 27th the English army was at Dundalk, forming "a camp at least three miles in length, in two lines." † King James still retired as William advanced; but at length, on the 30th, as the English army approached Drogheda, the enemy was seen encamped on the opposite south bank of the Boyne.

The army of James was in a strong defensive position. The stream which divided the counties of Louth and Meath was between him and his rival. "The river was deep, and rose very high every tide; and after these difficulties were surmounted, there was a morass to be passed, and behind it a miry ground." ‡ The camp of James on the Meath side was defended by intrenchments and batteries. The fortress of Drogheda, on the Louth side, was held by the Irish, and displayed the ensigns of James and of Louis. The numbers of his enemy were variously reported to William. He had received tolerably accurate information from a man who knew how to deal with exaggerations. An officer who had deserted from James's army greatly magnified their real amount. Mr. Cox, a civilian with Sir Robert Southwell, bade the officer look upon the English camp and say what their numbers were. "He confidently affirmed them to be more than double their real number; whence his majesty perceived he was a conceited ill-guesser." § William, surrounded by his generals, rode along the bank of the river on the morning of the 30th to inspect the position of the enemy. "We shall soon be better acquainted with their numbers," he observed. ‖ He alighted from his horse near the village of Old Bridge. It was a rising ground, within musket-shot of the river. His breakfast was spread on the grass, and he rested for a hour. On the opposite bank there were watchful eyes directed toward the group which surrounded William, and it was soon perceived that no common enemy was within the reach of cannon. Two field-pieces were quickly brought down from the hill, and planted in a ploughed field screened by a hedge. The king had remounted. One piece is fired, and the horse of Prince George of Hesse is hit. Another shot, and William himself is struck. The ball has rent his buff-coat, and grazed his right shoulder. His officers crowd around, for the king stooped upon his horse's neck. He alights, and the slight wound is dressed. A shout went through the camp of James; and the tale passed from mouth to mouth that the Prince of Orange was killed. The rumor soon crossed the sea. On the 2d of July feux-de-joie were fired in Paris to proclaim the great triumph. The next day had its own tale, of which James himself was the bearer. William was soon riding through every part of his army; and when the sun of that last of June was set, he was still in the saddle, making arrangements by torchlight for the coming struggle. He had resolved to pass the river the next morning. The enterprise was thought by Schomberg too dangerous. William felt that there was greater danger in delaying a decisive action. The event proved that the daring of the comparatively inexperienced prince was a better policy than the caution of the old hero of many a well-foughten field.

The right wing of William's army was the earliest in its movements after daybreak on that first of July. It was led by the son of Marshal Schomberg, accompanied by the Earl of Portland. There were twenty-four squadrons of horse and dragoons, and six regiments of foot under the command of Meinhart Schomberg, the marshal's brave son. Every man had a green bough in his hat, according to an order issued by the king on the previous night. This right wing marched toward the bridge of Slane, about five miles from the main camp. Rowland Davies, who was with this

* Burnet, vol. iv. p. 82. † "Life of James II.," vol. ii. p. 385.
‡ "Journal" of Rowland Davies, p. 101.
§ "Life of James II.," vol. i. p. 336.
‖ Rowland Davies, p. 117. ¶ Ibid., p. 119.

* Harris, "Life of William," Appendix, xl.
† Rowland Davies, p. 121. ‡ Harris, p. 266.
§ Ibid., p. 267. ‖ Ibid.

division, says, "At two fords we passed the river, where there were six squadrons of the enemy to guard the pass." Other accounts represent the right wing as passing over the bridge of Slane. Whether by the fords or by the bridge, the passage was resisted by some squadrons of horse, but they soon gave way. The French general Lauzun saw that the movement of the English right wing must be met, and he rapidly moved his best troops to prevent the rear of James's army being attacked. "As soon as we passed the river," says Davies, "we saw the enemy marching toward us, and that they drew up on the side of a hill in two lines." Portland recommended the horse and foot to be drawn up also in two lines, intermixing horse and foot, squadron with battalion—"grounded upon the example of Cæsar at the battle of Pharsalia."* Rowland Davies parades no such learned authority, in relating the same fact; and he says, "thus the armies stood for a considerable time, an impassable bog being between them." Reinforcements of foot having arrived, "we altered our line of battle, drawing all our horse into the right wing; and so, outflanking the enemy, we marched round the bog and engaged them, rather pursuing than fighting them, as far as Duleek."† It was arranged that King William should lead the left wing and pass the Boyne about a mile above Drogheda. This division consisted wholly of cavalry. Marshal Schomberg, commanding the centre, composed almost entirely of infantry, was to cross the river about half a mile higher up at the ford of Old Bridge. Count Solmes led his Dutch regiment of guards through the rapid water, though up to their middle. The English foot crossed up to their arm-pits. The Danes and French refugees also waded through the stream at other points. The south bank was bristling with Irish horse and foot. Some attempt at resistance was made by the Irish infantry while the greater part of the troops were still in the water; but at last the columns had crossed. Then the Irish foot would not face these resolute soldiers of many nations. An ancient superstitious fear of the Danes perhaps contributed to their panic. But the Irish cavalry, led by Hamilton, fought with desperate courage against the infantry that had gained the shore, or were still in the bed of the river. The issue was very doubtful. Caillemot, the commander of the Huguenots, was killed. The veteran Schomberg saw the danger, and, rushing to the river without waiting to put on his cuirass, crossed, and led the retreating Protestants, exclaiming, "Allons, messieurs! Voilà vos persécuteurs." Schomberg fell in the confusion; his skull was cloven. On the same ground fell the heroic defender of Londonderry, George Walker. At this critical juncture William arrived on the field. He had brought his left wing across the stream with some difficulty. There was a rapid tide. The bed of the stream was in some places a deep mud. His own horse floundered in the miry bottom, or was carried along by the rushing tide. But the king and his cavalry were at last on firm ground. William drew his sword, and was soon in the heat of the fight. The Irish horse retreated toward Donore, about a mile from the pass. Here, from his tent on the hill near the church, now a ruin, King James had watched the progress of the battle. Here his retreating horse made a stand. They turned upon their pursuers, and William's cavalry began to give way. He rode up to the Enniskilleners, and exclaimed, "What will you do for me?" "It is the king," said their officer. "You shall be my guards to-day," cried William, and led on the yeomen who were conquerors on the field of Newton Butler. The battle of the Boyne was not yet won. Again and again "Little Will,"‡ rallied his troops whenever they gave way, and brought them up to the charge. The fate of the day did not long remain in suspense. Hamilton, the traitorous messenger to Tyrconnel, was taken prisoner. "Will the Irish fight any more?" said William. "Yes, sir, upon my honor, I believe they will." "Your honor!" exclaimed the injured prince; and then directed that his prisoner's wounds should be looked to. There was little more fighting. James saw that the day was going against him, and he mounted his horse and fled, the French covering his retreat. At nine o'clock that night he arrived in Dublin.

It is remarkable that a battle so momentous in its consequences should have been attended with so small a sacrifice of life. The loss in James's army did not exceed fifteen hundred men, chiefly cavalry. On William's side the loss of men was not more than five hundred. If we may judge from a passage in Rowland Davies, the steadiness of the Dutch guards repelled the attacks of the Irish horse by a mode of fighting which is mentioned as if it were novel: "Count Solmes marched over the river with the blue Dutch regiment of guards. No sooner were they up the hill but the enemy's horse fell on them, ours with the king being about half a mile lower, passing at another ford. At the first push the first rank only fired, and then fell on their faces, loading their muskets again as they lay on the ground. At the next charge they fired a volley of three ranks. Then, at the next, the first rank got up and fired again, which being received by a choice squadron of the enemy, consisting mostly of officers, they immediately fell in upon the Dutch as having spent all their front fire. But the two rear ranks drew up in two platoons and flanked the enemy across; and the rest, screwing their swords into their muskets, received the charge with all imaginable bravery, and in a minute dismounted them all. The Derry regiment also sustained them bravely, and as they drew off maintained the same ground with great slaughter."

Such was the battle of the Boyne, in which Protestant Europe was fighting against Roman Catholic ascendency, in the island which had been distracted for a century and a half with the bitterest wars of religion. The Londoner, the Scot, and the English settler of Ulster, the Dutch Calvinist and the French Huguenot, stood the brunt of that first of July, with equal resolution and equal confidence in their leader.

A great principle was manifested in this battle—a principle not always understood by statesmen or warriors—that the results of a victory are not to be estimated by the numbers of killed and wounded on the side of the vanquished—nor by the possession of the field of battle—not even by the submission of the district in which the conquering army has gathered its laurels. Looking at the mere material results of the 1st of July, there was no sufficient cause for the dispersion of the Irish army, many of whom James had seen fighting bravely in his cause as he looked upon the valley of the Boyne from the hill of Donore. The real victory was in its moral consequences—in the instant and complete exposure of the character of the man for whom the better part of the Irish Catholics had been fighting, out of an honest conviction that they were in arms for the cause of their country and their religion. James first deserted them in his intense selfishness; he afterward insulted them in his cowardly ingratitude. On the morning of the 2d of July he assembled the magistrates of Dublin. He said that he had been often told that, when it came to the touch, the Irish would not bear the brunt of a battle. He had provided a good army, and had made all preparations to engage a foreign invader, and he had found the fatal truth of which he had been forewarned. Though the army did not desert him as they did in England, yet when the trial came they basely fled the field, and left it a spoil to his enemies. Thenceforward he determined never to head an Irish army, and now resolved to shift for himself, as they themselves must do. He exhorted them to prevent the plunder or destruction of the city, and to submit to the Prince of Orange, who was a merciful man. After this, the most devoted slave of the house of Stuart would perfectly understand that this ungenerous and cruel attack of James upon his army was a mere selfish expedient to cover the ignominy of his own desertion of the cause for which his adherents had fought—some with admirable resolution; others, as well as the miserable discipline in which they had been trained would lead a reasonable man to expect. They had been trained to plunder, to ravage, to make war with the instinct of savages; and when they had to meet the shock of civilized warfare they fled as a lawless multitude always will flee, regardless of everything but their own safety. The battle of the Boyne manifested the utter disorganization of the principal force by which Ulster had been wasted and harassed during a year of evil government.

There was another battle being fought on the south-eastern coast of England, at the very hour when the shot that was fired across the Boyne had very nearly settled the question whether the revolution of 1688 should be a starting-point in a race of honor and prosperity, or a broken trophy of one brief and useless effort for liberty and the rights of conscience. The departure of William for Ireland was the signal for an attack upon the English coasts, which was to be

* Harris, p. 268. † Journal of Davies, p. 123.

‡ "Little Will, the scourge of France,
No Godhead, but the first of men."—PRIOR.

accompanied with an insurrection of the Jacobites. A fleet sailed from Brest under the Count de Tourville. The English fleet was in the Downs, under the command of the Earl of Torrington. He sailed to the back of the Isle of Wight, and was there joined by a squadron of Dutch vessels under a skilful commander, Evertsen. Queen Mary and her council were aware that the French fleet had left Brest. It soon became known that the English admiral had quitted his position off St. Helen's, and had sailed for the Straits of Dover upon the approach of the French. The council determined to send Torrington positive orders to fight. The French fleet was superior in vessels and guns to the combined English and Dutch fleet; but the inequality was not so great that a man of the old stamp of Blake would have feared to risk a battle. Torrington did something even worse than hesitate to fight. He let the brunt of the conflict fall upon the Dutch. He put Evertsen in the van, and brought very few of his own squadron into action. The Dutch fought with indomitable courage and obstinacy, but were at length compelled to draw off. The gazers from the high downs of Beachy Head witnessed the shameful flight of a British admiral to seek the safety of the Thames. When the news came to London that Torrington had left the Channel to a triumphant enemy—when an invasion was imminent, for England was without regular troops—when plotters were all around, and arrests of men of rank, even of Clarendon, the queen's kinsman, were taking place—then, indeed, there was an hour almost of despair such as was felt when De Ruyter sailed up the Medway. But the very humiliation roused the spirit of the people. The queen was universally beloved; and, although studiously avoiding, when the king was at hand, any interference in public affairs, she took at once a kingly part in this great crisis. "The queen balanced all things with an extraordinary temper," writes Burnet. She sent for the lord mayor of London, and inquired what the citizens would do should the enemy effect a landing. The lord mayor returned to the queen with an offer of a hundred thousand pounds; of nine thousand men of the city train-bands, ready instantly to march wherever ordered; and a proposal for the lieutenancy to provide and maintain six additional regiments of foot; and of the mayor, aldermen, and common council to raise a regiment of horse, and a thousand dragoons, by voluntary contributions.* The same spirit was manifested throughout the land. The people might grumble against the Dutch; they might feel some commiseration for an exiled prince; they might be divided about questions of church government; they might complain that the revolution had brought them increased taxation. But they would have no papist government thrust upon them by the French king. They would not undo the work of their own hands. The gloom for the disaster of Beachy Head was quickly forgotten. On the 4th of July a messenger had brought letters to the queen which told that a great victory had been won in Ireland, and that the king was safe; and, says Evelyn in his quiet way, "there was much public rejoicing."

CHAPTER CXXV.

James embarks for France—William enters Dublin—The French devastate Teignmouth—William's march to Limerick—Siege of Limerick—The siege raised—William goes to England—Parliament—War supply—England and continental politics—William leaves for Holland—Congress at the Hague—Mons capitulates to the French—Vacant sees in England filled up—Plot of Preston and Ashton—Treason laws—Marlborough in Flanders—Limerick surrenders to Ginkell—Treaty of Limerick.

King James, "in compliance with the advice of all his friends, resolved to go for France, and try to do something more effectual on that side than he could hope from so shattered and disheartened a body of men as now remained in Ireland."† "Request of friends" is the apology for the foolish actions of the weak king as well as of the vain scribbler. On the 3d of July James quitted Dublin with all speed, about five in the morning; left two troops of horse at Bray, to defend the bridge there against any pursuers; rode over the Wicklow Mountains, and baited near Arklow: "mended his pace:" when four French officers maintained that the enemy was not far behind, and never stopped till he got to Duncannon about sunrise. His attendants found a merchant ship at passage. The captain was persuaded to take James on board in the evening. They sailed for Kinsale, and the next day the royal fugitive was secure in a French frigate, and was landed safely at Brest.* James repaired to St. Germains, where "his Most Christian Majesty came to see him, and in general terms promised all imaginable kindness and support." The sanguine exile having abandoned Ireland, had his ready scheme for invading England, "now naked and ungarnished of troops." Louis received the project coldly, and, finally, would have nothing to do with the affair, although James magnanimously offered to go with a fleet, either with or without an army, for he was sure "his own sailors would never fight against one under whom they so often had conquered."† His Most Christian Majesty pretended illness when his brother of England came to pester him with his new demands for ships and troops. "The court of France could not forbear speaking great disrespect, even in his own hearing, which the queen seemed much more sensible of than he did."‡ The courtiers of Versailles could guess at the truth, although "the few English courtiers who stayed with the queen in France, to justify the flight of their king, did not spare calumniating the Irish." They averred that "the Irish abandoned their prince, and left him exposed to the enemy;" and this version of the cause of James' return was so believed by the uninformed that the Irish who had been refugees in France since the days of Cromwell "durst not walk abroad or appear in the streets, the people were so exasperated against them."§

On the day that James fled from Dublin the citizens had to apprehend two sorts of danger. The forces of James, scattered about the vicinity, pressed by hunger, might return and rifle the town. The lowest of the Dublin populace, in a pretended zeal for religion, threatened to burn and plunder the houses of the papists. The city was saved from these calamities chiefly by the firmness of Captain Robert Fitzgerald.‖ On the 3d the camp of William on the Boyne was broken up. On the 4th the Dutch guards took possession of Dublin Castle. On the 5th the headquarters of the king were at Ferns; and on the 6th, being Sunday, he rode to Dublin, and in the cathedral of St. Patrick returned thanks to God for the success of his arms. William, however, continued to sleep in his camp. On the 8th "his majesty in person viewed and took a general muster of all the army, and was fourteen hours on horseback; only for one quarter he did alight to eat and drink."¶ The news of the disgrace of Beachy Head had reached Ireland on the 10th, when the king, contemplating a return to England, resolved to secure Waterford, as the most important harbor of the eastern coast. On the 11th of July the army was on its march. Rowland Davies records how, in defiance of the royal proclamation, the troops "robbed and pillaged all the road along." Execution followed execution. On the 14th, on the march to Carlow, "as we passed, two of the Enniskillen dragoons hung by the wayside, with papers on their breasts exposing their crime; and thereby our march was very regular, without any such excursions or pillaging as before."** On the 21st Waterford was in possession of William's troops, the garrison having capitulated. The king then determined to return to Dublin, with the view of embarking for England. With a French fleet in the Channel there was now greater danger to be met on the English shores than in the resistance which continued to be made in Ireland. The forces which had been scattered on the 1st of July had gathered around Limerick, and were prepared to defend that city. Officers and soldiers, without orders from their superiors, without a leader, all flocked to Limerick, "as if they had been all guided thither by some secret instinct of nature."†† But irregularly fortified, and its defence left to the Irish, it was considered as likely soon to fall. On his road to Dublin, on the 27th, more accurate intelligence from England had reached the king, and he determined to invest Limerick in person.

The shameful discomfiture of the allied fleet at Beachy Head had not been followed up by the French so as to produce any results that should give serious alarm to William. On the 22d of July the

* Maitland's "London," vol. i. 495.
† "Life of James II." Own Memoirs, vol. ii.

* "Life of James II." Own Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 402.
† Dalrymple. ‡ Dartmouth's note in Burnet, vol. iv. p. 100.
§ "Macariæ Excidium," Camden Society edit., p. 41.
‖ Harris, p. 273. ¶ Rowland Davies, p. 126.
** Ibid., p. 128. †† "Macariæ Excidium."

French admiral, Tourville, was anchored in Torbay, with the fleet which had chased Torrington to the mouth of the Thames; and he had been reinforced with a number of galleys, rowed by slaves. The whole fleet was employed to transport troops. The approach of danger had roused up the spirit of the July of 1588. The beacons are again blazing on the Devonshire hills. From every road in the interior the yeomen of the West are gathering on the coast, not shrinking from trying their strength against the veterans of France. Tourville loses faith in the assurances of the Stuart courtiers, that all England would be up to aid in his enterprise. 'All England is shouting "God bless King William and Queen Mary." But Tourville will do something. He lands some troops at Teignmouth, which Burnet calls "a miserable village," but which the inhabitants represented as consisting of two towns, having three hundred houses. The people of Teignmouth obtained a brief for their losses; and in this document they say that "the French fleet, riding in Torbay, where all the forces of our county of Devon were drawn up to oppose their landing, several of their galleys drew off from their fleet, and made toward a weak unfortified place called Teignmouth, about seven miles to the eastward of Torbay." The narrative then continues to describe the ravages of these heroes: "Coming very near, and having played the cannon of their galleys upon the town, and shot near two hundred great shot therein, to drive away the poor inhabitants, they landed about seven hundred of their men, and began to fire and plunder the towns of East and West Teignmouth, which consist of about three hundred houses; and in the space of three hours ransacked and plundered the said towns, and a village called Shaldon, lying on the other side of the river, and burned and destroyed one hundred and sixteen houses, together with eleven ships and barks that were in the harbor. And to add sacrilege to their robbery and violence, they in a barbarous manner entered the two churches of the said towns, and in the most unchristian manner tore the Bibles and Common Prayer-books in pieces, scattering the leaves thereof about the streets, broke down the pulpits, overthrew the communion-tables, together with many other marks of a barbarous and enraged cruelty. And such goods and merchandises as they could not, or durst not, stay to carry away, for fear of our forces, which were marching to oppose them, they spoiled and destroyed, killing very many cattle and hogs, which they left dead in the streets." After these feats, Tourville sailed away to France, and left behind him an amount of indignation that was worth more for defence than even the troops of horse raised by the citizens of London. The brief of the "poor inhabitants" of the towns of East and West Teignmouth and Shaldon—who "being in great part maintained by fishing, and their boats, nets, and other fishing-craft being plundered and consumed in the common flames," had lost, as they alleged, eleven thousand pounds—went through every parish from the Land's-End to the East, South, and North; and every penny that was dropped in the plate at the church door was accompanied with the pious hope that England might have strength from above to resist the papists who burned fishing-huts and tore the Bible in pieces, and who would ravage this island as they had ravaged the Palatinate.

On the 8th of August King William's main army was encamped at Cahirconlish, about six miles from Limerick. "As we came up," says Davies, "we saw houses in the country round on fire, which put the king into some concern." The Earl of Portland had advanced with a large body of horse and foot within cannon-shot of the city; and in the evening of the 8th William himself viewed the position in which the strength of the Irish Catholics was now concentrated. The French general, Lauzun, had declared that the place could not resist the attack of the advancing army. With the pedantry that sometimes clings to military science as well as to other sciences, he trusted more to walls and moats, such as Vauban constructed on the French frontier, than to resolute hearts, by which Limerick only could be defended. He left the Irish to their fate. The Irish resolved to redeem the dishonor of the Boyne. They had an intrepid counsellor in Sarsfield, their general, who put his own resolute spirit into the twenty thousand defenders of the city. Lauzun and Tyrconnel had marched away to Galway, as the English advanced guard approached. As the setting sun flashed on the broad expanse of the Shannon, William would see an old town entirely surrounded by the main stream and a branch of the great river, and connected with another town by a single bridge. The town on the island, with its ancient castle built by King John on the bank of the stream, was known as the English town. The other was known as the Irish town. The eye of the tactician would quickly see the capacity for defence of this position, even though its walls were not of the most scientific construction. The English town was accessible only through the lower Irish town. The Shannon, in a season of wet, overflowed its flat margin. "The city of Limerick," says one at whom some may laugh as an authority, "lies, an' please your honor, in the middle of a devilish wet swampy country. . . . 'Tis all cut through with drains and bogs."* Thus naturally defended, a besieging army had many difficulties to encounter, and there could be no want of supplies to the besiegers from the open country of Clare and Galway. The river approach from the sea was commanded at this time by a French squadron. William looked upon Limerick, and determined to commence the siege. On the 9th the main body of his army advanced. "When we came near the town, and found all the bridges within a mile of the city lined by the enemy, the king ordered a detachment of grenadiers to go down and clear them, which they immediately did, with all the bravery imaginable."† The peculiar missiles of the grenadiers thus employed are called "new invented engines;"‡ and the Irishman of this period is represented as ready to give his one cow if he could be safe "without these French and Dutch grenados."§ Before the night of the 9th the Irish town, according to Davies, was invested "from river to river." The expression has reference to the remarkable curve of the Shannon in its course to the sea, before it reaches the island on which the English town was built. The river thus incloses, in the form of a horseshoe, a long and narrow tongue of land, but not insulated from the country on the southern bank. William's position was taken up partly on this space between the windings of the stream, and partly on the south bank, near the Irish town. For several days the siege was not actively prosecuted, for the battering train had not arrived. On the night of the 10th Sarsfield, with about five hundred horse, passed out of Limerick, crossing the Shannon at Killaloe, with the object of intercepting the train of artillery and a supply of military stores and provisions, coming to the besiegers from Dublin. The convoy had arrived within eight miles of the English position. The ruined castle of Ballyneedy was at hand to offer a place of safety for the wagons and guns; but the escort was scattered about in the open plain, securely sleeping while a few sentinels watched. Sarsfield suddenly came down from the mountains; killed most of the too confident escort, the rest flying for their lives; loaded the guns to the muzzles, and half buried them; heaped up the barrels of powder around the guns, with a pile of wagons and stores; fired a train; and was safe in Limerick before the dawn. Part of the army was at Drumkeen, waiting for the heavy cannon, which were expected to be within three miles of them on the night of the 11th. "About three in the morning we were all awakened by the firing of two great cannon near us, which made our house shake, and all within it startle; and about an hour after were alarmed by a man that fled to us almost naked, who assured us that the enemy had fallen upon us, taken all our cannon, ammunition, and money, and cut off the guard."‖ Sarsfield attributed great importance to the success of this daring enterprise; for he told a lieutenant who was taken prisoner that if he had failed he should have given up all as lost, and have made his way to France. The loss of the cannon and stores was partially repaired by the arrival of two guns from Waterford. But that surprise was in some degree more fatal to the besiegers than in the actual havoc and loss. The success of the exploit gave new courage to those who resolved to defend their city against an army not greatly superior in numbers to themselves. The besiegers were proportionately depressed, for they knew that the materials for a bombardment were insufficient. On the night of the 17th the forces of William entered the trenches of the besieged; and the same desperate work went forward till the 27th, when a general assault was determined upon. The attack was unsuccessful. As the troops of William mounted a breach with the most determined bravery, the Irish repulsed them with equal resolution. A fort, called the Black Fort,

* Corporal Trim, in "Tristram Shandy." Sterne, says Lord Macaulay, "was brought up at the knees of old soldiers of William."
† Davies.
‡ "Macariæ Excidium."
§ Notes to the same, by Mr. Crofton Croker.
‖ Davies' Journal, p. 136.

was stormed and carried ; when a magazine was exploded, by which the greater part of a Brandenburg regiment was destroyed. After four hours of desperate fighting the besiegers retired, with fearful loss on both sides. At a council of war on the 29th it was determined to raise the siege. On the 30th King William was on his way to Waterford, and the next day the besiegers had quitted their trenches, and the camp was broken up. There was a reason for this determination of the council of war, even more powerful than the gallant resistance of the Irish. Another assault might be more successful ; for in this failure of the 27th some of the besiegers had penetrated to the very streets of the English town. But the elements were opposed to the further progress of the siege. Evelyn writes in his diary, "The unseasonable and most tempestuous weather happening, the naval expedition is hindered, and the extremity of wet causes the siege of Limerick to be raised." The Duke of Berwick asserted that when the siege was raised not a drop of rain had fallen. Rowland Davies, on the 25th of August, says, that day "proved so extremely wet that no one could stir ;" but he does not mention bad weather again till the 9th, when in the camp near Thurles the evening "proved extremely wet and stormy." In this uncertain condition of the evidence to disprove the insinuation of Berwick, that the wet weather was a pretence of King William to cover the shame of defeat, the testimony of the humorist, who preserved "the traditions of the English mess-tables," is worth something. "There was such a quantity of rain fell during the siege, the whole country was like a puddle ; 'twas that, and nothing else, which brought on the flux, and which had like to have killed both his honor and myself. Now there was no such thing, after the first ten days, continued the corporal, for a soldier to be dry in his tent, without cutting a ditch all round it, to draw off the water." *

King William landed at Bristol on the 6th of September, and slowly travelled to London. The renown of his victory at the Boyne was slightly diminished by his repulse at Limerick ; but the English of all ranks felt proud of their sovereign, and had confidence in his energy and sagacity. His reception by the people was as enthusiastic as could be indicated by huzzas and bonfires—by peals of bells and loyal addresses. The parliament was to meet on the 2d of October. In the interval an expedition had set sail for Ireland under the command of Marlborough. On the 22d of September the fleet was disembarking troops near Cork. The forces of Marlborough were soon joined by a portion of the army from Limerick under the Duke of Würtemberg. The German prince and the English earl settled a dispute about precedence, by agreeing that they should command on alternate days. Marlborough here displayed that genius which was to culminate in victories far greater than had ever been achieved by English generalship. Cork capitulated, after a struggle of forty-eight hours, on the 29th. On the 30th the Protestant magistrates of Cork proclaimed the king and queen. Marlborough did not wait to receive the freedom of the city, in the silver box which the corporation voted him. He was on his march to Kinsale ; and his cavalry arrived there in time to save the town from destruction, it having been fired by the Irish. The garrison, after a short resistance, also capitulated. Marlborough accomplished these successes with no great loss of men in action ; but many perished from the diseases incident to the season and the climate. The Duke of Grafton, who had accompanied the expedition as a volunteer, was wounded in the attack upon Cork, and died on the 9th of October. The spot where he fell is now called Grafton's alley.†

The second session of the second parliament of William and Mary was opened by the king on the 2d of October. His partial success in Ireland was modestly alluded to, with one slight reference to his own exertions : "I neither spared my person nor my pains, to do you all the good I could." He told the houses that the whole support of the confederacy abroad would absolutely depend upon the speed and vigor of their proceedings in that session. The parliament testified its belief that the support of the confederacy was a national object, by voting, in less than a fortnight, more than two millions and a half for maintaining an army of nearly seventy thousand men ; and a further sum of eighteen hundred thousand pounds for the navy and ordnance. So large a supply had never before been voted by parliament for warlike operations—"the vastest sum that ever a king of England had asked of his people." * This supply was to be raised by a monthly assessment on land, by doubling the excise duties, and by increasing the customs' duties on certain articles imported. The community in every rank of life would thus feel the cost of this war. Yet the House of Commons was almost unanimous in voting the supply. Burnet wrote to Mr. Johnston, the English minister at Berlin, that the members "dare not go back into their countries, if they do not give their money liberally. . . . We seem not to be the same people that we were a year ago ; and the nation seems resolved to support the king in the war, to the utmost to which it can possibly stretch itself." † Burnet attributes this change to the outrages of the French at Teignmouth, and to the gallant behavior of William in Ireland as contrasted with the meanness of James. This national conviction of the necessity of carrying on the war with extraordinary vigor may be ascribed to more general causes. Imperfect as were the sources of political information, the English people well knew that an European war against the preponderance of France was inevitable. The hostile attitude of the French king toward England was essentially connected with the long-formed determination of the Prince of Orange to organize a general resistance to the designs of Louis against the independence of nations. William had freed England from a bigoted despotism, and at the same time had put himself at the head of the European coalition. Louis, in his determined endeavor to restore the deposed king—untaught as James was by misfortune, and as obstinate as ever to maintain the prerogatives which he claimed by divine right—was attacking his continental enemies in the most vital part. William as King of England wielded an authority far greater than William as Stadtholder of Holland. When the English people took William as their king, they accepted the involvements of his continental politics as the unavoidable price of their liberty. Had they continued under the rule of James, they might have been spared the vast burdens of a continental war by remaining in a state of semi-vassalage to France. The condition of peace was slavery. They had made their election for freedom at whatever cost, and they were willing to abide by it. The Englishman of 1690 saw, what only dreamers have ever failed to see, that a state of isolation from continental quarrels was simply an impossibility, if his country were to hold her rank among the nations. He knew how she had sunk in all the attributes of honest greatness under the base government of the restoration. He knew that she had again a leader, who would strive to bring her back to the position in which Cromwell had placed her as the head of the Protestant states. But he also knew that, the idea of the isolation of England from continental politics being a delusion, it was better for her to fight her battles on the banks of the Meuse or the Scheldt than on the banks of the Thames or the Humber. In the operations of the confederacy to which England was committed by the sovereign of the revolution, there might be the mistakes inseparable from conflicting interests. Perfect co-operation in such alliances was scarcely to be expected. The same summer that saw the disgrace of Beachy Head and the havoc of Teignmouth, also saw the defeat of the allies at Fleurus by the greatest of French generals, Luxemburg. The thought might enter many minds that the power of the great French king was too mighty ; had such support in the most skilful of diplomatists ; was too entirely under the direction of one head to be adequately resisted by any combination of jealous courts, held together only by the energy of a prince of infirm health and blunt manners, who was indeed their natural and acknowledged leader, but as such leader of great kings and petty dukes—the pettiest, the most proud and punctilious—exposed to intrigues that would mar every well-concerted project, and rivalries that would arrest every bold enterprise. The victory of the French over the Dutch at Fleurus was attributed to the want of concert of the Elector of Brandenburg. Such want of organization might occur again, and the results of the alliance might only go to lead on the ambition of France to new encroachments. So might reason the refining politician of that period. But then would come the instinctive feeling of English common-sense, that even a battle lost might not be wholly unprofitable. When William was fighting at the Boyne, England was under the apprehension of an

* "Tristram Shandy," vol. iii. c. xl.
† Note of the editor of Davies' Journal.

* Burnet, vol. iv. p. 113.
† Quoted in Ralph's History, vol. ii. p. 247.

invasion. The news of Fleurus arrived to make men anxious. But to the movements of the allies, connected with the doubtful and bloody day of Fleurus, is attributed the fact that England was saved from the hostile descent of a great army The French, says Burnet, "had suffered so much in the battle of Fleurus, and the Dutch used such diligence in putting their army in a condition to take the field again, and the Elector of Brandenburg bringing his troops to act in conjunction with them, gave the French so much work that they were forced, for all their victory, to lie upon the defensive, and were not able to spare so many men as were necessary for an invasion." * Many thoughtful minds in England would thus see that William was not speaking with an un-English spirit when he said to his parliament, "If the present war be not prosecuted with vigor, no nation in the world is exposed to greater danger." It was better for the purpose of a continental war that the nation should be heavily taxed—that loans should be raised which should be felt in after time, rather as a precedent than for their actual amount; that the commerce of the country should decay; that even her population should dwindle; than that the country should have peace and dishonor under the tutelage of Louis of France. It was not the French nation that was at war with England, to place a satrap of King Louis on the throne at Whitehall. The man who said he was "himself the state," was the enemy to be opposed. The only man to oppose him was he who shrunk from no labor and no privation to earn the position which even Louis himself, a few years later, was obliged to concede to his merits. "I could not see him," writes the French king to Marshal Boufflers, "at the head of so powerful a league as that which has been formed against me, without having that esteem for him which the deference that the principal powers of Europe have for his opinions seems to demand." † The mental qualities of William—what St. Simon describes as the capacity, the address, the superiority of genius, which acquired for him "the confidence, and, to say the truth, the complete dictatorship of all Europe, excepting France"—these qualities were not only the best security of England against the renewal of her degradation under the Stuarts, but reflected some of their lustre upon the country which had chosen their possessor for its ruler. And thus, with treasons against him hatching at home; with nonjuring churchmen hating him for his toleration, and praying for a heaven-ordained king though he were a papist; with a popular feeling, not sufficiently propitiated by William himself, that he was more a Dutchman than an Englishman, he set out for the congress at the Hague, and the nation at any rate felt that its honor was in safe hands.

On the 5th of January, 1691, the king closed the session of parliament, with his thanks for the great dispatch they had used "in furnishing the supplies designed for carrying on the war." He was now at liberty, he said, to go into Holland. The wind was adverse for some days; but on the 18th he embarked at Gravesend, with many distinguished persons of his court. The passage that is now made in twenty hours occupied five days. The man-of-war in which the king sailed was becalmed off the English coast; and when the shores of Holland were neared, it was thought dangerous to approach in the thick fog that shrouded the land from view. William was resolved to make the coast in an open boat; but a night of cold and darkness was passed, before a landing was effected on the island of Goree. Covered with ice, the king and his nobles were too happy to enjoy the shelter and warmth of a peasant's hovel. The enthusiasm of his reception when he reached the Hague was an ample compensation for the disagreeable incidents of his voyage, and for the perils at which "he himself was the only person nothing at all dismayed." ‡ William had that hatred of parade which belongs to the truly great; and he at first resisted the entreaties of his countrymen that he should make a public entrance at the Hague. He yielded at length to their wishes; and on the 26th of January he passed through long files of his admiring compatriots, under triumphal arches, on which the chief actions of his life were painted. The pomp was soon over, and the real business began. The Tory historian, who has no affection for the person of William, writes, "Of the princes and ministers who attended his majesty at the congress, almost all authors affect to give a long and pompous list, in imitation perhaps of the tricks of the stage; where it is used to form a court, or a train, of scenemen or other rabble, to raise a higher idea in the audience of the hero presented before them." * In place of such a list, let us endeavor to give some notion of the interests that were represented at this extraordinary assembly of potentates and ministers.

The Emperor of Germany had his representative at the congress. His real interests were essentially concerned in resisting the oppressions of France; but his ruling desire was to succeed in his war against the Turks, chiefly with a view to the enlargement of his own dominions. He was a Roman Catholic, and had no sympathies for the Protestant coalition of England and Holland. Charles II. of Spain was there represented by the Marquis of Gastanaga, the governor of the Netherlands, the imbecile servant of a weak king and a decaying monarchy. The armies of France would soon have overrun the Spanish Netherlands if they had not been defended by some bolder arm than that of Spain. These great Catholic sovereigns had not been hostile to the prince who had ejected the papist king of England; for at the time when the revolution of 1688 was maturing, Pope Innocent the Eleventh was not indisposed to encourage any opposition to his oppressor, the French king. His ministers, it is affirmed by the historian of the popes, had personal knowledge of the designs of the Prince of Orange upon England; and if he knew not of the entire scheme, "it is yet undeniable that he attached himself to a party which was chiefly sustained by Protestant energies, and founded on Protestant sentiments." † But at the period of the congress at the Hague Innocent the Eleventh was dead. His successor, Alexander the Eighth, had indeed the same disposition to make common cause with those who opposed Louis. In July, 1691, that pope also died. His successor, Innocent the Twelfth, was of a more pacific disposition; and the French king saw the necessity of making concessions to the Papal See, and thus removing one cause of the strange union of Catholic and Protestant. Changes such as these rendered the task of William to hold the coalition together a work of constant and increasing difficulty. At the congress, however, there were princes who joined the alliance with a zeal for the cause which William represented as the sovereign of Protestant England and the first magistrate of Protestant Holland. The chief of these was Frederick the Third, Elector of Brandenburg, subsequently Frederick, first King of Prussia. His mother was aunt to William; and he succeeded to the electoral dignity seven months before his cousin landed in Torbay. William had sent him the garter in 1690; and it is said that the young elector was indulging his taste for pageants in a solemn investiture of the insignia of the "most honorable and noble order," at the hands of the English envoy at Berlin, when he ought to have been marching to the Sambre to aid the Prince of Waldeck. We have been made somewhat more familiar with the person and character of our William's cousin, in his relation of grandfather to Frederick the Great. ‡ Crooked, through an accident in his infancy, of weak nerves, of a turn for ostentation, an expensive prince, but nevertheless a spirited man and strictly honorable—this is he who, on the 3d of February, 1691, is entertained by his cousin, the king and stadtholder, "at his house in the wood," and sits on William's right hand, while the Duke of Norfolk is on his left, and great nobles, English and foreign, fill up the table. The gentleman who attended on one of these noble English lords tells us how "the first health was begun by the king, who whispered it softly to the elector, and the elector to the rest;" and he also tells us how, ten days after, the king dined with the elector, "who went out in the very street to receive him" when he came; and when he returned, "accompanied him to the very foot of his coach." § The Hohenzollern, "with his back half broken," knew how to show respect to his heroic little cousin with the constant asthma. Of other German princes at the congress there were the Elector of Bavaria and the landgraves of Hesse Cassel and Hesse Darmstadt; there were princes of Luxemburg, of Holstein, of Würtemberg, of Anspach. Few came out of disinterested love for the cause of nations

* "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 94.

† Letter dated July 12th, 1697, in Grimblot, "Letters," etc., vol. i. p. 24

‡ "A Late Voyage to Holland," written by an English gentleman attending the court.—1691. Reprinted in "Harleian Miscellany."

* Ralph, vol. ii. p. 264.

† Ranke's "History of the Popes," translated by Mrs. Austin vol. iii. p. 181.

‡ Carlyle, "History of Friedrich II. of Prussia."

§ "A Late Voyage to Holland."

ependence. Of one of these potentates there is this curious notice a contemporary: "The Elector of Saxony, a bold man, and a hard aker, as well as a zealous assertor of the Protestant religion, was ught into the confederacy by the promise of money: 'For,' said 'our friendships, though ever so good, must be confirmed by pres-s.'" *

Victor Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, had already joined his fortunes those of the confederacy. At the period of the Congress he was ending his own dominions against the armies of France. The ung prince had become weary of the domination exercised over n by the French court; had for some time been secretly negotiat- with Austria; and was watching the progress of the revolution England, with a view to make a decisive effort for independence. e vigilance of the diplomatists of Louis frustrated his designs; l, with the ultimate argument of an army marching upon Pied-nt, Catinat, the French general, demanded for his master that nch troops should garrison Turin and Vercelli. Victor put on a d front, refused compliance, and war was the inevitable conse-nce. An ambassador from Savoy came to London before William out for the Hague, and in a formal address to the king said, "You ve inspired my master with the hope of freedom after so many rs of bondage." The first military operations of the Duke of voy were unfortunate; and at the period of the congress many an xious thought of William must have been turned to Piedmont. e talent and bravery of Victor were undoubted—a capacity too ch mingled with Italian craft, but a courage that did not shrink m an encounter with fearful odds. The dangerous position of the ke of Savoy enabled William to stipulate successfully that the aldenses, who had been subjected to long and grievous persecu-n, should be allowed to exercise their religion in peace. A treaty ntaining a secret article for their toleration was signed on the 8th February, 1691.

The arrangements of the congress had sufficiently ripened in a nth to allow William to announce in the London *Gazette*, that the rious powers had agreed to furnish certain contingents, which uld enable an army of two hundred and twenty thousand men to ke the field. But while the King of England was infusing his spirit to his allies, some eager and confident, others tardy and lukewarm, ost with some especial private interest to accomplish—while, as e caricaturist of that day paid a homage to his powers, William as teaching his bears to dance †—Louis suddenly appeared in person the head of a great army to besiege Mons, the strongly-fortified pital of Hainault, and one of the chief barriers of the Netherlands ainst France. The French troops, gradually converging to the ntier from every quarter of the territory of Louis, were opening enches before this strong fortress, while the allied powers were liberating and dining at the Hague. William, with his accustomed ergy, at once broke up the congress, got together an army of fifty ousand men, but arrived only in time to learn that the burning y had capitulated amid the terrors of its population, after a bom-rdment which had destroyed one half of its dwelling-places. Louis ent back to Versailles, to hear the well-rehearsed flattery, that herever the great king appeared the genius of victory was there ady with the laurel crown. William ran over to England, with s secrets of the future kept close in his own bosom. He arrived on e 13th of April. On the 1st of May he was again on his way to olland. In these seventeen days the king had important affairs to ttle, which required the exercise of a clear intellect.

The period had arrived when it was necessary to fill up the sees, acant by the refusal to take the oaths, of the Archbishop of Canter-ury and the Bishops of Bath and Wells, Ely, Gloucester, Norwich, nd Peterborough. Two other nonjuring bishops, Worcester and hichester, had died in the interval since the revolution. A discov-y had been made of a correspondence of Turner, the Bishop of Ely, ith the court of St. Germains. Burnet says, "the discovery of the ishop of Ely's correspondence and engagements in the name of the st gave the king a great advantage in filling the vacant sees." Whether Turner was justified in stating to James that he was acting n concert with his brethren, when he advised that a French army ould come into England, may reasonably be doubted. Sancroft and few bishops denied the charge in a printed paper in answer to an anonymous pamphlet. Endeavors had been made to conciliate the nonjuring prelates. All that they would engage to do was to live quietly. Their deprivation was no longer opposed even by the king's Tory advisers. So Tillotson became Archbishop of Canterbury and Sharp Archbishop of York. Patrick, Stillingfleet, Moore, Cumberland, Fowler, and Kidder, filled the other vacancies. "In two years' time the king had named fifteen bishops; and they were generally looked upon as the learnedest, the wisest, and best men that were in the Church." This was Burnet's opinion; but from this opinion there were many dissentients. Tillotson was especially marked out for the hatred of the Jacobites. The violent High Churchmen saw cause of offence in all these preferments, for the successors of the nonjuring bishops "were men both of moderate principles and calm tempers." *

When the king closed the session of parliament on the 5th of January he noticed "the restlessness of our enemies, both at home and abroad, in designing against the prosperity of this nation and the government established." It was impossible that such "restlessness," and such dislike of "the government established," should not exist in some quarters. William alluded to the apprehension of Lord Preston, with two other agents of the Jacobites, on the night of the 31st of December. They were seized on board a smack in the river, with papers addressed to James, containing propositions for his coming over with a small force during the absence of William, when the nation would be undefended, and the people would be complaining of the burden of taxation. Preston and his humbler associate, Ashton, were tried for high treason in January, and were convicted upon very clear evidence. The altered character of the mode in which prisoners charged with political offences were treated by the judges and by the counsel for the crown was strikingly exhibited in this trial. In the "Life of James" there is a curious observation of the compiler, which shows in what light the laws of the realm were considered by the champions of arbitrary power. The law which makes a correspondence with a foreign enemy treasonable is for the safety of the commonwealth, as every other portion of the law of treason contemplates that safety. The biographer of James writes thus: "My Lord Preston and Mr. Ashton (there not appearing evidence enough against Mr. Elliott) were brought to their trials, condemned, and the latter executed, being the first that suffered by a court of justice for the royal cause; which was a new subject of grief to the king, for he knew not what would be the consequence when he found the laws, as well as the sword, turned against him." † The notion could never be driven out of the heads of those who had seen a king ejected for his contempt of the laws, that he alone was the source of all law; and that without him, the one legitimate head of the law, it was powerless to protect or to punish. The new head of the law, expressly chosen that the ancient laws, which gave the people security and freedom, should not perish, but should be strengthened by an infusion of principles having still higher regard for the general good—this sovereign of the revolution was always considered by James and his minions as an interloper having no legal rights. The solemn compact which had been entered into by the nation with William and Mary was to give them no real authority. William was but a Prince of Orange, who had traitorously and wickedly thrust out God's anointed; and the assassin's knife was therefore too good a fate for him. Happy was it for England that this prince was a man of justice and clemency. We shall have to mention plot after plot against his life and his government. But we shall have to record no sweeping proscriptions, no demands for new powers, no exercise of his own uncontrolled will. During the long continuance of plots and conspiracies, the laws of high treason were so modified as to assure the prisoner a much fairer trial than under the ancient system, by affording him every facility for his defence. We may have incidentally to notice the publication of the most virulent libels against the person and principles of William. But we shall also have to record that, at the very time when these attacks were most frequent and most inflammatory, the laws against printing and publishing were relaxed instead of being made more stringent—the censorship of the press was abandoned. We may probably attribute to this moderation of the king the circumstance that, although his reign was one of continual danger to his person; that

* Cunningham, "History," p. 133. † Macaulay, vol. iv. p. 8.

* Burnet, vol. iv. p. 132. † "Life of James II," vol. ii. p. 443.

although he was surrounded by treacherous servants and cold friends; that although a systematic attack upon the principles that raised him to power was constantly going forward—his power strengthened as it grew, out of the very absence of any attempt to prop it by unconstitutional devices. There might have been something in the character of the English people which led them to respect the equanimity which had no morbid dread of the conspirator or the libeller; which was never diverted from its own course of duty by fear or by revenge. But certainly there must have been something very remarkable in the character of William—very different from the ordinary character of those who are termed usurpers—to direct him toward the noble policy of making himself secure by equal justice instead of irregular despotism, and of living down calumny instead of weakly attempting to forbid its utterance. We have been led to these remarks by the fact, that when William returned from the continent in April he had to occupy some portion of his short visit to England by learning the extent of the conspiracy of which Preston was the chief agent, and of determining as to the fate of some of those accused as conspirators. We cannot enter minutely into the details of the discoveries which had been made by his ministers in the king's absence. Preston had confessed, when his own fate appeared to depend upon his confession, that he was guilty himself, and that Clarendon, Turner the Bishop of Ely, and William Penn, were implicated with him. When William returned to England, Preston was brought before him at the council; and he then said, "that Mr. Penn had told him the Duke of Ormond, the Earls of Devonshire, Dorset, Macclesfield, Lord Brandon,"* and others, were well affected to the plot. He also implicated Lord Dartmouth. The accusation against these eminent persons was probably without foundation. Whether or not, William stopped the hearsay testimony of Preston. The biographer of James shows the value of this wise discretion: "It is probable the Prince of Orange thought it not prudent to attack so great a body of the nobility at once; that what he knew was sufficient either to be aware of them, or by forgiveness and a seeming clemency gain them to his interest. Which method succeeded so well, that whatever sentiments those lords which Mr. Penn had named might have had at that time, they proved in effect most bitter enemies to his majesty's [King James's] cause ever afterward."† And this is deliberately written by the habitual maligner of King William.

Since the successes of Marlborough in the autumn of 1690 there had been no marked change in the positions of the two contending parties in Ireland. To follow up his successes was not a trust assigned to the victor at Cork and Kinsale. Marlborough was chosen by William to accompany him in his continental campaign. He was intrusted to collect all the English troops, and to wait near Brussels till the king should arrive to take the command. William had much diplomatic work on his hands—to encourage the wavering, to assist the weak, and to bribe the hungry. Victor Amadeus was in despair at the devastation of his country by the French armies; Schomberg was sent by William to raise the duke out of his despondency. The petty princes of the Germanic empire, striving, for the most part, for some personal dignity or profit, had each to be propitiated and kept in good humor. In the interval between the king's arrival at the Hague and his taking the command of the army, Marlborough was sorely tempted to make good some of the professions which he had secretly conveyed to the sovereign whom he had betrayed in 1688. It is recorded that Marlborough had, in London, told Colonel Sackville, an agent of the court of St. Germains, "that he was ready to redeem his apostasy with the hazard of his utter ruin;" and "proffered to bring over the English troops that were in Flanders if the king [James] required it." It is further stated that he wrote to the same effect to James himself, in January and May, 1691. "Nevertheless," says the compiler of James's life, "the king found no effect of these mighty promises; for his majesty insisting upon his offer of bringing over the English troops in Flanders, as the greatest service he could do him, he excused himself under pretence that there was some mistake in the message." Marlborough asked, however, for two lines under the hand of James, "to testify that he would extend his pardon to him."‡ James, it is stated, complied with this request. Whether the crafty Churchill really believed, as he assured James, that "in case the French were successful in Flanders, or any ill accident should happen to the Prince of Orange, his restoration would be very easy," it is pretty clear that he, like many others, saw nothing higher in politics than their own safety and their own profit. William had no suspicion of the man employed by him in a most important command. The opportunity was probably wanting for a decisive act of treachery in this campaign, in which nothing great on either side was accomplished or even attempted.

But if 1691 were a year of inaction in Flanders, it was a year of great events in Ireland. In the spring Tyrconnel had arrived from France to assume his position as the viceroy of James; and he was followed by a French general, Saint Ruth, as commander-in-chief of the Irish army. He took the command at Limerick, and made great exertions to bring the disorganized troops into a state of efficiency. On the English side, an experienced Dutch officer, Ginkell, was appointed to the command-in-chief. His first operation was to lay siege to Athlone. On the thirtieth of June, a day memorable with the English army, the grenadiers again put green boughs in their hats, and were led to the assault under the command of Mackay. The town was taken by a bold attack; and Saint Ruth, who was encamped near, marched away on the road to Galway. He took up a strong position at Aghrim, resolved to risk a general engagement. On the 12th of July, at five in the evening, the two armies joined battle. The Irish fought with the most desperate resolution. The English and Dutch attacked and fell back again and again. The issue was at one time very doubtful. But at the very crisis of the engagement the French general was killed by a cannon-ball, and his death was concealed. The other general, Sarsfield, was inactive with the reserve, waiting for orders. The Irish were overpowered, and were soon disorganized. The victory of the English was complete, and they did not use it with moderation. There were few prisoners; and four thousand Irish lay dead on the actual battle-field. It is supposed that seven thousand altogether fell in the horrible carnage which accompanied the total rout of Aghrim. Ginkell followed up his victory by obtaining the capitulation of Galway; its garrison, with the French general, D'Usson, being permitted to retire to Limerick. Here was the last stand made against the triumphant army of King William. That army was now well supplied with artillery and the munitions of war. The same ground was occupied as in the previous year; but it was not in the same wet condition. Ginkell, by a bold manœuvre, crossed the Shannon on a bridge of boats, and scattered the Irish horse that were encamped near the city. He then succeeded in carrying a detached fort, which commanded the bridge called Thomond's; and a fearful slaughter of the garrison accompanied this success. The bombardment was terribly effective. The garrison might hold out till the whole town was in ashes; but even then, unless the besiegers were compelled to retire on the approach of the wet season, hunger would effect what cannon-balls and bombs had left incomplete. The fall of the city became inevitable. In 1690 a French fleet commanded the approaches from the sea. Now an English fleet rode in the Shannon. Hostilities were suspended for some days during the progress of negotiations. On the 1st of October two treaties were signed—one military, the other civil. The civil treaty was signed by the lords justices, who had repaired to the camp. The first article of this civil treaty was in the following words: "It is agreed that the Roman Catholics of this kingdom shall enjoy such privileges in the exercise of their religion as are consistent with the laws of Ireland, or as they did enjoy in the reign of King Charles the Second. And their majesties, as soon as their affairs will permit them to summon a parliament in this kingdom, will endeavor to procure the said Roman Catholics such further security in this particular as may preserve them from any disturbance on account of their said religion." An entire amnesty was promised to all who should take the oath of allegiance. Limerick bears the name of "the City of the Violated Treaty." Years of unjust and vindictive penal laws, which are now happily swept away, have manifested that this reproach is not unfounded. The parliament of Ireland became wholly Protestant, and laws were passed which not only denied the Roman Catholic "privilege in the exercise of their religion," but deprived them of the most sacred civil rights—the rights of family. The war in Ireland was at an end, but not its woes. It was offered to the the

* "Life of James II.," p. 443. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid., p. 448.

nds of Irish troops at Limerick, to make their election for entering e army of King William, or to become the soldiers of King Louis France. The greater number decided for France. It had been omised by the Irish general that those who embarked for another untry should be allowed to take their wives and families with em. The promise could only be partly realized. "When the lest men," says the writer of "Macariæ Excidium," "were once t on shipboard, the women and babes were left on the shore, posed to hunger and cold, without any manner of provision, and ithout any shelter in that rigorous season but the canopy of aven, and in such a miserable condition that it moved pity in me of their enemies." Ireland thus passed under the rule of the nglish colonizers. Happy would it have been if years had not en suffered to elapse before it was felt that penal laws were the orst of all modes for securing religious conformity; happy if nother series of years had not been wasted in attempts to maintain e union of two nations without an equal participation of civil ghts. The present generation has honestly labored to repair the in- stice of the past; and the time may thus arrive when even the me of the third William shall be pronounced without party trreds.

CHAPTER CXXVI.

cotland—Affairs of religion—Plots—The Highland clans dispersed—State of the Highlands in 1691—Breadalbane—Proclamation of the government—The Master of Stair—Tardy submission of MacIan—Order as to rebels not submitted—Order for MacIan of Glencoe, and his tribe—Letters of the Master of Stair—Highland troops arrive in Glencoe—The massacre of the MacDonalds—Inquiry into the massacre in 1695—Resolutions of the Scottish parliament—Master of Stair dismissed—The other persons implicated—Breadalbane—Misconceptions connected with the massacre—Character of William unjustly assailed.

The politics of Scotland in the first two years after the revolution ere more complicated than those of England. The ascendency of ne Presbyterians had been established; but the Episcopalians were ill a formidable body. In 1689, although episcopacy had been bolished, the church government had not been defined. There was o supreme directing power in affairs of religion. In 1690 the parament of Scotland established the synodical authority; made the gnature to the Confession of Faith the test of orthodoxy; and atronage was abolished, under certain small compensations to the atrons. The dissensions connected with these arrangements gave ourage to those who looked to discord as the means for restoring ne Stuart king. A knot of turbulent and discontented men, known s the Club, entered into schemes for reversing all that had been ccomplished by the revolution. Their leaders were frightened, and nformed against each other. Lord Annandale implicated the nhappy Jacobite scribbler, Nevil Payne. He thought himself safer n Scotland than in London—a fatal mistake. We extract a passage in letter from the Earl of Crauford to the Earl of Melville, the king's igh commissioner, to show how the ancient ferocity still lingered mong the politicians of Scotland. The letter is dated December 1th, 1690: "Yesterday in the afternoon, Nevill Penn (after near an our's discourse with him, in name of the council, and in their resence, though at several times, by turning him out and then calling him in again) was questioned upon some things that were not of he deepest concern, and had but gentle torture given him, being esolved to repeat it this day. Which accordingly about six this vening we inflicted on both thumbs and one of his legs, with all the everity that was consistent with humanity, even unto that pitch that ve could not preserve life and have gone further; but without the east success."* This was the last occasion on which Scottish statesmen were disgraced by endeavoring to extort evidence against political malcontents, by "all the severity that was consistent with humanity."† The noble actors in this plot offered up the obscure Nevil Payne as a sacrifice, secured their own safety, and suffered he Lowlands to settle down into peace.

After the victory of Killiecrankie there was a new gathering of Highland clans. The command was taken by General Cannon, who had come over from Ireland with the three hundred troops sent by James to the aid of Dundee. The chieftains soon began to manifest their repugnance to be under the control of a stranger, although he had served in the Netherlands, and brought his military experience to aid their national mode of warfare. The comparative value of regular troops and of mountaineers, who if they failed in the first rush were quickly disorganized, was again to be tried. The Cameronian regiment at Dunkeld was attacked by four or five thousand Highlanders. The place was obstinately defended by the successors of the old Puritans, and after four hours' fighting the clans drew off, the chiefs signed a pledge to support King James, and their followers dispersed. The victorious army of Dundee melted away like a snow-drift. During 1690 there were various outbreaks of detached clans. But Mackay collected an overpowering force at Inverlochy, and there hastily built Fort William, and fixed a garrison there under the command of Colonel Hill.

King William, as early as March, 1690, manifested a wise disposition to tranquillize the Highlands by gentle measures. His warrant to George Viscount Tarbet to treat with the Highland chiefs authorizes him to offer the leaders of the clans indemnity, with money and honors, upon their "return to their duty." Early in 1691 a message had been sent to James "by the loyal Highlanders who had continued in arms for him in Scotland, that unless those of the south joined them, or that his majesty sent speedy succors, it would be impossible to hold out any longer." His majesty returned for answer that his abilities to assist were exhausted by the pressing necessities of Ireland; but that "he had made a shift to send them some present relief of flour, salt, brandy, tobacco, medicinal drugs, flints, etc.," and that if they could stand out no longer, he recommended "an outward compliance."* In 1690 a negotiation had been opened with Lord Breadalbane, to win him over to the government, and to employ his influence to conciliate the rebel chiefs. This negotiation failed. But in the autumn of 1691 Breadalbane, having made his submission to the government, was again authorized to treat with the heads of clans, and to expend twelve or fifteen thousand pounds in this work of pacification. It may well be doubted whether this Highland earl went about his trust in perfect good faith. He is described by his contemporary, John Macky, "cunning as a fox, wise as a serpent, but as slippery as an eel."† At any rate, those who had the most intimate knowledge of the rivalries and petty interests of the chiefs doubted the practicability of the plan, as they doubted the honesty of the man employed to work it. Colonel Hill, in May, 1691, had received an order from the council, as he writes to the Earl of Melville, "to fall upon those Highlanders within my reach that do not presently come in and take the oath of allegiance, and deliver up their arms." In a previous letter he says, "I could wish, if they rise again, that all the west country, and all the clans whom they have injured, may be let loose upon them *till they be utterly rooted out.*"‡ Utterly to root out a rebellious clan was the ready method that presented itself to the military mind. At this time Hill says, "I expect several of them in, and the M'Intoshes men in the Brae, and Glencoe men; if they fail, I'll put my orders in execution against them." On the 15th of May he writes to Melville, "I have last night received an order to delay the severity prepared by the former order, till I hear further."§ He took wiser measures than the plan of rooting out. He sent the clans the form of an oath, to which many chiefs subscribed. "The Appin and Glencoe men have desired they may go in to my Lord of Argyle, because he is their superior, and I have set them a short day to do it in."‖ By a letter of Sir Thomas Livingstone, who was chief in command of the king's forces, it appears that he "had been commanded by the Master of Stair, to order Hill not to act as yet any way vigorously on his side."¶ The Master of Stair, Sir John Dalrymple, was secretary of state for Scotland, and was then in attendance upon King William in Holland and the Netherlands. The scheme of Lord Breadalbane for bribing the chiefs to submission and loyalty was the cause of the direction to

* "Leven and Melville Papers," p. 582.
† "The law of England was the only code in Europe which dispensed with judicial torture."—Burton, "History of Scotland," vol. p. 85.

* "Life of James II.," vol. ii. p. 468.
† Quoted in Burton's "Scotland," vol. i. p. 156.
‡ "Leven and Melville Papers," pp. 610, 611.
§ Ibid., p. 613.
‖ Ibid., p. 618.
¶ Ibid., p. 622.

Hill not to act vigorously. Colonel Hill by no means approved of Breadalbane or his plan. He would, he writes, have had "much more of the people under oath had not my Lord Breadalbane's design hindered; which I wish may do good, but suspect more hurt than good from it: for my part, hereafter, if I live to have geese I'll set the fox to keep them." * Breadalbane came into the Highlands, and made his overtures to certain chiefs. "He tells them the money he has for them is locked up in a chest at London; but they believe, if he say true in this, he will find a way to keep a good part of it to himself." † On the 23d of July Dalrymple wrote to Livingstone from the camp at Gerpines, in the name of the king, to direct him to keep his troops on the Highland borders, but not to commit any acts of hostility against the Highlanders.‡ On the 29th of July, the privy council of Scotland expressed their opinion to the queen, that if the army had marched against those who held out when Hill was tendering the oath, "they would have submitted themselves, or been easily forced to it." §

The plans of Breadalbane did not produce the effect that was contemplated. Hill writes on the 23d of August that the country was peaceable, but that there were impediments to a general submission, through the oath of confederation among clans, "by which they are obliged to do nothing without the consent of each other." ‖ There was a strong suspicion that Breadalbane did get the lion's share of the money which he pretended to be in the chest at London, but which was really in his own coffers. According to a tradition preserved by Dalrymple, he refused to give any account of how it was applied, saying, "the money is spent—the Highlands are quiet—and this is the only way of accompting among friends." In the distribution of his gratuities he brought his own interests and passions into play. He was a great Highland lord, with large domains and hundreds of vassals, but his territories were often exposed to the depredations of the clans with whom he was at feud. The small clan, MacDonald of Glencoe, were bad neighbors to Breadalbane; and he took this occasion to require that the gratuity which he had to offer for their allegiance should be a set-off for certain claims of the Campbells for injuries committed by the MacDonalds. MacIan, their chief, as proud if not so great as Breadalbane, was wholly impracticable upon such terms. Others followed his example; and many clans remained in a state of inert rebellion. In August the government determined to bring the submission of the Highland chiefs to a decisive issue, by a proclamation offering indemnity to all who should take the oaths, on or before the last day of December, 1691, and threatening the extremities of military execution—in the old form of threatening the vengeance of fire and sword—against all and each who should not submit to the government, and swear to live in peace. "Letters of fire and sword had been so ceaselessly issued against the Highlanders that in the time of the Stuarts it was a usual and little noticeable form." ¶

It would appear by a letter of the Duke of Hamilton, dated as late as the 26th of December, that he regretted that Sir Thomas Livingstone, who had that night returned from London, had not seen the king, which "would have contributed more to his service than commanding him back; for he could have advised better measures than *is* taken, to have reduced the Highlanders, of which there is not one word signified to the council." ** Some of the chiefs had held out to the very last. But on the 31st of December all the clans had given their submission, with one exception—the MacDonalds of Glencoe. The submission of all the other chiefs who had been in arms against the government was an event which was not contemplated with satisfaction by the Master of Stair. Burnet says, "A black design was laid, not only to cut off the men of Glencoe, but a great many more clans, reckoned to be in all above six thousand persons." †† This may be a very loose assertion; but letters of Dalrymple, written to Lieutenant-Colonel Hamilton early in December, prove that he had an especial grudge against the MacDonalds, "for marring the bargain which the Earl of Breadalbane was doing with the Highlanders;" and that he entertained a hope that the MacDonalds would "fall into the net"—that is, not comply with the proclamation. He further intimates that the government is obliged to ruin some of the clans, "in order to weaken and frighten the rest." That Dalrymple contemplated something like "the black design" mentioned by Burnet is evident from his letter of instructions to the commander of the troops for his guidance, if the obnoxious clans should not have submitted by the prescribed day. He is directed to destroy entirely the country of Lochaber, Lochiel's lands, Keppoch's, Glengarry's, and Glencoe's. "Your power shall be large enough. I hope the soldiers will not trouble the government with prisoners." Mr. Burton considers that Dalrymple, from whose letters of this nature we now turn with such loathing, "only pursued the old policy of Scottish governments toward the Highlanders. . . . The rule had always been to show no more consideration to Highlanders than to wild beasts." *

The clan of the MacDonalds dwelt in the valley of Glencoe, under their venerable chief, MacIan. Their huts were scattered in several hamlets around his house—a small population of not two hundred adult males.† He had fought with his few hardy followers in the ranks of Dundee at Killiecrankie; he had the reputation of being one of the most daring of the Highland marauders; he had driven off cattle in the territories of Argyle and Breadalbane. He was therefore an object of especial hatred to those proud nobles, who regarded him as a paltry robber to be crushed when the opportunity came. MacIan had his own pride, and deferred his obedience to the proclamation till the last moment. On the 31st of December he presented himself, with some of his clan, at Fort William, and offered to take the oaths before Colonel Hill. The commander of the garrison had no legal power to receive them; he was not a magistrate. Hill gave him a letter to the Sheriff of Argyleshire, stating the application that had been made to him, and expressing a hope that the submission of the "lost sheep recovered" would be received. It was six days before he reached Inverary, over mountain paths covered with snow. The sheriff yielded to the old man's prayers and tears, administered the oath, and sent to the Sheriff-Clerk of Argyle, then at Edinburgh, a certificate to be laid before the council of the circumstances which had led him to do what was a departure from the letter of the proclamation, but which was within its spirit. The sheriff-clerk first tendered the certificate, with a copy of Hill's letter, to the clerks of the council, who refused to receive it. He then applied to individual privy counsellors, who would not interfere in the matter. The certificate was finally suppressed, and the general body of the council were kept in ignorance of it. Among those who advised that the certificate should not be sent in was the lord president, father of the John Dalrymple. Dalrymple, the secretary, was the medium for the transaction of Scottish affairs with the king. It would appear that the general submission of the clans was not quite certain; for the king had signed, on the 11th of January, instructions to Sir Thomas Livingstone to pursue with fire and sword those Highland rebels who had not taken the benefit of the indemnity; but to allow them to surrender on mercy. Objections were taken to the use of the term "fire and sword" in these instructions. On the 16th of January the instructions of the 11th were repeated, with verbal alterations, and with this addition: "As for MacIan of Glencoe and his tribe, if they can be well distinguished from the rest of the Highlanders, it will be proper for the vindication of public justice to extirpate that sect of thieves." Burnet alleges that "the king signed this, without any inquiry about it; for he was too apt to sign papers in a hurry." Those who doubt this allege that it was not even signed but superscribed by the king. The Hon. William Leslie Melville says "that the king's having both superscribed and subscribed 'one unfortunate sentence,' should not be received by all our historians and poets as a conclusive proof of his being cognizant of their contents. I find numerous warrants and orders from him, some superscribed and subscribed, some only superscribed some only subscribed, as a man in haste would dispatch business of form." ‡ It is of some importance to bear in mind that what William superscribed and subscribed was a long letter of instructions containing several clauses. It was a duplicate, with alterations, of what he had signed five days before. In this duplicate the "one unfortunate sente

* "Leven and Melville Papers," p. 623.
† Ibid., p. 625.
‡ Ibid., p. 631.
§ Ibid., p. 634.
‖ Ibid., p. 641.
¶ Burton's "History of Scotland," vol. i. p. 156.
** "Leven and Melville Papers," p. 652.
†† "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 274.

* "History of Scotland," vol. i. p. 170.
† Macaulay says "two hundred persons;" certainly an error.
‡ Preface to "Leven and Melville Papers," p. xxxv.

was added. In a little book, very useful as a summary of events, the compiler prints the words beginning, "As for MacIan," and ending, "sect of thieves," with "William R." as the superscription of these four lines only, subscribed "W. R." He then rejects the notion that William signed without reading the document because it consisted "of so few words."* We attach no importance to Burnet's defence. In our view the character of William is best defended by assuming that he did read the order; that he signed without knowing that MacIan had irregularly taken the oaths; and that the words, "to *extirpate* that sect of thieves," who were represented in a state of rebellious warfare, was not to direct their butchery with circumstances of treachery and cruelty. We are inclined to believe that William not only signed the order with a complete knowledge, but that the attempt to prevent any indiscriminate slaughter, by the words "if they can well be distinguished from the rest of the Highlanders," looks like an emanation from his mind. The Master of Stair would have little cared how many were slaughtered in a loose construction of the exceptional case of the MacDonalds. Whether the argument that the word *extirpate* "would naturally bear a sense perfectly innocent, and would, but for the horrible event which followed, have been universally understood in that sense,"† may admit of a difference of opinion. The word meant, no doubt, a complete suppression of a community not conforming to the laws of civilized society; but, as it appears to us, it did not mean their indiscriminate slaughter. Hill, who appears to have been no cruel oppressor, desires that the rebellious clans "may be utterly rooted out." To extirpate and to root out are synonymous terms. We believe that William knew what the word implied. He had probably never read "The Tempest;" but used the word as Shakespeare used it when he makes the King of Naples hearken to the suit of Prospero's brother, that he

> "Should presently *extirpate* me and mine
> Out of the dukedom."

If the long letter of instructions, concluding with the short sentence relating to the MacDonalds, had run in the ancient form for the destruction of Highlanders, he might have hesitated: "To invade them to their utter destruction, by slaughter, burning, drowning, and other ways, and leave no creature living of that clan, except priests, women, and bairns."‡ At any rate we may affirm that it is a falsehood in the compiler of the "Life of James II." to say, "By an order, which Nero himself would have had a horror of, the Prince of Orange commanded one Colonel Hill and Lieutenant-Colonel Hamilton to put Glencoe to death, and all the males of his line, [in age] not exceeding seventy."§ It is observed by Walter Wilson, in his "Life of Defoe," that "the inveteracy that marked the language of the Jacobites when speaking of King William, and with which their works are so highly seasoned, has descended in full force to our own day." We have an example of this temper in the valuable but somewhat prejudiced "Annals" issued from Oxford, in which it is inferred "that Stair did not really go beyond William's instructions in planning the massacre of Glencoe, although the parliament of Scotland had the complaisance to lay the greater blame on the minister." The parliament of Scotland expressly said, as the first result of their investigation in 1695, "We found, in the first place, that the Master of Stair's letters had exceeded your majesty's instructions." William was, indeed, justly indignant at this resolution; "frequently repeating that he thanked the parliament of Scotland; they had used him better than England had done his grandfather, for they had tried him for his life, and brought him in not guilty."‖ His pride was wounded that any investigation at all should have taken place as to his concurrence in the act of his minister. The parliament had voted the Glencoe slaughter to be a murder; and he thought it no compliment to be formally acquitted as an accessory before the fact.

In transmitting from London the instructions signed by the king on the 11th of January, the secretary of state for Scotland wrote to Sir Thomas Livingstone, "I have no great kindness to Keppoch nor Glencoe; and it is well that people are in mercy. Just now, my Lord Argyle tells me that Glencoe hath not taken the oath, at which I rejoice. It is a great work of charity to be exact in rooting out that damnable sept, the worst of the Highlanders." When Dalrymple sent the instructions of the 16th, he wrote to Livingstone, "For a just example of vengeance, I entreat the thieving tribe of Glencoe may be rooted out to purpose." To Colonel Hill he wrote on the same date, "That such as render on mercy might be saved;" but entreats that "for a just vengeance and public example the tribe of Glencoe may be rooted out to purpose. The Earls of Argyle and Breadalbane have promised that they shall have no retreat in their bounds." During another fortnight nothing was done toward accomplishing Dalrymple's entreaties. On the 30th he wrote again to Livingstone: "I am glad that Glencoe did not come within the time prefixed. I hope what is done there may be in earnest, since the rest are not in a condition to draw together to help. I think to harry their cattle and burn their houses is but to render them desperate lawless men; but I believe you will be satisfied it were a great advantage to the nation that thieving tribe were rooted out and cut off." To Hill he writes on the same day, "Pray, when the thing concerning Glencoe is resolved, let it be secret and sudden." Colonel Hill sent his orders to Lieutenant-Colonel Hamilton to march with eight hundred men straight to Glencoe; "and there put in execution the orders you have received from the commander-in-chief." Hamilton addressed his orders to Major Duncanson, his second in command; concluding his letter by directing that the avenues be so secured "that the old fox nor none of his cubs get away: The orders are that none be spared, nor the government troubled with prisoners. Major Duncanson then dispatched Captain Robert Campbell, of Glenlyon, to proceed to Glencoe in advance of the other troops with a detachment of a hundred and twenty men of Argyle's regiment. He arrived there on the 1st of February.

The valley of Glencoe has been variously described, according to the associations of those who have visited it. In the eyes of the picturesque historian of this period—who regards it as a rugged desert, "valued on account of the shelter which it afforded to the plunderer and his plunder"—it is "the most dreary and melancholy of all the Scottish passes, the very valley of the shadow of death."* To the equal-minded tourist, "the scenery of this valley is far the most picturesque of any in the Highlands.† To the enthusiastic believer in Ossian, it is the valley of Fingal—having a name, indeed, signifying in the Celtic tongue the Valley of Tears—"the most peaceful and secluded of narrow vales." Here "the matchless melody of the sweet voice of Cona first awaked the joy of grief." The blue stream of Ossian's Cona here bends its course to Lochleven. The glen, "so warm, so fertile, so overhung by mountains which seem to meet above you," is described as "a place of great plenty and security."‡ The admirable historian of Scotland from the revolution tells us of the narrow slip of grazing ground between the Alpine walls of Glencoe, and a few, still narrower, on the upper levels. If the MacDonalds had not lived, he says, by plunder, their arid glen could not have supported the population.§ Whether barren or fertile, whether filled by robbers or by "born poets," who treasured up "the songs of Selma"—here dwelt the MacIans in patriarchal simplicity. Campbell of Glenlyon, who came with his hundred and twenty Highlanders of the Argyle regiment on the 1st of February, 1692, spent twelve days with his men amid the somewhat unpoetical hospitalities of the clan. The MacIans had no affection for the Campbells; but Glenlyon's niece was married to the second son of their chief; and when he and his lieutenant, Lindsay, said they came as friends, and asked for quarters, being sent to relieve the garrison of Fort William, who were overcrowded, they were received with cordiality. Undoubtedly the chief and his clansmen trusted to the indemnity of the government, which they thought had been secured by the oath which MacIan had taken before the Sheriff of Argyle. Here they lived for twelve days as Highlander with Highlander. They had beef and spirits without payment. They were sheltered from the snow-storms in the huts of the poor people. Glenlyon became affectionate over his usquebaugh with the husband of his niece, played at cards with the

* "Annals of England," vol. iii. p. 371.
† Macaulay, vol. iv. p. 205.
‡ "Spalding Club Miscellany." Quoted by Mr. Burton.
§ "Life of James II.," vol. ii. p. 470.
‖ Defoe, "History of the Union," p. 73.

* Macaulay, vol. iv. p. 191.
† Pennant.
‡ See Mrs. Grant's "Letters from the Mountains." Letter xi. 1773.
§ Burton, vol. i. p. 162.

old chief, and entertained two of MacIan's sons at supper on the night of the 12th. At that time he had the following letter in his pocket, from Major Duncanson, dated on the 12th from Valacholis, in the immediate neighborhood: "You are hereby ordered to fall upon the rebels, the Macdonalds of Glencoe, and put all to the sword under seventy. You are to have especial care that the old fox and his sons do on no account escape your hands. You are to secure all the avenues, that no man escape. This you are to put in execution at five o'clock in the morning precisely, and by that time, or very shortly after it, I'll strive to be at you with a stronger party; if I do not come to you at five, you are not to tarry for me, but to fall on. This is by the king's special command, for the good and safety of the country, that these miscreants may be cut off, root and branch. See that this be put in execution without fear or favor, else you may expect to be treated as not true to the king and government, nor a man fit to carry commission in the king's service. Expecting you will not fail in the fulfilling hereof, as you love yourself, I subscribe these with my hand." Captain Campbell did not tarry for his superior officer. He was strong enough to do his murderous bidding without his aid. Sir Walter Scott thinks that the purposed crime was more foul, through its perpetration being "committed to soldiers, who were not only the countrymen of the proscribed, but the near neighbors, and some of them the close connections of the Macdonalds of Glencoe." He adds that, "the massacre has been unjustly attributed to English troops."* We venture to believe that English troops had not the qualities which would have recommended their employ. It is impossible not to see that the revenges of the Campbells had as much to do with this act as "the king's special command." Argyle and Breadalbane were not promising that the clan MacDonald should have "no retreat in their bounds," without making known their desire to their people that "the old fox and his cubs" should be wholly "cut off." The cunning of the affair was characteristic of the mountain tribes: "Highland history is crowded with incidents, which, in modern phraseology, would be stamped as treachery, but in the social system of the actors passed as dexterity."† Some agitation among the Argyle soldiers—whisperings and murmurs—had roused the fears of John MacIan. He went at midnight to the house of Inverriggen, in the hamlet where Glenlyon was quartered. The captain was up and his men about him. He was ordered, he said, to march against Glengarry's people. Could he be likely to harm his friends, and especially those among whom his niece had married? Would he not have given a hint to Alaster? The man was satisfied. The night was stormy. The valley lay quiet in mists and thick darkness. At five in the morning Glenlyon and his men slaughtered Inverriggen and nine other men. A child of twelve was stabbed by an officer bearing the name of Drummond. Lindsay and his party went to the house of the old chief, and killed him as he was dressing himself, roused by his faithful servants. His two sons escaped among the rocks. His wife was stripped of her trinkets by the savages, and died the following day from her ill-usage. In another hamlet, Auchnaion, a sergeant of the name of Barbour, with his detachment, shot Auchentriater, and seven others, as they sat round the fire in the dark morning. It is reckoned that the number of the slaughtered was thirty eight. Happily, the order that the avenues should be secured was not effectually carried out. Duncanson did not arrive in time. The reports of the murderous guns had alarmed the sleeping families, and three fourths of the adults, with their wives and children, escaped by the passes before the troops of Hamilton had barred their way. No deed of blood remained for those who came to Glencoe, when the sun was high in the heavens, but to slay an old man of eighty. Their work was to burn the huts of the tribe, and drive off their cattle. But the unhappy fugitives who had escaped the slaughter had to endure all the extremities of hunger and cold in that inclement season. The number who perished in the snow, sank exhausted in the bogs, crept into caverns and died for lack of food, was never ascertained. In a short time, some few stole back to their half-ruined cabins, and in after years the valley had again a population. Among those who returned to the scene of desolation was the bard of the tribe. "The bard sat alone upon a rock, and, looking down, composed a long, dismal song."‡

In an age of publicity the extraordinary occurrences of the valley of Glencoe would have been known in a week in every corner of these realms. In an age when newspapers were uncommon, and gatherers of news by no means vigilant to minister to public curiosity, no Londoner knew of this tragedy, or, if he heard some rumor, heeded it not. After some weeks had elapsed there was a report that a robber tribe had been engaged with Scotch troops, and that the chief and some of his clan had been killed. At Edinburgh people in the coffee-houses began to talk. Glenlyon was conscious of the remarks upon him, and said that "he would do it again if it were again to be done. He would stab any man in Scotland or England without asking why, if he were commanded so to do." Argyle's Highland regiment was quartered at Brentford, in June, 1692; and it was afterward published that the soldiers talked about the massacre, and that one said, "Glencoe seems to hang about Glenlyon night and day; and you may see it in his face." While public murmurings were faintly heard in Scotland—not "while public indignation was at the highest," as Scott says—Dalrymple wrote to Hamilton from the Hague, on the 30th of April, 1692, "For the people of Glencoe, when you do your duty in a thing so necessary to rid the country of thieving, you need not trouble yourself to take the pains to vindicate yourself, by showing all your orders, which are now put in the *Paris Gazette*. When you do right you need fear no body. All that can be said is, that, in the execution, it was neither so full nor so fair as might have been." Charles Leslie, the nonjuring clergyman, obtained some particulars of the deliberate treachery and cold-blooded ferocity which made the Glencoe massacre so peculiarly atrocious; and he published the circumstances about the end of 1692. A pamphlet called "Gallienus Redivivus" followed up this attack. Burnet says that the transaction at Glencoe "raised a mighty outcry, and was published by the French in their gazettes and by the Jacobites in their libels, to cast a reproach on the king's government as cruel and barbarous; though in all other instances it had appeared that his own inclinations were gentle and mild, rather to an excess."* The affair would probably have rested with the French gazettes and Jacobite libels had not the parliament of Scotland, after a recess of two years, met in 1695, when Glencoe was a subject which had roused the nation to demand inquiry; for the nonjurors and friends of King James had worked diligently in stirring up the popular feeling. Political hostility to the Master of Stair had something to do with the tardy indignation of the Scottish estates. William had in 1693 authorized an investigation of the matter by the Duke of Hamilton and others. The duke died; and the inquiry was left to die with him. The king was now advised to take a more decided course, anticipating the measures of the Scotch parliament. He issued a commission of precognition to the Marquis of Tweeddale, and other privy counsellors in Scotland. The inquiries were necessarily minute and complicated; but the document was at last produced. From that document, and the letters and oral evidence accompanying it, is an authentic narrative of the massacre to be collected.

The report of the commission, with the depositions and letters were read in the Scottish parliament on the 24th of June, 1695, and the result is thus recorded:

"After hearing of the said report, it was voted, *nemine contradicente*, that his majesty's instructions of the 11th and 16th days of January, 1692, touching the Highland rebels, who did not accept in due time of the benefit of his indemnity, did contain a warrant for mercy, to all, without exception, who should offer to take the oath of allegiance, and come in upon mercy, though the first day of January, 1692, prefixed by the proclamation of indemnity, was passed; and that therefore these instructions contained no warrant for the execution of the Glencoe men, made in February thereafter.

"Then the question stated and voted, if the execution and slaughter of the Glencoe men in February, 1692, as is represented to the parliament, be a murder or not, and carried in the affirmative."

It was then moved "that since the parliament has found it a murder, that it may be inquired into, who were the occasion of it, and the persons guilty and committers of it, and what way and manner they should be prosecute."†

* "Tales of a Grandfather," chap. lviii.
† Burton, vol. i. p. 165.
‡ Mrs. Grant.

* "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 155.
† "Acts of Parliament of Scotland," vol. ix. p. 377.

On the 10th of July the parliament agreed to an address to the king, which contains the following material passages :

"We humbly beg that, considering that the Master of Stair's excess in his letters against the Glencoe men has been the original cause of this unhappy business, and hath given occasion in a great measure to so extraordinary an execution by the warm directions he gives about doing it by way of surprise ; and considering the high station and trust he is in, and that he is absent, We do therefore beg that your majesty will give such orders about him for vindication of your government as you in your royal wisdom shall think fit.

"And likeways considering that the actors have barbarously killed men under trust, We humbly desire you majesty would be pleased to send the actors home, and to give orders to your advocate to prosecute them according to law, there remaining nothing else to be done for the full vindication of your government of so foul and scandalous an aspersion as it has lain under upon this occasion." *

The Master of Stair was only dismissed from office by the king. The parliament of Scotland did not accuse "the original cause of this unhappy business" as being participant in what they voted to be a murder. Whether the king ought to have placed the chief culprit on his trial for a great crime can scarcely be maintained without acknowledging that William had some excuse for his comparative lenity in the very mild recommendation of the parliament "to give such orders about him, for vindication of your government, as you in your royal wisdom shall think fit." Most persons will nevertheless agree with the historian that "in return for many victims immolated by treachery, only one victim was demanded by justice ; and it must ever be considered as a blemish on the fame of William that the demand was refused." † The Scottish parliament imputed no guilt to Livingstone or Hill ; they somewhat doubted about Hamilton and Duncanson ; but they were clear that Captain Campbell and Captain Drummond, Lieutenant Lindsay, Ensign Lundy, and Sergeant Barbour were the actors in the slaughter, and ought to be prosecuted. The king did not cause these to be prosecuted. He knew perfectly well that they had as sound a legal defence before a civil tribunal as any of the privates who discharged their muskets under the orders of Sergeant Barbour. Defoe affirms that "his majesty often said, it was a moot-point in war, whether they had broken orders or no ; and though I have the honor to know that his majesty exceedingly resented the manner, yet it did not appear at all that they had laid themselves open to military justice in it." ‡

There was one person connected with the Glencoe massacre, of whom we lose sight in the decisions of the Scottish parliament as to "who were the occasion of it." That person is the Earl of Breadalbane. But there is a further record in the minutes of that parliament which shows that the other great culprit besides Dalrymple had not been wholly overlooked : "July 1. A warrant granted to bring the Earl of Breadalbane down to the parliament house." § From the parliament house he was committed to the Castle of Edinburgh, on a charge of high treason. In the course of the Glencoe inquiries the Highland chief Glengarry, and others, deposed that in offering them money he alleged that he continued in the interest of King James, and pressed them to make a show of pacification, that they might be ready to serve him at some future time—the "outward compliance" which James had himself recommended. Breadalbane contrived that the inquiry should stand over from time to time, till the session of parliament came to an end. He had pleaded his pardon from the crown ; but the offences charged were subsequent to that pardon. Burnet says "he pretended he had secret orders from the king to say anything that would give him credit with them ; which the king owned so far that he ordered a new pardon to be passed for him." ‖ It is impossible to fathom the depths of the intrigues of the Scottish statesmen and great lords at this period. Burnet in his narrative of the Glencoe massacre says of Breadalbane : "That he might gratify his own revenge, and render the king odious to all the Highlanders, he proposed that orders should be sent for a military execution on those of Glencoe." ¶ We believe in no such refinement of Breadalbane's cunning. He and Argyle were glad to sweep out the MacDonalds, who annoyed them. Dalrymple would have exterminated the whole Celtic population of Jacobites, papists, and thieves—for the greater part were such in his mind—as his predecessors in power had often hunted them down as wild beasts. Not three months before Dalrymple put the order of January 16th before William to sign, he wrote to Breadalbane that no prince but William would have not been tempted to hearken to the earnest desires of all those he trusts in his government, "to have made the Highlanders examples of his justice, by extirpating them." * William acceded to the one exception to his general clemency, urged upon him by Dalrymple, Argyle, and Breadalbane ; for it was a measure justified to his mind by the "laws of war." It is one of the most lamentable evils of these laws, that in some cases a violation of the rights of humanity ceases to be regarded as a crime ; and that in all cases implicit obedience to orders is the paramount duty of a soldier, however revolting to his moral sense.

Sir Walter Scott, recalling his early recollections, says that "on the 5th of November, 1788, when a full century had elapsed after the revolution, some friends to constitutional liberty proposed that the return of the day should be solemnized by an agreement to erect a monument to the memory of King William, and the services which he had rendered to the British kingdoms." How was the proposal defeated ? By an anonymous letter in one of the Edinburgh newspapers, "ironically applauding the undertaking, and proposing as two subjects of the entablature for the projected column, the massacre of Glencoe, and the distresses of the Scottish colonists at Darien." We have related the one story with a scrupulous regard to facts. We shall have to tell the other distressing narrative with the same scrupulosity. Sir Walter Scott impresses upon his grandson this lesson : "You may observe from this how cautious a monarch should be of committing wrong or injustice, however strongly recommended by what may seem political necessity." † The great novelist left his juvenile readers, and his confiding adult readers, to the full belief that King William was the principal person to be accused as the author of both calamities. There probably it not a more striking instance of the blindness of a morbid nationality than in this mode of attributing "wrong or injustice" to a sovereign who, in the one case, was wholly under the guidance of his Scotch ministers, acting in the spirit of all Scotch statesmen toward the Highland clans ; and in the other case was wholly under the control of the English parliament, uttering the voice of the English nation in the commercial jealousies of the age. We have reached a period when all the false nationalities and party sympathies embodied in romance, and in histories more fictitious than fiction, have very nearly done their work ; when we may look at kings and statesmen through that achromatic glass which shows them under no false coloring in their public characters. We may therefore doubt, with a Scottish historian who belongs to this more advanced age, whether, in a period when the Highland chief was acting after his kind in the indulgence of a fierce revenge—when the Scottish statesman was acting as Scottish statesmen had done for ages before him—it was likely that a "far-seeing and deeply judging prince" should desert his nature and habits so much as "to countenance, suggest, and urge on the slaughter of those poor Highlanders." ‡ The anonymous libeller who would have inscribed "Glencoe" on the entablature of a column to William, if he had read the evidence, would have known perfectly well that this slaughter was devised by Scottish statesmen of the Lowlands, and carried through by Scottish captains of the Highlands. He would have known that the treachery of this military execution was the device, in the old crafty and ferocious spirit of clan hostility, of the native soldiers to whom the slaughter was intrusted. He probably knew that Glencoe was not the last of the Highland massacres, sanctioned by no intervention of King William, but by the old "letters of fire and sword" granted by the privy council of Scotland. These letters were not granted for any political object, but in the ancient spirit of revenge, by which a favored clan was authorized to destroy another less favored. Six years after the Glencoe massacre the Laird of McIntosh obtained letters of fire and sword against MacDonald of Keppoch. McIntosh and his followers, with the assistance of the governor of Fort William, are authorized to

* "Acts of the Parliament of Scotland," vol. ix. p. 425.
† Macaulay, "History," vol. iv. p. 580.
‡ "History of the Union," p. 72.
§ "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland," vol. ix. p. 389.
‖ "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 274. ¶ Ibid., p. 153.

* Burton, Appendix, vol. i.
† "Tales of a Grandfather," chap. lix. ‡ Burton, vol. i. p. 173.

hunt and take; if necessary to put to death; and if they retire to strongholds, to "raise fire and use all force and warlike engines." This process, then a legal one, was not sent out against the king's rebels—for the pacification of the Jacobite clans had been accomplished—but to obtain restitution of lands alleged to be unjustly held by a clan that did not care for being "put to the horn."* It were well if those who repeat glibly "how cautious a monarch should be," etc., would lead their readers to some real knowledge of the condition and manners of the Highlanders of those days, and of the mode in which the authorities of Scotland had for generations been accustomed to treat them. They would perhaps then be inclined to assign to its proper cause—a hatred of the political and religious principles of the king of the revolution—the imputation that to his "hard-heartedness" is to be ascribed "the massacre of Glencoe; an enormity which has left a stain on William's memory that neither time, nor the services that he was providentially the instrument of rendering to these kingdoms, can ever efface."†

In narrating the circumstances which retarded the union of the kingdoms of England and Scotland—a measure of which William observed, "I have done all I can in that affair, but I do not see a temper in either nation that looks like it"—Defoe says, "The affair of Glencoe was another step to national breaches." To us, looking calmly upon this affair at the interval of a hundred and sixty-six years, it would appear the most extravagant of national delusions to set up this as "a ground of national animosity." From the beginning to the end it was a Scottish affair. Not an English statesman was concerned in advising the proceeding. The character of the monarch who signed the order, as King of Scotland, is far more truly exemplified in one sentence of the proclamation of indemnity, which ought to have been the rule of conduct for those who urged on the massacre—"to interpret this indemnity in the most favorable and ample manner."

CHAPTER CXXVII.

Marlborough dismissed from office—Parliamentary debates—Independence of the judges—the king leaves for Holland—Threatened invasion—Declaration of James—Battle of La Hogue—Siege of Namur—Grandval's plot to assassinate William—Battle of Steinkirk—Parliament—Crime and public distress—Commencement of the national debt—The Licensing Act expires—Place Bill—Bill for triennial parliaments—The king's veto—Murder of Mountfort—Trial of Lord Mohun.

"The king was pleased, without assigning any reason, to remove my Lord Marlborough from his employments." Such is the brief notice of an important event by the wife of the great peer. Much fuller is her account of the circumstances which caused a serious disagreement between Queen Mary and her sister, the Princess Anne. The queen, three weeks after the dismissal of the earl, wrote to her sister that "it is very unfit Lady Marlborough should stay with you, since that gives her husband so just a pretence of being where he ought not." Mary said, "I need not *repeat* the cause he has given the king to do what he has done, nor his unwillingness at all times to come to such extremities, though people do deserve it." Anne refused to be separated from her beloved Mrs. Freeman; and Mrs. Freeman being commanded to leave the palace, Mrs. Morley left with her. Anne chose her abode at Sion House; and the nation was scandalized at a quarrel between the occupier of the throne and the sister who might one day be called to occupy it. It is easy to imagine that no circumstance in the lives of William and Mary produced more misery than this rupture. The dismissal of Marlborough occurred on the 10th of January, at the very time when, in the view of some candid persons, William was occupied in planning the slaughter of an obscure Highland clan. It was a period to the king of great political anxiety. Lady Marlborough says she could never learn "what cause the king had for his displeasure." The popular feeling regarded the earl's dismissal as a just punishment "for his excessive taking of bribes, covetousness, and extortion on all occasions from his inferior officers."‡ In another passage Evelyn attributes Marlborough's disgrace to his "having used words against the king." What Marlborough had really done has been revealed in a letter of James. The lieutenant-general of William, who also held the domestic office of his gentleman of the bedchamber, had concerted with the Jacobites to effect the recall of James by the subtlest of plots. He was organizing a party to propose and carry in parliament a motion that all the foreigners in the employ of the crown, civil or military, should be sent out of the kingdom. The object was to produce a rupture between the king and the parliament. Then, says the letter of James, "my Lord Churchill would declare with the army for the parliament; and, the fleet doing the same, they would have recalled me." James adds that some of his own imprudent friends, dreading that the scheme of Churchill had for its ultimate object to make the Princess Anne queen, discovered it to Bentinck, and thus "turned aside the blow."*

The parliament was adjourned on the 20th of February, having met on the 2d of the previous October. It was a session of great debate, but more remarkable for the discussion of important measures than for their final enactment. The rival claims of the old East India Company and of the new were the subject of earnest argument, not unmingled with party feelings. But nothing was finally decided, and a bill for the regulation of the India trade was suffered to drop.† A most important measure for regulating trials in cases of high treason was passed by the Commons; but becoming the subject of a great controversy between the two houses, as to the right of peers to be tried by the whole body of the upper house, as well during a recess as during the sitting of parliament, that valuable bill also fell through. A few years later the jealousy of the Commons was removed. Another measure of great public advantage was defeated by the king's veto. It was the first time in which William had exercised this power. The judges had been made independent of the crown as to their term of office. They were appointed by William and Mary "Quamdiu se bene gesserint:" they could not be arbitrarily removed. But their salaries had not been fixed, as they ought to have been. The houses passed a bill for legally establishing this judicial independence; also providing that each judge should be paid a thousand a year. But they charged the salaries upon the hereditary revenues of the crown, without the previous consent of the king having been accorded. The king, says Hallam, "gave an unfortunate instance of his very injudicious tenacity of bad prerogatives in refusing his assent." A later historian says that the circumstances under which the king used his veto have never been correctly stated. "William could defend the proprietary rights of the crown only by putting his negative on the bill. . . . It was not till the provisions of the bill had been forgotten, and till nothing but its title was remembered, that William was accused of having been influenced by a wish to keep the judges in a state of dependence."‡ This great constitutional principle was determined by the Act of Settlement of 1701 (13 Gul. 3, c. 2), which provides that after the limitation of the crown under that statute shall take effect, "Judges' commissions be made Quamdiu se bene gesserint, and their salaries ascertained and established; but upon the address of both houses of parliament it may be lawful to remove them."§

The king set out for Holland on the 5th of March. At the beginning of the session he had told the parliament that an army of sixty-five thousand men would be required, and the houses voted that number. The distribution of the land force gave about eleven thousand men for England, thirteen thousand for Ireland, two thousand

* Burton, vol. i. p. 177, note.
† "Annals of England," vol. iii. p. 120.
‡ Evelyn, "Diary," January 24.

* This letter, in French, is given by Macaulay, who mentions that a translation was published by Macpherson "eighty years ago." History, vol. iv. p. 166.
† See *ante*, vol. iv. p. 613.
‡ Macaulay, "History," vol. iv. p. 183. There is an exception to Lord Macaulay's wonted accuracy in his remarks on this subject. He says, "That great law [the Bill of Rights] had deprived the crown of the power of arbitrarily removing the judges." The Bill of Rights contains not a word on the subject; neither does the Declaration of Rights.
§ Mr. Hallam has pointed out that we owe the independence of the judges to this statute, and not to George III., as we have long been taught to believe. Blackstone contributed to this popular delusion, by ascribing vast importance to the statute 1 Geo. III., c. 23, which continued the commissions of the judges notwithstanding the demise of the crown—a point before doubtful. The recent editor of Blackstone, Dr. Kerr, has pointed out that "the learned commentator much exaggerates the value" of the statute of George III.

for Scotland, and thirty-eight thousand to serve beyond sea. The proportion of regular troops for the defence of England was thus comparatively small; but then the militia of the kingdom could be immediately called out, and the regiments of London and Westminster were always in readiness for service. The navy had been brought into a greater state of efficiency than at any previous period since the revolution. If loyal songs are to be believed in, the war was popular:

"Our army makes Lewis to tremble and quake,
He fearing that Mons we again will retake."*

Weavers, shoemakers, butchers, dyers, hatters—the men of London and the men of the West—were all ready to march under "renowned King William," says the popular doggerel. But something more effective than a broadside ballad was issued to stir up the country to defend its government. It was a declaration by James himself, which was not suppressed by the queen and her council, but reprinted, and widely circulated with appropriate comment. There was in this document not a word of regret for the past; not a word that could hold out a prospect of amendment for the future. It breathed vengeance against nobles and prelates who were proscribed by name; it threatened whole classes with punishment as guilty rebels; the judges and juries who had convicted Ashton and Cross, two of the plotting Jacobites, and the "fishermen and all others who offered personal indignities to us at Feversham." Such was a declaration issued to prepare the people for receiving their ejected king with contrite tears, when he came back at the head of a French invading army. James had at last induced the King of France to hazard the chance of a landing in England. The minister who had constantly opposed that dangerous project was dead. That minister was Louvois. He had been the chief military administrator of Louis for nearly a quarter of a century, but at last became obnoxious to his master. Louvois, says Burnet, "grew uneasy at the authority Madame de Maintenon took in things which she could not understand; and was in conclusion so unacceptable to the king that once, when he flung his bundle of papers down upon the floor before him, the king lifted up his cane, but the lady held him from doing more."† Saint Simon tells something like the same story, with the variation of the king catching up the fire-tongs instead of lifting his cane. Louvois died suddenly, not without suspicion of poison. Saint Simon represents Louis as feeling free when he had got rid of his old servant; and then relates that, when an officer came from James, at St. Germains, with a compliment of condolence, Louis, "with an air and a tone more than perfectly easy" (plus que dégagés) replied, "Give my compliments and thanks to the King and Queen of England, and say to them from me, that my affairs and their affairs will go on none the worse for what has happened." When the great war minister of France was saved by the hand of death from being sent to the Bastile, Louis was free to assist his confident brother at St. Germains with ten thousand French troops, and with the Irish regiments which had entered the service of France. A camp was formed at La Hogue; and James, in the declaration which we have noticed, announced that the Most Christian King had now "lent us so many troops as may be abundantly sufficient to untie the hands of our subjects, and make it safe for them to return to their duty and repair to our standard."‡

On the 24th of April James joined his camp in Normandy. He relied upon his French and Irish army, but he relied as much upon the defection of the English fleet. Not only Admiral Russell, but other officers had been tampered with. Russell, however, had been disgusted into something like a sense of honor and duty by the insane declaration issued by James. He sent word to the rebel-threatener that he ought "to grant a general pardon, and that then he would contribute what he could to his restoration, without insisting upon any terms for himself."§ This crafty renegade had still something of the Englishman about him; for while he proposed to get out of the way with the fleet he commanded, so as to give the invaders an opportunity of landing, he declared that "if he met the French fleet he would fight it, even though the king himself were on board."

On the 15th of May the English fleet was at St. Helen's. It had been joined by the Dutch fleet, the whole force amounting to ninety sail of the line. Russell was in command on board the Britannia. A scene took place in that flag-ship which is happily without a subsequent parallel in English history. A dispatch had arrived from Nottingham, the secretary of state, which Russell was commanded to read to the commanders of the fleet. In his cabin there were men whose names are inscribed among the great naval heroes of our land—Sir George Rooke, Sir Cloudesley Shovel. Such true hearts could have little suspected that he who read to them the magnanimous resolve of the queen was most obnoxious to its covert reproach. Nottingham said, in her majesty's name, that a report was spread abroad that some of the officers of her fleet were not hearty in their service, and that she had ordered many of them to be discharged. She further said that she believed the report was raised by the enemies of the government—that she retained an entire confidence in their fidelity and zeal for the service of the crown and the defence of the country, and was resolved not to displace any one. Then, with one accord, an address to the queen was signed—Russell probably not signing as being too exalted for suspicion to attach to him. It was an address, not cold and formal, but full of the devotion of the heart, concluding in these earnest words, "And that God Almighty may preserve your majesty's most sacred person, direct your counsels, and prosper your arms by sea and land against your majesty's enemies, let all the people say Amen, with your majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects."* There was no time for the enthusiasm of that hour to cool. On the afternoon of that day the French fleet, under Tourville, was seen from the coast of Dorsetshire. On the 17th the English and Dutch fleets were at sea. Tourville had with him only his own squadron, having sailed from Brest, and in his passage to Cape La Hogue had come within view of Portland. Off La Hogue the French transports were receiving troops. Tourville was to convoy this fleet of the invaders. On the morning of the 19th the two fleets came in sight of each other. Tourville immediately bore down upon an armament more than double his number. The wind was favorable to him, and only half of the ships of the allies could come into action. The defection upon which he relied was nowhere to be seen. To vindicate their honor, the commanders of the English fleet urged their men with a zeal that made them invincible, and Russell even told the sailors of the ships that he visited, to throw over any commander that played false, himself not excepted. Carter, Rear-Admiral of the Blue—who is said to have disclosed that overtures had been made to him from the Jacobites—broke the French line at the onset, was mortally wounded, and dying exclaimed, "Fight the ship as long as she can swim." The battle lasted five hours, when the wind changed, and the whole force of the allies was brought together. The victory was complete, the French flying in every direction to their own shores. Tourville's ship, the Royal Sun, the finest vessel of that day, got to Cherbourg, with two other three-deckers. There were no docks at that time to afford security. The great men-of-war were hauled into the shoals. Admiral Delaval attacked them with his fire-ships and his boats' crews, and the pride of the French navy and the two other vessels were burned to the water's edge. Tourville, during the chase, had shifted his flag to the Ambitious, and with twelve other large ships had got into the Bay of La Hogue. Here he lay, under forts and batteries, with the army of James close at hand, and the flags of England and France flying on one of the forts, for James himself was within. On the 23d of May Admiral Rooke led a flotilla of two hundred boats and numerous fire-ships into the bay. The huge vessels fired with little effect. There was a cannonade from the batteries and volleys of musketry from the shore; but on came the rowers, with the old battle-shout. The boats' crews of Tourville fled in confusion. The crews of the French ships abandoning them, the English sailors boarded and set them on fire. At eight the next morning again came Rooke into the bay with his terrible flotilla. The remaining vessels were in like manner burned, after their guns had been turned against the French batteries. "The defeat," says the biographer of James, "was too considerable to be redressed, and too afflicting to be looked upon, nor was it even safe to do it long."†

---

* "Songs of the London Prentices and Trades." Edited by Charles Mackay, p. 122. † "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 165.
‡ "Life of James II.," vol. ii. p. 479. § Ibid., p. 489.

* The address is in the London *Gazette* of the 19th of May, and is quoted in Ralph, vol. ii. p. 352.
† "Life of James II.," vol. ii. p. 496.

Saint Simon, mentioning that "the King of England" looked on at this battle from the shore, says, "He was accused of letting some words escape him of partiality in favor of his nation, although none had made good the promises upon which he had counted when he had urged a naval battle." Tourville, says the same authority, had sent two couriers to Louis to represent the extreme danger of relying upon the assurances of James as to the probable good will of the English commanders, and his confidence in the defection of more than half the fleet during an action. Evelyn writes in his Diary of the 5th of June, "Reports of an invasion were very hot, and alarmed the city, court, and people." On the 15th he writes, "After all our apprehensions of being invaded, and doubts of our success by sea, it pleased God to give us a great naval victory, to the utter ruin of the French fleet." The success was recognized by a temporary act of national gratitude, in a distribution of thirty-seven thousand pounds among the sailors, and in the bestowal of gold medals upon the officers. A more permanent demonstration of the feelings called forth by the victory of La Hogue was a declaration by the queen, that the royal palace of Greenwich should become what we now look upon with patriotic pride—the noble asylum for the disabled "mariners of England."

When the news of La Hogue reached the great supporter of James the French army was besieging Namur. The army of the allies, under the command of William, was encamped in the neighborhood. The French general, Luxemburg, with an overwhelming force, prevented any near advance for the relief of the besieged. Louis himself conducted the siege. "The fortified and threatening hill" looks over a "watery glade" of exquisite beauty;* but in the early summer of 1692 the Sambre had overflowed its banks; and the besiegers had to contend with other difficulties than those created by the science of Cohorn, the engineer of the States-General, who was in the citadel. Vauban, the great engineer of France, was in the lines with Louis. The magnificent monarch so far relaxed the rigor of his wonted etiquette as to permit Vauban to dine with him; at which distinction, says Saint Simon, Vauban was overwhelmed. It was a time when the presence of the monarch was of some importance. Boileau describes the king, with the basest adulation of a venal muse, as directing the siege:

"C'est Jupiter en personne."

Saint Simon shows him doing some service in a sensible human fashion, when it rained in torrents, and the trenches were full of mud and water. The soldiers were cursing Saint Médard; for that saint, like his brother of our calendar, was held to be in a rainy humor for forty days if he willed it to rain on his festival day, the 8th of June. Louis, who always travelled with a vast troop of idle lackeys and fine gentlemen of his household, commanded them to work in carrying corn to the army of Luxemburg. The roads were impassable for wagons, and the household troops and fine gentlemen were commanded to bear sacks of grain to the starving soldiers on the cruppers of their horses. Bitterly they complained; but the king would be obeyed. Without his presence, says Saint Simon, the siege would never have been successful. The besiegers were in extremity for want of provisions. Unfortunately Cohorn was wounded. The Governor of Namur and the garrison lost heart, and the town was first surrendered and afterward the citadel.

During the siege of Namur the army of William had often a distinct view of the operations of the French army. On the 1st of June the English were encamped at Ville, on the Mehaigne. The low grounds on each side of the river were so flooded by incessant rains that it was impracticable to cross, so as to attack the enemy on the opposite side. On the 5th the rains had destroyed most of the bridges over the Mehaigne. "I scarce see what we have to do here," writes one in the camp. On the 8th the allied army and the army of Luxemburg were each moving on opposite banks of the river. On the 13th the French army had drawn nearer to Namur, and William continued to follow their movements.† Namur surrendered on the 30th. "The king's conduct," says Burnet, "was on this occasion much censured; it was said he ought to have put much to hazard, rather than suffer such a place to have been taken in his sight." Boileau concludes his ode with a taunt to the enemies of France—"Go to Liège and Brussels, to carry the humble news of Namur taken under your eyes." Louis returned to Paris with his long train of carriages filled with ladies of the court—his poets, his comedians, and the musicians—"according to the old Persian luxury." William remained to watch Luxemburg, and to fight if opportunity offered. In the middle of July the allied camp was at Genappe. Three prisoners had been brought thither from Bois-le-duc, accused of a design to assassinate William. Their movements had been watched for some time. Burnet had made it known that M. Morel, of Berne, who had been incarcerated in the Bastile for seven years on refusing to renounce his Protestantism, and had been released in April, had written to him that he had been out of curiosity to St. Germains to see King James; and that returning in a public conveyance he met with a man named Grandval, whom he had observed in secret conversation with the exiled king. Grandval was very communicative, and said there was a design in hand that would confound all Europe—the Prince of Orange would not live a month. Various other circumstances had led to the arrest of Grandval and two men that he had associated in his enterprise, Dumont, a Walloon, and the Baron de Leefdale, a Dutchman. These two accomplices of Grandval had no desire to carry through the project to which they had agreed. They gave warnings that there was a plot to remove William by assassination. Leefdale came with Grandval from Paris to the Netherlands. Dumont, having previously told something of what he knew to the Duke of Zell, at Hanover, set out to meet Grandval. When apprehended, and brought to the camp at Genappe, a court-martial of general officers commenced sitting on the 23d of July, for the trial of Bartholomew de Liniere, Sieur de Grandval. The examination of the prisoner had been taken, and the witnesses were about to be confronted with him, when "greater matters intervening put a stop to the process of Grandval."*

The "greater matters" were the sudden determination of William to attack Luxemburg, and the disastrous issue of the enterprise. The French army was encamped between Enghien and Steinkirk, a few miles to the north-west of Hal. The headquarters of William's army were at Lambecque. Luxemburg had an agent in the allied camp who gave him information of the movements of the forces opposed to him—a secretary of the Elector of Bavaria, named Millevoix. A letter from this man was accidentally picked up and carried to the elector. His correspondence was discovered; and William, with remarkable presence of mind, took advantage of the discovery, not by hanging the traitor, but by making his treachery serviceable. He dictated a letter of false intelligence to the terrified Millevoix, in which Luxemburg was informed that the English would come the next day toward the French army to forage, and that a portion of the army would be at hand to protect the foragers. At dawn on the morning of the 3d of August the whole force of the allies was marching toward Steinkirk. Luxemburg was incredulous of the news which his scouts brought him, for he relied upon the informant in whom he thoroughly trusted. He at last roused himself. The nature of the ground was in his favor. The march had been tedious, for there were defiles to pass, and the country was inclosed. The Duke of Würtemberg led the vanguard, and drove the advanced brigade of the French from hedge to hedge. But Luxemburg, with the rapidity of genius, had soon the main body of his army in order of battle. The affair was no longer a surprise. We have before us an unpublished letter written by Marshal Conway in 1774, on the occasion of a visit to this battle-field: "From Oudenarde and Enghien by Grammont the road lies through a beautiful country. Near the former we took horses to go and see the ground of the famous battle of Steinkirk, where King William took such good measures to surprise Marshal Luxemburg; but by the activity and quickness of that able antagonist failed in his project, and was repulsed after a long and bloody engagement. The ground here remains, by all accounts, just as it was at that time, now eighty-two years ago."† As the ground was eighty-two years after the battle, we may readily conclude that another term of eighty-two years has made no very material

* See Wordsworth's Sonnet.

† Letters of Vernon to Colt, printed in Tindal's "Continuation of Rapin," vol. iii. p. 206.

* Letters of Vernon to Colt.

† From a MS. volume of Conway's letters to his brother, the Marquis of Hertford, the property of the author of this history.

change. Commerce has not here created new towns, though a railway may cut through the hedges and span the hollow ways, where the allied cavalry could not act, and the vanguard began to engage, while the main body of infantry was at some distance. Count Solmes, who was chief in command of the English, sent his horse to their relief; but, says a great military critic, "what signified his marching the horse, where the ground was so strait, and the French had such a nation of hedges, and copses, and ditches, and felled trees laid, this way and that, to cover them." * The eloquent corporal truly describes how five English regiments were cut to pieces; "and so had the English life-guards too, had it not been for some regiments upon the right, who marched up boldly to their relief, and received the enemy's fire in their faces, before any one of their own platoons discharged a musket." These brave fellows were led by Auverquerque. They saved the English life-guards; but they could not save the infantry, who had been left without support. Mackay, their brave leader, fell in the desperate conflict. The blame of this great reverse was imputed to Count Solmes, who had probably to bear the mistakes of others as well as his own. It is clear that the nature of the ground was not perfectly understood, and that the panic to be produced by a sudden attack was too confidently relied upon. William made every effort to bring up his men to relieve the vanguard; but Luxemburg was now reinforced by Boufflers, who heard the firing, and marched from his neighboring quarters. The king, it is said, looked upon the slaughter, and exclaimed, "Oh, my poor English, how are they abandoned." On each side there were about seven thousand killed and wounded. The allies marched from the field of battle in good order, to the camp from which they had unfortunately gone forth, as they believed, to victory. The nation was dispirited. The army was indignant that Solmes, a foreigner, should have been placed in the command of English troops, and then look on while they were slaughtered. In the House of Commons, three months after, the public voice found an indignant vent. That house now fully exercised the right from which it has never since parted, of seeking occasion freely to comment upon warlike operations—sometimes unjustly, often ignorantly, but never without advantage to the discovery of truth. On the 22d of November these words were heard in the house: "None are ignorant of the melancholy story of Steinkirk; every one knows that tragedy. The common soldiers had no opinion of their officers. I move," added Sir Peter Colleton, "that none but natives should command Englishmen." Sir Edward Seymour asked, "What number have you fit for general officers? They are few; and will you think to discharge and send away foreigners till you have generals of your own?" There can be no doubt that during the long vassalage of the Stuarts to France, England had lost all the qualities of a military nation, except the best quality, the spirit of her people—the blood and bone of those who fought in her ranks. She wanted scientific as well as brave leaders, bred in her own bosom. Seymour truly said, "Men are not born generals." There were in the House of Commons at that time, as there have been ever since, officers of rank, who came from active service in the field to the senate, and said honestly what they knew. Lord Colchester, who commanded the third troop of horse-guards, was one of these. He told his story simply and clearly; and his relation confirms the ordinary historical accounts in all essentials: "I find the business of Steinkirk stick with some gentlemen. The chief occasion of the ill-success there was the wrong information given to the king of the ground we were to pass, which was so full of hedges and woods that we could not draw up one body to sustain another; horse and foot were mingled. I saw the attack made by Fagel; Dutch, English, and all nations: they beat the French from hedge to hedge, but their very weight of men bore us down. The French came upon us, and Auverquerque came up, and behaved himself as well as any man in the world. He sent us two Danish regiments, and we retreated to the main body, and from thence to the main camp." † The anger of the house centred upon Solmes. "When this attack was formed," said Colonel Cornwall, "Solmes was there, with ten battalions to sustain them. Solmes said, 'That to send more was to slaughter more.'" The king withdrew his countenance from the obnoxious general, who had offended by his haughtiness as well as by his conduct in the battle of Steinkirk. He fell in a second unfortunate battle in the coming year.

The court-martial on Grandval was reopened in a week after the battle. Two of the generals of whom it was originally composed had fallen in the field—Mackay and Lanier. The duty of the court was not very embarrassing; for the prisoner had made a circumstantial confession, "without any constraint or pain, or being in irons." So says the official relation of the court-martial. He declared that the late French minister, Louvois, had in 1691 entered into an agreement with Anthony Dumont about the murder of King William; that upon the death of Louvois the design dropped, but that Barbesieux, the son of Louvois, who succeeded him as secretary of state to the French king, revived the project, and had several conferences with him, Grandval; that he was engaged in the affair with Colonel Parker, in the service of King James; and that with him, Barbesieux and Dumont, the plan was arranged, which was that he should shoot William, when he exposed himself during the campaign. Leefdale was then brought into the scheme. The most material averment of the prisoner was that he had seen James at St. Germains, his queen being present, and that James said, "Parker has given me an account of the business; if you and the other officers do me this service, you shall never want." Grandval was executed in the camp at Hal, according to his sentence. He declared in a letter to a friend that it cost him his life for having obeyed the orders of Barbesieux. The confession of Grandval was printed and circulated in several languages. No answer was made to its circumstantial statements, vouched for by ten distinguished officers of various nations who composed the court-martial.

The king returned to England on the 18th of October. The outward signs of a cordial welcome awaited him. There were illuminations as he passed through London to Kensington. There was a loyal address from the corporation of London; and the king dined at Guildhall on the lord mayor's day. There was a solemn thanksgiving for his safe return, and for the great victory at sea. But there were many symptoms of political and social distempers which made sober men uneasy. In September the queen had issued two proclamations—one for the discovery of seditious libellers, the other for the apprehension of highwaymen. The one proclamation was far more effective than the other. The libellers worked their secret presses, and the furious zealots circulated their productions without any material injury to the government. The people grumbled a little more under the pressure of taxation, and under other evils of their daily life, when they read inflammatory pamphlets from Jacobites and nonjurors; but a return to the times before the revolution was the farthest from their wishes. There was a good deal of alarm in that autumn of 1692, from the daring crimes that sometimes seem epidemic in a nation. Hence the proclamation against highwaymen. We have mentioned a robbery of the tax-collectors in Hertfordshire.* Similar gangs of banditti robbed mails and stage-coaches even in the day-time. William on his return took strong measures to put down these enormities. Many highwaymen were discovered and executed, and a regiment of dragoons was used as a preventive police, and patrolled all the great roads leading to the capital. Burglars were almost as bold and as numerous as footpads and highwaymen. We doubt whether there was any especial distress connected with this particular juncture; though it is said that there was a failure of the harvest—that the heavy rains had been fatal to the crops—that no fruit ripened—that the price of the quarter of wheat doubled. † Evelyn indeed writes in his Diary of the 1st of October, "This season was so exceedingly cold, by reason of a long and tempestuous north-east wind, that this usually pleasant month was very uncomfortable. No fruit ripened kindly." But he says nothing of a bad harvest in England. He says, "France is in the utmost misery and poverty for the want of corn and subsistence." The harvest of 1692 is represented as plentiful, so that England was exporting corn. ‡ Nevertheless there can be no doubt that among a people who had not previously borne such heavy burdens of taxation as four years of war had imposed upon them—and whose industry was not sufficiently developed to enable them to bear their burdens without being weighed down—there must have been much suffering and more discontent.

* "Tristram Shandy."
† "Parliamentary History," vol. v. col. 713.

* See *ante*, vol. iv. p. 614.
† Macaulay, vol. iv. p. 204.
‡ Tindal, vol. iii. p. 217.

The king opened the parliament on the 4th of November. He thanked them for their large supplies; he would be compelled to ask for a further supply to maintain a force by sea and land. He was sensible how heavy this charge was upon his people. It afflicted him to learn that it was not possible to be avoided without exposing the kingdom to inevitable ruin and destruction. He hoped for their advice and assistance, which had never failed him. The House of Commons set about giving its advice; but it did little more than display a good deal of ill-humor as to the conduct of the war. There were several important matters bearing upon the future condition of the country, arising out of the proceedings of this session, which we shall briefly notice.

Turning over the index of the ponderous statute-book, to look for acts that have had a permanent influence on the condition of the country, we might perhaps pass over one act that bears this lengthy title: "An act for granting to their majesties certain rates and duties of excise upon beer, ale, and other liquors for securing certain recompenses and advantages in the said act mentioned, to such persons as shall voluntarily advance the sum of ten hundred thousand pounds toward carrying on the war against France." * Under this statute commenced the national debt of England. The million of money which was to supply a portion of the expenses of the war "in a manner that would be least grievous," as the preamble says, was expected to be voluntarily advanced on the credit of the special provision of the new duties of excise, which were to be set apart as they were paid into the exchequer. The ten hundred thousand pounds were speedily subscribed; for the industry of the people had created capital which was seeking employment, although they had been far more heavily taxed during four years than at any previous period. Louis, although he was familiar with the system of loans, was somewhat amazed at the comparative ease with which taxes were raised and a million of money borrowed in England upon the credit of the taxes. He is said to have exclaimed, "My little cousin the Prince of Orange is fixed in the saddle; no matter; the last louis-d'or must carry it."† This was really a just view of the premises of success, though the great king's conclusions were fallacious. The people of England were in a far better condition than the people of France to fight on without expending all to the last louis-d'or. The working and accumulating middle class was far more powerful in the one nation than in the other. There can be no doubt that the means first created by the act of 1693 for the investment of superfluous capital have largely contributed to the progressive development of the national resources. There can be no doubt, on the other hand, that the facilities of borrowing by the creation of stock have often led to extravagant expenditure in wars that have averted no real danger nor secured any public advantage.

There can be nothing more true than the assertion of Mr. Ricardo that "there cannot be a greater security for the continuance of peace than the imposing on ministers the necessity of applying to the people for the taxes to support a war." He has further observed, speaking the language of common-sense, which is the language of all true political economy, that "the burdens of a war are undoubtedly great during its continuance, but at its termination they cease altogether. When the pressure of war is felt at once, without mitigation, we shall be less disposed wantonly to engage in an expensive contest, and if engaged in it, we shall be sooner disposed to get out of it, unless it be a contest for some great national interest."‡ Although the statesmen and the people of the reign of William III. felt that the war against the preponderance of France, and the consequent subjection of England, was for a great national interest, they also felt that the burden could not be borne in the existing state of the country without resort to the system of loans. In the case before us they did not contemplate a permanent loan. In the next year, when the Bank of England was established upon the condition of lending a sum of money to the government, of which the principal could not be demanded by the lenders, though the borrowers had the privilege of paying it off, a permanent debt was begun to be contracted. The system of borrowing went on for three years, till at the peace of Ryswick the debt amounted to twenty-one millions and a half. Nevertheless, so strong was the objection to the continuance of that system that, although engaged in a most expensive war for five years after the accession of Anne, the debt was reduced to sixteen millions. In half a century more it had increased to seventy-five millions. It was then the received opinion of financiers that if it ever reached a hundred millions the nation must become bankrupt.

When we look at the one million borrowed on life annuities in 1693, and the eight hundred and three millions constituting the public debt of the United Kingdom in 1858, we may be amazed at the vast amount of the burden which has been gradually accumulating, but we also can now distinctly perceive how that burden has been borne. It has not weighed down the country, because all the material resources of the country have been increasing with it. The increasing wealth—of which this vast debt owing by the nation to the nation is a symbol—produced by the incessant applications of capital and labor, of science and invention, has increased the ability of the great body of the people to participate in the advantages to be derived from a ready and secure investment of their savings, with the condition that the sum so invested might be easily transferable. To this cause may be attributed the ease with which the government of that day could obtain loans by the creation of public funds at a fixed rate of interest, chiefly upon annuities. That facility shows the growing importance of the trading class, who most readily lent their surplus capital. Money, also, was no longer hoarded by those who had no means of employing it commercially; although, for a considerable period, there were vast numbers who had not sufficient confidence in the government to lend. The time was far distant when there would be three hundred thousand persons receiving dividends upon stock, and when one million three hundred and forty thousand persons would also lend their small accumulations through the agency of savings banks. The country was steadily growing more prosperous, as the national debt went on increasing to six times the amount at the period when inevitable bankruptcy was predicted. It was six hundred millions at the peace of Amiens. The eighteenth century, deficient as it was in many social improvements which we now command, was a period of rapid progress in agriculture and manufactures; and with this progress came a greater command of food and clothing, better dwellings, less frequent and less fatal epidemics for the great bulk of the people. The loan of 1693 has furnished data for a remarkable inquiry into the prolongation of life in the eighteenth century, consequent upon the better condition and therefore improved health of the population. That loan was a tontine. Every contributor of 100*l.* might name a life, to receive a fixed dividend during the duration of that life. As the annuitants dropped, their shares of the dividends were also to be divided among the survivors, till the whole number of annuitants was reduced to seven. In 1790, during the ministry of Mr. Pitt, another tontine was negotiated. The comparative results, as exhibiting the probable duration of life at the two periods, have been worked out by Mr. Finlaison, upon the assumption that the 438 females and 594 males named in 1693, and the 3974 females and 4197 males named in 1790, were the youngest and the healthiest lives that the shareholders could select. Taking the dates at which the annuities of 1693 fell in, and estimating those of 1790 that had fallen or were still remaining in 1851, the calculation showed that in 1790 the expectation of life had increased one fourth.*

In 1692 "An act for continuing certain laws that are expired and near expiring" was passed, in which the act of Charles II., continued by that of James II., "for preventing abuses in printing seditious, treasonable, and unlicensed books and pamphlets, and for regulating printing and printing-presses," then about to expire, was continued to the 13th of February, 1692, and to the end of the next session of parliament. If that renewed act should expire, the press, exempted from the superintendence of a licenser, would to a great extent be freed; its real freedom would depend upon the law of libel and its honest application. The licenser of the Stuarts, Sir Roger L'Estrange, was ejected from his office at the revolution. "His sting is gone," says John Dunton. That worthy chronicler of publishers and authors sketches the characters of the successors of the Tory licenser, saying, very libellously, "he would wink at unlicensed books if the printer's wife" kept up to the example of too many wives of that

* 4 Gul. & Mar. c. 3. † Ralph, vol. ii. p. 398.
‡ "Works of David Ricardo," pp. 539 and 546.

* We gather these facts from a paper by Dr. Southwood Smith, read at Birmingham in 1857.

age. He describes Mr. Fraser "commonly called Catalogue Fraser, from his skill in books;" Dr. Midgley, "no bigot;" Mr. Heron, with "an air of pleasantness in his countenance;" and "our last licenser, before the act of printing expired, Edmund Bohun, Esqre.," "a furious man against dissenters," and "a pretty author himself."* Edmund Bohun brought his own house down over his head. He carried his party feeling into his official occupation, but had very strange notions which his party would not avow. He was bitterly attacked by a writer of very questionable notoriety, Charles Blount; and was more effectually damaged by a scheme of the same person "to ensnare and ruin him."† Blount wrote a pamphlet, which Bohun readily licensed—for it rested the rights of the sovereigns of the revolution upon a principle which would confer upon them absolute power. On the 22d of January complaint was made to the Commons that a pamphlet, entitled "King William and Queen Mary Conquerors, contained matter of dangerous consequence to their majesties, to the liberties of the subject, and to the peace of the kingdom." The house examined the matter, ordered the pamphlet to be burned by the common hangman, and prayed the crown to remove from his office Mr. Edmund Bohun, the licenser, who had suffered the pamphlet to be printed. With the removal of this licenser the system of licensing came to an end. The act for regulating printing expired. The house was in a libel-burning mood, with regard to the same description of offence: "Dr. Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury's book burnt by the hangman, for an expression of the king's title by conquest, on a complaint of Joseph Howe, a member of parliament—little better than a madman."‡ Some were for impeaching the bishop. The pastoral letter in which the doctrine was held was written in 1689. There could be no impeachment, for there had been an act of grace in 1690. The House of Commons has never failed to rejoice in any exhibition of the power of some member to make a bad joke. At the cry of "Burn it, burn it," the book was sent to the flames at Charing Cross.

There were two attempts made in this session to produce what may be called a reform in parliament. The Commons passed a bill excluding all placemen from sitting in the house who should be elected after February, 1693. Men holding office of every kind, civil and military, were in parliament. It was unwisely proposed to exclude all persons who should in future hold office under the crown. It was prudently determined by the sitting members not to exclude themselves. They passed no "Self-denying ordinance." The Lords rejected this measure by a very small majority. A bill providing that the existing parliament should end on the first of January, 1694, and that no parliament should in future sit more than three years, was introduced to the House of Lords by Shrewsbury, who represented the Whigs. It passed both houses. On the last day of the session the king rejected the measure, in the words of Norman French which would now be the most fatal words ever spoken by a sovereign. The constitution has worked itself clear of such contending powers. The use of the veto was not then thought "an exercise of prerogative which no ordinary circumstances can reconcile either with prudence or a constitutional administration of government."§ The bill for triennial parliaments was passed in the next year, without opposition from the crown. The most memorable circumstance connected with the bill which William rejected was, that having asked the advice of Sir William Temple, that advice, to pass the bill, was communicated to the king by the humble friend of the retired statesman, his secretary, Jonathan Swift.

Slightly connected with the political transactions of the beginning of 1693 was a tragical event that occasioned great public scandal. "After five days' trial and extraordinary contest, the Lord Mohun was acquitted by the Lords of the murder of Mountfort, the player, notwithstanding the judges, from the pregnant witnesses of the fact, had declared him guilty. But whether in consideration of his youth, being not eighteen years old, though exceeding dissolute, or upon whatever other reason—the king himself present some part, and satisfied, as they report, that he was culpable—sixty-nine acquitted him, only fourteen condemned him."‖ The people cried out that when blood was shed by the great there was no justice for the poor. Members of the House of Commons rejoiced that, in the last session, they had so strenuously opposed an extension of the privileges of the Peers, who thus sheltered one of their own guilty members. William Mountfort, the player, according to Colley Cibber, was in tragedy the most affecting lover; in comedy he gave the truest life to the fine gentleman. In 1694 he was in his thirty-third year—"tall, well-made, fair, and of an agreeable aspect." Nine years before he was patronized by Jeffries, when at the height of his power; and at a lord mayor's feast the jovial chancellor made Mountfort "plead before him in a feigned cause, in which he aped all the great lawyers of the age in their tone of voice, and in their action and gesture of body"—very much to the scandal of Sir John Reresby, who records the fact. This accomplished actor was the favorite of the town. But Mrs. Anne Bracegirdle was "the darling of the theatre." She was "the universal passion," but she admitted no favorite. Among the rakes and fops who frequented the one theatre that now enjoyed the monopoly of the drama, it was a fashion "to have a taste of *tendre* for Mrs. Bracegirdle."* Among those who toasted this lively brunette over their bumpers of claret were a Captain Hill, and his friend and admirer, the debauched young peer. The captain had addressed the actress in terms which she rejected with contempt. He became jealous, and his jealousy fixed upon Mountfort; for Hill had writhed at seeing the handsome actor in love-scenes, when the lady smiled upon her admirer with all the semblance of real passion. Hill, with the assistance of his noble friend, determined to carry off Mrs. Bracegirdle. They also determined to have no more trouble with the presumptuous player. They forced the actress into a coach as she was coming out of a house with her mother; but she was rescued, and the courtly pair departed, vowing vengeance on Mountfort. They loitered about the player's house till midnight. As he approached his home, Lord Mohun met him in Norfolk Street, entering into friendly conversation. Hill came behind, struck Mountfort on the head, and then ran him through the body. The grand jury found a true bill against Mohun and Hill for the murder. Hill escaped. The judges, at the request of Carmarthen, who presided at the trial, had given the opinion upon the case to which Evelyn alludes.

* Dunton's "Life and Errors," p. 351, edit. 1705.
† Macaulay. ‡ Evelyn, "Diary," Feb. 4.
§ Hallam, "Constitutional History," chap. xv.
‖ Evelyn, "Diary," Feb. 4.

CHAPTER CXXVIII.

Ministerial changes—Preparations for the campaign—Louis and William with their armies—Louis returns to Versailles—Battle of Landen—Naval miscarriages—A ministry formed—Government by party—Preponderance of the Whigs—Financial difficulties—Establishment of the Bank of England—Expedition against Brest—Illness of the queen—Her death.

King William had closed the session of the English Parliament on the 14th of March. He had made some important changes in official appointments. Sir John Somers had been promoted to the dignity of keeper, the great seal having been so long in commission that "all people were now grown weary" of the dilatory and expensive proceedings in chancery.† Russell was removed from the command of the fleet; for, in consequence of fierce differences between him and Nottingham, the secretary of state, they could not have held office together. At this juncture Burnet notices the formation of a party "that studied to cross and defeat everything." One of the principal leaders of this party was Sir Christopher Musgrave, who "upon many critical occasions gave up some important points, for which the king found it necessary to pay him very liberally."‡ The memory of this senator has been preserved from the utter oblivion to which such patriotism is best consigned, by four lines of the great satirist of the next reign:

> "Once, we confess, beneath the patriot's cloak,
> From the crack'd bag the dropping guinea spoke,
> And jingling down the back-stairs told the crew
> Old Cato is as great a rogue as you."§

The amount of business done in this way was very considerable. The bribe at Kensington was too often found necessary to neutralize

* Cibber's "Apology." † Burnet, vol. iv. p. 187.
‡ Ibid., p. 190. § Pope. "Epistle on the Use of Riches."

the bribe from Versailles. William grew more and more cynical and sullen under these degrading affairs of statecraft, and gladly rushed away to hunt in Holland or to fight in Belgium.

His Most Christian Majesty—"Jupiter en personne"—is again about to take the field. What privations he is now to undergo for the glory of France! He is fifty-seven years of age. He had been fifty-two years king; but his real sovereign power did not commence till the great minister, Mazarin, had closed his long career of intrigue. Then the magnificent sovereign burst forth in all the grandeur that can result from the implicit belief of one man that he is born to uncontrolled command, and that all that remains for millions of subject beings is to obey. The first maxim of government that Louis laid down was that kings are absolute lords; that all property was theirs; that the lives of their subjects were theirs also. He had the old feudal nobility of France at his feet. Their political power had burned out in the wars of La Fronde. All that was left to them were their exclusive privileges, and their capacity of grinding the occupiers of land by every variety of exaction. They had nothing in common with the great body of the people; they had no common rights to maintain; they were no longer the protectors of the vassals from a greater tyranny than their own. All the miseries of feudalism remained, with none of its security. The great lords of the soil had all become slaves of the court. They were yet, to a certain extent, brave and warlike. They fought in their embroidery at Steinkirk, as their fathers had fought in their armor at Agincourt. But their reckless gallantry had no higher principle for its support than that of the liveried menial whose bravery is founded upon the arrogance and ostentation of his master. Their adulation of their *grand monarque* was in some respects a trade. He was the fountain of all honor and all preferment; the grosser their flatteries the more certain their rewards. He was the sun that imparted life to all within its sphere. Where that sun did not shine, there was one universal thick darkness. But where did it not shine? It was the great central power that vivified all France. The sun rose upon France when the chief valet went forth from the royal bedchamber and said, "The king is awake." Then the princes of the blood, and the dukes and counts who were waiting in the antechamber, enter in solemn state, with the pages of the wardrobe, who bear the surtouts and the wigs, with other inferior habiliments that majesty may condescend to wear. As the sublime operations of shaving and hand-washing go forward, those who have the privilege of "la première entrée" gather round to behold how the Phœbus of France is gradually unfolding its beams. As that sun becomes more and more brilliant, "les grandes entrées" take placé, and marshals and bishops look on with humble adoration while a duke hands Louis his shirt, and a marquis assists him to pull on his stockings. The waistcoat, the coat, the blue ribbon, and the sword complete the courtly investiture of this more than mortal, who stands in the relation of Providence to France.* Such was the morning opening of the terrible routine day of Versailles—of its dreary etiquettes—its heartless splendors—its odious profligacies—the absolute king himself the merest slave of the artificial life which he enforced as the basis of his power. From such a monotony the king of France is about to seek relief in once more looking upon the pomp and circumstance of war. He departs from Versailles with his vast cavalcade of ladies, of cooks and valets, of actors and musicians. He puts himself at the head of the army of Boufflers, while Luxemburg with another army is near at hand.

On the 24th of March William left London to embark at Harwich. The wind was contrary, and he returned for a few days to Kensington. The court life of that suburban residence is as striking a contrast to the court life of Versailles as the little villa is insignificant itself when compared with the proud palace of the French king. The Kensington which William bought of Lord Nottingham was then surrounded with only twenty-six acres of plantations and gardens—"a patched building," says Evelyn. Another observer of the time says, "The walks and grass are very fine." Queen Mary directed the laying out of the gardens, and William rejoiced to watch the growth of the evergreens in which he delighted. It was a seat well suited for a king of simple tastes. Versailles was well suited for an ostentatious king, who counted it among his great works to have expended ten millions in subjugating nature by art—building a vast palace and creating magnificent gardens in a desert of sand and swamp.* A few days' quiet, and William is again hurrying with small retinue to the Hague. He has, as usual, to unite the discordant members of the confederacy, to soothe the rivalries of princes who each wanted some supreme command, to tempt some with money, some with promised honors. At the beginning of June Louis was with the army of Boufflers, who had taken up a position at Gembloux. The ladies of the court were left in safety within the walls of Namur. The other army commanded by Luxemburg was only half a league distant from that of Boufflers. William had intrenched himself near Louvain. He had thus posted himself to prevent an advance of the French upon Liège or upon Brussels. However inferior in numbers, he was resolved to hazard a battle if the enemy should advance. He took no sanguine view of his situation when such a mighty force was so near, having a perfect command of supplies. St. Simon, who was serving in this campaign as a captain of cavalry, says of William, "We have since known that he wrote several times to his intimate friend, the Prince de Vaudemont, that he was lost—that he could only escape by a miracle." Luxemburg urged Louis to advance. To the astonishment of the French armies the king announced his determination, on the 8th of June, to return to Versailles, and to send part of the great force into Germany. St. Simon attributes this resolution to the remembrance of the tears which Madame de Maintenon had shed at their parting, and to the letters in which she urged the return of her royal lover or husband. The same shrewd witness of what was clearly regarded as pusillanimity in the great king, describes the bursts of laughter among friends, the sneers, the whispered indignation, which even the most extravagant loyalty could not suppress. Louis retraced his steps to Namur, and on the 25th of June he arrived with his ladies at Versailles.

Boufflers had left the army of the Netherlands with the detached force sent to the Rhine. Luxemburg was now in the sole command of the French army, which was still superior to that of William. But this ablest of the generals of Louis by his skilful manœuvres contrived to weaken William's force. William had learned that Luxemburg was advancing to lay siege to Liège, and he determined to detach a large body to assist in its defence, leaving his own intrenched camp near Louvain, and marching with his remaining fifty thousand men to a favorable position on the River Gette. The feint of Luxemburg was successful. He suddenly turned from the road to Liège, and on the 28th of July William was aware that he had been deceived, and that the enemy was coming fast upon him with a greatly superior army. He would not retreat. All that could be done was to strengthen his position. In one night of incessant labor intrenchments had been thrown up, redoubts had been constructed, the hedges and mud walls of the two villages which the allies occupied had been converted into barricades. "It is incredible," says St. Simon, "that in so few hours such an extent of regular defences could have been created." On the morning of the 29th of July their value was to be tested.

When Luxemburg suddenly changed his apparent determination to move upon Liège, he ordered the fascines to be burned, with which each battalion had been provided for the siege. By a rapid march of eight leagues he had reached a plain within hearing of the multitudinous sounds of William's camp. All the night these noises were heard, and "we began to fear," says St. Simon, "that the enemy was about to retreat." The sun had scarcely risen when the batteries of the allied army gave effectual proof that no flight was meditated. The French artillery could not be brought up till an hour afterward. "We then began to see," says St. Simon, "that the affair would be difficult." The allies occupied the heights, and the two villages of Neerwinden and of Bas-Landen, one on the right and the other on the left. A long intrenchment, on the high ground, connected one village with the other. As the French cavalry advanced, the batteries from their commanding intrenchment did great execution. The great struggle was for the possession of these villages, especially of Neerwinden. The French infantry attacked with the impetuosity of their nation, and they were repulsed by the English characteristic obstinacy. At Neerwinden their general,

* De Tocqueville says of the centralizing system, "The French government having thus assumed the place of Providence."

* St. Simon.

Montchevreul, was killed, and the young Duke of Berwick was taken prisoner. The French cavalry endeavored to force the intrenchments, and were suffered to approach within pistol-shot of the allied infantry, when, says St. Simon, "the enemy gave such a well-directed volley that the horse wheeled round, and retired faster than they came." During four hours had this struggle been carried on. Twice had the French infantry been repulsed, and thrice the French cavalry. St. Simon relates how Luxemburg called the princes of the blood and his fellow-marshals to a conference at a spot out of reach of the cannon of the allies, and there for half an hour earnestly debated what course should be adopted, under the circumstances of such obstinate resistance. A third time it was resolved to attack Neerwinden, but with such an overwhelming force as should carry the victory, if victory were to be won. The household troops of Louis, headed by the Prince of Conti, attacked with irresistible fury. When they had carried the walled gardens and cleared the intrenched street, the carbineers and the cavalry poured in. The allies began to retreat as the French gained possession of Neerwinden, from the top of whose clock-tower the curé of the village looked down upon the terrible struggle. Suddenly William appeared at the head of his English guards; and the famous household troops of France, "until now invincible," says St. Simon, gave way before him. But all was in vain. The intrenchments of the main line could not be adequately defended, while the brunt of the conflict had to be borne in the two villages on the extreme right and left. The line was broken; a retreat was necessary; but it was not a disorderly retreat. William, according to the sober narrative of St. Simon, fought to the last, and he with the elector of Bavaria passed over the bridge which the allies had constructed over the Gette, when he saw that there was no reasonable hope in a further contest. A more enthusiastic relation thus paints the king: "Gallant mortal! This moment, now that all is lost, I see him, galloping across me, corporal, to the left, to bring up the remains of the English horse along with him to support the right, and tear the laurel from Luxemburg's brows, if yet 'tis possible—I see him, with the knot of his scarf just shot off, infusing fresh spirit into poor Galway's regiment—riding along the line—then wheeling about, and charging Conti at the head of it—Brave, brave, by Heaven! cried my uncle Toby—he deserves a crown." It is the fire of genius which thus lights up the traditions of Sterne's boyhood. The daring of William "when all was lost," was not "to tear the laurel from Luxemburg's brow," but to cover the retreat of his scattered forces, as they had to cross the temporary bridges, or plunge into the fords and climb the steep banks of the Gette. The exhausted victors remained upon the ground they had won. There had been twelve hours of fighting. Twenty thousand of both armies fell in that terrible battle-field, which the French call Neerwinden and the English call Landen. The victory of Luxemburg had no direct results. The retreat of William involved no greater disaster. He was not a fortunate general, but no one could deny his courage and his indomitable energy. He was one of those who possess the rare faculty of considering no misfortune, however severe, to be irretrievable. On the night of the battle he wrote a note to his friend Portland, in which he says, "These are great trials, which God has been pleased to send me in quick succession. I must try to submit to his pleasure without murmuring, and to deserve his anger less." In three weeks he had gathered all his forces around him at Brussels. The detachment that had been unfortunately sent to Liège had joined the headquarters in safety. The crisis, William said, had been terrible; but he thanked God it had ended no worse. The only successful result of the campaign in which Louis took the field with a hundred and forty thousand men, to sweep the allies from the Netherlands, was the taking of Charleroy, to which siege William offered no opposition. The biographer of James pours out his complaints that the court of France had not availed itself of the advantages gained over the allies, especially "at the famous battle of Landen," to be zealous in the matter of his restoration to the crown of England; "for there never was greater hopes of terrifying the English into their duty than at this time." His Most Christian Majesty did not avail himself of the favorable occasion. James had published a declaration in April, which promised all sorts of good things to his rebellious subjects, in which promises no one confided. The dream so long indulged of "terrifying the English into their duty" was the last hope; and that was doomed to disappointment. The French, says the biographer of James, "began to be so weary of the war, and were indeed so terrified themselves by the great scarcity which happened that year, that his Most Christian Majesty thought fit to make offers of peace, by mediation of the crown of Denmark." He adds, "It is not improbable but when the English saw the French so disheartened after such mighty advantages, that it allayed their apprehensions of the king's being forced upon them, and consequently their endeavors of restoring him themselves." *

During the absence of the king, England had undergone other disasters besides that of Landen. She saw the operation of the allies unsuccessful in every quarter. The French army which had been detached from Gembloux crossed the Rhine, and enabled another French force to take Heidelberg, and repeat the ravages which had previously disgraced their arms in the Palatinate. Catalonia was invaded, and the fortress of Rosas was taken by the French. The Duke of Savoy sustained a memorable defeat at Marsiglia. Worst of all, through the mismanagement of naval affairs, the rich Smyrna fleet of English and Dutch merchantmen, which was to be convoyed by English and Dutch men-of-war, was intercepted by Tourville, and captured, destroyed, or scattered. In the utter want of correct intelligence, the English admirals, Killigrew and Delaval, had thought the squadron safe when they had sailed to a certain point beyond Ushant; for they believed that Tourville was in Brest harbor. He had come out, and had joined the Toulon fleet. Rooke, against his remonstrances, was left with a very inadequate force, and the other admirals sailed homeward, ready to avert any attempt upon the English coasts. Off Cape St. Vincent Rooke learned that a French fleet was in the Bay of Lagos. He soon found himself in presence of an enemy of four times his strength. The Dutch fought bravely, while Rooke made all speed with part of his unfortunate convoy to Madeira. The loss to the mercantile interest of England and Holland was enormous. The suffering merchants of London sent a deputation to the queen, to pray for inquiry into the cause of this misfortune; and Mary's conciliatory reply disarmed some portion of the anger of the people. It was a time of great excitement. Violent pamphlets against the government were scattered abroad from secret presses. A printer named William Anderson was indicted for high treason, was convicted, and was executed. It requires a rather violent stretch of historical partisanship to affirm that such a conviction was legal, although the tracts inculcated a general insurrection, and the nation was exhorted to free itself from its tyrant. There was no proof of the printing of these tracts at the press of Anderson beyond what resulted from a comparison of the impressions of the types used with the types seized on his premises. Even if the proof of printing had been complete, we may conclude that there is "much danger in the construction which draws printed libels, unconnected with any conspiracy, within the pale of treason, and especially the treason of compassing the king's death, unless where they directly tended to his assassination." † The punishment of Anderson only increased the virulence of the Jacobite pamphleteers, as must ever be the case when extreme punishments are resorted to as the readiest means of prevention for political offences. The hanging of Anderson in London, and the torturing of Nevil Payne in Edinburgh, ‡ did more injury to the cause of William than the defeats of Steinkirk or Landen. He came to put down the injustice and cruelty of arbitrary power; and yet, said his enemies, with some truth, tyranny still walks abroad under the mask of freedom.

At the beginning of November William was again at Kensington. The parliament was to meet on the 7th. A great change in the administrative system of England was about to take place. The king for five years had endeavored to govern by choosing his ministers from each of the two great parties of the state; sometimes giving the preponderance to the Whigs, at other times to the Tories. These ministers carried on the public affairs of their several departments without very well defined principles of action, amid personal hatreds and jealousies which were too often highly injurious to the national interests. An experiment was now to be made to substitute for this individual direction of public affairs the administration of a party.

* "Life of James II.," vol. ii. p. 516.

† Hallam, "Constitutional History," chap. xv.

‡ We omitted to mention (*ante*, p. 645) that the warrant for the torture of Nevil Payne bears William's signature; a mere formal act, perhaps, but one which attaches obloquy to his memory.

The heads of departments were to be united by some common consent upon political principles. "Party divisions," says Burke, "whether on the whole operating for good or evil, are things inseparable from free government." He held it to be a duty for public men "to act in party," with all the moderation consistent with vigor and fervency of spirit,*—a duty not very easy at any time, and almost impossible in the earlier stages of representative government, when all were going through a sort of education in constitutional principles. William was about to change some of his ministers; at the same time to select new advisers from those who would "act in party;" who would submit their own wills to a general agreement; who would constitute what we now understand as a ministry, whose possession of power under the authority of the sovereign, and with the command of a parliamentary majority, implied the superior influence of the general principles which constituted their bond of political union. William had become convinced that he could best carry on his government through the party which had mainly accomplished the revolution. He would not compose his administration exclusively of Whigs, but there should be such a preponderance of those who held Whig principles that the Tory party, so closely bordering upon the Jacobite party, should be neutralized in what we may now call a cabinet. The functions of the privy council had become merged in the cabinet council. In a debate in 1692, on advice given to the king, one member exclaimed, "Cabinet council is not a word to be found in our law-books. We knew it not before. We took it for a nickname."† Another member described what the cabinet was: "The method is this: things are concerted in the cabinet, and brought and put upon them for their assent, without showing any of the reasons. That has not been the method of England. If this method be, you will never know who gives advice."‡ The objectors to a cabinet desired that every counsellor should, in the acts of council, set his hand to assent or dissent. This was to secure individual responsibility for evil measures—a responsibility which has vanished in the united responsibility of a ministry. However strong was the parliamentary jealousy of a cabinet, the exclusion of the privy council from the real business of the state became more and more established in the reign of William. But the jealousy remained. In a clause of the statute of the 12 & 13 William III., "for the further limitation of the crown," it was enacted that "all matters and things relating to the well-government of the kingdom, which are properly cognizable in the privy council, by the laws and customs of this realm, shall be transacted there." This was a prospective clause, to take effect after the succession contemplated by the act. It was repealed by the 4 & 5 of Anne, c. 20, where the clause is recited.§ To make the supreme administration of affairs—the questions of armaments that required profound secrecy, and of diplomacy whose success depended upon ministerial reserve — "properly cognizable in the privy council," has been impossible even if it had been salutary, since the power and influence of England gradually assumed the extension and proportions which began to characterize her policy subsequent to the revolution. As representative government gradually compelled the sovereign to choose an administration founded upon the preponderance of a party, so this administration by party gradually broke up that unseemly division of the servants of the crown into factions, which was occasionally manifested until the middle of the eighteenth century.

The Earl of Sunderland had become a confidential adviser of King William. "By his long experience," says Burnet, "and his knowledge of men and things, he had gained an ascendency over him, and had more credit with him than any Englishman ever had."‖ Sunderland's "knowledge of men and things" had been acquired in a long course of shaping his opinions by his conviction of what he thought the most expedient and profitable system for his own advancement and security. He had publicly supported the most tyrannous actions of James, however he might have secretly opposed some of them. To please his master he had declared himself a papist. To make himself safe in the revolution which he saw at hand, he had betrayed that master. He vanished from the scene of active politics when William became king, retired to Holland, and again declared himself a Protestant. He was excluded from William's act of grace as one of the chief instruments of the late tyranny. But he came back to England, and made himself a necessity for the new government. He had cut off all hope of being reconciled to the Jacobite party; he could be very useful to the party of the revolution. "His long experience" made him master of all the complications of political action. He was the representative in 1693 of that class of unprincipled politicians of which Talleyrand was the representative when the Bourbons were restored to France. His advice was not to be despised, however the man might be odious. Speaker Onslow, in his Notes upon Burnet, says, "I remember to have heard from a great personage, that when the Earl of Sunderland came afterward to be in King William's confidence, and pressed him very much to trust and rely more upon the Whigs than he had done, the king said he believed the Whigs loved him best, but they did not love monarchy; and though the Tories did not like him so well as the others, yet, as they were zealous for monarchy, he thought they would serve his government best. To which the earl replied, that it was very true that the Tories were better friends to monarchy than the Whigs were, but then his majesty was to consider that he was not their monarch."* Sunderland, out of his knowledge of men and things, knew that the republican party had ceased to exist; and William saw that Sunderland's distinction between the affection for monarchy, and the love of the monarch de facto, was a sound one. William did trust and rely more upon the Whigs than he had done. Somers had been made his keeper of the great seal; the choice was wise. The attorney's son had rendered the highest service in that great crisis which was to establish the government of England upon the basis of law. He was the leader of his party, as much by his moderation as by his eloquence and learning. Russell, who had more than once been tempted to betray the government he served, but when the hour of trial came did his duty to his country, was restored to the command of the fleet. Thomas Wharton, the son of a Puritan peer, had led a life of dissipation in the time of Charles the Second, and continued his course of profligacy under the sober *régime* of William. The man was hated, and yet he was popular. The hate with which he was regarded by the Tories was perhaps the result of his political consistency. When he died, a Tory wrote his elegy:

> "Farewell, old bully of these impious times,
> True pattern of the Whigs, and of their crimes."†

With Somers, Russell, and Wharton was joined, in William's new ministry, Charles Montague. He had cast off the honors of a second-rate poet to become a first-class politician. His parliamentary eloquence was almost unrivalled. His financial abilities were more necessary to a government conducting a most expensive war even than his eloquence. One more Whig was to be won, and he was Shrewsbury. He resigned the office of secretary of state in 1690, when William favored the Tories. He had been tampered with from St. Germains, and was faithless to his trust. But he had seen his error, and was now to be called back by William to a hearty allegiance. The seals were again offered to Shrewsbury. The king had a personal regard for him; but he refused to accept the office which Nottingham had relinquished. Before the meeting of parliament a lady wrote to him, by the king's command: "He assured me," says her letter, "that when he valued anybody as he did you, he could easily forget some mistakes."‡ Again Shrewsbury refused office. A female friend of this lady wrote to the coy earl, hinting that a dukedom would be the reward of his compliance. The ladies persevered for several months, and at last Shrewsbury yielded, and had his dukedom and the Garter. The chief female negotiator on the part of the king was Mrs. Villiers—one whom the scandal of the time regards as his mistress—one of whom Burnet makes no direct mention, but to whom he is supposed to have alluded when he says of the Prince of Orange and Mary, in 1686, that "the perfect union between them had of late been a little embroiled." Elizabeth Villiers,

* "Observations on a late State of the Nation."
† Waller, "Parliamentary History," vol. v. col. 731.
‡ Wharton, "Parliamentary History," vol. v. col. 733.
§ Curiously enough, the clause does not appear in the act of William, as given in the "Statutes of the Realm."
‖ "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 215.

* Burnet, Oxford edition, vol. iv. p. 5.
† "The Lord Whiglove's Elegy," 1715.
‡ Coxe, "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 20.

maid of honor to the Princess of Orange—afterward married to the Earl of Orkney—was a woman of remarkable ability, with whom Swift delighted to talk for hours; who, in 1713, gave the great writer her picture; but who was not formed for the usual female conquests, however great her mental powers. "I think," writes Swift to Stella, "the devil was in it the other day when I talked to her of an ugly squinting cousin of hers, and the poor lady herself, you know, squints like a dragon." *

The king and his new ministers did not shrink from demanding from the parliament a larger supply than ever for carrying on the war. Eighty-three thousand troops were voted for the service of 1694; and the naval estimates were also largely increased. The Whig majority in the House of Commons was strong enough to bear down all unreasonable opposition. There were violent debates on the naval miscarriages, but no blame was thrown on the conduct of the late disastrous campaign. How to raise the large sums necessary to maintain the land and sea forces was a matter of anxious discussion. A land-tax, a poll-tax, stamp-duties, a tax on hackney-coaches, and a lottery, were the expedients. High and low were the adventurers in this new system of state gambling, as Evelyn records: "In the lottery set up after the Venetian manner by Mr. Neale, Sir R. Haddock, one of the commissioners of the navy, had the greatest lot, 3000*l.*; my coachman 40*l.*" But money was still wanting. The necessity gave birth to one of the greatest public establishments of this or any other country, the Bank of England.

The statute under which this national institution was formed bears a very ambiguous title: "An act for granting to their majesties several rates and duties upon tonnage of ships and vessels, and upon beer, ale, and other liquors, for securing certain recompenses and advantages in the said act mentioned, to such persons as shall voluntarily advance the sum of fifteen hundred thousand pounds toward the carrying on the war against France." † The subscribers for the advance of a loan, upon the conditions set forth, were to be constituted a corporate body "by the name of the Governor and Company of the Bank of England." The money really required to be advanced was twelve hundred thousand pounds. ‡ The subscription list was filled in ten days. The trading community had been sufficiently prepared for a right appreciation of the project which was carried in the House of Commons by the energy of Montague. The scheme of a bank had been the subject of discussion for three years. William Paterson—a man whose name is associated with this most successful scheme of a great national bank for England, and with another most unfortunate project of a great national system of colonization for Scotland—had in 1691 submitted proposals to the government somewhat similar to the plan which was carried out in 1694. His scheme was ably supported among commercial men by Michael Godfrey, an eminent London merchant; and when the government at last adopted it, Godfrey's influence in the city was as useful as Montague's eloquence in parliament. The original plan of a national bank was met by every sort of objection. Some said it was a new thing, and they did not understand it. Others said the project came from Holland, and there were too many Dutch things already. § In 1694 "the men who were supposed to have most money opposed and appeared against it [the bank] with all their might, pretending it could not do without them, and they were resolved never to be concerned. ‖ Tories said that a bank and a monarchy could not exist together. Whigs said that a bank and liberty were incompatible, for that the crown would command the wealth of the bank. A clause was introduced in the act, which prevented the Bank of England making loans to the government without authority of parliament, which neutralized the Whig objection. With this restriction the Bank of England has yet, in all times, been a powerful ally of the government. The system of small loans came to an end, as thus described in a paper called "The Wednesday Club," written by Paterson himself, as his biographer affirms: "The state officers and privy counsellors of that time were brought to stoop so low as to become frequent solicitors to the common council of London, to borrow only 100,000*l.* or 200,000*l.* at a time, on the part payment of the land-tax, all payable within two years, and then to stipulate and receive guineas at 22*s.* per piece, besides still further securing allowances on such occasions, which one may suppose to have been considerable. As the state officers deigned to become suitors to the common council, so were the particular common councilmen to the inhabitants of their respective wards, going from house to house, as our parish officers do in case of briefs for fire, for building and repairing churches, or the like." *

The king prorogued the parliament on the 25th of April, and again set out for the continent at the beginning of May. The campaign was in no degree remarkable for its gains or its losses. But the French had been arrested in their march to European dominion. They were held at bay. The naval plan of warfare was vigorously conceived in the cabinet of William, but it was defeated by what was once thought accident, but which is now proved to have been treachery. A great French fleet under Tourville had sailed from Brest to the Mediterranean. A portion of the allied fleet of English and Dutch under Russell was to look after Tourville, and another portion, under Berkeley, was to form a secret expedition. Troops commanded by Talmash were taken on board Berkeley's squadron. The two admirals parted company west of Cape Finisterre. Russell sailed to the Mediterranean; Berkeley to Brest, which it was supposed was left without adequate defence. Berkeley and Talmash would not credit the report of their own officer, that the French were prepared for their reception. Eight English vessels entered Camaret Bay, and were received with the fire of many batteries. Talmash attempted to land his soldiers from boats, when strong bodies of cavalry and infantry appeared on the beach, and drove them back in confusion. The cannon of the fortifications that had been constructed in a few weeks swept away more than a thousand brave English. Talmash himself was mortally wounded, but lived to reach Portsmouth, whither the armament had returned in all haste. The discomfiture was caused by the purpose of the expedition having become known to the French government. Vauban had been sent to Brest, and his science and promptitude had soon defended the entrance from the bay to the harbor with bombs and cannon, placed in the most commanding positions. William at the end of June wrote to Shrewsbury from the camp of Roseback, "You may easily conceive my vexation when I learned the repulse our troops had experienced in the descent near Brest; and although the loss is very inconsiderable, yet in war it is always mortifying to undertake anything that does not succeed." † A few days later the king wrote: "I am indeed extremely affected with the loss of poor Talmash; for although I do not approve of his conduct, yet I am of opinion that his too ardent zeal to distinguish himself induced him to attempt what was impracticable." ‡ It is asserted that the resolution to attack Brest was betrayed to James by Godolphin, and also by a letter from Marlborough. § Of Marlborough's treachery to his country there is the unquestionable evidence of a letter written by him to James on the 4th of May, in which he says, that it has that day come to his knowledge that the expedition preparing at Portsmouth is to be commanded by Talmash, and designed to burn the harbor of Brest, and to destroy the men-of-war that are there. He then says, "This would be a great advantage to England; but no consideration ever can or shall hinder me from letting you know what I think may be for your service." ‖ That Marlborough had in view the destruction of a rival general, Talmash, is to load his memory with a charge of guilt even more atrocious than his systematic perfidy in affairs of state. Yet he did not lose a moment in soliciting a return to high employment when Talmash was no more. In a letter of Shrewsbury to the king he says: "It is impossible to forget what is here become a very general discourse, the probability and conveniency of your majesty receiving my Lord Marlborough into your favor. He has been with me since this news, to offer his service, with all the expressions of duty and fidelity imaginable." ¶ William gave a very short answer to the recommendation of his secretary of state: "As to what you wrote in your last letter concerning Lord Marlborough, I can say no more than that I

* "Journal to Stella," letter liv. † 5 & 6 Gul. & Mar. c. 20.
‡ See *ante*, vol. iv. p. 614.
§ Bannister's "Life of William Paterson," p. 100.
‖ Ibid., p. 96.

* Bannister's "Life of William Paterson," p. 97.
† "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 45.
‡ Ibid., p. 46. § Dalrymple.
‖ "Life of James," vol. ii. p. 522. Macpherson also prints the letter in his "Original Papers."
¶ "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 47.

do not think it for the good of my service to entrust him with the command of my troops." * The failure at Brest was attempted to be retrieved by miserable expeditions against defenceless towns on the French coast. Dieppe, Havre, and Calais were bombarded. This wretched mode of attack upon an enemy's harmless people, though begun by the French, was felt to be useless and exasperating —"a cruel and brutish way of making war—an action totally adverse to humanity or Christianity." †

William returned from the continent on the 9th of November. He had to learn, what is as damaging to a government as an unsuccessful attempt in war, that a state trial under a special commission at Manchester, of some Lancashire gentlemen accused of high treason, had resulted in an acquittal. The government was set on to this prosecution by one of those dangerous spies that always start up in unquiet times, and too often foment the conspiracies they are employed to discover. Before the trial, after swords and armor had been found in old houses, and arrests had been made, this Lancashire plot was turned into ridicule. At the trial the chief informer, when his brother spy had given evidence against the prisoners, swore that the alleged plot was an invention of their own. The counsel for the crown threw up his brief; the prisoners were acquitted; and the presiding judges were hooted as they left Manchester.

The parliament was opened by the king on the 12th of November. The Commons adjourned for a week. When they met for business they applied themselves in earnest to vote the supplies, and to discuss a bill "for the more frequent meeting and calling of parliament." This is the famous Triennial Bill, which the king had rejected by his veto in one session of parliament, and which the Commons had refused to pass in another session. The bill was now passed by both houses without much opposition. On the 22d of December William came to Westminster. Great was the anxiety to know what words would now be uttered by the officer who spoke that voice of the crown which confirmed or disallowed a measure of the two houses. The words uttered were the old form of assent, "Le roy et la royne le veulent." The king looked unhappy, but it was not a disquietude of state which moved him. Queen Mary was dangerously ill at Kensington.

"The small-pox raged this winter about London," writes Burnet. To comprehend at this time the significance of the word "raged," we must carry our minds back, far beyond the period when Jenner discovered vaccination—beyond even the period when Lady Mary Wortley Montague made inoculation fashionable. When Burnet adds that "thousands" were dying of this fatal disease, we must understand him literally. When the small-pox entered a house, it was considered as terrible a visitation as the plague. William went sorrowfully from the parliament house to Kensington. Mary had been ill two days. She had never had the small-pox; but her regular physicians disputed about the symptoms. Ratcliffe, the most skilful "in all early and quick discovery of a distemper"—but, "proud of his fame in his profession, which fed his natural haughtiness, and made him think himself above, and refuse the attending of the highest personages when he had taken any prejudice against them"—declined at first to attend the queen when he was sent for.‡ He came at last, and pronounced the fatal word "small-pox." William was in despair. "He called me," says Burnet, "into his closet, and gave a free vent to a most tender passion. He burst out into tears, and cried out that there was no hope of the queen, and that from being the happiest, he was now going to be the miserablest creature on earth. He said, during the whole course of their marriage he had never known one single fault in her; there was a worth in her that nobody knew besides himself." Mary's fortitude and resignation were above all praise. The religious consolations which her faithful friend and counsellor, Archbishop Tillotson, would have administered to the dying queen were to be bestowed by his successor, Tenison. Tillotson had died five weeks before. When Tenison made Mary aware of her danger, but with "some address not to surprise her too much," she was perfectly calm. "She thanked God she had always carried this in her mind, that nothing was to be left to the last hour." Queen Mary died on the 28th of December, in the thirty-third year of her age. All parties agreed in acknowledging the beauties of her character. Burnet, the Whig, says, "She was the most universally lamented princess, and deserved the best to be so, of any in our age, or in our history." Evelyn, the Tory, writes, "She was such an admirable women, abating for taking the crown without a more due apology, as does, if possible, outdo the renowned Queen Elizabeth." She had many arduous duties to perform in the repeated absences of the king; and not the least important was the distribution of ecclesiastical preferments. With a deep sense of religion she marked her preference for those divines who were moderate in their opinions, and earnest in the proper discharge of their high functions. When there were state affairs to attend to, she never shrunk from the proper labors of the sovereign. Her tastes were simple and unostentatious; her morals of unblemished purity; her charity was universal. Her deep attachment to her husband was founded upon her admiration of his high qualities. William's grief for her loss "was greater," says Burnet, "than those who knew him best thought his temper was capable of; he went beyond all bounds in it. When she died his spirits sunk so low that there was great reason to apprehend that he was following her." Queen Mary was sumptuously interred in Westminster Abbey, although, "on opening a cabinet, a paper was found, wherein she had desired that her body might not be opened, nor any extraordinary expense at her funeral, whenever she should die: this paper was not found in time to be observed."* The funeral cost fifty thousand pounds. A more worthy expenditure of public money in her honor took place when William determined to erect Greenwich Hospital, in compliance with that desire which she had expressed after the battle of La Hogue, to provide an asylum for disabled seamen. Mary, in following the fortunes of her husband, and accepting with him the sovereign power of these kingdoms to the exclusion of her father, discharged a higher duty even than that of filial affection. But she was always solicitous for that father's personal safety. The paltriness of James's character was manifested upon his daughter's decease, in a manner which St. Simon thus records: "The king of England [James] prayed the king [Louis] that the court should not wear mourning. All those who were related to the Prince of Orange, including M. de Bouillon and M. de Duras, were forbidden to wear it. They obeyed and were silent; but this sort of revenge was considered very petty."

* "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 53. † Evelyn.
‡ We find this character of Ratcliffe, and his refusal, in Onslow's Notes on Burnet.

CHAPTER CXXIX.

Extreme grief of William—Parliamentary corruption—War in the Netherlands—Siege of Namur by the allies—Namur taken—William's reception in England—State of the currency—A new parliament—Measures for a new coinage—Trials for treason regulated by law—The assassination plot.

The death of the queen appears to have prostrated William. Shrewsbury could hardly approach him, till a month after, in consequence of "the retired manner his majesty has lived in since his last great misfortune." † His "former application to business" had not yet returned with the healing power of strenuous occupation. His political correspondence with the grand pensionary of Holland was suspended. The general before whom he retreated at Landen was no more; the strange life of Luxemburg—the crook-backed voluptuary who appeared to have no higher object than sensual ease, but who on the battle-field was all fire and decision—came to an end. Louis thought that William would rejoice. William heeded not this important event, and expressed his belief that he himself was no longer fit for military command. The French court sent Harlay, the president of the parliament of Paris, to sound the Dutch as to the possibility of a peace. Pale and very thin was the envoy. Are you a sample, said the rough republicans, of the wretched condition of France? Let me send for my wife, replied the clever lawyer, and she will give you a notion of our thriving state.‡ Harlay, who had no accredited mission, did not put the Dutch in good humor by his joke. There was still to be a struggle before peace was established.

William gradually recovered his serenity. The houses of parliament went on as usual with their labors. The proposed renewal of

* Evelyn, "Diary," March 8.
† "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 218. ‡ St. Simon.

the Licensing Act was rejected without a division in the Commons. The press had been more than commonly bold, even seditious. But the representatives of the English people did not choose to interfere with that noble principle which, half a century before, had been proclaimed to all the civilized world by the most eloquent of freedom's advocates: "Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth so truth be in the field, we do injuriously, by licensing and prohibiting, to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple. Whoever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?" *

The proceedings of this session disclosed, what was no secret to men of all parties, the frightful corruption by which statesmen in power and statesmen in opposition were moved to support or to resist some measure in which large pecuniary interests were involved; or to screen some public delinquent. Guy, a member of parliament and secretary of the treasury, was sent to the Tower for receiving a bribe, in connection with some inquiries into the conduct of a colonel of a regiment, who had appropriated the money for which he ought to have paid the quarters of his troops. Trevor, the speaker of the House of Commons, was proved to have received a bribe of a thousand guineas from the corporation of London, for assisting in passing "An act for relief of the orphans and other creditors of the city of London" †—that act under which, when a poor man buys a sack of coals in this winter of 1858, he has still to pay a tax to this long-tolerated phantom of a departed greatness. Trevor had to put the question from the chair whether he himself was guilty of a high crime and misdemeanor, and had to say, "The ayes have it." He was expelled the house. The East India Company had spent a hundred and seven thousand pounds in secret service money, as an examination of their books had proved to a parliamentary committee. Eighty-seven thousand pounds had thus been distributed in 1693 and 1694. Sir Thomas Cook, the chairman of the company, had the management of these delicate matters. He was member for Colchester. In his place in parliament he refused to answer inquiries. The Commons then passed a bill compelling him to answer, under enormous penalties. Upon the bill going to the upper house, the Duke of Leeds—the Earl of Danby of Charles II., the Marquis of Carmarthen of 1689—spoke strongly against the bill, and, laying his hand on his breast, protested that he was perfectly disinterested in the matter. The inquiries went on, implicating others; and the Commons finally impeached Thomas, Duke of Leeds, president of the council, for that he did, "in breach of the great trust reposed in him, by himself, his agents, or servants, corruptly and illegally treat, contract, and agree, with the merchants trading to the East Indies, for five thousand five hundred guineas, to procure their charter of confirmation." ‡ The duke had appeared at the bar of the house, and had to a certain extent acknowledged his delinquency, by admitting that he had helped a friend to get the money. That friend was one Bales, who admitted that he had received the money to bribe the duke, and had given it to a Swiss, who was the confidential manager of the duke's private business. The Swiss fled; the parliament was prorogued; and the impeachment fell to the ground. The king's personal friend, Portland, was found to have been proof against these temptations, having refused a bribe of fifty thousand pounds.

The king was no doubt rejoiced to get away from this tainted atmosphere to the bracing air of a campaign. He was first reconciled to the Princess Anne, and then departed for the continent; having, when he prorogued the parliament on the 3d of May, said, "I will take care to place the administration of affairs, during my absence, in such persons on whose care and fidelity I can entirely depend." The Duke of Leeds was not one of those persons. Burnet, writing in the reign of Queen Anne, says of the princess, "Now that he [William] was to go beyond sea, she was not set at the head of the councils, nor was there any care taken to oblige those about her." § The bishop no doubt alludes to Marlborough and his duchess; and adds, "this looks either like jealousy and distrust, or a coldness toward her." Lord Dartmouth, in a note upon this passage, says, "The princess was not only next to him in succession, but there was a party which might have made a claim for her against him. She was a very good woman, and not likely of herself to give in to it. But she was not of the strongest understanding, and always influenced by others, who might have found their account in it." Marlborough took the more prudent course. Shrewsbury writes to Russell that the Princess Anne has lost no opportunity of showing her zeal to the king and the government; and that "our friend" [Marlborough] seemed resolved to encourage this union. "I do not see," adds Shrewsbury, "that he is likely at present to get much by it, not having yet kissed the king's hand, but his reversion is very fair and great." * The energy and perseverance of William were at length to be crowned with success. It was a real advantage to him that Luxemburg was gone. It was a greater advantage that Louis had appointed as his successor an accomplished courtier but a feeble general, Villeroy, and that this sycophant of the great king intrusted an important command to the Duke de Maine, the most favored of the illegitimate children of Louis. But the numbers and the high discipline of the French armies would have probably interfered with any signal advantage on the part of the allies, if William had not exercised in this campiagn many of the highest qualities of a great commander. The opening of the campaign, says St. Simon, was a beautiful game of chess; the Prince of Orange, the Elector of Bavaria, and the Earl of Athlone moving in detached bodies; and Villeroy, Boufflers, Harcourt, and Montal, regulating their own movements by those of their enemy which they saw, or by those which they expected. William, "who had well taken all his measures to cover his main design," suddenly turned his course toward Namur. The Elector of Bavaria and the Brandenburg army arrived at the same point. That strongest fort of Europe was invested by this united force at the beginning of July. Vauban had materially strengthened the fortifications since it had been taken by the French. The court of Louis thought William's attempt a rash one, and that it would signally fail. "I was of another opinion," writes St. Simon; "I persuaded myself that a man of the sagacity of the Prince of Orange would not commence so important a siege without well seeing how he was to come out of it." William's movement had been so admirably planned and rapidly accomplished that Boufflers had scarcely time to reinforce the garrison of Namur, and to take the command of the fifteen thousand men who were now within the walls. Villeroy expected to destroy that part of the allied army under Vaudemont which remained in Flanders, and then to relieve Namur. Vaudemont, by consummate prudence—aided by the incompetence and cowardice of the Duke de Maine—effected a retreat to Ghent. Villeroy took two small fortresses, Dixmuyde and Deynse, sending their garrisons into France in violation of a convention for exchange of prisoners. He bombarded Brussels, effecting a tremendous destruction of private property, "in reprisal," says St. Simon, "of the attacks on our coasts." He then marched with eighty thousand men to attack the besieging army at Namur; but Vaudemont had joined his force to that already on the banks of the Meuse and Sambre. Meanwhile the siege had proceeded with a vigor almost unparalleled. The letters of William himself furnish the best materials for tracing the progress of the siege, without perplexing ourselves or our readers with "the differences and distinctions between the scarp and counterscarp, the glacis and covered way, the half-moon and ravelin," with which "my uncle Toby did ofttimes puzzle his visitors and sometimes himself too." † In a letter to Shrewsbury on the 17th of June the king imparts his design of besieging Namur, "a very great undertaking—God grant that it may succeed." ‡ On the 1st of July he says, "This night we propose to open the trenches at the gate of St. Nicholas." On the 9th the English, Scotch, and Dutch battalions carried the lines "which the enemy had constructed to cover their works." On the 18th William writes, "Affairs here go on tolerably well, though not as expeditiously as I could wish. Yesterday we made our lodgment in the counterscarp, and I now flatter myself that we shall soon be masters of the town. I cannot sufficiently applaud the firmness and valor of the troops. It is very grievous to lose so many brave men, but it cannot be avoided in a siege like this." § It was on this occasion that William exclaimed to the Elector of Bavaria, who stood by his side, "See my brave English! See my

* Milton, "Areopagitica."
† 5 & 6 Gul. & Mar. c. 10.
‡ "Parliamentary History," vol. v. col. 937.
§ "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 261.

* "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 220.
† "Tristram Shandy," vol. i. c. xxvi.
‡ "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 90.
§ Ibid., p. 94.

brave English!" On the 28th of July the king writes to his secretary of state: "Although you will doubtless have heard of the surrender of Namur before you receive this letter, yet I would not omit informing you myself that we obtained possession of this place this afternoon. The day after to-morrow we shall open the trenches before the citadel, and I hope that God will also bless this enterprise; and that we shall soon be masters of it." * On the 15th of August Portland writes to Shrewsbury: "The king having slept little last night, and been on horseback the whole day, has ordered me to tell you, sir, that it is impossible for him to write this evening. Affairs here are at a great crisis. The siege of the citadel advances rapidly; the breach begins to be practicable, and I think a little time will render us masters of it, unless the enemy succor it by gaining a battle, since they approach us with a very numerous army." The two armies, that of William and of Villeroy, stood for three days in presence of each other, while the siege was proceeding under an incessant bombardment. On the 19th of August, the French army retired. The Elector of Bavaria had the immediate charge of the siege, while the king was watching Villeroy; and when it was known that the French had moved off, the storm of the citadel of Namur commenced. Portland had summoned Boufflers to surrender upon the retirement of Villeroy, but the French commander still held out. The assault was undertaken by the Bavarians, the Dutch, the Brandenburgers, and the English. The Brandenburgers had among their leaders the Prince of Anhalt-Dessau, a young man of nineteen, who afterward had the honor of introducing important changes in military science. "He invented the iron ramrod; he invented the equal step; in fact, he is the inventor of modern military tactics." † The Dutch and Brandenburgers accomplished their duty with little difficulty. The Bavarians suffered severe loss. The English, under Cutts, were at first driven back; but their intrepid commander, though wounded, led them on again, and they carried a battery which had swept away many in its deadly fire. Two thousand men were sacrificed in this terrible assault. Boufflers demanded a truce to bury the dead. He also intimated a desire to capitulate, but asked for a delay of ten days, when he would yield if not relieved. This request was refused; another storm was threatened; but on the twentieth he agreed to surrender with the honors of war.‡ On the 26th of August the French garrison, now reduced to five thousand men, marched out. But the brave marshal was detained a prisoner. William resolved to keep him till the garrisons of Dixmuyde and Deynse should be restored. Louis sent full powers to Boufflers to comply; and he was released after ten days' detention. On the day after the surrender William wrote to Shrewsbury, to announce the capture of the citadel of Namur: "With all its circumstances it is assuredly a great event, and we cannot sufficiently offer up our thanks to God for this success, from which we shall doubtless derive considerable advantages." § On the same day Portland wrote to Shrewsbury: "The English have greatly signalized themselves in this siege, by their share in the vigorous actions which have occurred, in which they have been *too much* animated by the presence of the king himself. But, thank God, he is very well. The fatigue he has suffered is incredible, as well as the care and trouble he has undergone, and is able to support." ‖ When we contemplate this feeble-bodied man with the most heroic spirit, one day in the trenches, another day on horseback from morning till night, expecting a battle with Villeroy, we can understand the confidence which he had won, in spite of repeated miscarriages and disappointments. The English, who were never wanting in their estimate of personal bravery, would follow such a leader through every hazard of war. The coolness of this model of self-command was among his most valuable qualities. One day, when William was in the trenches, the deputy-governor of the Bank of England placed himself at his side. "Mr. Godfrey," said the king, "why do you expose yourself?" The Londoner replied, "Not being more exposed than your majesty, should I be excusable if I showed more concern?" William, who had an especial objection to men going beyond their commission, replied, "I am in my duty, and therefore have a more reasonable claim to preservation." A cannon-ball in a few minutes finished the career of the over-zealous amateur. But while we admire the resolution and perseverance of William, and the undaunted courage of all the troops of the allies, we must not forget that much of the success was due to the science of the engineer Coehorn, the great rival of Vauban. When Namur was taken by the French in 1692, the forts which Coehorn had constructed for its defence could not resist the besiegers. He was now to devise the most scientific means of attack upon works which he had constructed, and which Vauban had perfected. He had the gratification of seeing this place of strength pass out of the hands of the power that had held it for three years.

The return of William to England was hailed by the popular enthusiasm which naturally attends success. The good man struggling with misfortune may be the noblest sight in the world, but it calls forth no huzzas or bell-ringings. The king reached Kensington through the illuminated streets on the night of the 10th of October, and immediately went to business. A proclamation was issued for a new parliament. In a week William set forth upon a most unusual mission, to propitiate the people by showing himself among them. He visited Newmarket; was entertained by the Earl of Sunderland at Althorp, and by the Duke of Newcastle at Welbeck. He hunted in Sherwood forest, amid oaks which tradition associates with the memory of the courteous outlaw who once reigned there by the title of his long bow and his broad arrows. He looked upon those towers of Warwick, where the great king-maker gave law, at a time when the throne rested upon feudalism, and representative government was a dream. William was making this holiday tour, to incline those who had to choose representatives to send men well affected to the principles of liberty which had placed him upon the throne. At Oxford he had personally to feel that too often the seats of learning are the last to be illumined by the progressive spirit of a generation—the last to perceive that they are halting while the great body of a nation are moving onward. The record of Evelyn is quite sufficient to note this fact: "The king went a progress into the north, to show himself to the people against the elections, and was everywhere complimented, except at Oxford, where it was not as he expected; so that he hardly stopped an hour there, and having seen the theatre, did not receive the banquet proposed." The elections generally were favorable to the government. The Whig party acquired a considerable accession of strength. The taxes were heavy; the currency of the kingdom was in a frightful state of depreciation; the price of grain was unusually high—and yet the nation manifested no alarming discontent. The Jacobites plotted; but they were as far from success as ever.

Looking at the depreciated state of the coinage in 1696, it is difficult to say how far the high price of grain was the natural result of a succession of bad seasons. The years from 1692 to 1699 are known as "the seven barren years." In Scotland there was a dearth approaching to famine. Legislation might have had something to do with the high prices. A bounty upon importation was established in 1689, which might not have sufficiently stimulated production to meet the ordinary wants of the people under the extraordinary drain of the war. The average price of wheat from the restoration to 1691 was about forty-eight shillings a quarter. From 1692 to 1699 the average price was about sixty-two shillings. A very factious member of parliament, Sir John Knight, made a speech in 1694, in which he complains that corn is sent out of the country "for the use of our Dutch allies, to enable them to live cheap, by making the same dear at home." He would have shown a better knowledge of the matter if he had said that the Dutch bought the corn cheaper than the natural rate, through the bounty, and then sold it in England again at a profit. The necessity, however, for feeding the armies abroad must have had a material influence on the market. But even the needful consumption and inevitable waste of four campaigns was not wholly without some compensating good: "In Norfolk and Suffolk, and in Lincolnshire, there was a wonderful improvement in husbandry and tillage; for the war was of great advantage to the farmers, who exported corn into Holland." *

The defective state of the coinage was now to be effectually re-

* "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 98.
† Carlyle, "History of Friedrich II.," vol. i. p. 395.
‡ The reader who compares modern historians will find, in the accounts of this siege, discrepancies as to dates. They proceed from the difference between the old and new styles. We follow in this instance the original narratives which give the old style.
§ "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 103. ‖ Ibid., p. 104.

* Cunningham, "History," vol. i. p. 153.

dressed. The evil had become insupportable. The established prescription of the gallows was found to be no remedy for the disease. In July, 1694, we read, "Many executed at London for clipping money, now done to that intolerable extent, that there was hardly any money that was worth above half the nominal value."* A writer of the period, who speaks with full knowledge of his subject, says that "the almost fatal symptoms of the general corruption of the silver money, like covered flames or distracted torrents, universally broke out upon the nation, as it were at once. Guineas on a sudden rose to thirty shillings per piece; all currency of other money was stopped: hardly any had wherewith to pay; public securities sank to about a moiety of their original value, and buyers had to be found even at these prices; no man knew what he was worth; the course of trade and correspondency almost universally stopped; the poorer sort of people plunged into inexpressible distress, and, as it were, left perishing, while even the richer had hardly wherewith to go to market for obtaining the common conveniences of life." This writer adds that "the intolerable corruption of the coin was alone sufficient to have provoked any nation on earth to extremities. . . . Nevertheless, the remainder of gratitude in the people to their deliverer, King William, was even still such, that they bore these inexpressible afflictions with an inimitable temper and patience."† It is difficult to understand these seemingly exaggerated phrases of "fatal symptoms," "inexpressible distress," "intolerable corruption of the coin," without some explanation. Those of us who lived in the latter years of George III. can recollect the time when there was not a sixpence, shilling, or half crown, in circulation, that was not worn perfectly smooth. These coins, which had originally come from the Royal Mint, were not counterfeits. They passed as counters. But their real value was not tested by their circulation in common with any new coinage. In 1695, of the various coinages of Elizabeth, of James I., and of Charles I., it was computed that five millions were in circulation, in common with about half a million of the new coinages of Charles II., James II., and William III. The old money, which had no milled edge, had been gradually clipped, so that at last the current silver coin had been diminished in weight nearly one half. Of this clipped money four millions were considered to be in circulation; while one million six hundred thousand pounds of unclipped coin were hoarded, or only appeared occasionally in remote places.‡ As fast as new silver coins were issued from the mint they disappeared. They were worth twice as much as the old clipped coin. While a single unclipped shilling was circulating in the same town with the shilling that was not intrinsically worth more than sixpence, traders would perpetually demand the honest shilling from their customers, and not being able to get it, would put a higher price upon their commodities to bear a proportion with the clipped shilling. The laborer who was paid his weekly wages in the depreciated coin could only obtain a small loaf instead of a large one. The dealer who had to make remittances in guineas, or in bills which represented guineas, was obliged to give at least thirty shillings to obtain the guinea. The money-changers and bankers were making large fortunes out of the perplexities of all those who had to sell or to buy. Evelyn grumbles that "Duncombe, not long since a mean goldsmith, had made a purchase of the late Duke of Buckingham's estate at near 90,000*l.*, and reputed to have near as much in cash:"

> "And Helmsley, once proud Buckingham's delight,
> Slides to a scrivener or a city knight"§

The new parliament was opened on the 22d of November. The most important part of the king's speech was that in which he said, "I must take notice of a great difficulty we lie under at this time, by reason of the ill state of the coin, the redress of which may perhaps prove a further charge to the nation." How were these words to be interpreted? Was the nation to bear the great loss of converting four millions of money, intrinsically worth only two millions, into money of the true standard? Was the public to sustain a loss of two millions? The subject had been widely agitated. It had been proposed to issue money of less than the intrinsic value to replace the old—to make a ninepenny shilling that would pass for twelvepence. Though the great merchant, Dudley North, who was also a great political economist, opposed the plan that was ultimately carried, he saw that a coin could not be treated as if it were only a counter: "What is true may be remembered, which is, that money went to foreign markets, and would not, as at home, pass by a stamp or denomination, but must be weighty"*—must pass at its real weight. He had proclaimed the sound doctrine, "that debasing the coin is defrauding one another." Locke demolished the theory of the little shilling in a masterly tract. His opinion was, that after a certain time the old money should only pass by weight, and that upon this principle it should be exchanged for a silver coinage of which a shilling should be worth twelvepence. By this plan the state would have effected the restoration of the currency without a national cost—but at the price of what individual misery! When the House of Commons came to debate this important question, the resolutions proposed by Montague, the chancellor of the exchequer, were finally agreed to. A new coinage of intrinsic value was to be issued; the loss of the clipped money was to be borne by the public, for which a special fund was to be provided by a house-tax and a window-tax. This was something like a revival of the hearth-money, but cottages were exempt. Up to the 4th of May the clipped money would be received in payment of taxes. The old money had then mostly disappeared; but the mechanical resources of that time were not sufficient to produce the new money in sufficient quantity to carry on the exchanges of the people. The difficulty was in some measure relieved by the issue of exchequer-bills. The difficulty was conquered when Newton was appointed master of the mint, and by vast exertions, connected with the establishment of provincial mints, gradually sent forth a supply of circulating medium equal to the demand. The distress and confusion had been enormous; but those who had thought the great change was ill-managed, at last said, "Better and worse in the means is not to be reflected upon, when a great good is obtained in the end."†

On the day on which the royal assent was given to the Recoinage Bill, the bill "for regulating trials in cases of treason and misprision of treason" also became law. This salutary measure had been repeatedly lost by the opposition of the Commons to a clause introduced by the Peers, with reference to trials of members of their own order.‡ The Commons no longer opposed the wishes of the upper house. One of the most important of the clauses of this statute, by which some of the injustice of the old modes of trial was obviated was, that prisoners should be admitted to make their defence by counsel learned in the law. History has properly recorded the effect produced by Anthony Ashley Cooper, Lord Ashley, the author of the "Characteristics," in his maiden speech in the Commons. When he rose to speak, he hesitated, looked bewildered, was still silent amid the encouraging cheers of the house, and at last said, "If I, sir, who rise only to give my opinion on the bill now depending, am so confounded that I am unable to express the least of what I proposed to say, what must the condition of that man be, who, without any assistance, is pleading for his life, and under apprehensions of being deprived of it?" We need not ask whether this stroke of genius was premeditated. Very soon after the meeting of parliament an unpleasant question arose which affected the popularity of the king. The Commons, though the factious hostility to William had greatly abated, came to a resolution to mark their dislike of some token of lavish favor which he had shown to his Dutch friends. He had ordered a grant to the Earl of Portland of a magnificent estate in Denbighshire, being a part of the hereditary domain of the crown. A sensible address was carried unanimously, in which William was told that the manors now intended to be granted had been usually annexed to the principality of Wales, and settled on the Princes of Wales for their support; and that such grant was in diminution of the honor and interest of the crown. The king answered the Commons who went up with the address, "Gentlemen, I have a kindness for my Lord Portland, which he has deserved of me by loving and faithful services; but I should not have given him these lands if I had imagined the House of Commons could have been concerned. I will therefore recall the grant, and find some other way of

* Evelyn.

† "Wednesday Club," 1717, quoted in Bannister's "Life of Paterson," p. 105.

‡ "Essay for the Amendment of the Silver Coins, 1695," quoted in Tindal, vol. iii. p. 305. § Pope, "Imitations of Horace," Sat. ii.

* "Life of Dudley North," p. 172. † Ibid. ‡ *Ante*, p. 650.

showing my favor to him." It was well that a constitutional king should learn a lesson which had never been taught to the Stuarts, when they alienated the domains of the crown for the endowment of their minions and of their illegitimate children.

On the 24th of February the king went to the House of Peers, and told the assembled Lords and Commons that he was come that day upon an extraordinary occasion: "I have received several concurring informations of a design to assassinate me; and that our enemies at the same time are very forward in their preparation for a sudden invasion of this kingdom." He had given orders, he said, regarding the fleet; he had sent for troops home; some of the conspirators were already in custody, and measures were taken for the apprehension of the rest. The houses immediately determined upon a joint address to the king; carried a bill for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act; and passed another bill that the parliament should not be dissolved by the death of William. It was then resolved in the Commons that the members should enter into an association, testifying and declaring "that his present majesty King William is rightful and lawful king of these realms," and pledging themselves in the following words: "We do mutually promise to engage to stand by and assist each other to the utmost of our power, in the support and defence of his majesty's most sacred person and government, against the late King James and all his adherents. And in case his majesty come to any violent or untimely death, which God forbid, we do hereby further freely and unanimously oblige ourselves to unite, associate, and stand by each other, in revenging the same upon his enemies and their adherents, and in supporting and defending the succession of the crown, according to an act made in the first year of the reign of King William and Queen Mary, entitled 'An act declaring the rights and liberties of the subject, and settling the succession of the crown.'" A similar association was formed by the Peers. But the words "rightful and lawful king of these realms" were changed to these—"That King William hath the right by law to the crown of these realms; and that neither King James nor the pretended Prince of Wales, nor any other person, hath any right whatsoever to the same." Some members of each house hesitated to sign, but they formed a small minority, and the nation generally entered with unwonted cordiality into a similar engagement. The project of the invasion of the kingdom and the concurrent assassination of the king, which thus roused the nation to rally round the throne, was a plot of no ordinary magnitude. There are ample materials for a connected narrative of this event, the most important in some respects of the reign of William; and those documents which recent years have brought to light render some aid in the solution of an interesting historical problem, Whether the atrocious scheme of assassinating his rival was suggested, or adopted, or encouraged directly or indirectly, by James himself.

The original autobiographical Memoirs of James that touch upon this interesting period have been preserved.* He tells us that having been informed at the beginning of 1696 that the affairs of the Prince of Orange did not wear so favorable an aspect as formerly—that the country party gave him trouble and vexation—his own friends, called Jacobites, thought it "a good occasion to blow the coals." These friends proposed that he should land in England with ten or twelve thousand men, when they were sure "the greatest part of the nation would rise and restore him." James communicated this "to His Most Christian Majesty," who promised the troops, but thought it would be best that these ardent Jacobites "should rise first." The narrative thus continues: "Upon this, the Duke of Berwick was sent over to head them in case they could be persuaded to rise first; and about the same time several officers, and other persons who had served, desired leave to go over into England and Scotland upon their private concerns." These "gentlemen of the guard" and others, who went over to England upon their private concerns, "had directions to join themselves with any that should rise and declare for the king, being most of them men of experience." The Duke of Berwick was the illegitimate son of James.

On the 27th of December Sir George Barclay, a Scot who had served under Dundee, received a commission from James, which, he says, in his narrative published in the Life of James, "was exactly as follows: 'James R. Our will and pleasure is and we do hereby fully authorize, strictly require, and expressly command our loving subjects to rise in arms and make war upon the Prince of Orange the usurper of our throne and all his adherents, and to seize for our use all such forts, towns, strongholds within our dominion of England, as may serve to further our interest, and to do from time to time such other acts of hostility against the Pce. of Orange and his adherents as may conduce most to our service, We judging this the properest, justest, and most effectual means of procuring our restoration and their deliverance; and we do hereby indemnify them for what they shall act in pursuance of this our royal command. Given at our court of St. Germains en Laye, the 27th of December, 1695.'" On the 27th of December Barclay says: "I parted from St. Germains, having none with me but Major Holmes, and about the 27th old style [January 6th] arrived in London." The narrative of Barclay, in some respects very important, in others very meagre, is to be satisfactorily pieced out by various evidence collected by the ministers of William. In Romney Marsh lived one Robert Hunt, who describes himself as yeoman. He had for some years "been employed by the party in all their correspondence with France." He deposed that Barclay and Holmes came over together some time in January, and about the same time sixteen or eighteen persons came over. At the beginning of February, "a tall young gentleman," who was particularly recommended by one Mr. Pigaut, at Calais, came over alone; and Hunt had heard since, and believed, this person was the Duke of Berwick. After Barclay had received the hospitalities of the smuggler's cottage in Romney Marsh, came two men in company, Harris and Hare. Harris deposed that he had served King James in Ireland as an ensign of foot, and since in France. On the 4th of January (new style) King James sent for him, and Hare his comrade; said he should send them to England; he had ordered money for that journey, and they were to follow Barclay's orders. The king then went on to say they would find Barclay every Monday and Thursday evening, between six and seven o'clock, in Covent Garden Square, and might know him by a white handkerchief hanging out of his coat pocket. Looking over a list, James added that they were to go by the names of Jenkins and Guinneys while in England. Harris and Hare met Barclay in London. They were ordered to keep close till there was an occasion for their service, and were put on a sort of establishment at five shillings a day.

We have now traced Barclay to his great scene of action, and may revert to his own official narrative. He became acquainted, soon after his arrival, with Mr. Charnock, who complained to him that he and others had a design on foot which would have facilitated the return of King James, but that his majesty would never permit them to put it in execution. Sir William Parkyns, a few days after, explained what that design was. They wanted nothing but his majesty's leave. "It was to form a party to fall upon the Prince of Orange." James, in his own Memoirs, states that in 1693 a proposal had been made to him "of seizing and bringing away the Prince of Orange, and of making a rising in and about London"—but he "would not hear of it, looking upon the project as impracticable." It was again proposed, he says, and again rejected. In 1695 it was a third time proposed by one Crosbie, alias Clench, who came from another set of men, who "made no doubt of seizing the Prince of Orange and carrying him off, but desired a warrant signed by his majesty to empower them to do it." James, as he says, rejected this matter, and charged Crosbie not to meddle in it. This very "indiscreet and insolent man," as the Memoir goes on to say, went not only to his own club, but to several of another club, "as Mr. George Porter, Goodman, Sir William Parkyns, and Charnock; engaged them to join with him; and, to gain the greater credit and reputation with them, assured them that an order would speedily be sent to him for the executing of it." When Charnock and Parkyns opened their design to Barclay "to fall upon the Prince of Orange"—something more intelligible than the delicate proposal of "seizing and bringing away the Prince of Orange"—Barclay says, "I did much approve of it, if it could be carried on with that secrecy and conduct as a thing of that consequence ought to be; upon which I immediately asked them if it was possible to find so many good men as would be requisite, and would undertake a brave action without asking of questions." They were certain of it. Upon this, the confidential agent of King James produced his commission for "acts of hostility against the Prince of Orange." He had parted with his master at St.

* "Life of James," vol. ii. p. 538.

Germains on the 27th of December, with eight hundred pounds put into his purse; he had no hesitation in interpreting the secrets of the royal mind; he was prompt

> "On the winking of authority,
> To understand a law; to know the meaning
> Of dangerous majesty;" *

and so, he says, "presuming, therefore, upon the commission I had from his majesty to make war upon the Prince of Orange and all his adherents, I thought myself sufficiently authorized to engage with them to attack that prince when his guards were about him; upon which I showed them my commission, which they were much pleased with."† Barclay, says James, "proposed to attack the Prince of Orange with forty horse on the road as he went to or came from hunting at Richmond; whereas his commission imported no such thing."

> "It is the curse of kings to be attended
> By slaves that take their humors for a warrant,
> To break within the bloody house of life." †

In the Memoirs of James we find that "the day his majesty left St. Germains, being the 28th of February, he met at St. Denis a servant of the Duke of Berwick, with a letter from his master to the Earl of Middleton, which gave an account of his being come back. . . . By some expressions in his letter, it was plain he had not succeeded in it [his negotiation] as expected." According to the deposition of Hunt, "the tall young gentleman" who arrived at Romney Marsh at the beginning of February returned from London within a week. The transport ships of Louis were to rendezvous at Calais on the 25th of February; and on that day Louis sent a message to James to let him know that "he thought it fit his majesty should go down forthwith to the sea-side, but not to let the men embark till he was sure the Jacobites were up in England." Why did James go down to the sea-side when it was plain the Duke of Berwick had not succeeded in raising the Jacobites in England? Barclay was in London with his commission. James saw the Duke of Berwick, and heard from him in "what condition he had left things in England." And still "he continued his own journey to Calais." We hear little more in the words of James himself. The compiler of his life says, "He still hoped something might happen, on which he could raise a request to let the troops embark first, and for that reason continued his journey to Calais; where he was no sooner arrived, but, according to his usual good fortune, found himself at the end of his expectation, by meeting the news of several gentlemen being seized on account of an attempt upon the Prince of Orange's person." It was, of course, necessary for the friends of James to deny his complicity in a scheme of assassination. He himself says that he, "finding nothing more was to be done, returned to St. Germains, longing to see Sir George Barclay, to know what he could say for himself, seeing his power for levying war was in general terms only." ‡ Berwick was himself perfectly well aware how Barclay and his friends had interpreted this general power.

The incidents of the discovery of the plot for taking the life of William furnish a signal instance, in addition to other evidences in English history, of the difficulty, if not impossibility, of many persons being associated in a conspiracy of so momentous a nature without detection. Barclay says in his narrative, that he had learned that one Captain Fisher, who lived in King Street, Westminster, had made several proposals for raising men for the service of King James; that Barclay, disguised, saw him; and that Fisher proposed "to attack the Prince of Orange between the two gates as he passed from Hyde Park to St. James's Park." Barclay says that he heard this, and other proposals, but never let Fisher know of any design he had on foot; but asked him "to give me notice when the Prince of Orange went a hunting, pretending I had a mind to see him hunt." On the 11th of February Fisher was in communication with the Earl of Portland. He told him there was a design against the king's life. What details he gave are not very clear. In a subsequent deposition he said that he was introduced to Sir George Barclay by one Johnson, alias Harrison, a monk, at a public house in Bow Street, where the scheme of the attack at Hyde Park gate was proposed; and that on the 5th they discoursed about seizing the king at Kensington House in the night, by scaling the garden wall. On the 13th Fisher went again to Portland. The cautious friend of William was not forward in giving credit to such statements; or he thought it more prudent to say nothing till his information was more distinct. On the evening of the 14th Portland, on entering his lodgings at Whitehall, found an unknown person in the antechamber, who begged to speak with him in private. "My lord," he said, "persuade the king to stay at home to-morrow; for if he go abroad to hunt he will be assassinated." Portland went to the king, and persuaded him, with great difficulty, to remain at home. Barclay, in his narrative, shows that he had not been idle since he opened his commission to Charnock and Parkyns: "I was at Kensington itself, and Major Holmes with me; and everywhere else about London where that prince [William] used to go, both to know the ground, and what judgment I could make of it, in case any occasion should offer." The place fixed upon was Turnham Green. He describes this convenient spot where the king was expected to pass, as "something narrow with hedges and ditches on each hand, so that a coach and six horses cannot easily turn, at least on a sudden; and at the very entrance of the green there were some little shrubs and bushes, which would put men under some sort of cover." The king would take this road to the water-side, where he usually took boat to cross to the Surrey side of the Thames. The 15th was the day planned for the attack with blunderbusses, musketoons, and well-sharpened swords. The reluctant resolve of William to forego his hunt disconcerted the arrangement. Parkyns had provided his five men well mounted; Porter and Charnock their five each; Barclay had given money to Holmes and Charnock to buy twenty horses and their furniture; the men he had ready under pay, with a list of their lodgings.* The king stayed at home; but on the following Saturday he would be made sure of.

Between the 15th of February and the 22d another of the conspirators was closeted with Portland. His name was De la Rue. There were now three persons who had given warning of the plot. Two had furnished a somewhat circumstantial account. On the evening of the 21st the man who had exhorted Portland to warn the king to stay at home was brought before William himself. Cutts was present, in his office of captain of the guards. Portland was there also. The man was a Roman Catholic named Pendergrass. For a long time he refused to give the names of any of the conspirators. He was not threatened, but exhorted. He at last required an assurance that his evidence should not be used against any of the criminals, and William gave his word of honor that it should not be so employed except with his own consent. He then wrote down a list of names. He especially desired to screen his friend Porter; and Porter himself, though one of the foremost in the scheme, was subsequently admitted as evidence. Barclay was recommended to Porter by Charnock and Parkyns; but he hesitated about trusting him; "not," says he, "that I mistrusted his loyalty, but that I heard he was much given to drink, and open-minded." On Saturday morning, the 22d, the conspirators assembled at Porter's lodgings; Pendergrass was among the number. They were in high glee. Their spies at the palace sent word that the king would certainly hunt that day—that the coaches had gone from the Mews at Charing Cross to take him to Kew ferry; that the guards had gone to Richmond. They were taking a parting glass at the Blue Posts in Spring Gardens, before starting separately, so as not to attract attention, when Keyes, one of their number, formerly a trumpeter in the Blues, who had been in constant communication with some of his old comrades, came to say that the coaches and the guards were come back. They hurriedly dispersed. The next day twenty prisoners were arrested. Barclay escaped.

A special commission was issued for the trial of the prisoners. The first tried were Charnock, Keyes, and King, on the 11th of March. Charnock—who had been a fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, when James took his arbitrary measures against that society, and then became its popish vice-president—was an indefatigable agent of the Jacobites. He defended himself with ability; for the act which allowed prisoners counsel, and gave them other advantages under a charge of high treason, was not to come into operation till the 25th

* "King John," act iv. sc. 3. † Ibid.
‡ "Life of James," vol. ii. p. 553.

* Barclay's "Narrative."

of March. It was unjust and impolitic in the government to press on the trials under this circumstance. The convictions of the accused would unquestionably have been as certain if the privileges of counsel, of a copy of the indictment, and of a list of witnesses, had been allowed them. Their crime was proved beyond a doubt by the evidence of Pendergrass, and of their more guilty accomplices. Their executions followed quickly upon the verdict of the jury. Burnet relates that Lord Somers told him that Charnock sent an offer to the king to disclose all he knew of the consultations and designs of the Jacobites, if his life were spared, but that William "was afraid to have such a scene opened, and would not accept of this offer." According to Dalrymple, Charnock said "he would disclose the names of all those who had employed him in England, if his punishment was changed from death into perpetual imprisonment. The king generously answered, 'I desire not to know them.'" Charnock on the scaffold delivered a paper to the sheriff, in which he denied that James had authorized assassination by any commission. But in a letter to a friend he justified the assassination of such an usurper as Cromwell or as William. "He thought either of them might be treated as one would do a thief or a robber, whom it is lawful in one's own defence to attack, and kill too, if nothing else will do." He quotes the authority of Grotius, that a subject of a dispossessed prince might lawfully kill the usurper of the supreme power. We take this doctrine of Charnock from an abstract in the "Life of James;" but the right of a subject to kill an usurper is thus qualified —"that indeed he requires the legal proprietor's commission, which Mr. Charnock said they had in general terms." * The original paper in the Bodleian Library is abstracted by Lord Macaulay, who gives the following sentence from it in a note: "Nobody that believes his majesty to be lawful King of England can doubt but that in virtue of his commission to levy war against the Prince of Orange and his adherents, the setting upon his person is justifiable, as well by the laws of the land, duly interpreted and explained, as by the law of God." †

There were five other trials connected with this formidable conspiracy. Sir John Friend, a rich London trader, had not taken part in the assassination plot, although he knew of it; but he had made large preparations for assisting in a foreign invasion. Sir William Parkyns, as we have seen, was an active participator in the design to kill the king. Three other conspirators, Rookwood, Cranborne, and Lowick, were tried. They were all convicted, and all suffered the death of traitors.

The effect upon the temper of the nation of the discovery of this Jacobite plot is forcibly expressed in the "Diary" of Evelyn: "Though many did formerly pity King James' condition, this design of assassination, and bringing over a French army, alienated many of his friends, and was likely to produce a more perfect establishment of King William."

The complete discomfiture of the plans of St. Germains is thus mentioned by the compiler of the "Life of James:" "This intended attempt being thus discovered, it raised such a ferment in the nation as put an end to the king's real design of landing, by making it impossible for his friends to assemble, they having enough to do to secure themselves from the strict and universal search which this discovery occasioned." No one who looks carefully at the evidence in this affair can doubt that "the king's real design of landing" came to an end when he knew that Sir George Barclay had not been able to carry out his commission "to make war upon the Prince of Orange," by stopping that prince's coach as it was dragged through the miry and narrow lane at Turnham Green, and with his eight good men, armed with pistols and "strong pushing swords," putting to death the hated usurper who was unlawfully called King of England.

* "Life of James," vol. ii. p. 556.
† "History," vol. iv. p. 675.

CHAPTER CXXX.

William in the Netherlands—His financial embarrassments—Great crisis of commercial difficulty—Revival of credit—The new currency established—Attainder of Sir John Fenwick—Negotiations for peace—The Peace of Ryswick—Opening of St. Paul's Cathedral—Parliament—Reduction of the army—Dangers of an insufficient force—The East India Company—Statute against Socinians—Reformation of manners—Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and for the Propagation of the Gospel—Licentiousness of the Stage—Embassy to France—French embassy to England—Czar of Muscovy in England.

After these harassing events had taken their course, William departed for the continent, to encounter dangers and difficulties far more oppressive than the risks of a battle—more insupportable to such a man than any dread of the assassin's knife. He left London in the very crisis of the monetary change, and was in Holland on the 7th of May. On the 22d of May the king wrote to Shrewsbury from the Hague. He informed his secretary of state that the French army had first taken the field; that the allied troops assemble as well as they can, but find it difficult to join, as the enemy had far advanced in great force. There was another reason, he said. The troops "in Flanders are so much in want of money that they can scarcely move; and if the treasury do not find prompt means to furnish supplies, I know not how I can possibly act." * On the 25th of May Shrewsbury wrote to William in great alarm: "We discoursed this morning with several of the most eminent goldsmiths, and with some of the bank, and had the dismallest accounts from them of the state of credit in this town, and of the effect it would soon have upon all the traders in money; none of them being able to propose a remedy, except letting the parliament sit in June, and enacting the clipped money to go again, the very hope of which locks up all the gold and good money, and would be to undo all that has been done." † The lords justices, who had the charge of affairs in William's absence, were to a great extent helpless. They saw clearly what locked up all the gold and good money; but to retrace their steps would have been fatal. Their position was one of extreme difficulty. Public clamor was loud in its demand "that clipped money should be current again; that the standard should be advanced, and the price of guineas improved." Temporary aid which they expected had failed the government. An act had been passed in the previous session for establishing a national land bank—a bank which was to lend money on mortgages, and to lend also to the state. Land and trade were two rival interests. Trade, or the moneyed interest, would not subscribe any portion of the two millions and a half that were required to establish the land bank; and land was looking for aid to the new scheme, in the shape of loans, and had no cash to spare in the shape of subscriptions. The scheme utterly broke down; and, at the same time, through the difficulties connected with the recoinage, the Bank of England could not pay its notes in specie. There was one universal panic throughout the land. There was a bold issue of small exchequer-bills, of which there was considerable distrust. The Bank of England indorsed their notes with a promise to pay in the new money when it came forth, and meanwhile to pay interest at the rate of 15 per cent. Merchants and smaller traders exchanged their promissory notes. But in spite of every expedient the nation was quickly coming to the condition of semi-civilization—barter. Of all the sufferers in this crisis it is impossible to conceive a man placed in a more distressing condition than the sovereign who was to fight the battles of his country at the head of a great European confederation. "In the name of God, determine quickly to find some credit for the troops here, or we are ruined," he writes on June 4th. "We are here reduced to greater extremities than ever, for want of money; and if we do not soon receive some remittances the army will be disbanded," is his language on the 23d of July. On the 30th he says, "The letter from the lords justices has quite overcome me, and I know not where I am, since at present I see no resource which can prevent the army from mutiny or total desertion." The king then adds a most remarkable sentence: "If you cannot devise expedients to send contributions, or procure credit, all is lost, and I must go to the Indies." From such a man these words cannot be regarded as the mere impatience of disappointment. The army, whose mutiny or total desertion was imminent, stood between Louis of France and the subjugation of Holland. If Holland became a province of France, England would soon be in the same condition, with a Stuart viceroy under the conquering Bourbon. What then remained? To found a great maritime and commercial empire in

* "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 114. † Ibid., p. 116.

the Dutch settlements—to call up the spirit of colonial freedom to balance the despotism of the old world. On the 31st the king sends Portland to England to arrange about assembling parliament: "Rather than perish all must be risked." Shrewsbury wrote a desponding answer to Portland's communications; and then William in his reply expressed that noble sentiment which every Englishman ought to bear in mind in the day of public calamity and fear, "May God relieve us from our present embarrassment, for I cannot suppose that it is his will to suffer a nation to perish which he has so often almost miraculously saved, though we have too well deserved it."* The heroic confidence of William had revived. "He was a man that knew how to meet adversity. His life had been one continued struggle with difficulties; but it had been the fixed rule of that life to encounter them with an unshaken fortitude, and a rigid adherence to what he considered to be right."† He would not "go to the Indies." The nation that God had "so often almost miraculously saved" would be saved again, even in the dire extremity of this time. It has been said with great truth, "The vessel of our commonwealth has never been so close to shipwreck as in this period."‡

On the 15th of August there was a great meeting of the general court of the Bank of England to discuss an earnest appeal that had been made to them by the king's ministers, for an advance of two hundred thousand pounds. Very reluctantly had this application been made. Shrewsbury was in despair. He wrote to the king, "A loan from the city is much doubted, by the incapacity which has appeared in many to discharge the bills which have been drawn upon them from all parts. If the application to the bank should not succeed, God knows what can be done." But he adds, "Yet anything must be tried and ventured, rather than lie down and die."§ The application to the bank did succeed. Immediate relief to the necessities of William, however small, was obtained. But he was not in a condition to carry on the campaign with any vigor. His difficulties were set forth with considerable exaggeration by the French. The Jacobites were everywhere rejoicing. But time was working that change, from temporary financial distress to growing ease and eventual relief, which is almost certain when the resources of industry are not exhausted, and the great body of the people are not alienated from a government. The embarrassments of the English had induced the Duke of Savoy to make a separate peace with France. Everywhere there were signs of a defection from the alliance of which William was the heart and soul. He came home at the beginning of October. He met the parliament on the 20th of that month. In him the indomitable resolution with which he had encountered so many adverse contingencies spoke out, when he said, "It is fit for me to acquaint you that some overtures have been made, in order to the entering upon a negotiation for a general peace; but I am sure we shall agree in opinion, that the only way of treating with France is with our swords in our hands; and that we can have no reason to expect a safe and honorable peace but by showing ourselves prepared to make a vigorous and effectual war." This was not the language of a bankrupt king; it was not addressed to a bankrupt nation. There were evident symptoms that the great difficulty of the currency was in some degree passing away. Had the government evinced the slightest disposition to recede from the measure of recoinage, to reduce the standard, to raise the denomination of the coin, the evil would never have been cured. The very first measure of the Commons was to pass this resolution—"That they would not alter the standard of the gold and silver, in fineness, weight, or denomination; and that they will make good all parliamentary funds since his majesty's accession to the crown, that have been made credits for loans from the subject." The effect of this true statesmanship, for which the honor is mainly due to Montague, was instantaneous. The expectations of those who hoarded guineas in the belief that a guinea would pass for thirty shillings—of those who hoarded crowns in the belief that what was worth five shillings would exchange for commodities at the value of seven shillings and sixpence, were at an end. The true money flowed into circulation. Trade revived. The financial and commercial crisis was past. The nation was solvent. A hundred and twenty-six years afterward, one of the ablest of English statesmen, in resisting a motion against the resumption of cash payments on the ground of agricultural distress, rested his most powerful arguments on the great historical precedent of 1696, and concluded his convincing speech by moving, in the very words of Montague's resolution, "That this house will not alter the standard of gold and silver, in fineness, weight, or denomination."* England fought through the great currency change of 1822 as England had thrown off the far heavier weight looking at the nation's comparative resources, of the change in 1696. The same spirit of the people was manifested at each crisis. A financier of the earlier period thus speaks of his contemporaries: "While our neighboring nations expected we should sink under this burden, and some were even prepared to receive us as a province, the strength of mind, constancy, and magnanimity of our people overcame it all."†

The two houses of parliament were occupied, during this session, with the extraordinary proceedings under a bill of attainder against Sir John Fenwick. The historical narratives of this event are, for the most part, as lengthy as the parliamentary debates. A very slight summary is all that we can attempt to give of an affair which has far more to do with the history of party than with the history of the nation, and of which the only thing of any real importance, after an interval of more than a century and a half, is the constitutional question of procedure by attainder.

In the deposition of Goodman, one of the witnesses for the crown in the assassination plot, he implicated Sir John Fenwick, as being, in conjunction with Friend, Parkyns, and others, in correspondence with James upon a projected invasion, and that Fenwick used to send over a list of the forces in England, and of their disposition. Porter, another of the conspirators, gave his testimony to a similar effect. Fenwick attempted to fly into France, under the assumed name of Thomas Ward; but in June he was apprehended at New Romney, in Kent. Fenwick was highly connected; he was a baronet of an ancient family. A letter which he had addressed to his wife, upon his apprehension, was intercepted. He exhorted her to make all friends. "I know nothing," he said, "can save my life, but my Lord Carlisle's going over to him [King William], backed by the rest of the family of the Howards, to beg it." In another passage he says, "I cannot think what else to say, but the great care must be the jury. If two or three could be got that would starve the rest, that or nothing can save me." Fenwick, being ordered for trial, offered to give evidence of great importance, and was visited in prison by the Duke of Devonshire, at the king's desire. In a written paper he implicated Shrewsbury and Godolphin, Marlborough and Russell, as having been in communication with James at various times. The paper was transmitted to William, who probably knew as much of these general treacheries as Fenwick could tell him. He transmitted the paper to Shrewsbury, saying, "You may judge of my astonishment at his effrontery in accusing you. . . . You will observe the sincerity of this honest man, who only accuses those in my service, and not one of his own party."‡ William was desirous that Fenwick should be brought to trial before the public affairs demanded his own return to England. There was a difficulty. Goodman had been tampered with, and could nowhere be discovered. Fenwick, in his letter to his wife, had said, "Money, I know, would do it; but alas, that is not to be had." The indefatigable aunt of the Earl of Carlisle did accomplish the means of preventing the evidence of Goodman before a jury. Two witnesses were required by law in cases of treason; one only was forthcoming. It was resolved to proceed against Fenwick by bill of attainder, in which the deficient legal evidence could be supplied by the previous deposition of Goodman before the privy council, and by the evidence of two grand-jurymen as to what he had sworn when the bill of indictment was found by them. This proceeding was altogether irregular, although the crime of Fenwick was conclusively established. The most prolonged and violent discussions therefore ensued, both in the Lords and Commons, as to the passing of this bill. In the Commons the majority for the bill was only thirty-three; in the Lords only seven. "The debates," says Burnet, "were the hottest, and held the longest, of any that I ever knew." Fenwick,

* "Shrewsbury Correspondence," pp. 119, 127, 129, 130, 132.
† Mr. Huskisson's Speech, June 11th, 1822
‡ Hallam, chap. xv. § "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 135.

* Huskisson's "Speeches," vol. ii. p. 166.
† "Wednesday Club," quoted in "Life of Paterson," p. 108.
‡ "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 145.

previous to the bill being moved in the Commons, had been brought to the bar, and persisted in refusing to make any further confession. Lord Hardwicke, in a note on Burnet, says, "The king, before the session, had Sir J. Fenwick brought to the cabinet council, where he was present himself. But Sir John would not explain his paper."* In another note he says: "My father was told by the Duke of Newcastle that his father, the first Lord Pelham, then a lord of the treasury, and a stanch Whig, voted against the bill, because he thought it hard to put a man to death, who on compulsion, that is, to save his life, had told disagreeable truths. And the management of party was such that Sir J. Fenwick was prevented from speaking out lest he should exasperate the great men on both sides, who knew he could tell tales. The consequence was that he was afraid to affirm his own tale, and lost his life."† He suffered death on the 28th of January. The proceeding by attainder is a blot upon the reputation of the Whigs, as defenders of public liberty. The conversion of such a solemn act into a revengeful party proceeding is disgraceful to many of the statesmen of that time. "It is now well known that Fenwick's discoveries went not a step beyond the truth." ‡

The king closed the session of parliament on the 16th of April, 1697, and on the 26th embarked for Holland. He had promoted Somers to be lord chancellor, instead of keeper of the great seal, and had created him a peer. Russell was created Earl of Orford. Montague obtained the higher office of first lord of the treasury. The campaign in the Netherlands was distinguished only by one considerable event—William rescued Brussels from a second bombardment. He outmarched the French generals by a rapid night movement over the plain of Waterloo, and through the forest of Soignies, and encamping near Brussels, intrenched himself, and saved the city.

In his speech at the close of the session of parliament, the king had alluded, though not in very decided terms, to the possibility that an honorable peace might be agreed to. The difficulty of concluding a general pacification was less on the part of France than on the part of some of the allies. Spain was haughty and intractable, though she had rendered little assistance in the war. The Emperor of Germany wanted the war prolonged, with a view to his own interest in the succession to the crown of Spain. Plenipotentiaries were appointed by the several powers to discuss the terms of a treaty with the ministers of France. They disputed long as to the place of meeting. At last it was agreed that their conferences should be held at Newburg House, a palace belonging to William in the village of Ryswick, between the Hague and Delft. The Earl of Pembroke, and others on the part of England; Harlay as the representative of France; the accredited agents of Spain, of the emperor, of Sweden and of other minor powers—these met twice a week with solemn bows and ceremonial speeches. At the end of June they had concluded nothing, with their infinitude of protocols. The French and English armies were facing each other in the neighborhood of Brussels. This state neither of peace nor war was not suited to the decisive temper of William. In each of the armies there was a man who could interpret in a straightforward manner the wishes of their respective sovereigns. Portland was thoroughly in the confidence of William. He sent a message to Boufflers, who had been his prisoner for a few days after the capture of Namur, when they formed that sort of intimacy that often springs up between generous enemies. Portland desired half an hour's private conversation with Boufflers, at some place between the two armies. Boufflers asked the consent of his sovereign, and received it, with the condition that he should repair "to this rendezvous with all the dignity becoming a marshal of France who commands one of my armies." § He was to speak as little as possible, and to draw from Portland all he could—a very general rule in that mysterious science called diplomacy. They met on the 8th of July at the village of Brucom, a short distance from Halle, standing apart from their attendants in an orchard. They had four subsequent discussions in open places, where walls could tell no secrets. Portland was authorized to say at the first interview, that William, on the part of England and of the States-General, was satisfied with the terms of territorial arrangement that Louis had proposed, provided satisfaction should be given upon points which concerned himself personally. At the sixth and last interview they met in a small house, and the points of the negotiation were put into writing. William demanded that Louis should sanction no attempt to disturb the existing order of things in England, by James and his friends, and that the Stuart exiles should remove from France. There is the show magnanimity in the answer of Louis, that his honor was wounded—"wounded by the proposal that has been made to me to name expressly in the treaty, and to engage to remove from my kingdom, a king who has found no asylum except with me, and no alleviation of his misfortunes except in the manner in which I have received him." As to the objection that while James was in France the secret practices of his party would be encouraged, even against the wishes of Louis, the great king answers in the tone that only absolute power can assume: "All Europe is sufficiently aware of the obedience and submission of my people; and when I shall please to hinder my subjects from assisting the king of England—as I engage to do by promising not to assist, directly or indirectly, the enemies of the Prince of Orange, without any exception—there is no reason to apprehend that he will find any assistance in my kingdom."* Portland waived the point that James should be mentioned by name, provided that Louis agreed not to favor rebellions and intrigues in England, when William would give the like assurance with regard to any factions or rebellions in France. The high-blown pride of Louis was signally manifested at this presumption of William. He writes to Boufflers: "You shall answer to this proposal that this equality of condition cannot take place; and that the submission of my subjects, and the tranquillity of my kingdom, give me no reason to fear either faction or rebellion."† William, however, succeeded in carrying the reciprocal condition. He refused the demand of Louis that a general amnesty should be granted to all the adherents of James. He would pardon offences of men who would live quietly, but he would not consent to such a stipulation on the part of a foreign power. The Treaty of Ryswick was concluded between France, England, the States-General, and Spain, on the 22d of September. An extended term was given to the Emperor of Germany to accede to the treaty.

On the 26th of November (N.S.) William made his entry into London. Never was public joy more manifest. The evil times had passed away; there was now hope that the nation would go forward in a career of prosperity under a stable government. On that night of universal gratulation, while fireworks were displayed and pitch barrels were blazing in every open place of London, William wrote from Kensington to his friend Heinsius, "I arrived here this evening, after having passed through the city amid the lively acclamations of the people. I do not recollect having ever seen so great an assemblage of well-dressed people. It is impossible to conceive what joy the peace causes here." Well might England rejoice. Her constitutional king was acknowledged by the proud monarch who had so long treated him only as the Prince of Orange. He had vindicated the choice of the nation by nine years of incessant struggle against difficulties which would have crushed any common man. He had established the freedom and independence of the country which had chosen him as its head. When the negotiations were going forward, James issued what he termed a solemn protestation against "all whatsoever that may be treated of, regulated, or stipulated, with the usurper of our kingdoms," and "against all the proceedings of his pretended parliament, and whatever tends to the subversion of the fundamental laws of our kingdom, particularly to those relating to the succession to our crowns." He urged upon all princes and potentates to consider how dangerous the precedent of peace with an usurper would prove to themselves; "and since ours is the common cause of all sovereigns, we call for their assistance in the recovery of our kingdoms." ‡ The unhappy man had not yet learned that there is something higher than "the cause of all sovereigns"—the cause of their people.

The 2d of December, 1697, was a memorable day in England. It was the day of general thanksgiving for the peace. It was especially memorable in London; for on that day the new cathedral of Saint Paul's, which, for twenty-two years, had been gradually rising out of the ashes of the old cathedral, was opened for divine worship. The king was to have attended this opening; but he heard Burnet

* Oxford edit., vol. iv. p. 323.
† Ibid., p. 324.
‡ Hallam, chap. xv.
§ Grimblot, vol. i. p. 5.

* Grimblot, vol. i. p. 21.
† Ibid., p. 36.
‡ "Life of James II.," vol. ii. p. 572.

preach at Whitehall, for he was told that if he went to Saint Paul's the streets would be so filled with spectators that all the parish churches would be forsaken. No crowd was assembled within the walls of the noble temple on that day of national thanksgiving; for the choir alone was constructed with a view to the performance of the ordinary ritual of Protestant worship. There, Compton, Bishop of London, preached; there, the lord mayor and aldermen represented the commonalty of London. Great public occasions have been since, when the vast spaces beyond that choir have been filled with multitudes. There is one annual solemnity when the voices of thousands of children unite here in hymns of adoration. But not till a hundred and sixty-one years had gone by, since the magnficent fabric of Wren had been opened for divine service, was the experiment made of assembling a vast congregation beyond the comparatively narrow limits of the choir, to join in the chants of our noble liturgy, to listen to the preacher who was now to speak to such an assemblage as were once spoken to by the preachers of the Reformation at Paul's Cross. To the mind of the great architect the notion could never have presented itself, that three thousand people would have been seated in attendance on the evening service of each Sunday night of a cold and wet winter—the greater number in the area where the choir, the nave, and the transepts join. Wren could not have imagined that, above those piers which carry the majestic concave to which no one ever looked up without a sense of its grandeur, the vast circle of the dome would be illuminated with many hundreds of jets of flame—brilliant as stars, shedding down a light as of noonday—produced by an invention unknown to his age of scientific discovery. On those Sunday nights of December, 1858, while the simplest chants of the cathedral service, and the commonest hymns of a rural congregation, were sung by a choral band of unusual number and skill, the voices of the vast assembly swelled louder than the organ-peal, as if they felt that, for the first time, the colossal fane which rises sublimely over the smoke and mists of London had been applied to its proper uses; that the decent solemnities of the Anglican Church had now acquired a grandeur which, could the pure-minded philosopher who sleeps in the crypt below the dome have foreseen this change, he would have thought that a far nobler destination for the great monument of his genius had been reached than all the pomp of Saint Peter's on its highest festivals.

The parliament was opened by William on the 3d of December. The most important passage in the royal speech was this: "The circumstances of affairs abroad are such, that I think myself obliged to tell you my opinion, that, for the present, England cannot be safe without a land-force; and I hope we shall not give those who mean us ill the opportunity of effecting that, under the notion of a peace, which they could not bring to pass by a war." He spoke the language of the sovereign of a free nation when he said, "That which I most delight in, and am best pleased to own, is, that I have all the proofs of my people's affection that a prince can desire; and I take this occasion to give them the most solemn assurance that, as I never had, so I never will nor can have, any interest separate from theirs." The House of Commons behaved with becoming gratitude to William, in fixing the royal revenue at a liberal amount for his life. They were somewhat precipitate, greatly to his annoyance, in their determination to reduce the army to ten thousand horse and foot. Before the opening of parliament the question of maintaining an army during peace had been warmly canvassed. The king wrote to Heinsius: "The members who have come from the provinces seem to be strongly prejudiced against this measure, and infinite pains are taken to discredit it in the eyes of the public by speeches and by pamphlets."* In January the Commons limited the vote for the maintenance of troops for the current year to three hundred and fifty thousand pounds. William again wrote to Heinsius to say how greatly he was embarrassed: "You cannot form an idea of the indifference with which all foreign affairs are now considered. People here only busy themselves about a fanciful liberty, while they are forced to acknowledge that they were never so free, and have nothing to apprehend from me."† In alluding to the clamor for what he calls "a fanciful liberty," William has reference to that popular jealousy of a standing army, which burst out the instant that the army abroad had done its work. The notion then set forth in very able tracts that "a standing army is inconsistent with a free government, and absolutely destructive to the constitution of the English monarchy," has long since passed away. But "the indifference with which foreign affairs are considered" has, again and again, been a cause of deep anxiety, not only to lavish ministers, but to disinterested patriots. The arguments that were urged in 1697 against leaving the kingdom in a defenceless state may be applied, with little change, to our own times. "If," says the author of a letter once attributed to Somers, "we were in the same condition that we and our neighbors were an age ago, I should reject the proposition of a standing army with horror. But the case is altered. The whole world, more particularly our neighbors, have now got into the mistaken notion of keeping up a mighty force; and the powerfullest of all these happens to be our next neighbor, who will very probably keep great armies. We may appear too inviting, if we are in such an open and unguarded condition that the success of an attempt may seem to be not only probable, but certain. England is an open country, full of plenty, everywhere able to subsist an army; our towns and cities are all open; our rivers are all fordable; no passes nor strong places can stop an enemy that should land upon us." The writer then contrasts the secrecy and dispatch with which an absolute government can carry forward its designs, while the measures of a free government must be contrived and executed without the same promptitude and the same concealment. This is good sense at any period; nor is the writer less sound when he points out the essential difference "between troops that have been long trained, who have learned the art and are accustomed to the discipline of war, and the best bodies of raw and undisciplined troops."* These arguments were of little avail. William, with his accustomed imperturbability, wrote to Heinsius, "I shall get on as well as I can. It is fortunate, however, that they have resolved to give half-pay to all the officers who shall be disbanded. I estimate their number at fifteen hundred, or nearly so; so that, if we could afford it, we should have the means of forming again a considerable army."†

The most important proceeding of this session of parliament was the bill for settling the long-disputed question of continuing the monopoly of the old East India Company or for establishing a new company. Fierce were the disputes between these rival traders; and these disputes took that form of party advocacy which is most violent when pecuniary interests are involved. The government, then composed almost exclusively of Whigs, favored the pretensions of the adventurers who desired to be formed into a new company, for they had promised to set on foot subscriptions for raising two millions sterling, to be lent for the public service upon interest at eight per cent. The old East India Company had offered to advance seven hundred thousand pounds, at four per cent. The necessities of the time made the offer of the highest sum most acceptable. The Whigs carried the new company against the Tories, who supported the old company. The favored adventurers were to be called "the English Company." The body which had been chartered by Queen Elizabeth, and called "the London Company," was to cease trading in three years. But the old company had obtained territorial possessions of small extent, and had now made an important acquisition by the purchase of Calcutta, where they had built a stronghold, known as Fort William. The new company had provided in this bill for the charge of sending ambassadors from the crown to the potentates of the East. They proposed that the king should now send an ambassador extraordinary to the Great Mogul, in whose dominions the original traders had their chief factories and settlements, to desire his favor for the new company. Sir William Norris, member for Liverpool, accordingly set forth with ample allowance for his dignity. But Aurungzebe was not propitiated by the professions of the representative of the merchants who came to rival those to whom he had already granted his sublime protection. The ambassador was unable to contend against the prescriptive privileges which had been bestowed upon Englishmen a century before, and which had been confirmed by the successors of Jehangir. The great "Alemgir," or "Conqueror of the World," ordered the ambassador to depart from Agra. The discomfited envoy had no choice but to obey, and he died on his way home. In four more years the rival

* Grimblot, vol. i. p. 139. † Ibid., p. 148.

* "A Letter balancing the necessity of keeping a land-force, with the dangers that may follow on it." † Grimblot, vol. i. p. 150.

companies were united.* From that period we may date the gradual extension of the power of the one East India Company, which was ultimately to win for England an empire in Hindostan far more extensive than that of the Mogul conquerors in the height of their grandeur.

In his speech on the opening of parliament the king said, "I esteem it one of the greatest advantages of the peace that I shall now have leisure to rectify such corruptions or abuses as may have crept into any part of the administration during the war; and effectually to discourage profaneness and immorality." Two months after, the Commons went up with an address to the king, praying that he would issue his proclamation commanding all magistrates to put in execution the laws against such profaneness and immorality; and they added a request that he would take measures "for suppressing all pernicious books and pamphlets, which contain in them impious doctrines against the Holy Trinity, and other fundamental articles of our faith." As the king intimated in his answer, that it was necessary to make some more effectual provision for suppressing the pernicious books and pamphlets to which the address alluded, an act was passed, by which it was provided that if any person who had been educated in the Christian religion, or had made profession of the same, should by writing, printing, or teaching, deny the Holy Trinity, or deny the Christian religion to be true, or the Holy Scriptures to be of divine authority, he should, for the first offence, be disqualified for any office; for the second, be rendered incapable of bringing any action, of purchasing lands, or of being guardian, executor, or legatee. He was moreover to be subject to three years' imprisonment.† That portion of the statute which related to persons denying the doctrine of the Trinity was repealed by the act of 53 George III. The law of 1698, with this exception, still remains unrepealed or unmodified. But it is perfectly clear that any attempt to enforce it would be wholly opposed to the spirit of this age—not that we are less earnest in religious feeling than the generation that passed this statute, but that we have learned that opinions are not to be put down by indictments, as long as they are not disgustingly obtruded upon society as an insult to its decencies. In the attack made by the act of William upon "blasphemous and impious opinions" regarding the doctrine of the Trinity, the difficulty, if not impossibility, was involved of so accurately measuring the difference between orthodoxy and heterodoxy as to enable plain men to decide upon points upon which divines themselves were disputing. Thomas Firmin, a London citizen, was one of the leading advocates of the popular schemes of that day, "for setting the poor to work;" that is, by providing the labor out of a common public stock which could not be provided by commercial enterprise, and thus increasing production without reference to the demand of the consumers, or making more poor by underselling the producers who were previously in the market. Firmin was, however, a man of real benevolence, and though his schemes upon any large scale would be impracticable, his exertions rescued many poor children from idleness and starvation. "He was in great esteem," says Burnet, "for promoting many charitable designs; for looking after the poor of the city and setting them to work; for raising great sums for schools and hospitals, and indeed for charities of all sorts, public and private." This practical Christian was the friend of Tillotson; "he was called a Socinian, but was really an Arian." He was as diligent in propagating his theological tenets as in his less questionable labors. According to Burnet, those who were at work to undermine the government "raised a great outcry against Socinianism, and gave it out that it was likely to overrun all; for Archbishop Tillotson and some of the bishops had lived in great friendship with Mr. Firmin, whose charitable temper they thought it became them to encourage." The clergy themselves came to dispute among themselves, and thus to be divided by their adversaries into "real and nominal Trinitarians." The spirit of controversy that was again called forth "made the bishops move the king to set out injunctions, requiring them to see to the repressing of error and heresy, with all possible zeal, more particularly in the fundamental articles of the Christian faith: and to watch against and hinder the use of new terms or new explanations in these matters. This put a stop to these debates, as Mr. Firmin's death put a stop to the printing and spreading of Socinian books." * How far the statute which immediately followed Mr. Firmin's death was conducive to the repression of infidelity, may be sufficiently estimated by its progress in the next two reigns, when the test of wit and wisdom, of refinement and taste, was to be a free-thinker after the fashion of Shaftesbury or Bolingbroke.

The Socinian books might have vanished; but the profaneness and immorality, which could not so readily be touched by act of parliament, had to be combated by an organization very peculiar to this country. The principle of association was to come to the aid of the government. Societies for the reformation of manners had for some time been in activity. They originated with the Puritans. They were encouraged by dissenters after the revolution; and they gradually embraced men of various modes of worship. Their business was to lay informations before the magistrates, of swearers, drunkards, Sabbath-breakers, and other offenders, and to appropriate that portion of the fines which were earned by common informers, to purposes of charity. The objection which ever was, and ever will be, against the most honest exertions of such societies is—that they are not impartial in their visitations. Defoe indignantly attacked the unequal distribution of punishment "in the commonwealth of vice," and boldly said "till the nobility, gentry, justices of the peace, and clergy, will be pleased either to reform their own manners, or find out some method and power impartially to punish themselves when guilty, we humbly crave leave to object against setting any poor man in the stocks, or sending him to the house of correction for immoralities as the most unjust and unequal way of proceeding in the world." †

Whatever were the immoralities of the upper classes—whatever was the laxity of some of the clergy—there was a spirit growing up which is the best proof of an extending sense of Christian obligation. When the influential members of a community have come to recognize the duty of association, for objects of benevolence of a wider range than their own parish, town, county, or kingdom, there is a principle stirring within them which, if not exaggerated into false enthusiasm, will make them more regardful even of the wants at their own doors. Such an association was that of the "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge;" such was the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts;" both established about this period. These societies were chiefly created and brought into a condition of practical utility by the efforts of one man. A society had been formed in 1649 under an act of the parliament of the commonwealth, "for the promoting and propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ in New England." It subsisted till after the restoration; but in that period —one of the decline of genuine Christianity—it fell into disuse. Thomas Bray, a native of Shropshire, born in 1656, was educated at Hart Hall, Oxford. While he held the benefice of Sheldon he published a very useful work, "Catechetical Lectures." The governor and assembly of the colony of Maryland, having established a legal maintenance for ministers of the Church, Dr. Bray was appointed a commissary, or general superintendent. One of his first labors, after selecting proper persons to be sent, was to provide libraries for their use. Another of his valuable designs was to establish lending libraries in England and Wales for the use of the clergy. He was truly the founder of those parochial libraries, established by act of parliament in 1708, which, if they had been carried forward with corresponding energy, would have tended to dissipate some of that ignorance among the people generally which it has been a main object in our own time to remove. To this admirable man was mainly owing the establishment of the two great and venerable societies which still maintain their utility in connection with the Church of England.

With a clergy even more zealous and united than the churchmen of the end of the seventeenth century—a clergy learned, logical, argumentative, but rarely touching the hearts of their hearers—the counteracting influences to such a society as that for promoting Christian knowledge were very great. Not the least of these opposing influences was the licentiousness of the stage. In 1697, Sunderland, as lord chamberlain, had issued an order to prevent the pro-

* See *ante*, vol. iii. p. 408.

9 Gul. III. c. 35 (c. 32 in the common printed editions).

* Burnet, "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 382.

† "The Poor Man's Plea against all the Proclamations, or Acts of Parliament, for Reformation."

faneness and immorality of the acted drama. In 1699 the master of the revels represented that the actors did not leave out such profane and indecent expressions as he had ordered to be omitted. The king therefore issued his command that nothing hereafter should be acted contrary to religion and good manners. How this command was obeyed, let Congreve, Farquhar, and Vanbrugh inform us. The master of the revels might refuse "to license any plays containing irreligious or immoral expressions," as he was commanded; but the master of the revels probably made no attempt to remonstrate against performances in which the phraseology might be tolerably decent, but of which the whole structure of the action was to represent chastity as the thin disguise of scheming women, and the pursuit of adultery as the proper business of refined gentlemen; to make the sober citizen the butt of the profligates who invaded his domestic hearth; to exhibit the triumphs of intellect in the schemes of venal lackeys to aid the intrigues of their masters, and of odious waiting-maids to surround their mistresses with opportunities of temptation. Was this a true picture of society? We believe not. None of these writers, with all their wit and vivacity, ever looked beyond the periwigs and point laces, the stomachers and towering caps, that they saw in the side boxes. The great middle class was wholly unknown to them—that class which, although it had cast aside some of those severities of Puritanism which confounded innocent gayety with vice, was not inclined to adopt the principle inculcated by the dramatists, that stupidity and decency were inseparable. There was an earnest public in England that disliked the stage because it was corrupting. Defoe was of this number, and he wrote against the drama with little of his usual discrimination. Jeremy Collier took a bolder course, and smote down the individual writers who made plays "the greatest debauchers of the nation," as Burnet says. He had even Dryden at his feet when the great poet acknowledges, "In many things he has taxed me justly. . . . It becomes not me to draw my pen in defence of a bad cause, when I have so often drawn it for a good one." Dryden maintains, however, that Fletcher's "Custom of the Country" is more offensive than any of the plays then acted. "Are the times," he asks, "so much more reformed now than they were five and twenty years ago?" * Unquestionably they were more reformed. But the morality of the age of the restoration still tainted the stage of the revolution. Charles the Second brought to England the manners of the court of France in the days of its worst profligacy. Since then the court of France had grown devout and decent. Burnet says, "It is a shame to our nation and religion to see the stage so reformed in France and so polluted still in England." † The court of William and Mary, in its seclusion at Kensington, had little influence upon the world of fashion; and thus there was no perceptible effect upon manners in the decorous example of the highest in the land. Burnet was pretty right in his antithesis—"The stage is the great corrupter of the town, and the bad people of the town have been the chief corrupters of the stage." ‡

The court of Louis the Fourteenth was now to be brought into intimate acquaintance with the court of William the Third. As the parliament had interfered to prevent the King of England emulating, even for purposes of national defence, the great armies of the King of France, William, with a pardonable ostentation, resolved that his ambassador to Versailles should not go without the trappings of a magnificent royalty. He could scarcely afford this most expensive outlay, especially as five days before Portland, the ambassador, set forth with his sumptuous retinue on this friendly mission, Whitehall had been burned down. The Banqueting House was saved with great difficulty. William wrote to Heinsius that the principal portion of the palace was in ashes. "The loss is considerable, but we have no remedy, and we have nothing left but to pray God to preserve us in future from such accidents," writes the equal-minded king. § Portland was received in France with extraordinary courtesy. At every town through which he passed from Calais to Paris, guards of honor attended upon him, and salutes were fired from every citadel. Early in February he had his private audience of Louis at Versailles. Saint Simon has described the superb suite of Portland—his horses, his liveries, his equipages, his hospitable table. He appeared, says this careful observer, with a politeness, with the air of a court, with a gallantry and grace, that were surprising. The French were charmed with him; it became the fashion to see him, to fête him, to attend his parties. And yet this envoy of William exhibited a warmth on one occasion which was scarcely in unison with the habitual calmness of his friend and master. He writes to the king on the 16th of February: "Marshal Boufflers has taken an opportunity of speaking to me of the surprise and indignation which I had expressed, rather publicly, at seeing the Duke of Berwick and others at Versailles; on which occasion I had said that the blood boiled in my veins at their approach, and that I hoped there was no intention of accustoming me to see the assassins of the king my master. He attempted to soften this in a way which led me to infer that my words had been reported, and that he spoke to me by command. For this reason I deemed it necessary to state still more fully what I thought of the residence of King James in France, and of their tolerating and maintaining in this country villains who had attempted your life." * To Louis himself Portland spoke out in the same blunt manner, especially about those he calls "the assassins;" to whom the great king replied, with regal suavity, that "he was not perfectly acquainted with this affair," and that he would never take the step of obliging King James to withdraw from France. William took this matter very quietly. He was not surprised at the reply which Portland had drawn from the king. "It would have been more desirable if you had received such a refusal at the close of your negotiations rather than at the commencement, for it may cause you a good deal of embarrassment throughout, and especially in regard to the most important point of all, the Spanish succession." † Upon this "most important point of all," as William clearly saw, would the future destinies of Europe depend. The death of the King of Spain was then expected; and to avert a war with France, if that event took place, or to find the means of carrying on a war, was the great anxiety of William's life for his few coming years.

Portland made his public entry into Paris on the 9th of March. His letter to William, describing some circumstances of the ceremonial, is very curious. His disputes with the "conductor of ambassadors," about matters of etiquette, are highly amusing. "In my case," he says, "difficulties have been raised on every conceivable point; and as I do not understand the ceremonial, I am embarrassed by them, and can only meet them with obstinacy, which is here rather indispensable." Comedy cannot imagine a richer scene than the burly Dutchman refusing to come down from the top of his staircase to meet the representative of the Duchess of Burgundy, who refused to go more than half way up, "messengers passing backward and forward between us." ‡ When the English ambassador's carriage was at last fairly on its way to the Louvre, Portland was surprised to see the windows and balconies filled with "all the people of quality in the city," and the crowd on the Pont Neuf expressing their wonder at the solemn reception of the representative of a monarch whose effigy they had been burning for eight years on the same bridge. At last he got into the sublime presence of Louis. The king spoke first. The courtiers said "he was never seen to speak to an ambassador first, or in so familiar a manner;" and they were perfectly astonished that Portland was not embarrassed at the sight of the gorgeous assemblage that surrounded the great potentate. §

While this parade was going forward in the most magnificent court of Europe, Count Tallard had arrived in London, to be introduced to William in the humble cabinet at Kensington. The correspondence of this ambassador with his master shows how narrowly every political movement in this country was watched; what anxiety there was to propitiate the ministers of the king, and the leaders of the opposition; how every indication of popular feeling was observed and noted down. The French government had active agents in England, as in every other country, whose business it was to transmit the most detailed reports of all the political matters that came within their view—to record the whispers of the drawing-room and the mutterings of the coffee-house. Such an agent was at work in England to prepare the way for Tallard. The "Memorandum on the Affairs of England," written by the Abbé Renaudet, in February, 1698, contains some curious notices of the government and the people, which are not without a permanent interest. ‖ He thinks that

* Preface to the "Fables." † "Own Time," vol. vi. p. 263.
‡ Ibid. § Grimblot, vol. i. p. 144.

* Grimblot, vol. i. p. 163. † Ibid., p. 181. ‡ Ibid., p. 220.
§ Ibid., p. 225. ‖ Printed in Grimblot, vol. i. p. 228.

the country will be more difficult to govern during peace than it was during the war. He measures the political disposition of the aristocracy by a very different standard than that prevailing at Versailles. "An English noble does not much mind being on bad terms with the court, inasmuch as he is able to support himself by joining the popular party." He thinks the existing ministry will fall, and therefore it will be necessary for the interests of the French king "to discover, as far as possible, what are the feelings of the two houses on this subject," lest too much confidence should be placed in men who are in an unsafe position. He says that this precaution is the more necessary, as "the English nobility were never more discontented than they are at present with those who possess the entire confidence of the master whom they have set over them. They are all convinced that they have no share in his confidence. They see with indignation the Dutch loaded with wealth and honors, especially the last favorite, who is a young man of great insolence and dissipation." * The sagacious abbé, holding that, "among the Peers, there is a party formed against the court," nevertheless recommends the greatest caution in all transactions with discontented persons, lest "the jealousy of the nation should be roused," to suspect designs "against religion and liberty." Flatter the pride of the nobles, by all kinds of attentions; take their part in trivial matters; strive to gain the friendship of those who are in credit; and do nothing except through a third party, in all that may affect interests hostile to the court—such are the means by which France was to keep up its influence in England—far more dangerous as an intriguing friend than as an open enemy. His last recommendation is the most insidious: "Too much esteem and respect cannot be shown to the prelates of the Anglican Church, several of whom entertain sentiments favorable to King James."

The "Instructions of Count Tallard, his majesty's ambassador extraordinary to the King of England," are conceived in the same spirit of concealed dislike to the government of William, and inculcate the same watchfulness over every manifestation of party hostility or popular discontent. The knowledge displayed of the English political system, and of the temper of the parliament, shows the range and accuracy of the statesmanship of France. The advantage of having access to the accounts of income and expenditure, of commerce, of the state of the army and navy, of the crown revenues, of all that relates to finances, is pointed out. These, being laid before parliament, "are not kept secret; we may, therefore, judge to a certainty, by their contents, of the real state of England." It is evidently a matter of great satisfaction to France that the parliament has exhibited "much less submission" to the king; "that the reduction of the army, of the navy, and of the subsidies disables him from undertaking anything in future without the consent of the nation;" and that, probably, "the difficulties will be found greater in future parliaments." William had already tasted of the bitter cup which was preparing for him. At the beginning of March he wrote to Portland, "I cannot conceal from you that I have never been more vexed and melancholy in all my life than I am now." † He was vexed and melancholy to witness the rash haste with which the parliament resolved to leave the kingdom almost wholly defenceless. A week later, he again wrote to his ambassador at the court of Louis. "I confess that I have so heartfelt a desire to see no more of war during the short period I yet may have to live, that I will not omit anything, which in honor and conscience I can do, to prevent it." He instructed Portland to say for him, that he so ardently desired the preservation of peace that he "was not averse from listening to any proposal calculated to insure its continuance, even in the event of the demise of the King of Spain"—an occurrence which he feared, with the prescience of a sound statesman, might "again plunge all Europe in war." In the same month—when there was a general report that the King of Spain was so enfeebled "that the slightest accident might carry him off in a moment"—William, in a letter to Heinsius, said, "I shudder when I think of the unprepared state of the allies to begin a war, and of the dilapidated state of Spain. It is certain that France is in a condition to take possession of that monarchy, before we shall be able to concert the slightest measures to oppose it. Such is the state of matters here that I shall be able to contribute little toward the land forces." Rouse the allies on all sides to the necessity of remaining armed, was the earnest exhortation of William to the grand pensionary of Holland. "I wish I could be armed too," he sighed, "but I see little appearance of it." *

The lapse of a century and a half produces mighty changes in the political aspects of the world. There was a sovereign in 1698 in England who had no voice in the congress of the Hague—no interests to assert at the peace of Ryswick. He came here in very humble guise—by no means like a ruler who was to found a mighty empire, whose growth has been the terror of Western Europe. "He is mechanically turned, and seems designed by nature rather to be a ship-carpenter than a great prince. . . . He is resolute, but understands little of war. . . . He is a man of a very hot temper, soon inflamed, and very brutal in his passion." † Moreover, he is given to brandy-drinking, and is subject to convulsive motions all over his body. This was Peter I., Czar of Muscovy, who, whatever Bishop Burnet might have thought, had really some notions of government and war—a tall man, with a taint of something savage in his handsome countenance—but one who knew what curbing savages meant. He was a very incomprehensible monarch to the English people. William hired Mr. Evelyn's house at Sayes Court for the czar, that he might see the building of ships in the dockyards at Deptford and Woolwich. Mr. Evelyn's servant writes to his master, "There is a house full of people, and right nasty. . . . The king is expected here this day. The best parlor is pretty clean for him to be entertained in." William paid his visit. "The czar had a favorite monkey, which sat down upon the back of his chair. As soon as the king was set down, the monkey jumped upon him in some wrath, which discomposed the whole ceremonial." ‡ Peter ruined Mr. Evelyn's holly-hedge; and after his day's work as a carpenter at Rotherhithe, upon a ship that was building for him, recreated himself with beer and brandy, and smoked his pipe, at an alehouse on Tower Hill. Burnet writes, "After I had seen him often, and conversed much with him, I could not but adore the depth of the providence of God that had raised up such a furious man to so absolute an authority over a great part of the world." Pieter Timmerman, who worked for wages at Saardam, and cooked his own dinner, became, through his extraordinary process of self-education, the instrument of working out designs of Providence of which we are yet far from seeing the full development.

* Arnold Jost Keppel, Earl of Albemarle, was of an ancient noble family of Guelderland, and came over with William as page of honor. He was now twenty-eight years of age. † Grimblot, vol. i. p. 219.

* Grimblot, vol. i. pp. 307–313. † Burnet, vol. iv. p. 396.
‡ Dartmouth's Note on Burnet, vol. iv. p. 396.

CHAPTER CXXXI.

Commercial policy of England—System of prohibition—Restrictions upon the trade of Ireland—Restrictions upon the trade of Scotland—Scotch spirit of commercial adventure—African and Indian Company—Scotch colony at Darien.

In the commercial policy of England, at the period of which we are now treating, there were two words of magical power, which represented the system upon which all industrial operations were conducted. These words were, prevention—encouragement. We open the statute-book. At one page we find "An act to prevent." We turn a few leaves, and we find "An act to encourage." There is some home manufacture to be supported; there is some foreign product to be prohibited. To carry out these statutes required a vigilance of no ordinary nature. Officers of the government were constantly scouring over the sands and marshes of the coast, to embarrass the operations of a most indefatigable race, known by the name of smugglers, with which we are still familiar, and by the name of owlers, which has lost its place in our language. Owling and smuggling were carried on upon a large scale, by considerable capitalists. In the session of 1698 the parliament proceeded against some dozen of opulent merchants with foreign names, by impeaching them of high crimes and misdemeanors, for fraudulently importing foreign alamodes and lustrings, and for illegally exporting native wool. They carried on this traffic in vessels regularly passing be-

tween France and the English coast, where the smugglers were waiting to bear away the silks to the interior, and the owlers were at hand with a return cargo of wool for Picardy. The delinquent merchants pleaded guilty at the bar of the Lords. One was fined ten thousand pounds; one, three thousand pounds; two, fifteen hundred pounds each; three, a thousand pounds each; and one, five hundred pounds. These sums were applied to the building of Greenwich Hospital.

If the paternal system of prohibition, which all governments are so unwilling to relinquish, had been confined to countries then regarded as natural rivals, if not as natural enemies, a century and a half might have elapsed before even well-informed Englishmen would have regarded the principle as fallacious, and injurious to the real interests of a country. Not half a century has passed since those who advocated a contrary opinion were denounced as hard-hearted political economists. Logicians of this character still linger in a few provincial towns; and even a grave historian dates the certain ruin of our people from the establishment of commercial freedom. Great states in our own day look upon the vast extension of the trade of these islands, but make very small advances to accomplish the same ends by the same means. The most despotic government in Europe dares not encounter the monopolists of iron. The transatlantic government, that claims to be at the head of free institutions, clings to its exclusive tariff. Nations have their infancy as well as individuals. "When I was a child," says the apostle of the Gentiles, "I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man I put away childish things." Nations, in their apparent manhood, do not readily "put away childish things." The go-cart is still necessary to keep their feet from falling. They still delight to play with straws and feathers.

There is probably no manifestation of commercial jealousy more absurd than the interference of England, after the restoration of Charles II., with the free course of the industry of Ireland and Scotland. The rural interests of England had prevented the importation of Irish cattle. In the statute of Charles II. such cattle were called "a nuisance." The Irish farmers took to breeding sheep; and wool being abundant, woollen manufactures were set up. In 1698 the Commons went up with an address to the king, in which they expressed their great trouble that "Ireland should of late apply itself to the woollen manufacture;" and they implored his majesty "that he would make it his royal care, and enjoin all those he employed in Ireland, to use their utmost diligence to hinder the exportation of wool from Ireland—except imported hither—and for discouraging the woollen, and encouraging the linen, manufacture in Ireland." Upon this representation, William wrote to the Earl of Galway, "The chief thing that must be tried to be prevented is, that the Irish parliament takes no notice of what has passed in this, here; and that you make effectual laws for the linen manufacture, and discourage, as far as possible, the woollen." In their address to the king the Commons implored him to "find means to secure the trade of England, by making his subjects of Ireland to pursue the joint interests of both kingdoms. We can now understand how these joint interests would have been better promoted by leaving the productive industry and the commercial intercourse of both countries perfectly free. The reason which the Commons expressed, as to the necessity of the paternal compulsion of the king to make Ireland understand her true interest, was, that the Irish were "dependent on, and protected by England, in the enjoyment of all they have."

The King of England was also King of Scotland. But he was King of the Scots, with a distinct parliament, with a distinct Church, with a people not only indignant at the notion of submission to England, but thoroughly convinced that the day was not yet gone by for a contest for dominion, if the opportunity should arise. Fletcher of Saltoun, who held the necessity of subjecting the indigent and lawless population of Scotland to a condition of feudal slavery, yet believed that England had reached the culminating point of her prosperity; that there was a hardy race in Scotland whose energy would soon outstrip the luxurious nation that had become corrupted by riches. A federal union, between the degenerate race that had nearly run its course, and the vigorous breed that were pressing forward to a nobler goal, was all that the patriotic Scot could consent to—a perfect equality in their several nationalities, but no joint interests. Such were the doctrines that the pride of Scotland eagerly listened to, and which led her to dream of coming struggles with the haughty English for the commerce of the seas and the wealth of colonization. Yet Fletcher had been perfectly right, if he could have gone a step farther, and could have contemplated the period when the "perfervidum ingenium Scotorum" should have entered with England into a career of sympathy instead of antipathy. When, having ceased to manifest her peculiar social tendencies by hanging a boy for blasphemy, as she hanged the victim of religious intolerance, Thomas Aikenhead, in 1696—and by putting twenty-two witches upon trial for their lives, as the Scotch privy council commanded, at the same period—she had carried forward the enlightenment of her system of parochial school education into the development of her people, to form the most intelligent, the most industrious, and the most accumulating members of a British community. We had each a great deal to learn, and a great deal to endure, before that consummation of the united destinies of two countries, so formed for successful amalgamation out of their very differences, could be accomplished. There is nothing more instructive in the history of the human race than the complete union of England and Scotland into one Great Britain. The most remarkable occurrence of the period before the legislative union of the two countries is that conflict for separate interests which saw the King of England, certainly wishing well to the prosperity of both the kingdoms that he had been called upon to govern, hesitating between the jealousies of the one kingdom and the rash assertion of an impossible independence in the other—which saw William embarrassed even to the point of resigning his great scheme of policy to neutralize the dangerous ambition of France by a national enthusiasm which utterly set at nought the dangers and difficulties which it involved for him as the sovereign of two disunited realms. Those who have regarded William as the callous enemy, or the cold friend, of Scotland, in the transactions which we associate with the name of Darien, have scarcely made allowance for the peculiar position of the head of this very divided empire. Those who lived in the time of the events which saw Scotland impoverished and humiliated by the results of an enterprise which was rashly undertaken, ignorantly conducted, and ending fatally, were led to the verge of a civil war by obstinately looking only at one side of a very complicated question.

About six or eight years before the close of the seventeenth century a spirit of commercial activity seems to have sprung up in Scotland, and to have taken a direction somewhat remarkable in a country possessing very little superfluous capital. Yet this direction may be satisfactorily explained. The natural commerce of Scotland was laboring under great disadvantages. The ancient intercourse with France was cut off by the war with Louis XIV. The exchange of commodities with England was interrupted by prohibitions and heavy duties. The trade with the English colonies was absolutely forbidden. The most serious impediment to the commercial progress of Scotland was the Navigation Act of Charles II.—distinctly opposed to the policy of Cromwell, by whose ordinance all goods passing from England to Scotland, from Scotland to England, or from Scotland to any of the English foreign dominions, were to be treated exactly the same as goods passing from port to port in England. The two countries were then regarded essentially as one kingdom in those matters of trade in which the prosperity of each country was involved. Scotland, in the time of William III., could not advantageously trade with the East Indies, in consequence of the monopoly of the East India Company. Nevertheless, it was not legally cut off from that trade, as were English adventurers. It could not trade with the American plantations, in consequence of the Navigation Act. It is not surprising, therefore, that a kingdom which was beginning to feel the benefits of peaceful industry—a kingdom containing a most energetic and industrious population—should desire to seek new fields of enterprise, under the jealousies which prevented their fully participating in the commerce of its richer neighbor. This national desire was manifested in the act of the parliament of Scotland in 1693 "for encouraging foreign trade." It declares that nothing has been found more effectual for the improvement and enlargement of trade "than the erecting and encouraging of companies, whereby the same may be carried on by undertakings to the remotest parts, which it is not possible for single persons to undergo." It accordingly provides that merchants may enter into societies for carrying on trade to any kingdoms or parts of the world,

not being at war with our sovereign lord and lady. The East Indies were not excepted.* The general powers of this statute seem to have excited little alarm among the jealous merchants and party legislators of England. They probably knew nothing of this attempt to legislate for rival interests. English statesmen were too much accustomed to look with contempt upon the poverty of Scotland to entertain much dread of her commercial competition. It is recorded that Sir Edward Seymour, in a debate in parliament which touched upon a union with Scotland, applied a coarse proverbial saying about marrying a beggar.†

But at the end of 1695 the favor with which a Scottish commercial project had been received in England stirred up all the national jealousy of the House of Commons. A Scot, who was well known as the originator of the scheme of the Bank of England, had been in London, and under the authority of a Scottish act of parliament, passed in the previous June, had in a few days obtained subscriptions to the amount of three hundred thousand pounds, for constituting a company "for trading from Scotland to Africa and the Indies." This success was secured by the energy of William Paterson, when the English government was in great financial difficulties. The supporters in London of the project for a Scottish trading company were apprehensive of a parliamentary opposition to the scheme. "They think," wrote Paterson, on the 9th of July, to the lord provost of Edinburgh, "that we ought to keep private and close for some months, that no occasion may be given for the parliament of England, directly or indirectly, to take notice of it in the ensuing session, which might be of ill consequences, especially when a great many considerable persons are already alarmed at it." ‡

A new parliament met in November, and in December the Lords and Commons went up with an address to the king, to represent that an act which had lately received his royal assent in his kingdom of Scotland, "for erecting a company trading to Africa and the Indies, was likely to bring many great prejudices and mischiefs to all his majesty's subjects who were concerned in the wealth or trade of this nation." The answer of William was perhaps the only one that he could have given with any regard to prudence: "He had been ill-served in Scotland, but he hoped some remedies might be found to prevent the inconveniences which might arise from this act." § "He had been ill-served in Scotland." Dalrymple, the Master of Stair, had been his principal servant; and for his share in the affair of Glencoe the Scottish parliament had requested the king to signify his disapprobation at this very period. He had promoted the scheme of the company trading to Africa and the Indies. When Sir Walter Scott affirms that Dalrymple was deprived of his office of secretary of state to William, not for his share "in the bloody deed of Glencoe," but for "attempting to serve his country in the most innocent and laudable manner, by extending her trade and national importance," ‖ he uses the privileges of the novelist. William had been "ill-served" in both these matters. The House of Commons went farther than the king. They resolved that the directors of the Scottish company, naming the Lord Belhaven, William Paterson, and others, were guilty of a high crime and misdemeanor, upon the ground that under color of a Scotch act of parliament these directors had levied money, and had done other corporate acts in England, which could not be legally done without the sanction of the English parliament.

With every symptom of a national jealousy unworthy of a people that was becoming commercially great, it could scarcely be expected that in England the very sweeping powers of the "company trading to Africa and the Indies" should not have excited considerable alarm. The ships of the favored company were to be free from all dues; the company were to be privileged to fit out vessels of war; they were authorized to make settlements and build forts in any uninhabited places in Asia, Africa, or America; they might make alliances with sovereign powers; all other Scotsmen were prohibited from trading within their range, without license from them. But the English jealousy of commercial rivalry once roused, there could be no compromise which would make the speculation safe for the London capitalists. They forfeited their first instalments upon their shares. The angry mood of the English legislature had also roused the public spirit of Scotland; and by a general consent it was resolved that a great opportunity of asserting the national independence should not be lost. In six months from the opening of the subscription books the sum of four hundred thousand pounds was subscribed. This subscription was not accomplished by a few large capitalists, such as those who had come forward in London. "The subscription book is an interesting analysis, as it were, of the realized wealth of Scotland, at a time when it was more difficult to raise five pounds than it is now to raise a hundred." There were a few large subscriptions from the nobility and the higher mercantile classes; but the majority of the subscribers were professional men and shopkeepers. The list "affords little indication of that quiet and comfortable class, deposited in a long-enriched social system like the Britons of the present day, who are seeking a sure investment for disengaged capital." * The available funds of Scotland were devoted to the romantic adventure of founding a great Scottish colony, in some favored spot of the new world which was yet shrouded in mysterious anticipations. Not Cortez,

"Silent upon a peak in Darien," †

stared at the Pacific with more eager eyes than those intrusted with Paterson's secret. The concealed destination of the colony was the famous Isthmus of Panama. A Scottish merchant, named Douglas, shrewdly guessed Paterson's design, in September, 1696, and he exposed the perils and uncertainties of the enterprise. This acute reasoner held the amount proposed to be raised as insufficient for the project, and predicted that the company would have to encounter the determined hostility of the Spaniards. "He" [Paterson] "deceives the company, and imposes upon them—and indeed the nation, which is generally concerned in it—in that he puts them upon attempting so hazardous and costly an undertaking with so little stock. Whereas it is reasonable to believe that, if they were able at last to accomplish it, after a long war with the Spaniards, and to make themselves masters of both seas, it may cost more millions than they have hundreds of thousands." ‡ Nevertheless the national enthusiasm was at its height, filled with dreams of gold and rubies and copper-mines—of untaxed trade, and the mighty power of joint-stocks. "Trade's Release" was the theme of an "excellent new ballad:"

"Come, rouse up your hearts, come rouse up anon!
Think of the wisdom of old Solomon;
And heartily join with your own Paterson,
To fetch home Indian treasures." §

The four hundred thousand pounds which, on the 1st of August, appeared to have been subscribed, were, to some extent, made up "by a method of fictitious support well known in the stock market." The ledgers of the company, which still exist, show that some large subscribers were guaranteed by the directors. ‖ Twenty-five per cent upon the subscriptions was, however, paid up within the year, or very nearly so. With this amount in hand, somewhat less than a hundred thousand pounds, the company began to engage in magnificent undertakings. They did not leave the trade of Scotland to adapt itself to their enterprise of finding new markets for a profitable exchange, but made contracts in various small seats of manufacture, for iron goods and cutlery, for stockings and gloves, for hats, shoes, linen, periwigs, and tobacco-pipes. The Highlands even were stimulated into the production of home-woven tartan. They issued bank-notes; and with this device, and with the general confidence in their credit, they collected stores and built warehouses. But their means were still found inadequate to their ambition. They attempted to dispose of stock at Hamburg, but were interfered with by the English resident. Remonstrances were made to King William, but he afforded no redress to the complaints of his Scottish lieges. "Whether from wisdom," says Mr. Burton, "or the obduracy of his Dutch nature, he long effectively baffled every attempt to extract from him either an act or an opinion." We are inclined to think that if the king had followed the higher wisdom of pointing out to the Scottish legislature that they had sanctioned and stimulated an enterprise fraught with peril, and likely to cause his government seri-

* "Acts of Parliament of Scotland," 1693, vol. ix. p. 314.
† See Burton's "History of Scotland," vol. i. p. 264.
‡ Bannister's "Life of Paterson," p. 133.
§ "Parliamentary History," vol. v. col. 975.
‖ "Tales of a Grandfather."

* Burton, vol. i. p. 294.
† Keats.
‡ Bannister, p. 148 to p. 158.
§ Ibid., p. 48.
‖ Burton, vol. i. p. 297.

ous embarrassment in the difficult and delicate position in which it stood in relation to foreign affairs, he would have brought down upon himself even a greater amount of indignation than was the result of his cold reserve. On the other hand, had he encouraged the project, which many sensible men proclaimed as fallacious, and which the jealousy of his English parliament had denounced, he would have risked a rupture with that parliament, which he scrupulously avoided even under the severest mortifications personal to himself. It was more than difficult for him to steer a just and prudent course as the sovereign of two kingdoms having such conflicting interests in their unnatural separation. The embarrassments arising out of the Darien scheme without doubt gave a stronger impulse to his ardent wish for the union of England and Scotland.

On the 26th of July, 1698, three vessels, purchased from the Dutch, and armed as ships of war, sailed from Leith, with twelve hundred men on board. "The whole city of Edinburgh poured down upon Leith, to see the colony depart, amid the tears, and prayers, and praises of relations and friends." * The destination of the adventurers was unknown to them. Paterson was on board one of the vessels, the Saint Andrew, but in no responsible position. He addressed a report of his proceedings at the end of the next year to the court of directors of the company. At the first, when he suggested that a council should be held to inquire how the vessel was provided for the voyage, he was told by the captain not to interfere with business for which there were ample instructions. The passengers were soon reduced to short allowance. Throughout the voyage the projector of the colony was at issue with the officers of the ship and the council appointed by the directors. The sealed orders were opened at Madeira, and then the destination of the twelve hundred colonists ceased to be a secret. On the 4th of November they landed at a point in the Gulf of Darien. In a letter which Paterson wrote to a friend in Boston, we find that his sanguine spirit had overcome all the unpleasant circumstances of the voyage. "Our situation is about two leagues to the southward of Golden Island (by the Spaniards called Guarda), in one of the best and most defensible harbors, perhaps, in the world. The country is healthful to a wonder, insomuch that our own sick, that were many when we arrived, are now generally cured. The country is exceedingly fertile, and the weather temperate." The riches of the country, he says, are far beyond what he ever thought or conceived. The natives, for fifty leagues on either side, are in entire friendship. The Spaniards, indeed, are much surprised and alarmed—the news of the arrival of the colony has come like a thunder-clap upon them. "We have written to the President of Panama, giving him account of our good and peaceable intentions, and to procure a good understanding and correspondence. If this is not condescended to, *we are ready for what else he pleases.*" † The spot where the colonists landed was a peninsula united to the mainland, and capable at its narrower junction of being fortified. The colony was to be settled on that mainland, which was to be called New Caledonia. Seven gentlemen had been appointed for the government of the settlement. They were thoroughly ignorant of what they ought to do for the management and profitable employ of twelve hundred men, some of whom were of the old buccaneering stamp, and far readier for plunder than for labor or traffic. It had been ostentatiously proclaimed that the Scottish colony was to be the great emporium of free commerce; that the ships of all nations were to exchange in its favored ports without restriction. The projectors were before their time in their doctrine, as set forth in some verses of the day,

"that trade by sea
Needs little more support than being free."

The adventurers had little acquaintance with the difficulties of colonization, and knew not the obstacles that would prevent a body of private men, unsupported by the strong arm of a government, from planting themselves on the Isthmus of Panama, and becoming the medium of commercial intercourse between the Atlantic and the Pacific. There had been terrible visitors there before the Scots—ruffians who had carried desolation into the Spanish possessions on the Isthmus—robbers and murderers who hoisted the black flag—the remembrance of whose atrocities was still fresh. The colonists sent civil messages to the governors of the neighboring Spanish settlements. Their overtures were rejected with disdain. Soon they got into conflict with the Spaniards, in taking part in a dispute between them and some friendly Indians. At Carthagena a vessel of the company, armed with fourteen guns, running into the bay, the captain and crew were seized and condemned to death as pirates. The English resident interfered and saved the men. The authorities of the colony now declared war against Spain, attacked the ships of that power, and turned very readily to the same sort of exploits for which Captain Morgan, the great buccaneer, had been distinguished. The court of Spain, by its ambassador, made a formal representation to the government in London, that its territory had been invaded by the subjects of King William. In our narrative of the remaining events of William's reign it will be seen how indispensable a right understanding with Spain was, for the great objects of England's foreign policy. The proceedings in the Gulf of Darien had alarmed the English government previous to this remonstrance; and notice had been sent to the governors of English colonies in the West Indies, and in America, that the objects of the expedition had been unknown to the king, and that the proceedings of the adventurers had not his sanction. The colonists soon found how improvident had been the arrangements for their establishment. They began severely to feel the want of food. No supply from home had reached them, for Scotland itself was suffering from a fearful deficiency of harvest. The directors of the company wrote to the unfortunate men, who relied upon a sympathy and foresight that would have left nothing wanting, "We have had scarcity of corn and provisions here since your departure hence, even to dearth, and poverty of course occasioned thereby; which, to our regret, hath necessarily retarded us in our designs of sending you such recruits as our inclination did prompt us unto." * By "recruits" they do not mean men which Scotland would have been glad to have shipped off, but provisions that the company had not the means to purchase. They had wherewithal to exchange for food, thought the directors of the company: their cargoes of axes and knives, of shoes and linen, would easily command the necessaries of life. The unhappy settlers could find no exchangers among the Indians. They had sent in vain to Jamaica to obtain supplies. In the huts which they had built pestilence found its seat, side by side with famine. The spring came. Those who remained alive resolved to abandon the land to which they had gone with such eager hopes. They sailed away, sick and feeble, in their three vessels, two of which arrived at New York and one at Jamaica with the remnant of the colonists in a state of indescribable wretchedness. Paterson, who had opposed the departure, was among their number. "I desired them," says he, "not to design, or so much as talk of, going away." The immediate cause of their despair is thus related by Paterson: "Upon the 3d day of May we dispatched the sloop brought in by Pilkington and Sands, to Jamaica, with money and other effects, in order to purchase provisions and necessaries for the colony. . . . Then we began to expect these two sloops: viz., that of Pilkington's and this from Jamaica; also that other supplies would be dropping in, till a reinforcement should come from our country. When, instead thereof, a periagua of ours returned from the coast of Carthagena, which had met with a Jamaica sloop, by whom she had the surprising news that proclamations were published against us in Jamaica, wherein it was declared that, by our settlement at Darien, we had broken the peace entered into with his majesty's allies, and therefore prohibited all his majesty's subjects from supplying, or holding any sort of correspondence with us, upon the severest penalties. And it seems the Governor of Jamaica had been so hasty and precipitant in this matter that these proclamations were published upon the Sabbath day (the like whereof had not been formerly known). But it was to prevent the going out of two sloops bound out next morning, and fraughted with provisions for Caledonia." † Certainly, a severe measure. But Defoe states, in the most unqualified terms, that "whoever has the least knowledge of the affairs of that country, and of the trade of the English colonies, must needs know that, had the Scots Company who had placed themselves at Darien, been furnished either with money or letters of credit, they had never wanted provisions, or come to any other disaster, notwithstanding the procla-

* Dalrymple.

† "Life of Paterson," p. 209.

* Burton, Note, vol. i. p. 317.

† "Life of Paterson," p. 195.

mations of the English against correspondence." * The whole affair has some resemblance to the expedition of Raleigh to Guiana; more resemblance to the filibustering adventures of our own day. "They," says Scott, "who thus perished for the want of the provisions for which they were willing to pay, were as much murdered by King William's government as if they had been shot in the snows of Glencoe." We are not inclined to retort uncourteously upon this ebullition of nationality, but we can scarcely avoid inquiring whether the court of directors in the city of Edinburgh—who had sent out twelve hundred men to a barren country with insufficient supplies, and in reply to their demands for aid had said, "We have had scarcity of corn and provisions here since your departure," which has prevented us doing "what our inclination did prompt us unto"—were not partakers in the alleged murder? †

In the spring and summer of 1699 the company in Scotland were enabled to do something for their colonists beyond imparting to them their kind intentions. Two vessels with provisions were sent out in May. On the 5th of June Paterson was attacked with the fever of that pestilential region. By the 10th, he says, "all the counsellors and most of the officers were on board the several ships, and I left alone on shore in a weak state." By the 18th of June the fort was abandoned, and the haste to sail away was such that the vigilance of one of the captains alone prevented the guns being left behind. But another expedition had been organized; and in September, thirteen hundred men, ignorant of the unhappy fate of those who had gone before them, set sail from Leith. When the truth became known in Scotland, of their lamentable failure in the scheme which had raised the hopes of the nation to an extravagant height, the directors assumed the warlike attitude of injured princes; sent out another squadron under military command; and ordered their officers to pay no respect to any authority but that of the secretary of state for Scotland. Those who had embarked in May arrived at Darien in the rainy or winter season, to find a scene of desolation where they expected abundance. The expedition which had left in September arrived in the latter part of the winter, when the rains were passing away: the opening of the new year is the beginning of summer in that climate. This numerous body of men, who had come with ardent expectations, but without any well-defined purpose, found themselves wanting in the immediate means of preserving life, on the barren spot where so many of their countrymen had perished. They, as well as those who had preceded them, had been insufficiently provided with a stock of food. For the most part they kept on board the vessels, quarrelling with each other, and ready for any act of mutiny. Accounts at last reached them that the Spaniards were preparing to attack the Scottish settlement with an overwhelming force. Then the old spirit of many a foray and of many a battle was roused. Campbell of Finab, who had come out with the warlike instructions of the company, led two hundred men, by a wearisome march of three days, across the Isthmus, and finding a Spanish force on the river Santa Maria, took the post by storm. The Spaniards fled from this fierce onslaught, and Campbell and his band marched triumphantly back with their spoils of war. During their absence five Spanish men-of-war had arrived. The settlement was blockaded by an overpowering naval squadron. It was surrounded by large bodies of troops by land. A surrender was inevitable. On the 18th of March the settlement was abandoned, upon terms of capitulation which had been agreed upon with the Governor of Carthagena.

The incidents which illustrate this text of Burnet—"the nation was roused into a sort of fury upon it"—would be painful, and almost revolting, to look back upon, if we were not sure that such an event as the Darien scheme could never happen again, and if the very calamity had not been productive of the greatest blessing to Scotland and England, their political, commercial, and social union. When the Scottish parliament took up the whole course of the Darien transactions in a revengeful mood—making no allowance for those trade jealousies which were as rife in Scotland as in England—looking at the position of the king as if he could govern England with his right arm upon one course of policy, and govern Scotland with his left arm upon a totally opposite course—utterly rejecting the notion that anything in the world could be of more paramount importance than the interests of a body of shareholders who had paid up two hundred thousand pounds capital, to carry forward plans which sober-judging merchants and disinterested politicians considered as symptoms of insanity—we can scarcely conceive any more effectual remedy for the national fever than the cold reserve of William. The wrongs of the Indian and African Company were echoed from the English border to the remotest North. The Jacobites were active in proclaiming the iniquity of a king who had sacrificed Scotland to preserve the Dutch possessions in the West Indies. Associations were formed to forbid the consumption of articles of English production. The Scottish parliament was not propitiated by a temperate and conciliatory message from the king, that it had been to him a deep regret that he could not agree to the assertion of the right of the company's colony in Darien; that he was fully satisfied that his yielding in this matter would have infallibly disturbed the general peace of Christendom, and have brought on a heavy war, in which he could expect no assistance. The parliament agreed to a series of resolutions, in which the national grievances of Darien were recapitulated, as if Scotland rejected all considerations of the general peace of Christendom, and stood isolated among the nations, proud and defiant. Whoever defended the king was a libeller of the nation; and to the fire of the common hangman were committed the few printed attempts to induce charity and forbearance. Such a fierce crackling of the thorns under the pot was of course soon at an end. The king appears to have been the only one who could see something bright beyond the passing smoke. The House of Lords addressed him in terms of strong condemnation of the proceedings of the colonists at Darien, and of approbation of the means adopted by the colonial governor to discourage and injure them. William, in his reply, declared that "he cannot but have a great concern and tenderness for his kingdom of Scotland, and a desire to advance their welfare and prosperity; and is very sensibly touched with the loss his subjects of that kingdom have sustained by their late unhappy expeditions, in order to a settlement at Darien. His majesty does apprehend that difficulties may too often arise with respect to the different interests of trade between his two kingdoms, unless some way be found out to unite them more nearly and completely, and therefore his majesty takes this opportunity of putting the House of Peers in mind of what he recommended to his parliament soon after his accession to the throne, that they would consider of an union between the two kingdoms."

Six or seven years passed over, during which the Darien affair was a constant source of irritation in Scotland against the English government and the English people. The East India Company had become prosperous beyond expectation, in the amalgamation of the new company with the old. The more prosperous that great association, the more jealous and angry were the Scots, who believed that their company, unless ruined by the tyranny of King William, might have opened the whole commerce of the East to their favored nation. In the negotiations for the union in 1706, the Scots commissioners clung firmly to the principle that the charters, rights, and privileges of the African and Indian Company should be maintained. The English commissioners as firmly resolved that the condition of free intercourse, which was the basis of the union, should not result in "a perfect laying open the East India trade, or at least erecting a new East India Company in Britain." * A compromise was effected in a manner which smoothed many of the difficulties which the Darien affair presented to the establishment of cordiality between Scotland and England. The lords commissioners for England—"being sensible that the misfortunes of that company have been the occasion of misunderstandings and unkindnesses between the two kingdoms, and thinking it above all things desirable that upon the union of the kingdoms the subjects of both may be entirely united in affection"—

* "History of the Union," p. 67.

† Mr. Burton's narrative of the Darien affair, in his excellent "History of Scotland, from the Revolution," is the most candid and impartial account of these transactions that has been given by any Scottish writer; and though, in our view, he scarcely makes adequate allowance for the tremendous difficulties under which William was placed, his account is not colored by that intense nationality which renders the relation of this unhappy business by Sir Walter Scott and others necessary to be received with a cautious regard to the general politics of that time, and to the condition of society in both kingdoms. Mr. Burton had the advantage of consulting the original documents "connected with this ill-fated company."

* "History of the Union," p. 178.

agreed to purchase the shares of the particular members of that company. The stock "had been a dead weight upon many families; the sums paid were given over as utterly sunk and lost; and after all this, to find the whole money should come in again with interest for the time, was a happy surprise to a great many families, and took off the edge of the opposition which some people would otherwise have made to the union in general." *

The patriotic aspirations of King William, in the largest sense of patriotism, for the removal of the difficulties with respect to "the different interests of trade in his two kingdoms," were slowly realized. A way was found out "to unite them more nearly and completely." In less than a quarter of a century the fatal rivalries were completely at an end. The merchants of Glasgow and the merchants of Liverpool traded upon equal terms. The two kingdoms, thus united, went forward in a career of prosperity beyond the hopes of the most ardent imagination. In a century and a half, when Great Britain had planted new colonies in regions known only as the lands of savages; when the North American plantations had amalgamated into a great republic; when the gold discoveries of California and Australia had given a new impulse to the commerce of the world—over that Isthmus of Panama where Scotland vainly attempted to establish a settlement amid the hostility of the Spanish claimants of its territory, was constructed a railway, by which the great highways of North and South America were connected by the wonder-working powers of science, devoted to the magnificent object of gradually making the human race one great family.

CHAPTER CXXXII.

Question of the succession to the crown of Spain—The partition treaties—Negotiations at Loo—Correspondence of the king with his ministers—First partition treaty signed—The new parliament—The troops disbanded—William's mortification—A rash resolve and a calmer judgment—The Dutch guards dismissed—Penal law against Catholics—Portland and Albemarle—Admiral Rooke in the Baltic—Policy of Louis the Fourteenth.

In 1698 Charles II., the son of Philip IV., had been for thirty-four years King of Spain and the Indies. He had become the head of that corrupt and decaying monarchy when a child of four years of age. His early life had been spent under the tutelage of his mother, and of his illegitimate brother, Don John of Austria. He had one glimpse of happiness in his affection for his young wife, the Princess Louisa of Orleans, whom he soon lost. Under his second wife, a princess related to the emperor, he was governed as in his childish days. His body and mind were equally enfeebled. In June, 1698, Stanhope, the English ambassador, wrote from Madrid, "The name the doctors give to the disease of the king is *alfereyn insensata*, which sounds, in English, a stupid epilepsy." Charles had no issue. The question of the succession was very complicated. Louis XIV. had married Charles' eldest sister; but, upon their marriage, the Infanta of Spain, by a solemn contract, had renounced for herself and her successors all claim to the Spanish crown. The Emperor Leopold had married a younger sister, and she had made a similar renunciation. Her daughter had married the Elector of Bavaria, and their son, the electoral prince, was the inheritor of whatever claim his mother might have upon the Spanish crown; for her renunciation was considered of none effect from not having been confirmed by the Cortes, as the renunciation of the elder sister had been. The emperor himself was a claimant to the succession in his own person, for he was the grandson of Philip III. of Spain, and first cousin to Charles II. Thus the legitimate heir, the Dauphin of France, was barred by that renunciation of his mother which was considered valid. The next in order of inheritance, the Electoral Prince of Bavaria, had a less doubtful claim, for his mother's renunciation was held invalid. The emperor, who was farthest removed in blood, was not fettered by any contracts. We can readily understand how, with this complication of interests, the question of the Spanish succession influenced the political combinations of Europe. We can also understand the deep anxiety which William felt, when he saw what an opening would be presented by the death of the King of Spain to the realization of the most ambitious projects of France. This was no chimerical dread, in which William stood apart from the people he governed. His most anxious hours had been given to discussions with Tallard, the French ambassador, of the terms of a treaty which would reconcile these conflicting claims. But in May, 1698, Tallard wrote to Louis that the English nation "consider the partition of the succession of the King of Spain as something in which they must take a part. . . . They conceive that their commerce and its interests are at stake, and that it would be ruined if your majesty were in possession of the Indies and Cadiz. . . . You may rely upon it that they would resolve on a war, if it were suggested to them that your majesty desires to render yourself master of the countries which I have just named, and if the King of Spain were to die before a treaty had been made." * Although William readily went into negotiations with France for a partition treaty, he had a deep conviction that the question of succession would not be decided by diplomacy. He said to Tallard, "that it was much to be feared that it would be necessary to have recourse to the sword before it could be settled." He desired peace, he added; he was old and worn out; he should be very glad to enjoy repose. But France was alone to be feared, and he could be guided by no other rule than the interests of the kingdoms which he governed.†

The scheme of a partition of the vast dominions of the crown of Spain unquestionably originated with the court of France. It had been hinted to Heinsius by the French ambassadors, before the beginning of 1698. It was formally proposed to Portland soon after his arrival in Paris, as "a thing of the greatest importance, and which demanded the greatest secrecy." The truth of history is not substantially violated by the humorist, who has so capitally described the compact between Lewis Baboon, John Bull, and Nic Frog: "My worthy friends, quoth Louis, henceforth let us live neighborly. I am as peaceable and quiet as a lamb of my own temper, but it has been my misfortune to live among quarrelsome neighbors. There is but one thing can make us fall out, and that is the inheritance of Lord Strutt's estate. I am content, for peace sake, to waive my right, and submit to any expedient to prevent a lawsuit. I think an equal division will be the fairest way." ‡ John Bull, then represented by "a little long-nosed thin man," thought Louis an honest fellow who would stand by his bargain. It would be scarcely worth while here to pursue the story of treaties that were broken through like cobwebs, if the negotiations only exhibited the folly and danger of that diplomacy which attempts to settle the destinies of peoples by regard alone to the interests of crowns. "It was the fashion to do such things," says the satirist.§ The fashion, unhappily, is not quite obsolete. But there was one essential difference between the partition treaties which William negotiated with Louis, and later treaties, in which the word partition is another term for robbery: "an equal division" had no reference to the especial advantage of England or the States-General, beyond their protection against the first imminent danger of a vast addition to the power of France, or the secondary danger of a similar addition to the power of Austria. William, as King of England and as stadtholder, negotiated these treaties upon purely defensive principles. "I have had the honor," says Defoe, "to hear his majesty speak of these things at large; and I appeal to all those noble persons now living, who were near the king at that time, who I believe often heard him express himself with great caution as to the giving too much to the empire, as equally dangerous to the public peace with giving it to France." ‖ The partition treaties are associated with the subsequent policy of Europe; and they require a little more consideration to understand the objects with which William entered upon them, than is necessary to pronounce that "a more infamous proceeding is not recorded in history." ¶

As the summer of 1698 was approaching, the king contemplated his usual journey to Holland. Tallard wrote to Louis that this intention gave much uneasiness to the nation. The French ambassador saw clearly the difficulties with which William was surrounded: "The King of England is very far from being master here. . . . So much is certain, that the situation of the king is

* "History of the Union," p. 180.

* Grimblot, vol. i. p. 508. † Ibid., p. 365.
‡ Arbuthnot, "History of John Bull," part ii. chap. vi.
§ Ibid. ‖ "Review," quoted in Wilson, vol. iii p. 230.
¶ Alison's "Life of Marlborough," p. 29.

still very precarious, and that the moment which has given repose to all the world has been but the beginning of troubles to this prince."* William went to the country where he was venerated: "His countenance was expressive of the joy which he felt at going to Holland. He took no pains whatever to conceal it from the English; and, to say the truth, they speak very openly about it."† Tallard was invited to follow the king, and the negotiations were resumed at Loo. On the 24th of August they were arrived at such maturity that Portland was authorized by the king to write to Mr. Secretary Vernon, to impart to him the proposed conditions of a treaty: "You may speak to my lord chancellor about it, to whom the king himself writes by this post, that he would likewise talk about it with those he thinks he may trust with the secret, which it is of the highest importance to keep with the utmost care." In the letter of the king to Somers he refers to the fact that the chancellor had been previously apprised by him of the inclination that had been expressed by the court of France "to come to an agreement with us concerning the succession of the King of Spain." Since that time Count Tallard had made certain propositions which Portland had communicated to Vernon, for the purpose of Somers deciding to whom else they should be imparted, "to the end," says the king, "that I might know your opinion upon so important an affair, and which requires the greatest secrecy." William then adds, "If it be fit this negotiation should be carried on, there is no time to be lost, and you will send me the full powers, under the great seal, with the names in blank, to treat with Count Tallard."‡ Vernon, the secretary of state, in reply to Portland, rejoices that there is a prospect of avoiding a war when we are in so ill a condition at present for entering into it again. At this present time, August 20th, Orford, one of the ministers, wrote to Shrewsbury: "Here is no news, but that we daily expect to hear the King of Spain is dead. What will become of us then, God knows. I do not see the king has made any provision for such an accident."§ The king had been laboring for months to make such provision. Somers was in ill-health at Tunbridge Wells when these important dispatches arrived from Loo. By his direction their contents were communicated to Shrewsbury, Orford, and Montague. On the 8th of September Somers wrote to the king an elaborate letter, conveying their joint opinions. They thought that the proposal would be attended with ill consequences, "if the French did not act a sincere part." But they were fully assured that the king "would not act but with the utmost nicety in an affair wherein the glory and safety of Europe were so highly concerned." They thought that there was little hope of preventing France taking possession of Spain, "before any other prince could be able to make a stand," in case nothing was done to provide against the accident of the death of the King of Spain, "which seemed probably to be so very near." They were convinced that the nation was "not at all disposed to the thought of entering into a new war, and that they seem to be tired out with taxes to a degree beyond what was discerned, till it appeared upon the occasion of the late elections." They had doubts upon some of the points of the proposed treaty; but they could not expect that France would "quit its pretences to so great a succession without considerable advantages." Their last conviction is very characteristic of a humbler policy than William contemplated: "If it could be brought to pass that England might be in some way a gainer by this transaction—whether it was by the Elector of Bavaria (who is gainer by your majesty's interposition in this treaty), coming to an agreement to let us in to some trade to the Spanish plantations, or in any other manner, it would wonderfully endear your majesty to your English subjects." The lord chancellor makes not the slightest objection to sending the king a blank commission. "I should be extremely troubled if my absence from London has delayed the dispatch of the commission one day." He adds in a postscript: "The commission is wrote by Mr. Secretary; and I have had it sealed in such a manner that no creature has the least knowledge of the thing, besides the persons named." Before this commission arrived, William had signed the draft of the treaty, with a note at the foot, "in which he declares it to be converted into a treaty, *if the King of Spain should die before the exchange of ratifications.*" So writes Tallard to Louis on the 9th of Septem[illegible]g to [illegible]tion. stating that the treaty itself would not be signed till the 29th of t[illegible]rien month, partly because the full powers had not arrived, on account [illegible]ose the absence of the chancellor from London. Tallard conjectu[illegible]ok- that the most essential reason for the delay was, that the king "wou[illegible]ith not have it known by a date, either in England or in the Hague, that[illegible] a treaty had been signed before they (William's ministers) had been consulted."* Doubtless the king acted unconstitutionally in concluding the terms of a treaty without waiting for the advice of responsible ministers, although it was only a temporary measure. Doubtless, also, the chancellor acted unconstitutionally in sending a blank commission under the great seal, for the appointment of commissioners to conclude a treaty upon the king's sole authority. Lord Campbell states these facts in terms which are scarcely too strong to be employed by a constitutional lawyer of the nineteenth century. But we cannot think that the learned historian of the chancellors is warranted in saying that "Lord Somers so far acted properly that he immediately communicated this letter to four of his colleagues, and they all agreeing with him as to the inexpediency of the treaty, he sent their explicit opinion to the king, with the reasons on which it is founded." We have given an abstract of that "explicit opinion," which is very far from setting forth the "inexpediency of the treaty." When Somers tells the king that the people of England will not sanction a war, and that, knowing this fact, "your majesty will determine what resolutions are proper to be taken," he clearly sanctions a negotiation whose sole purpose was to avert a war. When he tells the king "we are all assured your majesty will reduce the terms as low as can be done, and make them, as far as possible in the present circumstances of things, such as may be some foundation for the future quiet of Christendom," he distinctly sanctions the general expediency of such a treaty. The whole tone of the dispatch is to the effect that the king was a better judge of such matters than the advisers of his domestic policy. He had always been his own minister for foreign affairs; and the urgency of the case furnishes in some degree an excuse for his unconstitutional rejection of ministerial responsibility. Lord Campbell, we venture to think, is more rhetorical than just when he asks, "If the government was to be carried on by the sovereign's personal exercise of the prerogative, what had been gained by the revolution?"† Two years and a half later the constitutional question was more fully raised in the impeachment of Somers. This treaty, known as the first partition treaty, was definitively signed at the Hague on the 11th of October by the Earl of Portland and Sir Joseph Williamson, as the two commissioners whose names were inserted in the blank space of the commission sent by Somers. Without entering into minute details, it may be sufficient to state that in the treaty was stipulated that the kingdom of Spain, with the Indies and the Netherlands, should be assigned to the electoral Prince of Bavaria; that Naples and Sicily should belong to the Dauphin of France; and that the Duchy of Milan should be allotted to the Archduke Charles, the second son of the emperor. These territorial arrangements were rendered in great part nugatory by an event which occurred only four months after the first partition treaty had been signed. The electoral Prince of Bavaria, then in his eighth year, died on the 5th of February, 1699. He had been named by the King of Spain as his successor, by a will made in 1698, with a condition that the vast Spanish dominions should not be dissevered. The partition treaty had become known. William, upon the death of the young prince, keenly felt the embarrassment of his position. He had been persuaded not to communicate the treaty to Spain or to the emperor. On the 10th of February he wrote to Heinsius, "I cannot comprehend how we shall ever be able to declare our having intended the succession to the monarchy for the elector of Bavaria, and still less to communicate it to the imperial court; so that we are in no small labyrinth, and may it please God to help us out of it." The mode of getting out of the labyrinth was to construct a new labyrinth. The plan of construction was somewhat less complex than the first design. There were now only two claimants to the succession, whose interests had to be accommodated. The second partition treaty, which was concluded in 1700, gave Spain, the

* Grimblot, vol. i. p. 466.
† Tallard to Louis. Grimblot, vol. ii. p. 91.
‡ Ibid., p. 121.
§ "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 552.

* Grimblot, vol. ii. p. 149.
† "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. iv. p. 142.

agre , and the Netherlands, to the Archduke Charles. The Bourcon were now to have the Milanese, or an equivalent territory, in ilie tion to the arrangements of the former treaty. When Somers aft his letter to the king said that the entertaining the proposal of the ter treaty "seems to be attended with very many ill consequences an he French did not act a sincere part," he gave a warning which o illiam did not then heed, but which was ultimately found to con in something of prophetic wisdom. When Louis, upon the death f the King of Spain, broke through the whole spirit of the two treaties by seizing the Spanish crown for his grandson, William, with an honest candor, wrote to Heinsius, "We must confess we are dupes; but if one's word and faith are not to be kept, it is easy to cheat any man." * But at any rate those who acted for England and Holland were honest dupes. They sought no personal gain; they sought no national acquisition. They endeavored to prevent by negotiation what it required years of warfare less effectually to prevent—the union of Spain to the crown of France. Upon the authority of a modern French writer, one who ought to aim at historical accuracy has ventured to say, "By secret articles attached to this treaty, the Spanish colonies beyond seas were to be divided between England and Holland." † Had even the commerce with the Spanish colonies been secured by the partition treaties to England and Holland, the Commons, who in their impeachment of Somers declared that the "treaties were evidently destructive to the trade of this realm," would have hailed the king and his chancellor as the saviors of the country.

The new parliament—chosen as Somers said in his letter on the Partition Treaty, under a state of public opinion which showed "a deadness and want of spirit in the nation universally"—assembled on the 6th of December, 1698. William only arrived in England two days earlier: and before he delivered his speech he wrote to Heinsius, "It is impossible to foresee what will be the upshot of this session; but notwithstanding the short time I have been here I clearly perceive that my greatest difficulty will be in retaining the troops." Nevertheless he did not shrink from repeating the idea which he had constantly endeavored to enforce since the peace of Ryswick, that it was dangerous wholly to disarm. In his speech to the house he now said, "I have no doubt that you are met together with hearts fully disposed to do what is necessary for the safety, honor, and happiness of the kingdom; and that is all I have to ask of you." They had to consider what strength ought to be maintained at sea, and what force kept up on land for this year. "The flourishing of trade, the supporting of credit, and the quiet of people's minds at home, will depend upon the opinion they have of their security; and to preserve to England the weight and influence it has at present in the councils and affairs abroad, it will be requisite that Europe should see you are not wanting to yourselves." Edmund Burke, in quoting this last sentence, describes it as proceeding from a ruler "full of the idea of preserving, not only a local civil liberty united with order, to our country; but to embody it in the political liberty, the order, and the independence of nations united under a natural head." ‡ The predominant idea of William, in the view of the same philosophical statesman was, at this very time, "to compose, to reconcile, to unite, and to discipline all Europe against the growth of France." § This factious and prejudiced parliament could not comprehend the high aims of the man who had delivered England from the degradation which has been so truly described by an illustrious Frenchman. "While Charles II. and James II. reigned, England had belonged [*avait appartenu*] to Louis the XIVth." ‖ The Commons met William's exhortations with unusual discourtesy. They voted no address in answer to the speech from the throne; and they passed a resolution that all the land forces of England, in English pay, exceeding seven thousand men, should be forthwith paid and disbanded; that the seven thousand should consist of natural born subjects; and that all the forces exceeding twelve thousand men in Ireland, these also natural born subjects, should be paid and disbanded. This resolution was carried on the 16th of December, on a motion made by Harley, the leader of the Tory party. The Whig ministry made a very feeble attempt to resist it; and the king had the bitter mortification of beholding himself humiliated in the eyes of Europe, and of being personally outraged by being deprived of his Dutch guard, and of the faithful Huguenots—both the companions of his toils and dangers during a war of nine years. Truly has it been said, these troops "had claims which a generous and grateful people should not have forgotten: they were many of them the chivalry of Protestantism, the Huguenot gentlemen who had lost all but their swords in a cause which we deemed our own; they were the men who terrified James from Whitehall, and brought about a deliverance which, to speak plainly, we had neither sense nor courage to achieve for ourselves." * The bill for disbanding the troops was carried through with unusual rapidity. Tallard, who had come to England, wrote to Louis, "The House of Commons has acted as in a fury." The agony of mind which the king endured overthrew, for once in that troubled life, entirely his wonderful command of temper and self-sacrificing discretion. He came to the resolution of abandoning the government of England, and of declaring the same to the parliament. Somers, in a letter to Shrewsbury, says, "When he first mentioned this to me, I treated the notion as the most extravagant and absurd that ever was entertained, and begged of him to speak of it to nobody, for his own honor. . . . The last time I saw him he would not suffer me to argue with him, telling me plainly he saw we should never agree, and he was resolved. I told him I hoped he would take the seal from me before he did it; that I had it from him, when he was king, and desired he would receive it from me while he was so." ‡ Somers at first thought the threat of William was "as an appearance only, and to provoke us to exert ourselves." There is ample confirmation that he was thoroughly in earnest, in a passage of a letter to Heinsius: "I am so chagrined at what passes in the lower house with regard to the troops that I can scarce turn my thoughts to any other matter. I foresee that I shall be obliged to come to resolutions of extremity, and that I shall see you in Holland sooner than I thought." In the British Museum there is a document of singular interest—a speech written in William's own hand in French, which he intended to deliver to the parliament. ‡ The following is a translation of the plain words of this characteristic address:

"My lords and gentlemen, I came to this kingdom, at the desire of this nation, to save it from ruin, and to preserve your religion, your laws, and liberties; and for that end I have been obliged to maintain a long and burdensome war for this kingdom; which, by the grace of God, and the bravery of this nation, is at present ended in a good peace; under which you may live happily and in quiet, provided you will contribute to your own security, in the manner I had recommended to you at the opening of the session. But seeing, to the contrary, that you have so little regard to my advice, and that you take no manner of care of your own security, and that you expose yourselves to evident ruin, by divesting yourselves of the only means for your defence, it would not be just nor reasonable that I should be witness of your ruin, not being able to do anything of myself to avoid it, it not being in my power to defend and protect you, which was the only view I had in coming into this country. Therefore, I am obliged to recommend to you to choose and name to me such persons as you shall judge most proper, to whom I may leave the administration of the government in my absence; assuring you, that, though I am at present forced to withdraw myself out of the kingdom, I shall always preserve the same inclination to its advantages and prosperity. And when I can judge that my presence will be necessary for your defence, I shall be ready to return, and hazard myself for your security, as I have formerly done; beseeching the good God to bless your deliberations, and to inspire you with all that is necessary for the good and welfare of the kingdom."

The equal mind soon came back to this extraordinary man. In a few weeks Portland told Tallard that the king "preferred calmness and mildness to what appeared best for his own interest." The King of France, who was shrewdly suspected of having stimulated some of this factious fury in the Commons by the old system of

* Grimblot, vol. ii. p. 477.

† Sir Archibald Alison quotes a passage from Capefigue, "Histoire de Louis XIV., upon which he relies for this monstrous assertion: "Par des articles joints du traité les colonies Espagnoles etoient cédées à la Grande Bretagne et à la Hollande."—"Life of Marlborough," p. 28.

‡ "Letters on a Regicide Peace."

§ Ibid.

‖ Guizot, "Civilization en Europe," Leçon xiii.

* Hallam, "Constitutional History," chap. xv.

† "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 573.

‡ Printed in the Collections of Letters, etc., by Sir H. Ellis.

bribes, looked upon the fray with very much of the spirit attributed to the great tempter of evil. In the French archives there is a dispatch of Louis to Tallard, in which the crafty king, reverting to his practices when England was under the Stuarts, says, "In this conjunction it might be proper to assist him [William] to do without the help of his people; and I would do so with pleasure, if, by such means, it were possible to induce that prince to treat with me for the sum which I should give him for the principality of Orange. . . . He would secure his authority in England, and consequently the happiness and tranquillity of his life, by finding means to do without the assistance of parliament." * There is no evidence that this atrocious temptation was offered to William at the time when he said, "matters in parliament are taking a turn which drives me mad," nor at any other time. Tallard had a better knowledge of William's character than his presumptuous master possessed. "He is honorable in all he does; his conduct is sincere; he is proud, none can be more so, though with a modest manner." Such were the terms in which the ambassador spoke of William. He would not have dared to insult this proud and honorable man with a proposal to sell himself to France, that he might become a despot in England. The "calmness and mildness" which the king had resolved to pursue were so signally displayed that his conduct toward the parliament has been called "the meanest act of his reign," and "below his greatness." † He gave his assent to the Disbanding Bill in these words: "I am come to pass the bill for disbanding the army as soon as I understood it was ready for me. Though, in our present circumstances, there appears great hazard in breaking such a number of troops; and though I might think myself unkindly used, that those guards who came over with me to your assistance, and have constantly attended me in all the actions wherein I have been engaged, should be removed from me; yet it is my fixed opinion that nothing can be so fatal to us as that any distrust or jealousy should arise between me and my people." Secretary Vernon sent a copy of the speech to Shrewsbury, and said, "Many people seemed moved with it, and express an inclination to gratify the king in continuing the Dutch guards." On the 18th of March William sent this message to the Commons: "His majesty is pleased to let the house know that the necessary preparations are made for transporting the guards who came with him into England; and that he intends to send them away immediately, unless, out of consideration to him, the house be disposed to find a way for continuing them longer in his service, which his majesty would take very kindly." The house would not even appoint a committee to consider the message, but drew up an address which William, in a letter to Heinsius, called "very impertinent." The king was bluntly told "that nothing conduces more to the happiness and welfare of this kingdom than an entire confidence between his majesty and his people, which could no way be so firmly established as by intrusting his sacred person with his own subjects." The king's answer to this address was a model of forbearance: "I came hither to restore the ancient constitution of this government. I have had all possible regard to it since my coming, and I am resolved through the course of my reign to preserve it entire in all the parts of it." The House of Commons had the power under the constitution of determining the amount of the army by limiting the supplies for its maintenance; and the constitutional king accepted its decision. Mr. Hallam judiciously rejects what he calls "the vulgar story which that retailer of all gossip, Dalrymple, calls a well-authenticated tradition, that the king walked furiously round his room exclaiming, 'If I had a son, by God the guards should not leave me.'" His real temper was far more characteristically displayed in a letter to Galway, in which he says, "I am afraid the good God will punish the ingratitude of this nation." A rash man, with a despotic tendency, might have provoked another civil war, by retaining the Dutch guards, and by bringing over other Dutch guards. William was wiser. He said to the Commons, in his reply to their insulting address, in the hour in which his health and spirit sank under the indignity offered him, "It shall be my study to the utmost of my power to perform the part of a just and a good king; and as I will ever be strictly and nicely careful of observing my promise to my subjects, so I will not doubt of their tender regards to me."

The Commons had carried their jealousy of a standing army, and their hatred of foreigners, to the very verge of political disorganization. The kingdom was left almost entirely without military force. Credit was destroyed by no sum being voted for the discharge of debt; for it was in vain that William had said at the opening of the session, "I think an English parliament can never make such a mistake as not to hold sacred all parliamentary engagements." The political machine had come to a dead lock. Tallard wrote to Louis, "Till the session of parliament is closed there is no hope of being able to advance a step in anything that is wanted to be done, of what nature soever." Nevertheless—setting aside the obvious conclusion that patriotism had a great deal less to do with the temper of the Commons toward the king than the blindness of faction, perfectly reckless in its opposition to his policy of preserving to England its weight and influence in foreign affairs—there was a deep substratum of English spirit beneath all this violence. Tallard had the sense to perceive how deceived Louis would be if he fancied these dissensions opened to him any prospect of bringing back the nation to its old subjection to his will: "Though the affairs of this country are in this state, I must warn your majesty that if the least circumstance should occur which inspired them with jealousy, and if means should be found to persuade them that they ought to be on their guard, the same spirit of liberty and of fickleness which induces them to do all that I have had the honor to intimate to your majesty, would determine them to give their last penny for their defence, or to prevent what they should believe to be injurious to them." * Unchanged and unchangeable England!

The parliament was prorogued on the 4th of May, after having passed a bill which had a personal bearing on the king's exercise of the prerogative. It was to appoint a commission to inquire into the extent of Irish forfeitures of estates, "in order to their being applied in ease of the subjects of England." This measure was tacked to a money-bill, so that it could not be discussed in the House of Lords or rejected by the crown. The king had granted some of these estates to Portland, Albemarle and other favorites, and a very natural and proper jealousy was excited. In previous parliaments a measure for the public appropriation of the lands had been successfully resisted. Nine years before this session the king had undertaken to make no grants till the principle of the application of forfeitures had been determined. But the interference of parliament having ceased, the lands were granted to various persons; "it being an undoubted branch of the royal prerogative that all confiscations accrued to the crown, and might be granted away at the pleasure of the king." This is the doctrine held by Burnet. In the next session of parliament, which commenced on the 16th of November, 1699, the commissioners of inquiry presented their report. The grants made by the king, in spite of the exaggerations of the report, were very enormous. A bill of resumption was brought in, by which the whole of the Irish forfeitures were to be applied to the public uses. In a measure which the Lords had rejected eight years before, one third was to be reserved for the disposal of the king. The present measure was certain to be carried by the Tory majority in the Commons. The Whigs moved an amendment, to resume all grants of lands and revenues of the crown made since the 6th of February, 1684—the date of the accession of James II. This was a much more sweeping resumption than the opponents of William contemplated. But they had the decency not to resist its adoption. The Commons again tacked the Resumption Bill to a money-bill, and fierce disputes ensued between the two houses. The king, though bitterly mortified by the measure itself, saw the extreme peril of any conflict upon such a question, and exerted himself to get the bill passed by the Lords. He gave his assent to it, and immediately prorogued the parliament. The Commons were preparing a resolution that an address should be presented to the king, "that no person, not a native, except the Prince of Denmark, should be admitted to his councils in England or Ireland." The prorogation prevented this last personal affront. Somers, the only one of the Whig ministers that William had retained, now quitted office. The triumphant Tories succeeded in

* Grimblot, vol. ii. p. 242. This extraordinary proposition is struck out of the original; but M. Grimblot prints it, "as faithfully expressing the sentiments of Louis XIV."

† Onslow's note on Burnet. Oxford edit., vol. iv. p. 391.

* Grimblot, vol. ii. p. 292.

effecting his removal, although they could not succeed in blackening his character by a vote of the House of Commons.

This house, so furious in its hostility to the crown, passed the most disgraceful law of this reign. The tolerant disposition of William had in England made the old penal laws against papists in many respects a dead letter. Tallard wrote to his court in 1698 that the Catholic religion "is here tolerated more openly that it was even in the time of King Charles II.; and it seems evident that the King of England has determined to leave it in peace, in order to secure his own." The "Act for the further preventing the growth of popery" recites that there has been a greater resort into this kingdom than formerly, of popish bishops, priests, and Jesuits. Any person apprehending and prosecuting to conviction any such bishop, priest, or Jesuit, for saying mass, or exercising any priestly function, is to receive a reward of a hundred pounds. The punishment for such convicted persons, or for a papist keeping a school, is to be perpetual imprisonment. Every person educated in the popish religion, upon attaining the age of eighteen, to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and subscribe the declaration against transubstantiation and the worship of saints, and in default of such oath and subscription is declared incapable of purchasing lands, or of inheriting lands under any devise or limitation, the next of kin, being a Protestant, to enjoy such devised lands during life."* Many old and wealthy Catholic landowners would necessarily come under the penalties of this atrocious law. But it is satisfactory to know that the chief object of the statute, which was to drive out these proprietors, was defeated, in most cases, by the more liberal spirit of the time. "The judges," says Mr. Hallam, "put such constructions upon the clause of forfeiture as eluded its efficacy; and, I believe, there were scarce any instances of a loss of property under this law."

To be governed by favorites is the most dangerous position in which a sovereign can be placed. To lavish gifts upon favorites is almost as dangerous even to a sovereign like William, who was not very likely to be governed by any man. The resumption of the Irish grants was a severe lesson to the king. It was very quickly followed by such a manifestation of the jealousy of Portland toward Albemarle as must have taught William that it is scarcely safe for the very highest in station to have any absorbing friendships, such as private men may indulge in. Burnet says that Portland observed the favor of the king for Albemarle with great uneasiness. "He could not bear the visible superiority in favor that the other was grown up to; so he took occasion, from a small preference that was given him, in prejudice of his own post, as groom of the stole, and upon it withdrew from court, and laid down all his employments." The letters of William to Portland, written about the time of the termination of the stormy session of 1699, exhibit a warmth of feeling very different from the supposed coldness of his nature: "Not to enter into a long dispute with you, on the subject of your retirement, I will say nothing to you about it, but I cannot help expressing my extreme grief at it, which is greater than you can imagine; and I am convinced if you felt half as much, you would soon change your resolution. . . . I conjure you to come and see me as often as you can, which will be a great consolation to me, in the affliction which you cause me, not being able to help loving you most tenderly as before." William succeeded, after much importunity, in obtaining the consent of Portland to continue the negotiations for the second partition treaty: "I cannot help telling you that the welfare and the repose of all Europe may depend upon the negotiation which you have in hand with Count Tallard."

The passing of the act for disbanding the army and the reduction of the navy by a vote of the Commons left England in a very weakened condition for internal defence, or for preserving to England its weight and influence in affairs abroad. Yet the king did not abate one jot of his resolution to maintain the attitude before Europe that belonged to the states which he governed. England and Holland were under treaties of alliance with Sweden, and were bound to render her assistance should she be attacked. The king, Charles the Twelfth, was only in his eighteenth year, and it seemed a favorable opportunity for the King of Denmark, the Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, and the Czar of Russia, to form a league against him for the dismemberment of Sweden. The young hero threw himself into the affray with that characteristic energy which afterward astonished the world; and he called upon England and Holland to assist him. The King of Denmark had insolently declared that now the King of England was unsupported by his parliament, he would be able to do little in Europe. "I will teach the King of Denmark," said William, "that I can yet do something." He would ask for no vote from parliament: he "apprehended," says Burnet, "that some of them might endeavor to put an affront upon him, and oppose the sending a fleet into the Sound." He did do something. He sent an armament of English and Dutch ships into the Baltic, under the command of Sir George Rooke, when his remonstrances to Denmark and the other powers were unheeded. Rooke formed a junction with the Swedish fleet, and they drove the Danish navy into Copenhagen. Charles exerted himself with wonderful spirit, and prepared with his allies for a siege of the Danish capital. Frederick IV. of Denmark now professed his willingness to accept the mediation of England and Holland; and a treaty of peace was signed under their guarantee. "The king's conduct on this whole matter was highly applauded. He effectually protected the Swedes, and yet obliged them to accept of reasonable terms of peace."* The King of England, with his eight thousand soldiers and his seven thousand sailors, had manifested a spirit which was probably as impressive upon the minds of European statesmen as the ostentatious array of sixty thousand troops in the camp of Compiègne by the King of France. St. Simon has described this wonderful pageant as he alone could describe the prodigal ostentation of the court of Louis. He resolved to show all Europe, which believed that his resources were exhausted by a long war, that in the midst of profound peace he was as fully prepared as ever for arms. "He wanted to convince the world," says the compiler of the "Life of James II.," that he had concluded the peace "more out of a Christian motive than the want of money." To present a superb spectacle to Madame de Maintenon he announced that he counted upon seeing the troops look their best. The officers vied with each other in the finery of their dresses and the magnificence of their banquets. The temporary houses were furnished with all the splendor of the Parisian saloons. Marshal Boufflers kept open table at all hours. Every luxury which the epicures of France could desire was brought to the camp by unnumbered express carriages. The king showered gratuities of hundreds and thousands of francs upon the officers, according to their several degrees. These gifts were a very small compensation for the extravagant expenditure which the king had stimulated. "There was not a single regiment, officers and men, that was not ruined for several years." Twenty years afterward, says St. Simon, some of the regiments were still in difficulties from this cause. "Truly did the king astonish Europe. But at what a cost!" When sovereigns, as well as private men, rush into prodigal expenditure to convince the world that they have no "want of money," the real want is pretty sure to overtake them. Louis had to endure this bitter experience in his subsequent humiliation. His suffering people had to endure such poverty and privations as never can be the lot of an active and industrious nation, but through misgovernment and false ambition.

There can be little doubt that at this time, when Louis was carrying on the solemn farce of negotiating a second treaty with William for securing the peace of Europe, he was organizing that system of intrigue in Spain which had for its object to make himself the virtual head of two great monarchies, and as such the powerful enemy of that Protestantism which it had been the chief object of his recent years to subject to the most atrocious persecution in his own realms. He had passed from a life of profligacy to a life of the most ostentatious piety. When, as Saint Simon records, the officers of Compiègne looked on with wonder as he walked with the most profound reverence at the side of the sedan-chair of Madame de Maintenon, he was testifying his homage to the devout widow of Scarron, who had become the keeper of his conscience. He had no qualms when he committed the atrocity of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; for his ambition was to destroy heresy, and compel all his subjects to return to the bosom of the Church. The massacres, the imprisonments, the banishments, that attended this frightful persecution, touched not his heart, for he was manifesting his devotion to the great cause of Catholicism. He contemplated with no nice sense of

* 2 Gul. III. c. 4.

* Burnet.

honor the probable issue of intrigues which would lead him to break his faith to England and Holland; for were they not Protestant countries, and was not the head of them a heretic, who kept out the rightful Catholic king? It was the great monarch who set the fashion in all things—in religion as in dress. He fancied that it was for him to make the court and the nation devout; and the mask was put on for a time by the court and nation. Addison writes to Halifax from Paris, in October, 1699, "As for the present state of learning, there is nothing published here which has not in it an air of devotion. Dacier has been forced to prove his Plato a very good Christian before he ventures to translate him, and has so far complied with the taste of the age that his whole book is overrun with texts of Scripture, and the notion of pre-existence supposed to be stolen from two verses out of the prophets. Nay, the humor is grown so universal that 'tis got among the poets, who are every day publishing legends and lives of saints in rhyme."* After this sacred literature came Voltaire; after this courtly holiness came the regency.

CHAPTER CXXXIII.

A Tory administration—Death of the Duke of Gloucester—The Electress Sophia, of Hanover—Death of the King of Spain—Will of Charles, which Louis accepts—The new parliament—The king asks assistance for the states—The act of settlement—Impeachment of Somers and other Whigs—The Kentish petition—The legion memorial—The great alliance formed by William—Death of King James—Louis declares the son of James King of England—William opens his last parliament—His accident—His message on the union—Death of William the Third—Note: The Act of Settlement.

After the prorogation of parliament in April, the king, contrary to his usual custom, passed three months in England. He had gone through what he described as "the most dismal session I ever had;" and he had no resource but to aim at the neutralization of the violence of the Tory party by opening to them most of the chief employments of the state. But it is evident that there was a great unwillingness in the minds of reflecting men to deem such arrangements likely to be permanent. No lawyer of eminence would accept the great seal; and after a month's delay it was given to Sergeant Wright, as lord keeper. Secretary Vernon wrote to the Duke of Shrewsbury that "when the sergeant took the seals, he did it with a foresight that he should not hold them long, and therefore intended to move his majesty that his compliance might not turn to his prejudice by any change."† Sunderland was laboring—whether honestly or in his old intriguing spirit it would be difficult to say—to effect the return of Somers to the high office which he had so ably filled. Montague wrote to Somers that, according to the report of Vernon, "Lord Sunderland has found out a method whereby the seal may again be put in your hands." But he adds, "this seems only like a shift of Lord Sunderland to lessen the odium"—that is, the odium excited by the dismissal of Somers.‡ The violent hatreds of the rival factions rendered it very difficult for the king to conduct the government upon any settled principles. William quaintly observes in one of his letters, "We must always say here, like the newspapers, 'time will show.'" But these rivalries also made the most able and honest of the king's advisers shrink from the responsibility of office. Shrewsbury, during the next parliament, when the violence of party had reached its climax, wrote to Somers, "I wonder that a man can be found in England, who has bread, that will be concerned in public business. Had I a son, I would sooner breed him a cobbler than a courtier, and a hangman than a statesman."§

The summer and autumn of 1700 were productive of events of the greatest importance to the future of England. On the 30th of July the Duke of Gloucester, the only one remaining of the seventeen children of the Princess Anne, died at Windsor, after a short illness. He had just entered upon his twelfth year, his birthday having been celebrated six days previous to his decease. Burnet had been the preceptor of the young prince for two years. The king sent a message to the princess "that he put the whole management of her son's household into her hands, but that he owed the care of his education to himself and his people, and therefore would name the persons for that purpose."* When he named Burnet as preceptor to the prince, he also named Marlborough as his governor. Burnet has recorded the system of education which he pursued. He "read over the Psalms, Proverbs, and Gospels with him," and gave copious explanation; so that he "came to understand things relating to religion beyond imagination." To divinity the bishop added geography; forms of government in every country; the interests and trade of each nation; the history of "all the great revolutions that had been in the world;" and the explanation of "the Gothic constitution and the beneficiary and feudal laws." Burnet says the prince "had gone through much weakness, and some years of ill health." This loading of the mind of a weakly boy with so much of that knowledge which belongs to riper years, instead of giving him a more complete possession of the keys of knowledge, had probably reference to the fact that "the king ordered five of his chief ministers to come once a quarter and examine the progress he had made." Something more of spontaneous application would perhaps have been a wiser system. Lady Jane Grey enjoyed reading Plato; but we doubt if the poor Duke of Gloucester had much enjoyment, or much profit, in puzzling over "the Gothic constitution and the beneficiary and feudal laws." He was to display "his knowledge and the good understanding which appeared in him," at the quarterly examinations. Had he been construing Virgil, and playing in the fields of Eton, instead of hearing his worthy preceptor talk of these abtruse things "near three hours a day," as they moped about on Windsor Terrace, that event might not have occurred which made the Jacobites "grow insolent upon it, and say, now the chief difficulty was removed out of the way of the Prince of Wales' succession;" and which, on the other hand, "turned the eyes of all the Protestants in the nation toward the Electress of Brunswick."†

William had not left the country more than three weeks when this unforeseen calamity rendered it necessary to take serious thoughts of the English succession. Politicians in England were anxiously discussing this matter. "The house of Hanover is much spoken of. The objection is, 'What! must we have more foreigners?'"‡ The Electress Sophia of Hanover was the last surviving child of Elizabeth Stuart, the daughter of James I., and of Frederic, the Elector-Palatine, who accepted the crown of Bohemia. Sophia, or Sophie, their twelfth child and fifth daughter, was born in 1630, and thus was in her seventieth year when the question arose as to the Protestant succession of England. In 1658 she married Ernest Augustus, who became Duke of Hanover in 1679 and elector in 1692. Her eldest son, George Lewis, became Elector of Hanover in 1698, when in his 38th year. The Princess Sophia was a lady of unusual talent and knowledge, the friend of many learned men whom she collected around her in her court, but no female pedant, being distinguished as much for her good sense and refined manners as for her various acquirements.§ The electress had been visited by William in 1699, and now she came to Loo, to return the visit, at the time when the interests of her family were thus affected by the death of the Duke of Gloucester. The Princess Sophia, with her large experience and keen observation, saw not only the advantages but the difficulties that were opened by this prospect. There is a very curious letter from her, written in French, to George Stepney, who, by the grace of Doctor Johnson, is counted among the English poets, and by the friendship of Charles Montague was a busy diplomatist in the German courts. The electress says that if she were thirty years younger she has a sufficiently good opinion of her blood and her religion to believe that people might think of her in England. But as there is little likelihood that she should survive two persons, William and Anne, it is to be feared that her sons will be regarded as strangers. She hints that the son of James II., who would be glad to recover what his father had lost, might be made what was desirable—that is, might be led to change his religion. She does not look enthusiastically at the prospect before her own family; for, she wisely says, "it seems to me that in England there are so many factions that one can

* Kemble's "State Papers and Letters," p. 237.
† "Vernon Letters," vol. iii. p. 59.
‡ "Hardwicke State Papers," vol. ii. p. 436. § Ibid., p. 441.

* Life of Burnet, "Own Time," vol. vi. p. 305.
† Ibid., vol. iv. p. 439. ‡ "Vernon Letters," vol. iii. p. 129.
§ See the notice of her character in the admirable volume of "State Papers and Correspondence," edited by John M. Kemble.

be secure in nothing." * The English Jacobites were acting upon the prospect of the succession of the Prince of Wales, and sent over a representative to St. Germains to propose that he should be educated in England—we presume after the death of William. Lord Manchester, the English ambassador, wrote to Vernon, "the changing his religion will never be suffered; and they have lately declared that they would rather see him dead." The house of Savoy would probably have had a better chance of succeeding to the English crown, had the duke not deserted the English alliance before the peace of Ryswick. When Victor Amadeus was the friend and ally of William, a negotiation had been entered into with him, to send his son into England, to be educated as a Protestant. This son, Charles Emmanuel, was the grandson of Henrietta Maria, the daughter of Charles I., who married the Duke of Orleans. Their daughter, Anne Marie, married the Duke of Savoy. The descendant of the daughter of Charles I. had a higher claim by the law of inheritance than the descendant of the sister of that king. There were many other claimants, who were equally disqualified with the house of Savoy, by being Roman Catholics.

More pressing considerations than belonged to the possibly distant event of the Protestant succession in England now demanded the utmost exercise of William's foresight and perseverance. In October the King of Spain was considered to be in the most imminent danger. The Treaty of Partition existed between France, England, and Holland; but the emperor had not yet signed it. He was holding off, expecting to obtain greater advantages than the treaty had given him. William wrote to Heinsius from Loo on the 11th of October, "You may assure the ambassadors of France from me that I shall rigidly observe the treaty, in the expectation that their master shall do the same." In another letter of the 15th he says, "I find much too great precipitation on the part of France, who wishes to take instant possession of everything." France had other views than the execution of the treaty in exhibiting this haste to carry out its conditions before the event which the treaty contemplated. The agents of Louis were about the death-bed of Charles of Spain, striving to influence the feeble prince to dispose of the succession by will in favor of the Bourbons. The agents of the emperor were also intriguing for the same object, in favor of the imperial family. Louis had contrived to persuade the King of Spain that England and Holland alone were to blame in the matter of the Partition Treaty. The knowledge of this treaty had provoked such wrath at Madrid that the Spanish ambassador at London published a declaration so insolent that William commanded him to leave—a measure which was retaliated by the dismissal from Spain of the English and Dutch ambassadors. The revelation of the secret of the treaty was attributed to Louis, as the readiest way to attain something better than those Italian possessions of Spain which the treaty gave him.† The dying king was tormented, on one side, by the importunities of his queen and her confessor, to favor the emperor; on the other side, the Cardinal Porto-Carrero subdued the mind, always feeble, but now prostrate in superstition, by arts which Rome counts among its most precious accomplishments. The wretched prince was first terrified into the belief that his health was affected by sorcery; and the cardinal then procured a Capuchin monk, "very intelligent and well practised in matters of enchantment and casting out devils," to perform the rite of exorcism. Charles was persuaded that his health would be restored if he descended into the vaults of the Escurial, and looked upon the mouldering remains of his ancestors. The coffins of his mother and of his first wife were opened; and when he saw the face of his loved queen, scarcely yet touched by corruption, he rushed away, exclaiming, "I shall soon be with her in heaven." Enfeebled in body and mind, the poor king still clung to the idea that he ought to preserve the inheritance of Spain to the Austrian family from which he had sprung. The authority of the pope was called in to determine for him what he ought to do. Innocent XII. decided that the whole Spanish monarchy belonged by right of inheritance to the dauphin; but to prevent the union of the crowns of Spain and France it was desirable to give the succession to the Duke of Anjou, the dauphin's second son. Thus fortified, Porto-Carrero, and Harcourt, the French ambassador, worked with unremitting energy. The wretched man grew worse and worse. Ecclesiastics surrounded his bed to urge, under the penalties of divine wrath, obedience to the councils of the Vatican. The famous Testament which plunged Europe into a war of ten years was signed. The king exclaimed, "Now I am as one of the dead." When the last breath had departed, after Charles had lingered four weeks, the Duke of Abrantes came forth from the council, of which Porto-Carrero had obtained from Charles the nomination as chief, and announced that Philip, Duke of Anjou, was the sole inheritor of the vast Spanish monarchy. Saint Simon relates an amusing incident which preceded the formal announcement. Blécourt, the ambassador of France, who was probably in the secret of the will, and Count d'Harrach, the ambassador of the emperor, who thought that his master would be the fortunate heir, were anxiously waiting in the crowd around the council door. Abrantes came out, looked a moment at Blécourt, then turned his eyes another way, and fixing them on D'Harrach, moved toward him, embraced him, and thus spoke: "Sir, it is with much pleasure"—bows and reciprocal embraces—"yes, sir, it is with extreme joy, that for the rest of my life"—more embraces—"and with the greatest contentment that I part from you, and take my leave of the august house of Austria."

On the 12th of November the Earl of Manchester, the English ambassador to France, wrote home, "I must now acquaint you that there is an end of our treaty." The King of France had decided to accept the will. One of his reasons was that the emperor had not yet acceded to the treaty. The emperor had in his possession a will of the King of Spain, made in the previous June, which gave the inheritance to the Archduke of Austria. He had to learn that Charles had cancelled that will when he signed the Testament of the 2d of October. The exultation of the court of France was scarcely attempted to be concealed. Louis affected to doubt what his decision should be, and he went through the mockery of consulting his council. He then came forth, and addressed the boy-king. "Sir, the King of Spain has named you his successor. The nobles demand, the nation desires you, and I give my consent. You will reign over the greatest monarchy in the world." The Spanish ambassador did homage to Philip V.; and when the youth parted from his affectionate grandfather, the superb monarch exclaimed, "The Pyrenees exist no longer." William knew what the pretended separation of the crowns of France and Spain really meant. He had arrived in London in November, where he received the news that Louis had broken his engagements. He immediately wrote to Heinsius: "I am perfectly persuaded, that if this will be executed, England and the republic are in the utmost danger of being totally lost or ruined." * In a letter, three days later, he says: "My chief anxiety is to prevent the Spanish Netherlands from falling into the hands of France. You will easily conceive how this business goes to my heart." † The most heroic period of the life of William was now to be entered upon—that period in which Burnet says, "there was a black appearance of a new and dismal scene;" but the period which called forth the most wonderful display of the energies of the king's character. William's conduct cannot be better described than in the magnificent words of Burke: "In all the tottering imbecility of a new government, and with parliament totally unmanageable, he persevered. He persevered to expel the fears of his people by his fortitude; to steady their fickleness by his constancy; to expand their narrow prudence by his enlarged wisdom; to sink their factious temper in his public spirit. In spite of his people he resolved to make them great and glorious; to make England, inclined to shrink into her narrow self, the arbitress of Europe, the tutelary angel of the human race. In spite of the ministers, who staggered under the weight that his mind imposed upon theirs, unsupported as they felt themselves by the popular spirit, he infused into them his own soul; he renewed in them their ancient heart, he rallied them in the same cause. It acquired some time to accomplish this work. The people were first gained, and through them their distracted representatives." ‡

The parliament which had been prorogued in April was dissolved in December, 1700. The Tory party were now in the ascendant, and

* "Hardwicke State Papers," vol. ii. p. 442.

† "Louis," says John Bull, "revealed our whole secret to the deceased Lord Strutt, who, in reward to his treachery and revenge to Frog and me, settled his whole estate upon the present Philip Baboon."—Arbuthnot.

* "Hardwicke Papers," vol. ii. p. 393. † Ibid., p. 395.

‡ "Letters on a Regicide Peace," Letter I.

they had all the advantages of government influence in the elections. The king, if we may judge from the first aspect of proceedings in the House of Commons, was the person in this kingdom who had the least control upon the temper of the people's representatives. Ralph, the laborious party-historian of these times, relieves his usual dreariness by the following anecdote: "His majesty, in dismissing the Whigs, because they could no longer do his business in parliament, had done enough to disoblige them, but not enough to gain the Tories: and so met with such treatment from both as once gave him occasion to say, in a pet, to Lord Halifax, 'that all the difference he knew between the two parties was, that the Tories would cut his throat in the morning and the Whigs in the afternoon.'"* The houses met on the 6th of February. Godolphin was now at the head of the treasury; Rochester was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Under the ministerial influence Harley was chosen speaker by the new parliament, by a majority double that of the Whig nominee. The speech of the king touched upon the two great events of the past year—the death of the Duke of Gloucester, and the death of the King of Spain. The loss of the Duke of Gloucester "made it absolutely necessary that there should be a further provision for the succession of the crown in the Protestant line." The death of the late King of Spain "has made so great an alteration of affairs abroad that I must desire you very maturely to consider their present state." The house divided upon a motion arising out of the king's speech, carrying this resolution only by a majority of twenty-one, 'That they would stand by and support his majesty and his government, and take such effectual measures as may best conduce to the interest and safety of England, the preservation of the Protestant religion, and the peace of Europe." Burnet says that a design was laid, to open the session with a vote that the king be requested to own the King of Spain; but the opponents of William's policy thought better of the scheme when a member, Mr. Moncton, who was present at the discussion, said that if the vote were carried, he should expect the next vote would be for owning the pretended Prince of Wales.† The king was, however, moving steadily forward to the completion of the great object of his policy. When he received the address of the Commons in reply to his speech, he laid before them a memorial from the envoy extraordinary of the States-General. It set forth that they had acknowledged the new King of Spain, under the condition that a negotiation should be entered into, in concert with their allies, to secure the peace of Europe. They prayed the King of England to send the necessary instructions to his minister at the Hague to act conjointly with them. But they added that, as French troops were moving toward their frontier, they requested the succor agreed to be provided for their defence, under a treaty made by England with the States in 1677. The Commons asked that the treaty of 1677 should be laid before them. They then unanimously resolved to request the king to enter into such negotiations with the States-General, and with other powers, as might conduce to the mutual safety of these kingdoms and the United Provinces, and promising their support in performance of the treaty. William was unexpectedly gratified by this decision. "Nothing," he said to the houses, "can more effectually conduce to our security than the unanimity and vigor you have shown on this occasion." From that hour the king calmly and resolutely looked upon the future. There was a slight change in the temper of the Commons, which he probably could trace to a higher cause than the change which he had made of his ministers. Public opinion was slowly but surely coming into operation. There were few organs of opinion besides party pamphlets; but the people had some knowledge of political events, even from their meagre newspapers. They thought for themselves, and they expressed their thoughts freely among themselves. In the heat of the contest between William and the House of Commons about disbanding the army, we are assured that the king "was in truth more really beloved by the body of the people than he thought himself to be, or than his enemies seemed to believe he was."‡ Swift, who, in 1701, looked upon politics from a higher elevation than the molehill of party, says that one cause of the popular aversion to some of the proceedings of the Commons was, "a great love and sense of gratitude in the people toward their present king, grounded upon a long opinion of his merit, as well as concessions to all their reasonable desires, so that it is for some time they have begun to say, and to fetch instances, where he has in many things been hardly used."* We shall soon see this temper of the people coming into direct collision with their representatives.

It was on the 3d of March that the portion of the king's speech which relates to the Protestant succession was brought forward in the Commons. Burnet says: "The manner in which this motion of the succession was managed did not carry in it great marks of sincerity. It was often put off from one day to another, and it gave place to the most trifling matters." During the whole of March and April the two great parties were engaged in the most furious broils. It was perhaps fortunate that their attention was diverted from high matters that concerned the future, to temporary ebullitions of party rage. The nomination of the Princess Sophia and her descendants might otherwise have been resisted by the furious Jacobites; and the clauses of the Act of Settlement which gave guarantees for constitutional freedom, in addition to the Bill of Rights, might have been opposed by the advocates of absolute government. There was comparatively little discussion about these conditions "for better securing the rights and liberties of the subject." They were proposed by Harley, supported by the Tories, and not resisted by the Whigs—although the clauses against the sovereign going out of his dominions without the consent of parliament, and for preventing any foreigner holding office, had the appearance of a personal reflection upon the government of King William. The clause which disqualifies all holders of office, and all receivers of pensions, from sitting in the House of Commons, was repealed early in the reign of Anne. Burnet says, "those who wished well to the act were glad to have it passed any way, and so would not examine the limitations that were in it." He reckoned it "a great point carried that we had now a law on our side for a Protestant successor; for we plainly saw a great party formed against it, in favor of the pretended Prince of Wales." It was indeed a great point gained for the welfare of these realms, that an act was passed by which the House of Brunswick has possessed the crown for a century and a half, under whose rule there has been a constant progress toward the solution of the difficult problem of representative government—the union of the largest amount of individual liberty with the most perfect security for social order.†

Negotiations were proceeding at the Hague between England, Holland, and France, for the removal of French troops from the Spanish Netherlands, and for other objects of prevention against the preponderance of France. Burnet affirms that "the French, seeing these demands run so high, and being resolved to offer no other security for the peace of Europe but the renewing the Treaty of Ryswick, set all their engines at work in England to involve us in such contentions at home as should both disable us from taking any care of foreign affairs, and make the rest of Europe conclude that nothing considerable was to be expected from England." It was scarcely necessary that party rage should be stimulated either by the intrigues or the gold of France. The Tories applied themselves to the task, most unpatriotic at such a moment, of assailing the partition treaties with unmeasured invectives, and of pursuing the chiefs of the late Whig ministry with a rancor very little proportioned to any offences which could be alleged against them. The Commons resolved to impeach Portland, Orford, Somers, and Halifax, for their concern in the treaties by which the king had endeavored to save Europe from the war which was now impending, and for other alleged offences. It is scarcely necessary, in a narrative which attempts chiefly to regard those historical events which have a permanent interest, to enter into a minute relation of these violent party conflicts. These party dissensions called up a third party, that had hitherto manifested very little participation in the contests of the two great factions. Swift, with the strongest good sense, temperately pointed out to the members of parliament, during the recess—which he calls "a lucid interval"—the consequence of their bitter animosities: "It would be

* Ralph, vol. ii. p. 908.

† Burnet's loose mode of narration would imply that this was mooted in parliament, which Ralph explicitly denies.

‡ Onslow's Note on Burnet, vol. iv. p. 392.

* "Contests and Dissensions in Athens and Rome," chap. v.

† We have printed the Act of Settlement as a note at the end of this chapter.

wise in them, as individual and private mortals, to look back a little upon the storms they have raised as well as those they have escaped; to reflect that they have been authors of a new and wonderful thing in England, which is for a House of Commons to lose the universal favor of the numbers they represent."* The Commons having decided upon impeachment, asked the king to condemn the four peers without trial, by removing them from his councils and presence forever. The Lords begged his majesty to pass no sentence of discredit upon his late servants, till their alleged high crimes and misdemeanors should be inquired into. The king gave a very general answer to the Commons that he should employ none but those he thought deserving of trust. To the Lords he said nothing. He evidently had made up his mind to let the factions fight out their battle without his intervention. Conferences were held between the two houses, which became unseemly squabbles. The days were fixed for the trials of Somers and Orford. The Commons said they should not have justice, and refused to attend. The impeachments fell to the ground.

That "new and wonderful thing" of 1701—a House of Commons displeasing to the people—a popular party speaking by other voices than that of its legally-constituted organs—became too familiar to the nation, in times much nearer to our own than the opening of the eighteenth century.† In 1701 the popular feeling began to take the form which has subsequently shaken many a faction, and disturbed many a scheme of blind and selfish policy. On the 15th of May Secretary Vernon wrote to the Duke of Shrewsbury, "There grows a great ferment out of the house, which begins to make our topping men uneasy. They are endeavoring to suppress petitions; and perhaps the means they make use for it may blow them up higher."‡ At the quarter sessions for the county of Kent, held at Maidstone on the 29th of April, the grand jury drew up a petition to the House of Commons, which was unanimously signed by them, and also by the chairman of the sessions, and twenty-one of the justices. It was also signed by a large body of freeholders. Mr. Colepeper, the chairman, with four other gentlemen, proceeded to London with the petition, which was at last presented to the house by Mr. Meredith, one of the members for Kent, on the 8th of May. It is a plain-spoken document, but one which we should now call temperate and respectful: "We, the gentlemen, justices of the peace, grand jury, and other freeholders, at the general quarter sessions at Maidstone, in Kent, deeply concerned at the dangerous estate of this kingdom, and of all Europe; and considering that the fate of us and our prosperity depends upon the wisdom of our representatives in parliament, think ourselves bound in duty, humbly to lay before this honorable house the consequence, in this conjuncture, of your speedy resolution, and most sincere endeavor, to answer the great trust reposed in you by your country. And in regard, that from the experience of all ages it is manifest, no nation can be great or happy without union, we hope that no pretence whatever shall be able to create a misunderstanding among ourselves, or the least distrust of his most sacred majesty; whose great actions for this nation are writ in the hearts of his subjects, and can never, without the blackest ingratitude, be forgot. We most humbly implore this honorable house to have regard to the voice of the people, that our religion and safety may be effectually provided for, that your loyal addresses may be turned into bills of supply, and that his most sacred majesty (whose propitious and unblemished reign over us we pray God long to continue) may be enabled powerfully to assist his allies before it is too late." Upon hearing this read the house resolved, "That the said petition was scandalous, insolent, and seditious, tending to destroy the constitution of parliaments, and to subvert the established government of these realms." They then ordered that those gentlemen who had brought the petition should be taken into custody, as guilty of promoting it. They were committed to the gate-house. The "great ferment out of the house," which Vernon describes, then ran through the country. "This disposition to blame the slowness in which the House of Commons proceeded with relation to foreign affairs, and the heat with which private quarrels were pursued, began to spread itself through the whole nation."§ The imprisonment of the Kentish men led to many discussions of the right of the Commons to imprison any persons but their own members, or such as had violated the privileges of the house.* On the 14th of May, the day after Mr. Colepeper and his friends were committed, a paper, signed "Legion," was conveyed to Harley, the speaker; some accounts say, was presented to him as he entered the house. It purported to be a memorial, in which the grievances of the nation were set forth, and the rights of the people asserted, in the boldest terms. The concluding paragraph may be taken as a sample of its general spirit: "Thus, gentlemen, you have your duty laid before you, which 'tis hoped you will think of: but if you continue to neglect it, you may expect to be treated according to the resentment of an injured nation; for Englishmen are no more to be slaves to parliaments than to kings." In that "History of England from the Revolution," which still holds its place in companionship with that of Hume, it is written, "The Commons were equally provoked and intimidated by this libel, which was the production of one Daniel Defoe, a scurrilous party-writer, in very little estimation."† The author of "Humphrey Clinker" might have been expected to speak somewhat more respectfully of the author of "Robinson Crusoe." There is little doubt that Defoe did write the Legion Memorial. When the Kentish gentlemen were released at the end of the session of parliament, a public dinner was given to them at Mercers' Hall by the chief citizens of London; where, says a Tory writer, "Nothing was wanting to show their respect to them, and the cause of sedition they had been carrying on—no, not so much as some of the nobility themselves, to give a stamp of authority to what had been done, contrary to all law, good manners, or prudence."‡ Another Tory pamphleteer says, speaking of this dinner, "Next the Worthies [the Kentish men] was placed their secretary of state, the author of the Legion letter, and one might have read the downfall of parliaments in his very countenance."§ The bitterness of Defoe was no doubt excited by his devotion to the king. William probably found in this most sturdy and sagacious representative of the great middle class an enlarged patriotism, and a sympathy with his own high views which he had almost ceased to look for among those who were "swaddled, and rocked, and dandled" into statesmen. William respected the man who had the courage to attack that vulgar prejudice which, regarding every foreigner as an enemy to England, compelled him to dismiss the Dutch guards and the French refugees, who had served him so long and so faithfully. "The true born Englishman" of Defoe, made this prejudice contemptible. The Kentish Petition and the Legion Memorial struck at the power which had set the representatives of the people above public opinion—the power of commanding a majority of the House of Commons by frothy declamation and passionate invective. The Tories possessed the superiority in this power, and they abused it, in this season of real national peril, to an extent which has sometimes been equalled by both of the great parties in parliament, but never excelled. The impeachment of William's Whig ministers had "dragged its slow length along," for weeks, amid conflicts between Lords and Commons. The terms of the partition treaties were again and again debated, the Commons thus subjecting themselves to the just reproof of "Legion," "Voting the Treaty of Partition fatal to Europe, because it gave so much of the Spanish dominions to the French, and not concerning yourselves to prevent their taking possession of it all." The States-General had made the most urgent appeal for the assistance of England. They were preparing for the same sort of resistance to France which had signalized them under the guidance of the young Prince of Orange. The heart of the prematurely-aged king of England must have leaped in his bosom when his countrymen sent to him to say, "We have been obliged to put ourselves in a state of defence, more than if we were actually attacked, by overflowing our country, and even cutting our dykes, to secure our frontiers." Though the Commons had passed two formal votes of support to the king in carrying out the old treaty with the Republic, they were too much occupied with their party-quarrels to look steadily at the great question upon which William had asked their advice and assistance. They were told by Legion "that they were deserting the Dutch when the French are at their doors, till it be

* "Contests and Dissentions," etc.
† See Dr. Arnold's "Lectures on Modern History," lecture vii.
‡ Vernon Letters, vol. iii. p. 145. § Burnet, vol. iv. p. 497.

* Burnet, vol. iv. p. 497. † Smollett, chap. vi. § 54.
‡ Quoted in Wilson's Defoe, vol. i. p. 405. § Ibid.

almost too late to help them." Gradually the House of Commons came more clearly to understand the public feeling. The people wanted more deeds and less talk. They turned "from petty tyrants to the throne." The House of Lords had a quicker comprehension of the national temper than the Commons had. They addressed the king in terms which encouraged him in the work to which the remainder of his life was devoted: "We humbly desire your majesty will be pleased, not only to make good all the articles of any former treaties to the States-General, but that you will enter into a strict league, offensive and defensive, with them, for their common preservation; and that you will invite unto it all princes and states who are concerned in the present visible danger, arising from the union of France and Spain." The Commons stopped short of directly sanctioning the extensive alliance which William desired, and which the Lords contemplated—an alliance which could have no other end than war. But they voted sufficient supplies to enable the king to send assistance to the States—telling him, however, "they are more than ever were given in a time of peace." On the 24th of June the parliament was prorogued. On the 1st of July the king embarked for Holland.

Burke has vividly described the great crisis of the summer of 1701. The House of Commons had been more reserved than the Lords. "But now they were fairly embarked, they were obliged to go with the course of the vessel; and the whole nation, split before into an hundred adverse factions, with a king at its head evidently declining to his tomb, the whole nation, Lords, Commons, and people, proceeded as one body informed by one soul." There probably is no higher example of decision of character than the energy of William in the last six months of his life. If we imagine that he had only to lay before "princes and states" his notions of their common danger, and then to secure their cordial co-operation in its resistance, we should take a very imperfect view of the policies of the various European governments. The emperor, no doubt, could be easily induced to take part in a great confederacy to secure for his family their coveted share in the Spanish dominions. But the smaller German states were moved by various conflicting influences—of ambition, of jealousy, of fear. The notion of some was to combine in a neutrality, in which they might gain something and risk little. Several of the German electors had as much dread of Austria as of France, and probably more hatred of the power with which they were more immediately in contact. The northern maritime states, though quarrelling with each other, had no affection for the Dutch, who interfered with their commerce. William, during his sojourn in Holland, concluded treaties with the States-General, with the King of Sweden, with the King of Denmark, with the emperor. He laid the foundation of future alliances with the King of Portugal, with the King of Prussia, with the Duke of Savoy. He had an able assistant in Marlborough, whose treachery he had long ceased to fear, and in whose great ability he had a just confidence. But the experience of William in all the complications of European politics; the confidence which those with whom he had to deal had in his judgment and honesty; and, more than all, his own undoubted reliance upon the conviction of his earliest and of his latest years, that the power of France must be limited if England and Holland were to be secure and free—these were the means by which that league which history now calls the grand alliance was formed. One of the most remarkable features of this alliance in its earlier stages of the union of England, the States, and the emperor, was its extreme prudence. It made no declaration as to the inheritance of the crown of Spain. It only stipulated that the contracting powers should be united to prevent the union of the crowns of France and Spain; that France should be compelled to evacuate the Netherlands; and that she should not acquire any of the Spanish colonies in the West Indies. England was not committed by William to a war.

The treaty of alliance between England, the States-General, and the emperor, with powers for all kings and states to join the league, was signed at the Hague on the 7th of September. In Italy war had previously begun on the part of the emperor. Prince Eugene commanded the imperial army, and drove the joint forces of the French king and the Duke of Savoy from their position along the Adige. Marshal Villeroy subsequently attacked Prince Eugene, but was repulsed. The warlike events of the year had no decisive results. But one event now took place which involved England in a war against France, upon far more popular grounds than the question of the succession in Spain. On the 16th of September King James II. expired at St. Germains, in the sixty-seventh year of his age. The biographer of the exiled sovereign describes the visit of the King of France to the death-bed, when Louis, having desired that nobody should withdraw, said, "I am come, sir, to acquaint you, that whenever it shall please God to call your majesty out of this world, I will take your family under my protection, and will treat your son, the Prince of Wales, in the same manner I have treated you, and acknowledge him, as he then will be, King of England."* The biographer describes how the French and English courtiers threw themselves at his Most Christian Majesty's feet, weeping and lauding so generous an action. In the court, says Saint Simon, "nothing was heard but applause and praise." Yet reflection came to some. It was seen that to recognize the Prince of Wales was in direct opposition to the recognition, as King of England, of the Prince of Orange at the peace of Ryswick; and thus to wound that prince in the tenderest point, and to invite England and Holland to become allies of the emperor against France. Saint Simon, who takes this common-sense view, holds that the resolve of Louis XIV. was "more worthy of Louis XII., or of Francis I., than of his own wisdom." The recognition of the son of James II. as King of England was no private act of Louis. Lord Manchester, the English ambassador, wrote home: "The Prince of Wales was immediately proclaimed King of England by the title of James III. I do not hear there was any other ceremony than that, after he had taken the title of king, those of St. Germains kissed his hand and treated him with 'majesty.'" William desired that his ambassador should immediately quit the French court. It was alleged by France that the bare owning of the prince's title was not a breach of the Treaty of Ryswick, as they gave him nor assistance to make good his claim. Neither the King of England nor his people were deceived by this sophistry. William saw that the greatest opportunity of his life had now arrived; that the factions which had so long harassed him would shrink away before the might of public opinion; that he could now—when France believed he was broken down, worn out, dying—lead a great people to go with him, heart and hand, in the work of their own national salvation, as he had led his own countrymen in the full vigor of his early manhood. Before the news arrived from St. Germains he had been in communication with Sunderland on the state of affairs in England. In the remarkable correspondence, carried on in the third person, between the king and this Ulysses of the distracted camps of the two factions, William expresses his doubts of calling a new parliament, "the Tories giving him great hopes, and making him great promises." Sunderland replies with a freedom which sounds like the greatest integrity. "It is a melancholy thing, that the king, who has more understanding than anybody who comes near him, is imposed on by mountebanks, or by such as, he himself knows, hate both his person and his government."† William, on the 10th of October, sent Mr. Galway to Somers, to confer with him confidentially on the state of English politics. Somers drew up a body of arguments to induce the king to call a new parliament, of which the first argument was, "the present ferment and disposition of the nation;" and he says, with a politician's confidence in the principle of expediency, "the art of governing in England is watching and using such opportunities." The king came from Holland on the 4th of November. On the 11th he dissolved the parliament.

On the 30th of December the two houses met, and Harley was chosen speaker of the Commons, by a majority of fourteen over Littleton, the Whig speaker of a former parliament. On the last day of the year 1701 King William delivered his last parliamentary speech—"the best speech," says Burnet, "that he or any other prince ever made to his people." He alluded to the loyal and seasonable addresses which he had received, in resentment of the late proceedings of the King of France. He described the setting up of the pretended Prince of Wales as King of England as the highest indignity that could be offered to himself and to the nation. It so nearly concerned every man who had a regard for the Protestant religion, or the present and future quiet and happiness of his country, that he earnestly exhorted them to lay it seriously to heart. He

* "Life of James II." vol. ii. p. 598.
† "Hardwicke State Papers," vol. ii. p. 447.

then proceeded to take a general view of the position of England with reference to the Spanish succession :

"By the French king's placing his grandson on the throne of Spain, he is in a condition to oppress the rest of Europe, unless speedy and effectual measures be taken. Under this pretence he is become the real master of the whole Spanish monarchy ; he has made it to be entirely depending on France, and disposes of it as of his own dominions, and by that means he has surrounded his neighbors in such a manner, that, though the name of peace may be said to continue, yet they are put to the expense and inconvenience of war. This must affect England in the nearest and most sensible manner, in respect to our trade, which will soon become precarious in all the variable branches of it ; in respect to our peace and safety at home, which we cannot hope should long continue ; and in respect to that part which England ought to take in the preservation of the liberty of Europe." The king then announced that he had concluded several alliances, in order to avert the general calamity with which the rest of Christendom is threatened by the exorbitant power of France. "It is fit I should tell you the eyes of all Europe are upon this parliament ; all matters are at a stand till your resolutions are known ; and therefore no time ought to be lost. You have yet an opportunity, by God's blessing, to secure to you and your posterity the quiet enjoyment of your religion and liberties, if you are not wanting to yourselves, but will exert the ancient vigor of the English nation ; but I tell you plainly, my opinion is, if you do not lay hold on this occasion, you have no reason to hope for another." He called upon them to provide a great strength at sea, and a land force that should be proportionate to the forces of the allies. He exhorted them to take care of the public credit, "which cannot be preserved but by keeping sacred that maxim, that they shall never be losers who trust to a parliamentary security." The king concluded with this bold and stirring exhortation :

"My lords and gentlemen : I hope you are come together determined to avoid all manner of disputes and differences ; and resolved to act with a general and hearty concurrence for promoting the common cause, which alone can make this a happy session. I should think it as great a blessing as could befall England, if I could observe you as much inclined to lay aside those unhappy fatal animosities which divide and weaken you, as I am disposed to make all my subjects safe and easy as to any, even the highest offences, committed against me. Let me conjure you to disappoint the only hope of our enemies by your unanimity. I have shown, and will always show, how desirous I am to be the common father of all my people. Do you, in like manner, lay aside parties and divisions. Let there be no other distinction heard of among us for the future, but of those, who are for the Protestant religion, and the present establishment, and of those who mean a popish prince, and a French government. I will only add this : if you do in good earnest desire to see England hold the balance of Europe, and to be indeed at the head of the Protestant interest, it will appear by your right improving the present opportunity."

This speech, so earnest, so manly, so thoroughly addressed to the great English heart, could be met with no factious strife or sullen coldness. William had the nation at his back. The Commons very speedily voted a supply of six hundred thousand pounds. They resolved than an address be presented to the king, requesting that it be an article in the several treaties of alliance, "That no peace shall be made with France until his majesty and the nation have reparation for the great indignity offered by the French king, in owning and declaring the pretended Prince of Wales King of England, Scotland, and Ireland." They voted forty thousand men for the land forces, and forty thousand for sea service. The only want of unanimity was in the resistance to a bill "for abjuring the pretended Prince of Wales," but this was finally passed on the 24th of February.

When William went to Holland in the summer of 1701 he appeared in the last stage of bodily feebleness. His spirit had been deeply mortified by the parliamentary conflicts which promised little of future tranquillity. But in the labors of that autumn his health appeared to grow better. It has been admirably said : "Let those who doubt the dominion of the soul over the bodily powers ; who deny that a strong mind can sway, and strengthen, and force onward a feeble and suffering frame ; let such observe, whether, in the last labors of William to form the alliance, or in the alliance itself when formed, they can discover any trace of sickness—one single mark of languor or decline." * The altered spirit of the English parliament seemed to infuse a new life into the king. He took delight in his additions to Hampton Court. He went there once a week to hunt, although so weak as to be obliged to be lifted on his horse. It was there that, on Saturday, the 21st of February, "he fell from his horse that stumbled at a mole hill." † He fractured his collar-bone ; but the injury was not considered serious. He was conveyed to Kensington. On the 23d he sent a message to the Commons, in which he said that, being confined by an unhappy accident from coming in person, he thus signified what he designed to have spoken from the throne. He referred to the appointment of commissioners in the first year of his reign for treating of a union between England and Scotland. He was convinced that nothing would more contribute to the present and future happiness and security of the two kingdoms than a firm and entire union between them. "His majesty would esteem it a peculiar felicity if, during his reign, some happy expedient for making both kingdoms one might take place ; and is therefore extremely desirous that a treaty for that purpose might be set on foot ; and does, in the most earnest manner, recommend this affair to the consideration of the house." It was a solemn appeal, which was made doubly solemn by the event which was impending. On the 3d of March Vernon wrote that the king "is very near well of his hurt." Three days later he was in extreme danger. Albemarle had been sent to Holland, to arrange for an early campaign. "He came back on the 7th of March in the morning, with so good an account of everything that, if matters of that kind could have wrought on the king, it must have revived him : but the coldness with which he received it showed how little hopes were left. Soon after he said, '*Je tire vers ma fin*'—I draw toward my end." ‡ He signed a commission for passing the Bill of Abjuration and the Money Bill. The next day, the 8th of March, he was evidently dying. He received the sacrament. "He was often looking up to Heaven in many short ejaculations." He took Portland by the hand, "and carried it to his heart with much tenderness," but his voice was gone. "His reason and all his senses were entire to the last minute. . . . He died with a clear and full presence of mind, and with a wonderful tranquillity." § The enemies of William could not respect this tranquillity, and wanted some better evidence of his piety than the circumstance that "when he was so weak that he could scarce speak, he gave the Archbishop of Canterbury his hand, as a sign that he firmly believed the truth of the Christian religion." ‖ The contemporary and the historical revilers of William III. have passed away, as those worshippers of absolute power have passed away who toasted "William's horse ;" and drank "a health to the little gentleman dressed in velvet." ¶ He died before any new caprice of fortune, any fickleness of public opinion, came to cloud the bright prospect which was opening before him, of the destinies of the country which he had served so well, and which had so ill rewarded him, and of his own land, which never failed to recognize his admirable qualities. "The Earl of Portland told me," says Burnet, "that when he was once encouraging him, from the good state his affairs were in, both at home and abroad, to take more heart, the king answered him, that he knew death was that which he had looked at on all occasions without terror ; sometimes he would have been glad to have been delivered out of all his troubles ; but he confessed now he saw another scene, and could wish to live a little longer." The wish was not granted by the Supreme Disposer of the affairs of nations. But the chief object of William's life was in great part accomplished. The union of Europe was consolidated. "Just as the last hand was given to this immense and complicated machine, the master workman died : but the work was formed on true mechanical principles, and it was as truly wrought. It went by the impulse it had received from the first mover. The man was dead : but the grand alliance survived in which King William lived and reigned." **

* Lord Mahon, "War of the Succession in Spain," p. 43.
† "Vernon Letters," vol. iii. p. 184.
‡ Burnet. § Ibid. ‖ Ibid.
¶ The mole that raised the hill over which "Sorrel" stumbled.
** Burke, "Regicide Peace."

NOTE.—AN ACT FOR THE FURTHER LIMITATION OF THE CROWN AND BETTER SECURING THE RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES OF THE SUBJECT.

THE preamble to this act recites the tenor of the statute of the 1st of William and Mary; and sets forth that the late queen and the Duke of Gloucester being dead, the king had recommended a further provision for the succession of the crown:

"Therefore for a further provision of the succession of the crown in the Protestant line, we, your majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lords spiritual and temporal and Commons in this present parliament assembled, do beseech your majesty that it may be enacted and declared, and be it enacted and declared, by the king's most excellent majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal and Commons in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that the most excellent Princess Sophia, Electress and Duchess Dowager of Hanover, daughter of the most excellent Princess Elizabeth, late Queen of Bohemia, daughter of our late sovereign lord King James the First, of happy memory, be and is hereby declared to be the next in succession in the Protestant line to the imperial crown and dignity of the said realms of England, France, and Ireland, with the dominions and territories thereunto belonging, after his majesty and the Princess Ann of Denmark, and in default of issue of the said Princess Ann and of his majesty respectively; and that from and after the decease of his said majesty, our now sovereign lord, and of her royal highness the Princess Ann of Denmark, and for default of issue of the said Princess Ann and of his majesty respectively, the crown and royal government of the said kingdoms of England, France, and Ireland, and of the dominions thereunto belonging, with the royal state and dignity of the said realms, and all honors, styles, titles, regalities, prerogatives, powers, jurisdictions, and authorities to the same belonging and appertaining, shall be, remain, and continue to the said most excellent Princess Sophia, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants. And thereunto the said Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, shall and will, in the name of all the people of this realm, most humbly and faithfully submit themselves, their heirs and posterities, and do faithfully promise, after the deceases of his majesty and her royal highness, and the failure of the heirs of their respective bodies, to stand to, maintain and defend the said Princess Sophia, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants, according to the limitation and succession of the crown in this act specified and contained, to the utmost of their powers, with their lives and estates, against all persons whatsoever that shall attempt anything to the contrary.

"Provided always, and it is hereby enacted, that all and every person and persons who shall or may take or inherit the said crown by virtue of the limitation of this present act, and is, are, or shall be reconciled to, or shall hold communion with the See or Church of Rome, or shall profess the Popish religion, or shall marry a Papist, shall be subject to such incapacities as in such case or cases are by the said recited act (1st Gul. & Mar.) provided, enacted, and established. And that every king and queen of this realm who shall come to and succeed in the imperial crown of this kingdom, by virtue of this act, shall have the coronation oath administered to him, her, or them, at their respective coronations, according to the act of parliament made in the first year of the reign of his majesty and the said late Queen Mary, entitled 'an act for establishing the coronation oath,' and shall make, subscribe, and repeat the declaration in the act first above recited, mentioned, or referred to, in the manner and form thereby prescribed.

"And whereas it is requisite and necessary that some further provision be made for securing our religion, laws, and liberties, from and after the death of his majesty and the Princess Ann of Denmark; and in default of issue of the body of the said princess and of his majesty respectively, be it enacted by the king's most excellent majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same,

"That whosoever shall hereafter come to the possession of this crown shall join in communion with the Church of England as by law established.

"That in case the crown and imperial dignity of this realm shall hereafter come to any person, not being a native of this kingdom of England, this nation be not obliged to engage in any war for the defence of any dominions or territories which do not belong to the crown of England, without the consent of parliament.

"That no person who shall hereafter come to the possession of this crown shall go out of the dominions of England, Scotland, or Ireland, without consent of parliament.

"That from and after the time that the further limitation by this act shall take effect, all matters and things relating to the well-governing of this kingdom, which are properly cognizable in the privy council by the laws and customs of this realm shall be transacted there, and all resolutions taken thereupon shall be signed by such of the privy council as shall advise and consent to the same.

"That after the said limitation shall take effect as aforesaid, no person born out of the kingdoms of England, Scotland, or Ireland, or the dominions thereunto belonging (although he be naturalized or made a denizen, except such as are born of English parents), shall be capable to be of the privy council, or a member of either house of parliament, or to enjoy any office or place of trust, either civil or military, or to have any grant of lands, tenements, or hereditaments from the crown to himself, or to any other or others in trust for him.

"That no person who has an office or place of profit under the king, or receives a pension from the crown, shall be capable of serving as a member of the House of Commons.

"That after the said limitation shall take effect as aforesaid, judges' commissions be made quam diu se bene gesserint, and their salaries ascertained and established; but upon the address of both houses of parliament it may be lawful to remove them.

"That no pardon under the great seal of England be pleadable to an impeachment by the Commons in parliament.

"And whereas the laws of England are the birthright of the people thereof, and all the kings and queens who shall ascend the throne of this realm ought to administer the government of the same according to the said laws, and all their officers and ministers ought to serve them respectively according to the same, the said Lords spiritual and temporal and Commons do therefore humbly pray, that all the laws and statutes of this realm for securing the established religion, and the rights and liberties of the people thereof, and all others laws and statutes of the same now in force, may be ratified and confirmed. And the same are, by his majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the said Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, and by authority of the same, ratified and confirmed accordingly."

CHAPTER CXXXIV.

Accession of Queen Anne—Her declaration to the privy council—Parliament continues sitting—Preponderance of Tories—Marlborough sent as envoy to the States-General—War declared—Marlborough's first campaign—Expedition to Cadiz—Vigo—New parliament—Tory majority—Bill against occasional conformity—Defoe's shortest way with the Dissenters—Marlborough created a duke—Revolt in the Cévennes—Marlborough's second campaign—The Methuen treaty with Portugal—Occasional Conformity Bill again rejected by the Lords—Aylesbury election case—The great storm—Oaths of witnesses—Queen Anne's bounty—Touching for the evil—May-poles.

"WHEN the king came to die," says the Duchess of Marlborough, "I felt nothing of that satisfaction which I once thought I should have had upon this occasion; and my Lord and Lady Jersey's writing and sending perpetually to give an account as his breath grew shorter and shorter filled me with horror." It is the common story of royal death-beds. "As soon as the breath was out of King William," as Lord Dartmouth affirms, "by which all expectations from him were at an end, the Bishop of Salisbury drove hard to bring the first tidings to St. James's; where he prostrated himself at the new queen's feet, full of joy and duty."* From Edward III. to William III., from William III. to George IV., it was ever the same:

"Gone to salute the rising morn."

That Anne should have dropped a tear for her brother-in-law was scarcely to be expected. Friends they had never been. Since the death of Mary they had avoided all unseemly differences. Anne, subjected to the will of a domineering favorite, who hated William upon the well-known principle that we hate those whom we have injured, could form no independent opinion of his merits as a king. She regarded him as a disagreeable man, generally sullen, and rarely civil. His appointment of Marlborough in the summer of 1700 to an employment of high trust had probably disposed the new queen to make no hesitation in accepting the great principles of foreign policy which William had rendered triumphant by his unshrinking constancy. It has been attributed to the foresight of the "master workman" in the Grand Alliance, that he appointed Marlborough to the command of the troops sent to the assistance of the States-General, because he knew that in the event of his own demise the favorite of his successor would be the chief moving power in English affairs. "The king proposed, by this early step, to engage the earl so much in the war as to make it his particular interest to pursue it with vigor in the succeeding reign."† There was not an hour lost in declaring the policy that the new sovereign was counselled to pursue. On the evening of King William's death, Queen Anne, when the privy council were assembled, as is usual on the demise of the crown, thus spoke upon the vital question which was the foremost in the public thought: "I think it proper, upon this occasion of my first speaking to you, to declare my own opinion of the importance of carrying on all the

* Onslow, Note on Burnet, vol. v. p. 1. † Ibid., p. 7.

preparations we are making to oppose the great power of France; and I shall lose no time in giving our allies all assurances that nothing shall be wanting on my part to pursue the true interest of England, together with theirs, for the support of the common cause." *

By a statute of 1696, which had regard to the dangers of invasion or conspiracy, it was provided that parliament should not be dissolved by the demise of the crown, but might sit for six months after, unless prorogued or dissolved. † The queen went to the House of Lords on the 11th of March. She spoke of the late king, as having been "the great support, not only of these kingdoms, but of all Europe." She said of herself, "I know my own heart to be entirely English." Words were thus put into Anne's mouth which gave that praise to William which could not be withheld, and stirred up prejudices against his memory which her Tory advisers were ready to keep alive. With regard to foreign affairs she repeated the sentiments she had addressed to the privy council. Within five days the Earl of Marlborough received the Order of the Garter, and was made captain-general of the forces. He probably would not have received such immediate and signal honor and preferment if he had not, with his consummate adroitness, made the queen consider that he belonged to the party for which she intended her chief rewards. "As soon as she was seated on the throne," says the wife of Marlborough, "the Tories, whom she usually called by the agreeable name of the Church party, became the distinguished objects of the royal favor." "I am firmly persuaded that, notwithstanding her extraordinary affection for me," adds the all-powerful Mrs. Morley, who professed Whig principles, "and the entire devotion which my Lord Marlborough and my Lord Godolphin had for many years shown to her service, they would not have had so great a share of her favor and confidence, if they had not been reckoned in the number of the Tories." There could be no mistake about Anne's general preferences. Somers, Halifax, and Orford were struck out of the lists of the privy council. Nottingham was appointed secretary of state, and Seymour comptroller, Rochester was continued as lord-lieutenant of Ireland; Normanby, another violent partisan, had the privy seal. Gradually Godolphin and Marlborough obtained such an ascendency as drove their less moderate colleagues from office. The Whigs supported their war-policy. The favorite says, "I resolved from the very beginning of the queen's reign to try whether I could not by degrees make impressions on her mind more favorable to the Whigs." Anne could not help "being extremely concerned that her dear Mrs. Freeman was so partial to the Whigs," as she writes about half a year after her accession. "I would not have you and your faithful Morley differ in the least thing." Something stronger than Mrs. Freeman's arts drove the violent Tories from office. Something which the faithful Morley could not resist gave the Whigs the preponderance. The war was a magnificent success; and public opinion, whatever was the cost of the war, placed the party in power that had given Marlborough the support which enabled him to win Blenheim and Ramilies. Godolphin and the duke became united with the Whigs. The Tories had their business to perform of stirring up new contests at home for what were called "high-flying" principles; and the Jacobites were not yet weary of looking forward to the time when the son of James II. should again have a clear stage to vindicate the great theory of the divine right of kings, and to overturn the notions of constitutional liberty and religious toleration that had taken root under what they deemed the usurpation of 1689.

Before the end of March Marlborough had been sent as an envoy extraordinary to the States-General. On the 31st of March he delivered a speech to their "high and mighty lordships," in which he declared the resolution of his queen to maintain the alliances which "King William of glorious memory" had formed, and to enter into such other alliances as might most conduce to the interests of both nations, and the preservation of the liberty of Europe. Marlborough did not stay more than a week in Holland; but he arranged for a joint declaration of war against France by England, the States, and the emperor, on the same day, May 4th; * and he concerted the plan of the first warlike operations. The skilful negotiator left the Hague on the 3d of April. On the 4th of May war was proclaimed with the usual solemnities in Westminster and the city of London. The parliament was prorogued on the 25th of May. It was dissolved on the 2d of July. The civil list that had been granted to King William was continued to Queen Anne. Her majesty was empowered to appoint commissioners to treat for union between England and Scotland, not without some insolent reflections from Sir Edward Seymour and others, in the same coarse and haughty spirit which had greatly irritated the Scotch in 1700. The queen's speech at the close of the session was somewhat ambiguous on one point: "I shall be very careful to preserve and maintain the Act of Toleration, and to set the minds of all my people at quiet: my own principles must always keep me entirely firm to the interests of the Church of England, and will incline me to countenance those who have the sincerest zeal to support it."

When we open the valuable collection of Marlborough's letters and dispatches,† we at once perceive the high position in which he is recognized by the princes and states of the alliance. Immediately on his return from Holland we find him writing from St. James's to the King of Prussia and Elector of Hanover, as one speaking with authority about "the common cause." Marlborough left London on the 18th of May; was detained at Margate by contrary winds; but soon after his arrival at the Hague was appointed by the States as generalissimo of all their forces. He appears to have succeeded, as if by common consent, to the power which was wielded by King William—he, a man who had fought his way up to promotion by no very honorable means; who had alienated two kings by his treachery; who was known to have the most especial eye to his own interests; who had not acquired any high reputation as a general, though no doubt from want of opportunity; but who was now considered to have the entire favor of the new sovereign of England, and, what was of no small importance, had been trusted by William in the latter part of his life, and had justified the trust by his consummate ability. Marlborough went vigorously to the work before him. He drew the allied forces together, so as to be at the head of a powerful army. He carried Venloo by storm on the 18th of September, when, as he writes to Nottingham, the secretary of state, "the English grenadiers had the honor of being the first that entered the fort." He besieged and took Ruremonde and Stevenswart. He captured Liège by storm on the 23d of October, the English being the first that got upon the breach; and in a few days afterward the castle of the Chartreuse was surrendered to him. In these operations he had the same aid that was so valuable to William—the scientific knowledge of Coehorn, the great rival of Vauban. Marlborough, at the close of the campaign, had an adventure, in which he was compared to Cæsar among the pirates. He was seized in a boat, as he was going down the Maese, by a body of French partisans, and after some detention escaped, after being plundered by those who did not know the value of the man they had intercepted. For a short time the allies were in consternation. But Marlborough safely returned to London, to receive high honors and rewards. While he was fighting at Liège, and only a few hours before the surrender of the place, he wrote a letter to Nottingham which shows how thoroughly he had his eye upon all the distant arrangements for carrying on a vigorous war: "I had written a very long letter in answer to two of your lordship's; but yours of the 6th of October, which I received this morning, that brings the ill news of Cadiz, has made me burn my letter, most of it being my thoughts of what I wished might be done if we had been successful. I am sorry from my heart if it proves otherwise." He was not one to be daunted by misfortune. He might have learned the value of perseverance from the great example of the man who took Namur after he had been defeated at Landen. "I hope ill success will not

* Burnet takes occasion to mention that "she pronounced this as she did all her other speeches, with great weight and authority, and with a softness of voice and sweetness in the pronunciation that added much life to all she spoke." Dartmouth says that Anne was taught to speak by Mrs. Barry. Onslow relates that he heard her speak from the throne, and that "it was a sort of charm." The rare faculty, it might seem, has descended as a royal inheritance to the next queen-regnant.

† 7 & 8 Gul. III. c. 17.

* This is the date used for this declaration, according to the old style, which we must still follow, to prevent discrepancies in dates. After 1700 the difference between old and new style is eleven days. The 4th of May old style is the 15th of May new style.

† "Letters and Dispatches of John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, from 1702 to 1712." Edited by Sir George Murray. 5 vols. 1845.

hinder you from advancing with sea and land officers, if this matter be capable of being retrieved." *

The ill success at Cadiz was the failure of an expedition which had been planned by King William. It was carried out with the usual results of divided counsels and separate commands. A large combined fleet of Dutch and English ships, with fourteen thousand troops of both nations on board, after many delays had reached the Bay of Cadiz on the 18th of August. There was a commander of the fleet, Sir George Rooke; and there was a superior commander of the land and sea forces, the Duke of Ormond. There was an English general and a Dutch general at the head of their respective contingents. Three days were spent in debate upon the plans to be pursued. The leaders were "not only divided, sea against land, but land against land, and sea against sea." † They knew nothing of the localities where they proposed to disembark, and nothing of the force that might be brought against them. The Marquis of Villadaria, the captain-general of Andalusia, was a man of energy and military skill. He had roused the population; and when some troops had landed and marched to Port St. Mary's, an unwalled place — which safe course had been preferred to a descent upon the Isle of Leon, and a vigorous attack upon Cadiz — they found the old town deserted. There was, however, abundance of specie and other valuables there, to satisfy a rapacious soldiery, under very imperfect discipline. The Prince of Darmstadt had joined the expedition, in the hope that the Andalusians would declare for the cause of the Austrian Archduke, who claimed the title of King of Spain. The Spaniards were disgusted by the outrages of those who held out the hand of friendship to the people, but acted as brutal enemies. No serious attempt was made to accomplish some object worthy of such an armament. If the army remained longer on shore the probability was that they would have become wholly undisciplined, and have fallen sacrifices to the just revenge of the indignant population. The troops re-embarked in the middle of September. But there was a prize yet to be reached. The Spanish fleet, which yearly arrived from the Indies, laden with bullion and rich merchandise, finding Cadiz blockaded, had run into Vigo. It was against the monopoly of the Cadiz merchants that any other port should receive these annual treasures. The galleons could not land their cargoes until the tardy officials at Madrid had given permission. Ormond and Rooke had obtained information that there were richer trophies to be won that the honor of fighting for the stronghold of Cadiz. They made for Vigo, which, during their useless sojourn at Port St. Mary's, had been strengthened, and a boom thrown across the harbor. Two thousand men were landed. The galleons fled down the bay and attempted to put some of their valuable cargo on shore. The English squadron pursued them; and then the Spaniards threw their wealth into the sea, and fired their ships. Six galleons were seized by the English, and seven French ships of-war. The loss of life on the side of the Spaniards and French was terrific. The destruction of property was immense, exceeding eight million dollars. Much of the treasure taken was embezzled. "The public was not much enriched by this extraordinary capture, yet the loss our enemies made by it was a vast one." ‡

The first parliament of Queen Anne met on the 20th of October. Harley was chosen speaker. The royal speech contained no decided expression which could indicate what temper of the houses would be most agreeable to the court. It was well known that there would be a large Tory majority. It was now thought desirable by this majority to compliment the queen upon the progress of the war under the command of Marlborough, and to insult the memory of him whose firmness and perseverance had alone enabled England and Holland to hold in check the power of France. It was carried in the Commons by a majority of 180 against 80, that these words should be used in their address to the queen: "The wonderful progress of your majesty's arms, under the conduct of the Earl of Marlborough, have signally *retrieved* the ancient honor and glory of the English nation." Those who proposed to substitute the word "*maintained*," had to learn that the grave is no shelter from the violence of party spirit. This was harmless malice. But there was something more than the gratification of the old hatred of a constitutional king, when the queen was told, in the same address, that as she had always been an illustrious ornament to the Church, "we promise ourselves that, in your reign, we shall see it perfectly restored to its due rights and privileges."

Under the Toleration Act of 1689 the Protestant dissenters, a numerous and wealthy body, had been relieved "from the penalties of certain laws," as the title of that act expressed. Dissenting ministers might teach and preach, having subscribed some of the articles of the Church of England; and their followers were free to frequent conventicles, having subscribed the Declaration against Popery, prescribed by the statute of Charles II. Complying with these requisitions, the offices of coporations were open to the very influential class that differed in some points from the Established Church under various denominations. In 1697 a violent excitement was produced in the city of London by the lord mayor, Sir Humphrey Edwin, attending a meeting-house, with the trappings of his office—a circumstance which Swift had in mind when he told "how Jack's tatters came into fashion in court and city; how he got upon a great horse, and ate custard." * During the reign of William the feud between the Church and Dissent was confined to the preachers and the pamphleteers. The state looked on without taking any part in the quarrel about occasional conformity, by which the dissenters kept their share of civil power, without compromising, as most of them believed, their rights of conscience. But when Anne came to the throne, the High Church party were for extreme measures against the separatists; and one of the first proceedings of the Tory ministry in the new parliament was to bring in a bill to prevent occasional conformity. The spirit of the time of Charles II. was roused from its long sleep. Not only were holders of office to be subject to the Test Act, but also all electors for boroughs. To enter a dissenting place of worship after having once taken the sacrament according to the rites of the Church, was to be punished with heavy fines, and with transportation upon a repetition of the offence. The bill was quickly passed by large majorities of the Commons. In the House of Lords, where the majority of spiritual peers were distinguished for their moderation—where the learning of Somers and the eloquence of Halifax had their due weight—the factions of the lower house were met with a firm and temperate resistance, although the Whigs were not strong enough to throw out the bill. Amendments were introduced by the Peers, which the Commons indignantly rejected. Conferences then took place between the two houses, in which the question was debated with great pertinacity on both sides; but in which the Lords manifested a regard for civil rights, a hatred of extreme penalties, and a respect for religious liberty, which ought to be borne in mind by those who are inclined to believe that the power in the state which does not directly represent the popular interest is necessarily indifferent to the welfare of the people. We may judge of the masterly reasoning upon which the Peers defended their amendments by the following passage: "The Lords think an Englishman cannot be reduced to a more unhappy condition than to be put by law under an incapacity to serve his prince and country; and therefore nothing but a crime of the most detestable nature ought to put him under such a disability: they who think the being present at a meeting to be so high a crime can hardly think that a toleration of such meetings ought to continue long; and yet the bill says, 'The Act of Toleration ought to be kept inviolate.'" †

The chief business of the session was this great battle of principle. The Lords insisted on adhering to their amendments. The Commons persisted in rejecting them. The court made every effort to get the bill passed in the Lords—the Prince of Denmark, though not of the Church of England, and being an occasional conformist himself, having voted for it as a peer of parliament. But the vote of adhering was carried in the Lords by a majority of one. The battle of the press was as violent as that of the parliament. The most remarkable production of the time was Defoe's "The Shortest Way with the Dissenters." It is seldom that irony can be sustained through many pages; but the power which this great writer possessed in his fictitious narratives, of giving a reality to imaginary events and persons, enabled him to adopt the tone of a violent high churchman, and carry forward the declamation of the party into an extravagance

* "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 47.
† Letter of Colonel Stanhope, quoted in Lord Mahon's "War of the Succession," p. 47.
‡ Burnet, vol. v. p. 45.

* "Tale of a Tub." The lord mayor's great horse is of higher antiquity than the lord mayor's state coach.
† "Parliamentary History," vol. vi. p. 71.

which made the general argument odious and ridiculous. It was the most successful literary hoax ever perpetrated. Furious churchmen applauded the pamphlet. Sensitive dissenters were indignant at the terms in which they were denounced. Dull moderate men stood aghast at the monstrous cruelty and wickedness of these "Proposals for the establishment of the Church," which thus argued: "If the gallows instead of the compter, and the gallies instead of the fines, were the reward of going to a conventicle to preach or hear, there would not be so many sufferers; the spirit of martyrdom is over; they that go to church to be chosen sheriffs and mayors would go to forty churches rather than be hanged." When the hoax was discovered, the rage of the followers of Sacheverell and other haters of toleration was unbounded. A reward of fifty pounds was offered by proclamation for the apprehension of Daniel Defoe, "charged with writing a scandalous and seditious pamphlet entitled 'The Shortest Way with the Dissenters':—"a middle-aged spare man, about forty years old." The House of Commons voted the little book to be burned by the hangman. Defoe was indicted at the Old Bailey Sessions in February, 1703, and was brought to trial in July. He acknowledged himself to have written this piece of exquisite banter. To us who live in better times, which we owe as much to the press as to the parliament, it is inconceivable that all parties did not laugh at Defoe's wit. He was found guilty, and was sentenced to a fine, to stand three times in the pillory, and to be imprisoned during the queen's pleasure. Defoe was pilloried, on three successive days, at the Royal Exchange, at the Conduit at Cheapside, and at Temple Bar. On the first day of this exhibition he published his "Hymn to the Pillory." His was the spirit that, in every age in England, has made oppression recoil upon the oppressor. The hymn was read as its author stood before the crowd not ignominiously:

"Earless on high stood unabashed Defoe."

Pope meant this for contempt. The more equal judgment of another age receives it as praise, and reads "fearless," not "earless"—"unabashed by, and unabated in his contempt for, tyranny and dulness." *

"The Earl of Marlborough is grand vizier, as you may imagine," writes a political observer at the time of the accession of Anne. † The successes of his first campaign encouraged the queen to shower honors upon her favorite's husband, which left nothing higher in her gift for the triumphs of his subsequent career. On the 10th of December, 1702, her majesty announced to the Commons that for the eminent services of the Earl of Marlborough she had thought fit to grant him the title of duke. But the queen went farther. She said she had granted the duke five thousand a year from the revenues of the post-office. The Commons demurred to this grant, and Marlborough received the first check to that avidity for money which was one of the conspicuous faults of his character. The cold support he obtained from his Tory friends was not to be readily forgiven. His views, moreover, as to the conduct of the war, were far more comprehensive than the views of the administration. Louis XIV. had renewed the horrible persecutions of the French Protestants in Languedoc. In his anxiety to conclude the peace of Ryswick, William III. had made no stipulations for the free exercise of the reformed faith in the provinces of France. His attention was called to this omission by Heinsius, as the States were on the point of signing the treaty. But the communication to William was too late: "God grant," he replies, "that some expedient may have been found before you can receive this letter, for it will probably not reach you till after midnight, and consequently not till after the expiration of the term fixed for the signature of the treaty. ‡ In 1702 a serious revolt of the persecuted Protestants broke out in the Cévennes, a mountainous district of Languedoc. The poor mountaineers, who held their religious meetings in solitary places, were again to be converted by the "booted missionaries" of the Roman Catholic Church. Their dangers called forth a spirit of fanaticism, such as had characterized the Cameronians of Scotland. They had prophets among them. They looked for miracles to be wrought in their favor. There was a ruthless bigot in the Cévennes, the arch-priest Du Chaila, who had been the persecutor of the Protestants there from the time of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. In 1702 this detestable fanatic was endeavoring to tread out the fanaticism of his victims by unheard-of cruelties. He subjected his prisoners to frightful tortures. He flogged and mutilated young children, to obtain information of the concealment of preachers. His atrocities at length received their reward. He had imprisoned in his château—a strong place, capable of resisting any ordinary attack—a number of Protestants, whom he intended to put to death, as he had put to death a young girl six months before. The peasantry surrounded the château, forced the gates with a rude battering-ram, set the building on fire, and murdered the arch-priest as he attempted to escape. The insurrection now became general. Leaders sprang up who organized the embittered mountaineers. The contest seriously distracted the attention of the French government, and was so far favorable to the allies. Marlborough desired to render assistance to the insurgents. Nottingham and the other Tory ministers would not sanction any rebellion against a legitimate king. The civil war in the Cévennes, when it first broke out, was looked upon as an effort of despair, which would quickly end in massacres and executions. It was at its height in 1703, when the Camisards, as the insurgents were denominated, were opposed, under the leadership of a young man named Cavalier, to a Marshal of France, with twelve thousand veteran troops under his command. Cavalier, who as a boy had tended sheep on his native hills, had fled from the persecution which threatened his home, and had apprenticed himself to a baker at Geneva. He was in his twentieth year when he suddenly appeared again in his birthplace and became the head of the most daring band of insurgents. There is no romance more interesting than the adventures of this baker's boy, who displayed a courage, a sagacity, and a military genius which compelled Marshal de Montrevel to give up in despair his system of terror and wholesale destruction by fire and sword. He was recalled, and Marshal Villars was substituted, who adopted milder measures. Cavalier concluded a negotiation with Villars in 1704. The allies could render him no assistance, such as he had expected. The revolt had, in some degree, worn itself out. Villars promised amnesty, with free egress to those who chose to emigrate, and a toleration of religion. The youth on whom the Marshal of France looked with wonder, that he should have succeeded so long in defying the armies of the great monarch, trusted to French diplomacy without receiving any guarantees for the performance of the conditions which he required. They were partially adhered to; but the promise to the Protestants of the free exercise of their religion was soon broken. Cavalier's own comrades were indignant with him for making terms at all. Another chief, Roland, continued the war. Roland was killed in 1704. The fire in the Cévennes "was covered up rather than extinguished," says Burnet. Cavalier afterward served in Spain, subsequently entered the English service, and died at a very advanced age as Governor of Jersey, with the rank of a major-general.*

The campaign of 1703 was as barren of any signal advantages to the arms of the allies as to the arms of France. The parliament had voted an augmentation of troops, and there was no want of decision on the part of Marlborough, to employ the forces of which he had the command in the manner most likely to be productive of a great result. "Our affairs go very ill in Germany," he wrote to Nottingham on the 26th of March. † The Elector of Bavaria had now proclaimed his adhesion to France, had surprised the strong fortress of Ulm, and by effecting a communication with the French on the Upper Rhine had opened a way for the armies of Louis to the centre of Germany. The French forces under Boufflers in the Netherlands threatened Holland; and Marlborough was desirous of attacking them, while the stronger French armies were otherwise engaged. The States-General pressed upon him the desirableness of securing Bonn, which capitulated after a short siege. Three months later Huy was surrendered to the allies. But these successes were of comparatively small import. Marlborough had been in anxious correspondence with Coehorn on a matter which he repeatedly terms "le grand dessein," and "la grande affaire." ‡ Marlborough and Coe-

* "Historical and Biographical Essays," by John Forster, vol. ii. p. 50. It is curious that Mr. Wilson quotes the line as if Pope had really written "fearless," and had not falsified the fact by assuming that Defoe had his ears cut off, as Prynne's were.

† Kemble. "State Papers." Ellis to Stepney, p. 259.

‡ Grimblot, vol. i. p. 32.

* Cavalier wrote an account of the wars in the Cévennes. There is an excellent notice of this remarkable man by Mr. Kemble, "State Papers," p. 384 to 431.

† "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 74. ‡ Ibid., pp. 113, 118.

horn had matured a plan for attacking Antwerp, and carrying the war into Flanders. The failure is attributed by Marlborough to "M. de Coehorn's stubbornness, and the dissensions among the generals." He, therefore, had to return toward the Maese; and having taken Huy, to propose some other plan that would have terminated the year with an energetic operation that promised success. The duke proposed, in a council of war, on the 20th of August, to attack the French lines between Mehaigne and Leuwe. This plan was agreed to by the generals in command of the forces of Denmark, Luneburg, and Hesse, as well as by the English generals. The French carefully avoided a battle, and were safe beyond their lines, which Marlborough desired to force. The plan was submitted to the States-General, and was by them rejected. They wanted another fortress, Limbourg, to be taken, which Marlborough said could be accomplished by a detachment of the army. The great general was naturally irritated by this interference with his plans; but he submitted. Marlborough wrote to their high mightinesses that, from the undoubted information he had received of the situation of the enemy, the design was not only practicable, but almost sure of success. "The opportunity is lost, and I wish from my heart that there will be no cause for repentance when it is too late."* He attacked Limbourg, which surrendered after a short siege. In the next campaign Marlborough laid his plans with such secrecy, and carried them out with such promptitude, that the States-General had scarcely time to find fault with the independence of his movements before they heard of their complete success.

On the 9th of November the queen opened the second session of her first parliament. The foreign policy which she announced assumed larger proportions than the object which had been originally defined for the war. Its object was no longer simply "to resist the great power of France," but "for recovering the monarchy of Spain from the house of Bourbon, and restoring it to the house of Austria." The queen announced that she had made a treaty for this object with the King of Portugal, and that subsidies would be required for the Duke of Savoy, who had declared his intention to join the alliance. The principles of the agreement with Portugal were laid down in what is known as the Methuen treaty—called after the name of the ambassador who negotiated it—and that treaty, and its effect upon the commerce of England and the habits of her people, lasted, through five generations even to the present time. The wines of Portugal were to be admitted upon the payment of a duty 33⅓ per cent less than the duty paid upon French wines; and the woollen cloths of England, which had been prohibited in Portugal for twenty years, were to be admitted upon terms of proportionate advantage. Up to that time the claret of France had been the beverage of the wine-drinkers of England. From 1703 port established itself as what Defoe calls "our general draught." In all commercial negotiations with France the Methuen treaty stood in the way; for the preferential duty was continued till 1831. France invariably pursued a system of retaliation. It was a point of patriotism for the Englishman to hold firm to his port. The habit was established; and even now, when the vine-growers of France and the iron-masters of England are equally desirous that commercial restrictions should be removed, it is in vain to say, as Hume said more than a century ago, "We lost the French markets for our woollen manufactures, and transferred the commerce of wine to Spain and Portugal, where we buy worse liquor at a higher price."†

The Archduke Charles of Austria was now hailed as King Charles of Spain. He came to England on the 26th of December. On the 29th he was entertained for two days by the queen at Windsor. Her majesty, according to the official account in the London *Gazette*, received at their first meeting the compliment of the King of Spain, "acknowledging his great obligations to her for her generous protection and assistance." He was all courtesy and humility. He would scarcely take the right hand of the queen at table; and "after supper he would not be satisfied till after great compliments he had prevailed with the Duchess of Marlborough to give him the napkin which he held to her majesty when she washed." Had the new king, without a kingdom, stayed long enough in England to observe the temper of the parliament and the people, he might have felt that her majesty's "generous protection and assistance" was not the only thing to be considered in our insular politics. At this time the famous Leibnitz, whose acquirements as a philosopher did not interfere with his keen calculations upon political affairs, wrote from Berlin, "The great animosity that prevails between the Whigs and the Tories gives many people a bad opinion of the affairs of England."* How could the people of the continent understand these affairs? Here was England engaged in the greatest war, and committed to the most complicated alliances, of any period of her history, and her government was making the most strenuous efforts to disturb the internal tranquillity which had long subsisted under a system of toleration, and revive the bitter hatreds in matters of religion which appeared to have died out, except among the extreme bigots of either party. A fortnight had scarcely elapsed since the opening of the session, when a new bill against occasional conformity was brought in, and the Commons renewed the work of the previous session with redoubled fury. They passed the bill very quickly by a majority of two hundred and twenty-three to a hundred and forty. The Lords rejected it by a majority of twelve. To analyze the dreary debates would have little interest now. The excitement out of doors has been described by one of the greatest of humorists: "I wish you had been here for ten days, during the highest and warmest reign of party and faction that I ever knew or read of, upon the bill against occasional conformity, which two days ago was, upon the first reading, rejected by the Lords. It was so universal that I observed the dogs in the streets much more contumelious and quarrelsome than usual; and the very night before the bill went up, a committee of Whig and Tory cats had a very warm and loud debate upon the roof of our house. But why should we wonder at that, when the very ladies are split asunder into high church and low, and, out of zeal for religion, have hardly time to say their prayers."† Marlborough, perhaps very little to his taste, was dragged in by the Tories, to whom he yet pretended allegiance, to vote for the bill. He wrote, during the heat of the discussions, to Count Wratislaw, to show how this controversy interfered with the real business of parliament. "If it had not been for the bill against occasional conformity we had reason to flatter ourselves that the session would have terminated with more of unanimity, and that a greater dispatch would have been given to public affairs than we had seen for many years."‡

There were other parliamentary turmoils in this session which involved the most serious disputes between the Lords and Commons. One of these was the controversy about privilege in the matter known as the Scottish plot, which we shall refer to a chapter on Scotland. The other was the constitutional question connected with the famous case of an Aylesbury election. Ashby, a burgess of Aylesbury, sued the returning officer for maliciously refusing his vote. Three judges of the King's Bench decided, against the opinion of Chief Justice Holt, that the verdict which a jury had given in favor of Ashby must be set aside, as the action was not maintainable. The plaintiff went to the House of Lords upon a writ of error, and there the judgment was reversed by a large majority of peers. The lower house maintained that "the qualification of an elector is not cognizable elsewhere than before the Commons of England;" that Ashby was guilty of a breach of privilege; and that all persons who should in future commence such an action, and all attorneys and counsel conducting the same, are also guilty of a high breach of privilege. The Lords, led by Somers, then came to counter-resolutions, of which the most important is, "that the assertion that a person wrongfully hindered from giving his vote for the election of members of parliament, by the officer who ought to take it, is without remedy by the ordinary source of the law, is destructive of the property of the subject, is against the freedom of elections, and manifestly tends to encourage corruption and partiality." The prorogation of parliament put an end to the quarrel in that session; but in the next it was renewed with increased violence. The judgment against the returning officer was followed up by Ashby levying his damages. Other Aylesbury men brought new actions. The Commons imprisoned the Aylesbury electors. The Lords took strong measures that affected, or appeared to affect, the privileges of the Commons. The queen finally stopped

* "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 173.
† "Essay on the Balance of Trade."

* Kemble, "State Papers," p. 306.
† Swift, Letter to Rev. Dr. Tisdall, December 16th, 1703.
‡ "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 218.

the contest by a prorogation, and the quarrel expired when the parliament expired under the Triennial Act. Lord Somers "established the doctrine which has been acted on ever since, that an action lies against a returning officer for maliciously refusing the vote of an elector." *

About the time when these violent political tempests commenced, the nation was terrified by that wonderful war of the elements known as the great storm of 1703. On the night of the 27th of November a mighty wind arose in the western and southern districts of England, and in part of the eastern, which toppled down steeples, unroofed houses, drove great ships from their anchorage, and swept away the watch-towers of the coasts. The shores of the Channel were strewn with wrecks. The Thames and the Severn were crowded with dismasted merchantmen, and hulls whose crews had been swept into the raging sea. Fourteen or fifteen men-of-war were cast away, and fifteen hundred seamen perished with them. The parliament went up with an address to the queen, beseeching her to build new ships, which cost they would effectually defray. Marlborough, in his communications with foreign courts, spoke of the storm as a grievous national calamity, but one which he hoped would not interfere with the dispatch of troops for his Catholic majesty.† A general fast on the 19th of January was observed with unusual devotion, "the terror which the tempest had left on the people's minds," says an historian of the time, "contributing much to their affectionate discharge of that religious duty." Sermons of exhortation to hearken to God's judgments—one of which was called "A warning from the winds"—were preached throughout the land. Defoe wrote a circumstantial account of the unprecedented calamity. But this visitation was soon forgotten in the excitement of war. Marlborough's wonderful campaign of 1704 caused the passing terror of 1703 to be soon forgotten. Addison—it may be somewhat profanely—compared Marlborough in the storm of battle to the angel "who rides in the whirlwind,"

"Such as of late o'er pale Britannia past."

This famous simile of "The Campaign" was pronounced to be wonderfully fine and true. The moralist was soon neglected who said, "I cannot but have so much charity for the worst of my fellow-creatures, that I believe no man was so hardened against his Maker, but he felt some shocks to his wicked confidence from the convulsions of nature." ‡

The commotions of party, in the first and second years of the reign of Anne, were so extreme that men who had higher aims than the possession of power for its own sake looked on with dread and sorrow. Somers wrote to Shrewsbury, who was abroad, in 1704, "Never man was wearier of a place than I have been of this country for many years; nor any one reckoned you happier than I have, for being out of the reach and hearing of all the malice, and baseness, and violence, that men are practising upon one another." § And yet calm and earnest reformers of gross abuses did contrive to carry some measures that were untainted by the breath of faction, and whose benefits still remain to us. One measure of law reform was passed in 1702, in a clause of a statute entitled "An Act for punishing of Accessories to Felonies and Receivers of Stolen Goods, etc." We should scarcely expect to find, under this act for extending the range of the criminal law, a clause which, from that time, has afforded protection to a prisoner under trial, by placing the witnesses in his favor upon an equality with the witnesses for the crown. This clause is as follows: "And be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that from and after the said twelfth day of February, one thousand seven hundred and two, all and every person and persons who shall be produced or appear as a witness or witnesses on the behalf of the prisoner upon any trial for treason or felony, before he or she be admitted to depose or give any manner of evidence, shall first take an oath to depose the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in such manner as the witnesses for the queen are by law obliged to do, and if convicted of any wilful perjury in such evidence shall suffer all the punishments, penalties, forfeitures and disabilities, which by any of the laws and statutes of this realm are or may be inflicted upon persons convicted of wilful perjury." * Lord Lyndhurst, in 1836, when he so admirably urged the adoption of the bill for giving to all prisoners the right to "full counsel," which had been given, in 1695, in cases of high treason—pointed out that anomaly in the law which was corrected by this statute of Anne: "In cases of felony, no witnesses were examined on the part of the prisoner until Queen Mary sent down directions to the Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas to take evidence on the part of the accused, as well as against him. Still the law remained imperfect, because, though witnesses were examined, they were not examined upon oath. Lawyers are sometimes very astute at finding out reasons to support every existing institution, and they assigned a very singular reason for this practice. They said it originated in lenity toward the prisoner, because the witness, not being bound by an oath, would speak largely and beneficially for him. This was rather a singular doctrine, the object of a court of justice being to elicit the truth. But let your lordships mark its practical effect, as exhibited in numerous instances in the state trials—the witnesses against the prisoner being examined on oath, and those in his favor not being examined on oath. The moment the judge began to sum up the evidence to the jury, and contrast the evidence for the prosecution with that given on the part of the prisoner, he always took care to inform the jury that, in estimating the degree of weight which was to be attached to the testimony on each side, they must not lose sight of the important fact that the witnesses for the prosecution were examined on oath, while those for the defence were free from that obligation." †

Amid the violent disputes in parliament upon conformity, stimulated by the equally violent divisions in the convocation—which now claimed a right to sit during a session of parliament without being prorogued—there was one measure of real benefit to the clergy, which is popularly known as "Queen Anne's Bounty." The "first fruits and tenths" of all spiritual preferments had become part of the revenues of the crown, under the statute of Henry VIII., giving to the king, as head of the Church, what the clergy had been accustomed to assign to the pope, in spite of the efforts of parliament to prevent or restrain this practice. The "first fruits" were the whole profits of the preferment during the first year, and the "tenths, or *decimæ*," the tenth part of the annual profit of each living. When given to the Papal See, they were computed upon a valuation of the time of Edward I. When they became part of the royal revenue, they were computed upon that valuation in the time of Henry VIII. known as "The King's Books." But by the statute of the 26th of Henry VIII. the payments for the smaller rectories or vicarages were wholly or partially remitted; but the larger benefices were bound to contribute to the crown these portions of their nominal value. Queen Anne, by letters-patent of the 3d of November, 1703, "restored to the Church what had been thus indirectly taken from it." ‡ But the restoration was effected in the most judicious manner, not to relieve the larger benefices, but in some small degree to equalize the condition of incumbents, by vesting the first-fruits and tenths in trustees, to form a fund for the augmentation of the smaller livings. These letters-patent were confirmed by statute, of which the preamble is suggestive of what some consider the evils of what is known in our day as "the voluntary principle:" "Whereas a sufficient settled provision for the clergy in many parts of this realm has never yet been made, by reason whereof divers mean and stipendiary preachers are in many places entertained to serve the cures and officiate there, who, depending for necessary maintenance upon the good will and liking of their hearers, have been and are thereby under temptation of too much complying and suiting their doctrine and teaching to the humors rather than the good of their hearers; which hath been a great occasion of faction and schism, and contempt of the ministry." §

When the accession of Queen Anne indicated a nearer, though not a complete approach to the absolute principle of legitimacy, which

* Lord Campbell's "Lives of the Chancellors." Life of Somers.
† "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 214. ‡ Defoe, "The Storm," 1704.
§ "Shrewsbury Correspondence," p. 641.

* 1 Annæ, stat. 2, c. 9.
† "Mirror of Parliament," 1836; quoted in "Suggestions for the Repression of Crime," by Mr. M. D. Hill, Recorder of Birmingham, a volume which not only displays the large and benevolent views of its author, but contains a mass of valuable information on the great topics to which Mr. Hill has especially devoted his later years.
‡ Blackstone, vol. i. p. 281, Mr. Kerr's edition.
§ 2 & 3 Annæ, c. 20 (in "Statutes of the Realm").

was set aside by the revolution and the Act of Settlement, it became the policy of the extreme Tories and High Churchmen to induce the people to look again with complacency upon some of the customs which, at the restoration, had marked the triumphs of divine right and the downfall of Puritanism. Queen Anne revived the ceremony of touching for the king's evil, by which all English monarchs, from the time of Edward the Confessor, whether saints or sinners, of the Roman Catholic or the Reformed Church, had asserted the miraculous power of the wearer of the "golden rigol." William III. was profane enough not to believe in this power. Whiston, who had himself a talent for humor not generally belonging to the vain and eager controversialist, tells a story that William was once prevailed upon to touch for the malady which kings could cure, and that he said to the patient that he prayed God to heal him, and grant him more wisdom at the same time. The discontinuance of the superstition by the king—who, although a truly pious man, made it "his rule all his life long, to hide the impressions that religion made upon him as much as possible"*—necessarily rendered Queen Anne desirous to manifest its efficacy to the world. Her majesty was not perfectly successful in all cases. Dr. Johnson's mother carried him from Lichfield to London, to be touched by the queen, and he used to relate how he had "a confused, but somehow a sort of solemn recollection of a lady in diamonds, and a long black hood." Boswell says, with much gravity, "This touch, however, was without any effect." It was more effectual in a case related by Daines Barrington, of an old man who was witness in a cause, describing how the good queen had touched him when he was a child: "I asked him whether he was really cured? upon which he answered, with a significant smile, that he believed himself never to have had a complaint that deserved to be considered as the evil, but that his parents were poor, and had no objection to the bit of gold"†—the angel of gold, with the impress of St. Michael, which was hung about the patient's neck.

The May-poles that had been set up at the restoration—when the Puritan justices and constables who had pulled them down were no longer in a condition to declare war against them—after the revolution had the fate always harder than persecution, that of neglect. They had ceased to be indicative of party feelings; and they gradually mouldered away upon the village green, and were displaced from the streets of cities in which commerce was more important than merriment. But when Anne came to the throne there was a revival. "I appeal to common knowledge," says Defoe, "if in the first half-year of her present majesty almost all the May-poles in England were not repaired, and re-edified, new painted, new hung with garlands, and beautified." Defoe associates this with the revival of "drunkenness and revelling." He was looking at the May-poles through the old Puritanical glasses, which saw in harmless sports nothing but popery and vice. But the setters-up of the May-poles probably loved as little the merriment of the people as the nonconformists did. "Up went the May-poles," writes Defoe, "that the Church's health might be drunk, till the people not only knew not what they did, but might be ready to do they knew not what, to the demolishing the Church's pretended enemies, the dissenters."‡ A Puritanical rhymester of 1660 makes "Sir May-pole" say,

"There's none as I so near the pope."

The satirist of the extreme opinions of this time is not grossly exaggerating when he says that Martin, in his "mad fit, looked so like Peter in his air and dress, and talked so like him, that many of the neighbors could not distinguish the one from the other, especially when Martin went up and down strutting in Peter's armor, which he had borrowed to fight Jack."§

CHAPTER CXXXV.

Difficulties of recruiting the English army—The campaign of 1704—Marlborough's secret plan of operations—His march along the Rhine—Arrives at the Danube—Battle of the Schellenberg—Devastation of Bavaria—Junction of the French and Bavarian armies—The battle of Blenheim—Results of the victory—Subsequent operations of the campaign—Marlborough returns to England—Honors and rewards—Party conflicts—Parliament dissolved.

THE extreme measures taken by the House of Commons in 1699, for reducing the army to a point almost incompatible with the desire of King William to preserve to England its weight and influence abroad, must have proved a serious embarrassment to the government of Queen Anne in the first two years of her reign. When, in the spring of 1704, Marlborough, taking no counsel of foreign princes or states, and imparting little of his plans to the civil directors of English affairs, was revolving in the most secret recesses of his own mind the plan of that daring campaign which was to exhibit war on its grandest scale, he must have sometimes contemplated with anxious doubt the insufficient means at his own command. We find him on the 29th of March writing from St. James's to M. Hop, the Dutch minister, that the public funds not being sufficient to carry on the war with vigor, the queen had provided additional means out of the privy purse; and he announces that the transports will speedily arrive in the Meuse, with nearly a thousand recruits for the infantry of the English army.* A thousand recruits only, to supply the waste of two campaigns! But if we have reference to the difficulty of recruiting, we shall not be surprised at the small force which Marlborough could contribute, to be drafted into the regiments which he was contemplating to lead upon the most distant march ever attempted in our continental wars. When preparing himself to embark at Harwich, on the 6th of April, he sends to Mr. Secretary Hedges, "the list of officers for the two new regiments of foot to be raised under the command of the Lord Paston and Colonel Heyman Rooke."† But how to be raised? An act of parliament passed on the 23d of March will inform us. When Farquhar was gathering that professional experience which he embodied in 1705 in his "Recruiting Officer," the Captain Plumes and Sergeant Kites, with their drums, and ribbons, and strong ale, were unable to fill the ranks of the army with the "youth of England, all on fire." A bill was brought into parliament in 1704 for a forced levy from each parish—a measure which was rejected as unconstitutional. A plan of general conscription being thus refused, an act was passed, which gave as happy an occasion for favoritism and corrupt influence as when "Master Corporate Bardolph" had "three pounds to free Mouldy and Bull-calf."‡ By the statute "for raising recruits for the land forces and marines," justices of the peace, and mayors or other head-officers of boroughs, were empowered "to raise and levy such able-bodied men as have not any lawful calling or employment, or visible means for their maintenance and livelihood, to serve as soldiers."§ The constables were to receive ten shillings per head for bringing the tattered prodigals before the justices, and the justices were to consign them to the queen's officer, who was to present each of these cankers of a calm world with twenty shillings, and then send them to the wars, to "fill a pit as well as better." This statute of 1704 was renewed in 1705; and the system was also tried in the latter end of the reign of George II. That it had a tendency to lower the military character can scarcely be doubted. But if such recruits were ready to plunder, they were also ready to fight; and for a century and a half England has been contented with such, and has not yet discovered the way to recruit an army by holding out the prospect of honorable distinction and just promotion to the deserving.

The campaign of 1704 was meant by Louis XIV. to decide the great question by which Europe was agitated. The war for two years had been a war of sieges, in which the advantages on the part of the allies had been more than balanced by advantages on the part of France and Bavaria. If Marlborough had gained some strong places in the Netherlands, the French had taken strong forts on the Upper Rhine and the Moselle, and the Bavarians and the French had defeated the imperial troops and were masters of Augsburg and Passau. By the alliance of France with Bavaria, and through the successes of their joint forces, the way to Vienna was open to a great army to be collected on the Danube. Large detachments from the French army of Flanders were to be led by Marshal Villeroy. Marshal Tallard was

---

* Burnet, "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 547.
† "Observations on our Ancient Statutes."
‡ "Review," quoted in Wilson, vol. ii. p. 10.
§ "Tale of a Tub." It is scarcely necessary to add a note found in most editions of Swift; "Peter, Martin, and Jack, represent Popery, Church of England, and Protestant dissenters."

* "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 247.
† Ibid., p. 248.
‡ "Henry IV.," part II. act 3.
§ 2 & 3 Annæ, c. 13.

to leave the Rhine, and advance into Suabia through the Black Forest. The army of Italy was to march through the Tyrol into Austria. The Hungarians, then in a state of insurrection, were to be assisted by French troops. Another century was to pass away before Germany should be again threatened by such a formidable concentration of the military power of France. It required the most extraordinary combination in one man of daring and prudence to conceive the plan of a great war—to devise a vast series of operations upon a similar scale with those of Louis—but of operations to be conducted by the union of many discordant interests, and the subjection of many petty and adverse schemes to the policy of a master-mind. Marlborough had not only to mature his design with small counsel from those who were to join him in carrying it out, but absolutely to conceal it from those who were to render him the most efficient assistance. The difficulties of his course may be traced in his letters; but we also therein trace the indomitable will by which he is determined to surmount them. On the 29th of April he writes from the Hague to Mr. Secretary Hedges, "We are not yet come to any final resolutions here upon the operations of the siege."* On the 2d of May he again writes to the secretary, that in a conference with the deputies of the States, he had informed them of his resolution of going to the Moselle, "as what may most conduce to the public service."† On the 5th of May, the States having consented that Marlborough should lead the joint forces to the Moselle, the troops began to march out of their garrisons. On the 10th of May the great general has got to Ruremond. He now writes confidentially to Mr. Stepney, the English ambassador, that he would not conceal from him "my resolution of marching with the English, some of our auxiliaries, and what other troops can with safety be spared, up to the Danube; but as I have not yet made any declaration to the States of my design of going so far, and as it behoves us to have particular management for them, I must not only desire your secrecy, but pray you will intimate the same thing to his majesty the emperor."‡ He next takes an Englishman into his confidence—Mr. St. John. On Wednesday next, he writes on the 11th of May, the troops will pass the Meuse at Ruremond, on their way to the Moselle; "and I may venture to tell you, though I would not have it public as yet, I design to march a great deal higher into Germany."§ Heinsius, the friend of William III., knew the plans of Marlborough. So did Prince Eugene. But his impenetrable secrecy prevented the Dutch opposing his resolves upon the ground that it would leave their own frontier defenceless. "Under the blind," says Burnet, "of the project of carrying the war to the Moselle, everything was prepared that was necessary for executing the true design." The movements of Villeroy, who had passed the Meuse at Namur, alarmed the Dutch, and they sent a pressing message to Marlborough to halt. The movements of Tallard frightened the Margrave of Baden, and he implored Marlborough to come to his aid. He quieted their fears with smooth words, and went rapidly and steadily on his own march. The French themselves could not understand the movements of Marlborough. Villeroy had been ordered to observe him wheresoever he marched.‖ The French marshal suddenly lost sight of him altogether, and only learned where he really was when he received the news of his first victory over the Bavarians.¶ A contemporary writer accounts for this ignorance, which caused Villeroy to march and countermarch in the neighborhood of the Moselle, while Marlborough had pushed on to the Danube: "They make great use of spies; they also stop all passengers they meet, inquire their names, whence they come, what news they hear. They depend upon such rumors and reports, and take their measures accordingly, in matters of the last importance."**

Marlborough is now moving among scenes as familiar to many English as the banks of their own rivers. From the heights of Ehrenbreitstein, then a strong fortress belonging to the Elector of Trèves, he saw his cavalry pass over the Rhine. His infantry soon followed. His artillery and stores were put on board transports at Coblentz, as well as his sick soldiers. Marlborough's attention to detail—which was also one of the distinguishing characteristics of the great commander who came a century after him, with the same mission of arresting the ambition of France—saved his soldiers from many a privation and many a defeat. The allied troops moved along the banks of the Rhine, in the gray dawn and the soft twilight of that early summer. During the noontide heat they rested under the shadow of slopes clothed with budding vines. "The Rhine was a great refreshment to the soldiers," says Cunningham. It was a striking change from the dull plains of Flanders, for the English to gaze upon a river far grander than their own Thames or Severn—to hear their "Grenadiers' March" echoed from ruined castles perched upon every rock beneath which they wound their way; to drink huge draughts of the sharp Rheinwein, in quaint villages where money secured a hearty welcome. On they went cheerily through these novel scenes. "When the confederates had drawn up their ships beyond Andernach, the Mouse Tower, Bingen, and Bacharach, there opened to them on the left hand a large plain, whereon the whole army was seen to march at once, making a glorious sight in their arms and new clothes."* The army halted a day at Cassel, near Mayence, where the elector reviewed the troops; and when he first looked upon the English officers in their scarlet and gold—"all plumed like estridges"—he exclaimed, "These gentlemen seem to be all dressed for the ball." Marlborough wrote to Godolphin that he should send to Frankfort to see if he could raise a month's pay for his English upon bills; "for, notwithstanding the continual marching, the men are extremely pleased with this expedition, so that I am sure you will take all the care possible that they may not want."†

While the army under the immediate command of Marlborough was thus moving toward the Danube, by the Rhine, it was no small part of his anxiety so to regulate the movements of the other confederates that a junction of the principal forces should be effected before they appeared in the presence of their powerful enemies. Up to this time some of the allies had been kept in ignorance of his ultimate plans; but he had so skilfully managed his communications with them that they, in drawing toward the Moselle, might be ready to march far beyond to effect a junction with his main army. Marlborough passed the Neckar, on the 3d, by a bridge of boats at Ladenburg. He here halted for two days. Troops were drawing near to join him as he advanced—Dutch, Luxemburg, Hesse, and Danish allies. He then expected to be on the Danube in ten days; but he found the roads excessively difficult, and had to make circuitous marches. He evidently had an imperfect knowledge of the country. At Mundelshiem, on the 10th, Marlborough and Prince Eugene met for the first time, and after three days they were joined by Prince Louis of Baden. Prince Eugene was in Marlborough's full confidence, and they hoped to act together for their common object. But for the present they were unable to arrange that united command which each desired in his reliance upon the other's judgment. Prince Louis of Baden asserted his claim of precedence to be with the main army as its commander. It was at last agreed that he and Marlborough should command on alternate days; and that Eugene should return to the Rhine to command a body of thirty thousand men—"the security of the lines and the passage of the Rhine being of the last importance to us."‡

Toward the end of June we find in the letters of Marlborough ample evidence of the deep anxiety with which he regards the great crisis which is approaching. Slight indications of doubt and impatience manifest themselves beneath the surface of his imperturbable temper. His friends in Holland, he understands, are alarmed, and he entreats that they may be quieted; for if, misled by appearances, they were to give orders for their troops to march back, all his projects would be entirely disconcerted.§ On the 29th he writes to Harley, that the army, in camp at Giengen, is within two leagues of the Elector of Bavaria; but the Danish horse are not come up; "though if the Duke of Würtemberg had hastened his march, according to the repeated orders I sent, he might have been here by this time."‖ But the English infantry and artillery have at length joined the cavalry with which Marlborough himself had pushed on; and he is now ready for serious work. Marshal Tallard and Marshal Villeroy, he learns, are at Strasburg, preparing to send the elector a

* "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 251.
† Ibid., p. 252.
‡ Ibid., p. 258.
§ Ibid., p. 264.
‖ Ibid., p. 270.
¶ Voltaire, "Siècle de Louis XII."
** Cunningham, vol. i. p. 373.

* Cunningham, vol. i. p. 373.
† Coxe, "Memoirs of Marlborough," vol. i. p. 331, edit. 1820.
‡ "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 307.
§ Dispatch to M. d'Almelo, 23d June, vol. i. p. 323.
‖ Ibid., p. 328.

great reinforcement through the Black Forest.* One blow may be struck at the elector before his friends come to his aid.

On the 1st of July Marlborough had received advice from a peasant living near Donawert, that thirteen thousand Bavarians and French were posted in an intrenched camp upon the Schellenberg. This eminence is described by Mr. Hare, the duke's chaplain, as about two English miles in circumference at the base, having a gradual ascent, and a large flat at the top, where the enemy was encamped in several lines. The Schellenberg joined the town of Donawert, from which an intrenchment was carried round the top of the hill, at whose base, on the south, flowed the Danube. The intrenchment was the strongest and the most regular on the north, where the hill is accessible from a spacious plain. Cunningham has given a somewhat picturesque description of the Schellenberg: "On the top of the hill stands a church, with a churchyard, which was encompassed by the camp, and surrounded with the intrenchment. Adjoining to the churchyard is a little hill, which extends itself westward to a plain, and toward the south is broken into several hillocks, the bottoms whereof are washed by the Danube. Toward the east there is a ridge of hills covered by thick woods, frequented by robbers, and dangerous to passengers; and at this time not less fit for an ambuscade than the purposes of rapine."† At three o'clock on the morning of the 2d of July Marlborough marched out of his camp with a detachment of six thousand foot, thirty squadrons of horse, and three regiments of imperial grenadiers. The roads were difficult, and it was noon before they reached the river Wernitz, a tributary of the Danube. They had marched twelve miles, and there were yet three miles of very rough ways to pass. The main body of the army was following the detachment. Fatigued as the men were, the duke resolved to storm the Schellenberg before the night closed. At six o'clock the attack began. The foot advanced in four lines up the rising ground; the horse in two lines. The cannon from the intrenchments of the hills, and from the works at Donawert, swept away officers and men with case-shot. The allied troops carried fascines to be thrown down into the intrenchments; but by a mistake they threw them down into the hollow way which ran before the works, and the enemy came out of their trenches to charge a confused host, whose commanding officers were for the most part killed or wounded. But the English guards stood their ground, presenting that solid front which has arrested many an onset; and the Gallo-Bavarians retired. The whole force of the Schellenberg was now concentrated upon the English and Danish assailants. The infantry shrunk before the incessant fire; but the horse closed up and rallied them, and again they attacked with redoubled vigor. Meanwhile, the enemy having withdrawn his men from the works on the right, nearest to Donawert, Prince Louis of Baden led the imperialists to the feebly defended intrenchments, and they, throwing their fascines into the ditch, passed over with slight loss. The contest on the left still raged. The intrenchments were obstinately disputed, but at the end of an hour and a half the lines were forced; the allies possessed the camp; the routed enemy fled toward Donawert, whither they were pursued with great slaughter; the Bavarian general, Count d'Arco, saved himself with difficulty; and as the flying crowds crossed the bridge of the Danube it broke down, and the waters swallowed those who had escaped the sword. Only three thousand of the men of the intrenched camp of the Schellenberg joined the Elector of Bavaria, out of the twelve or thirteen thousand that occupied that almost impregnable position. But the allies also sustained a loss of more than five thousand killed and wounded. The determination of Marlborough to storm the intrenched camp was daring—almost rash. Marshal Conway, in 1774, viewed the ground, and wrote: "The intrenchments on the heights of Schellenberg are, for the form, still entire, and appear, both for construction and position, very strong."‡ There were fourteen English infantry regiments in the action, and seven of cavalry. Twenty-nine of their officers were killed, and eighty-six wounded. Marlborough, in his dispatch to Harley, does not mention the aid he received from the Prince of Baden. This was not jealousy, but contempt. The partisans of the prince repaid this, by ascribing the victory to the imperial general.

It would be a satisfaction to the honest pride of an Englishman if he could ascribe to the commands of the Prince of Baden the disgraceful scenes of the next fortnight. Negotiations had been going on between the emperor and the Elector of Bavaria, to induce the elector to join the allies. Articles had been agreed upon; but when the elector was expected to sign, he sent his secretary to say that as Marshal Tallard was marching with an army of thirty thousand men to his relief, it was not in his power, nor consistent with his honor, to quit the French interest. Marlborough, who relates this to Mr. Secretary Hedges, coolly adds, "We are now going to burn and destroy the elector's country, to oblige him to hearken to terms."* To burn and destroy a country may be a glib phrase of war, to which some persons may attach no very definite meaning. It was here no idle threat to make the elector come to terms. The work was set about in a very business-like manner. On the 31st of July three thousand horse were sent out, "to begin in the neighborhood of Munich," under the command of the Comte d'Orst Frise. To him Marlborough writes the next day to say, that he has desired the Comte de la Tour to execute the same job in another quarter, during a couple of days, "brûlant en attendant tout ce qu'il pourra."† On the 3d of August he writes to Harley, that his titled agents have returned, "having burnt a great number of villages between this and Munich, so that the elector can expect nothing less than the ruin of Bavaria for his obstinacy and breach of promise."‡ The elector can expect nothing less! But the elector's people? The politic duke thoroughly knew what "the ruin of Bavaria" meant. He is quite sentimental when he writes to his duchess about these matters. To burn and destroy "is so contrary to my nature, that nothing but absolute necessity would have obliged me to consent to it, for these poor people suffer for their master's ambition. There having been no war in this country for above sixty years, these towns and villages are so clean, that you would be pleased with them." His nature suffers, he says, to see so many fine places burned. And then the sweet domestic affections break forth from his troubled heart: "I shall never be easy and happy till I am quiet with you."§ He had a wife and children for whom he yearns. He has given up thousands of hapless wives and children to the destroyer. The villages, "so clean," that gave them shelter; the food they have just begun to gather into their garners; the standing corn—all are burned; the wives and children, with the husbands and fathers, are perishing, because the Elector of Bavaria prefers the French interest to that of the emperor. An English historian writes, "Thus was avenged the barbarous desolation of the Palatinate thirty years before."‖ Surely this sort of vengeance has at length become so odious that Churchill the duke, and Morgan the buccaneer, might be placed in the same category as enemies of the human race, if the hero, in all ages, had not been held exempt from the ordinary code of morals. In Mr. Addison's day such deeds were not held to be crimes; "courage and compassion" were joined in the "good and great" Marlborough, when "he thinks it vain to spare his rising wrath:"

> "The listening soldier fix'd in sorrow stands,
> Loth to obey his leader's just commands;
> The leader grieves, by generous pity sway'd,
> To see his just commands so well obey'd."¶

Forty years ago Archdeacon Coxe thus caressingly writes of his hero: "Although Marlborough was thus compelled to fulfil the most unwelcome duty which can fall to a general, his private correspondence shows that he felt as a man."** Perhaps the reverend biographer would have been less moved with the maudlin sentimentality of the letter to the duchess, which we have quoted, if he had known how one greater than Marlborough regarded such "duty." When Massena abandoned Portugal in March, 1811, burning and destroying every town and village as he retreated before the English army, Lord Wellington thus described the operations of the French general: "His retreat has been marked by a barbarity seldom equalled and never surpassed."†† Barbarity is the word—the act of a savage, as distinguished from the act of the civilized man. "The laws of war, *rigorously interpreted*, authorize such examples when the inhab-

* Dispatch to M. d'Almelo, 23d June, vol. i. p. 331.
† "History of Great Britain," vol. i. p. 377. ‡ MS. Letter.

* "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 358. † Ibid., p. 383. ‡ Ibid., p. 384.
§ Coxe, vol. i. p. 375. ‖ Alison's "Marlborough," p. 74.
¶ "The Campaign." ** Vol. i. p. 37.
†† Wellington Dispatches, vol. vii. p. 358.

itants take arms," writes Sir William Napier, the historian of the Peninsular campaigns. The quiet population upon whom Marlborough let loose all the terrors of fire and sword had not lifted a finger to oppose his progress. And yet Marlborough was not a cruel man. He always treated his prisoners with exemplary humanity. There may be situations in war when severity is truly mercy. Was this such a situation?

On the 3d of August Marlborough was encamped at Friedberg. He writes to Harley that the allies intend to march on the morrow, the artillery being ready at Nieuburg for the siege of Ingolstadt. Prince Louis, he says, "has made me the compliment either of commanding or covering the siege; I believe I shall choose the latter." He adds, "We have nothing new of M. Tallard, which makes us apprehensive that he may be halted at Ulm, in order to repass the Danube, by which he may be more uneasy to us than if he joined with the elector." Tallard, however, did join the elector, and their united forces were encamped at Biberach on the 8th of August. Marlborough had weakened his main army by dispatching Prince Louis to carry on the siege of Ingolstadt. Prince Eugene was encamped at Donawert. On the 9th Eugene hastily rode into Marlborough's camp, to announce that the united Gallo-Bavarian army had advanced from Biberach toward Lauingen, with the supposed intention of passing the Danube. It was agreed that the prince should be immediately reinforced, and that the whole army should advance nearer the Danube, in order to join him.* Tallard and the elector passed the Danube on the 10th, and encamped at Dillingen. On that day Marlborough was encamped at Schonefeldt. It was a crisis of extreme danger; for if Tallard had attacked either army before their junction, his superiority in numbers would have assured him a victory. Eugene commanded a force of twenty thousand men, composed of Prussians, Danes, Austrians, and troops of the empire. Marlborough commanded a force of thirty-six thousand men, composed of English, Dutch, Hessians, Hanoverians, and Danes. Tallard, and his fellow-general Marsin, commanded forty-eight thousand Frenchmen, and the Bavarians numbered twelve thousand. On the 11th Marlborough marched from Schonefeldt, and crossing the Lech at Rain, joined Eugene that night, having passed the Danube at Donawert. They intended to advance and encamp at Hochstet, "in order whereto," says Marlborough, "we went out on Tuesday [the 12th] early in the morning to view the ground, but found the enemy had already possessed themselves of it, whereupon we resolved to attack them."† It was no rash resolve, which dispensed with the necessary precautions to insure success. Marlborough and Eugene went up into the steeple of the church of Dapfheim; saw a camp being marked out upon a hill where the enemy's cavalry were stationed, and the infantry in full march toward it; carefully noted all the practicable ways from their own camp to that which they saw forming; and, to facilitate the movements of the next day, ordered a ravine to be levelled by their pioneers.‡ The allied army was encamped to the north-west of the river Kessel. The French and Bavarian army was encamped beyond the river Nebel, in the broadest part of the valley of the Danube, their right resting upon the great stream to which the Kessel, the Nebel, and two intervening rivulets are tributaries. The distance between the Kessel and the Nebel is four or five miles, with the wooded heights of the Schellenberg shutting in the valley, till it opens into the wide and fertile plain of Blenheim.

On the night of the 12th orders were given that the allied army should move before break of day. In the plain to the north-west of the Nebel there are three villages: Kremheim, close upon the Danube; Unterglaugh, in the centre of the valley; Berghausen, at its eastern extremity. At three o'clock in the morning of the 13th of August the army of Eugene, filing by the right, in four columns, and the army of Marlborough, also in four columns, were passing the Kessel, over bridges which had been constructed on the previous day. Two brigades, which had taken position in advance at Dapfheim the evening before, formed a ninth column. This column had a considerable accession of strength given to it, and, under the command of the gallant Lord Cutts, marched along the Danube, upon the extreme left, by Kremheim, with orders to attack the village of Blenheim. Marlborough and Eugene, with the advanced guard, were sufficiently near by seven o'clock to take a view of the positions of the Gallo-Bavarian army. Their right was at the village of Blenheim, where Marshal Tallard had his headquarters. Their left was at the village of Lutzingen, covered by a wood. The space occupied by their lines was in length about four miles, upon rising ground which commanded the whole plain to the Nebel, in front. The morning was hazy, and Tallard was somewhat unaccountably deceived as to the intentions of Marlborough and Eugene. In a postscript to a letter which he wrote at a very early hour, he says, "This thirteenth, the enemy beat 'la générale' at two o'clock, and at three 'l'assemblée.' . . . According to all appearance they will march to-day, and the report of the country is that they are going to Nordlingen." Tallard found his mistake when the sun cleared away the mist, and the columns of Eugene were seen coming out from the hill-side behind Berghausen. His first operation was to call in his foragers, and to set fire to the villages on that side of the Nebel on which the allies were advancing. At eight o'clock the French began to cannonade, and the batteries of Marlborough and Eugene soon replied. Eugene, however, had found considerable difficulty in taking up his ground. His march upon the edge of the wooded hills had been rough and circuitous. He had rivulets to cross running through swampy ground. His wing had been necessarily extended. It was past noon when he had placed his troops, upon the extreme right, in front of the Elector of Bavaria; and it had been agreed between the two commanders that the battle should not commence till both were ready. The announcement from Eugene was made; and then Marlborough mounted his horse, and gave the command that the lines should move forward to cross the Nebel, and that Cutts should commence the attack upon Blenheim.

The village of Plentheim, or Blenheim, had been converted by Tallard into a strong post. It appeared to him that the Nebel was impassable in the centre of the plain, and he therefore concentrated his chief strength on the right, leaving his left equally strong under the elector. The military critics of the time of Tallard severely blamed him for this disposition of his force. St. Simon says that, by a blindness without example, he had placed twenty-six battalions of infantry, six regiments of dragoons, and a brigade of cavalry—an entire army—merely for the purpose of holding a village, and supporting his right, which would have been better supported by the Danube. An English marshal, who viewed the ground seventy years afterward, writes, "As far as the disposition was concerned, the neglect of the centre, and the crowding so many battalions into Blenheim, while the flank of the village was not proportionally sustained, seem to me among the principal faults of M. Tallard."* The French marshal took extraordinary pains in the defence of Blenheim, by forming barricades between the village and the Danube, and by making every house and garden a little fortress. As far as regarded the attack upon this spot, the means of defence were wholly successful. At one o'clock the allied troops under Cutts descended to the Nebel, and crossed by two water-mills which had been set on fire. Brigadier-general Rowe led the English to the attack, supported by a brigade of Hessians. When they were within thirty yards of the palisades which surrounded the village, a heavy fire of grape swept away their ranks. Rowe led his men to the barriers, determined to enter sword in hand. He fell, mortally wounded, and the irresistible fire of the enemy compelled a speedy retreat. Squadron after squadron crossed the rivulet at other points, and advanced in front of the village. Three times were the assailants repulsed, but at last they held their ground, and were enabled to occupy the attention of the great body of troops within Blenheim, by keeping up a feigned attack, while the main body of Marlborough's army was crossing the Nebel. It was a difficult and dangerous operation, which occupied several hours. The stream in one part had two branches, with soft and marshy ground between each branch. "There was very great difficulty and danger," says the duke's chaplain, "in defiling over the rivulet in the face of an enemy already formed, and supported by several batteries of cannon; yet by the brave examples given and great diligence used by the commanding officers, and by the eagerness of the men, all passed over by degrees and kept their

* "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 387. † Ibid., p. 391.
‡ Hare's Journal: "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 396.

* MS. Letter of Marshal Conway. The "Memoirs of St. Simon" were not published when this letter was written.

ground."* The reliance of Tallard upon the difficulty of passing the marshes would appear to have been the reason that he offered no opposition to the passage of the allied army, but that of a continual discharge of cannon. St. Simon severely blames him that he left a large space between his own troops and the brook, that his enemies might pass at their ease, "to be overthrown afterward, as was said." The English, according to the same authority, speaking the opinions of French officers, had plenty of ground at their disposal, while Tallard by a different arrangement might have been master of a vast plain. Nevertheless, as the columns of the allies passed the stream, volleys of musketry were poured upon them, and the charges of French cavalry were incessant. The conflict gradually extended from the left to the centre, as English, Dutch, Danes, and Hanoverians came into position. Marsin, who commanded the French at the west of the valley, near the village of Oberglaugh, repulsed the Danish and Hanoverian horse. The Prince of Holstein Beck then led eleven battalions from the heights on the opposite side of the Nebel, and began to cross. His columns were immediately charged by nine battalions, including the Irish brigade in the French service, and the foremost battalions of Holstein Beck were cut to pieces. Marlborough then led a body of cavalry and infantry to the rescue, and compelled the enemy to retire. During the passage of the left wing of the allies, Prince Eugene had been fighting the elector on the right with indifferent success. Three times had he attacked, and three times he had been compelled to retire to the wood, and re-form his broken ranks. As the sun was westering the issue of the battle might appear doubtful. The French, on the extreme left of the line of the allies, held Blenheim securely. The French and Bavarians on the right had repulsed all the spirited attacks of Eugene, and the combatants faced each other, exhausted and irresolute. The main bodies under Tallard and Marlborough had not yet come to a general encounter. Marlborough has formed his cavalry in two lines in the centre of the plain, with his infantry in their rear toward the left. At five o'clock the trumpets sound a charge, and the horse and foot mount the acclivity. The French receive the charge firmly, and the allies fall back, but still keep the brow of the hill. Their cannon are brought up, and the fire on each side is close and incessant. It is the weak part of the French line, and they cannot stand against the storm of musketry. Another charge, and now the French horse are scattered. Nine battalions of French infantry that had been intermingled with their cavalry are cut to pieces. Marsin has fallen back to avoid a flank attack, and the centre of the French line is more and more in danger. Tallard dispatches orders to the little army shut up in Blenheim to come to his aid. It is too late. He sends for a reinforcement to the elector. Eugene has given the elector enough to do in his own position. A third charge of Marlborough's horse, and the battle is won. The centre of the French lines is broken by these terrible charges, and now Tallard's cavalry endeavor to rally behind the tents of their camp. The allies close upon them. The rout is now general. Some fly toward Hochstet, about two miles in the rear. Others crowd to the nearer village of Sonderheim, upon the bank of the Danube. General Hompesch pursues those who had gone in the direction of Hochstet. Marlborough himself, with his victorious cavalry, charges upon those who fled toward Sonderheim. Down the steep banks of the Danube rush the fugitives. Many attempt to swim the river, and are drowned. Others file toward Hochstet under the banks, and prepare to rally. The victorious squadrons appear, and again they flee. Marshal Tallard has reached Sonderheim, but he finds retreat impossible, and surrenders himself to an aide-de-camp of the Prince of Hesse. One extraordinary document still in existence exhibits the wonderful self-possession of the conqueror in this agony of his triumph. The great duke pauses a minute in his pursuit of the flying enemy to write this note, in pencil, to his duchess, upon a slip of paper, torn from a memorandum-book:

"August 13th, 1704.

"I have not time to say more, but to beg you will give my Duty to the Queen, and let her know her Army has had a Glorious Victory. Monsr. Tallard and two other Generals are in my Coach, and I am following the rest. the bearer my Aid de Camp Coll Parke will give Her and account of what has passed, I shal doe it in a day or two by another more at large "Marlborough"

* "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 403.

The fighting was over. And there was a large body of Bavarians and French at one end of the line, and there were twelve thousand French shut up in Blenheim at the other end. The troops of the elector and of Marsin seeing the rout of Tallard, and being closely pressed by Eugene, had set fire to their positions of Oberglaugh and Lutzingen, and were moving away in unbroken order. Night was coming on; the distance was indistinct from the clouds of smoke which hung over the battle-field; and Marlborough, mistaking the troops of Eugene for part of the army of the elector, "marching in good order, and in such a direction as might have enabled them advantageously to flank our squadrons, had they charged the other part of the elector's force"*—offered no interruption to their retreat. The scene at Blenheim was of a far more stirring character. During the day the French there had held out against every attack; but now, when the main body of Tallard's army was routed, the allies closed round the barricaded village. Horse and foot were ready to assail the isolated forces in every direction. Artillery was brought up, and batteries constructed. All the great English generals were assembled to unite in this final struggle. Cutts was there, and Orkney with his Scotch Royal; Churchill, and Lumley; Ross, and Ingoldsby; Webb, and Wood. The French finally surrendered as prisoners of war. St. Simon has told the story of this surrender, with a Frenchman's sense of national humiliation, but with a minuteness which leaves no doubt that he had his details from the first authority—that of the officer who signed the capitulation. This officer was Blansac, the camp-marshal, who had been left in command when his superior officer had abruptly withdrawn himself. Denonville, a young officer who had been taken prisoner, came toward the village, and waving a handkerchief, demanded a parley. He came to exhort Blansac and the troops to surrender. Blansac sharply dismissed him. Denonville returned again, with an English lord, who demanded a parley with the commandant. The Englishman told Blansac that the Duke of Marlborough had directed him to say that he was marching upon Blenheim with forty battalions and sixty pieces of cannon; that he was beginning to surround the village on all sides; that there was no force left to support the position; that Tallard was in flight; that the elector had retreated; that he had no succor to hope; and that he had better surrender himself and all his men as prisoners of war. Blansac was for sending the lord back with a hasty refusal. But the Englishman pressed him to step out of the village with him, only a couple of hundred paces, and behold the state of things with his own eyes. Blansac could no longer doubt. He returned, and submitted to his chief officers that, however frightful would be the impression upon the French nation that twenty-six battalions and twelve squadrons should have surrendered as prisoners of war, it was better to preserve so many brave men for the future service of their king. "This horrible capitulation," as St. Simon terms it, was forthwith signed. Marlborough was embarrassed by the number of his prisoners. In a few days he had more than twelve thousand on his hands; and he writes to Sir Charles Hedges, "they are not only very troublesome, but oblige us to continue here, while we should be pursuing our blow and following the enemy." †

The post road from Ulm to Ratisbon traverses a part of the field of Blenheim. It "rests partly on a foundation of bones of men and horses, part of which were disinterred in constructing it a few years back."‡ This is more wholesale evidence of the mighty battle than when little Peterkin found "something large and round" beside the rivulet, and old Kaspar shook his head with a natural sigh:

"'Tis some poor fellow's skull, said he,
Who fell in the great victory." §

It is computed that the two armies of Marlborough and Eugene had eleven thousand men killed and wounded; and the armies of France and the elector, fourteen thousand. It was supposed that the total loss of the French and Bavarians in the battle, and during their retreat amounted to forty thousand men, including prisoners and deserters.‖ The blow to the power of France was tremendous. All

* Hare, "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 457. † Ibid., p. 414.
‡ Murray's "Hand-Book of Southern Germany," p. 137.
§ Southey, "Battle of Blenheim."
‖ Dispatch of Cardonnell to Harley. "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 409.

the prestige of her glories under Turenne and Luxemburg was gone. "There never," says Cunningham, "was a battle fought within the memory of man, wherein either the courage of the soldiers or the prudence of the generals were more conspicuous than on this day, which first ruined the French fortunes, and put a stop to their long course of victories." Louis received the fatal news on the 21st, but without any details. For six days he remained in uncertainty as to the real losses. "We were not used to misfortunes," says St. Simon. "The grief of the king at this disgrace and this loss, at the moment when he believed that the fate of Europe was in his hands, may be imagined. When he might have counted upon striking a decisive blow, he saw himself reduced to act simply upon the defensive."

The day after a great victory rarely leaves the conqueror at his ease. Marlborough had no dread of a desperate enemy returning to a new contest. The French were flying through the Black Forest, and did not hold themselves safe until they had crossed the Rhine by the bridge of Strasburg. On the night of the battle the victors found a hundred slaughtered oxen in the French camp, with other food. On the 15th of August Marlborough was imploring the Duke of Würtemberg to send him two hundred wagons to carry bread to the army, without which, he says, "we can neither stir nor remain where we are." The English soldiers, when the oxen were devoured, could not subsist upon the herbs and vegetables that they found in the French tents. In a previous letter Marlborough had said to Godolphin, "Our greatest difficulty is that of making our bread follow us; for the troops that I have the honor to command cannot subsist without it; and the Germans, that are used to starve, cannot advance without us." He had not only to feed his own camp, but had twelve thousand prisoners, who would be as clamorous under starvation as the English and Dutch. The 17th of August "was devoutly observed through the whole army, in returning thanks to Almighty God for his blessing upon the arms of the allies."* The difficulties were speedily surmounted, and on the 20th the army was before Ulm. "We must not leave this city behind us," writes the provident general. "When we are masters of it, I believe the French will hardly attempt coming again into this country."† On the 12th of September Marlborough received the news that the garrison had capitulated. The allies were then advancing to the siege of Landau, which the Prince of Baden was to conduct, and Marlborough was to cover with his army, for Villeroy was hovering around, but would not come to battle. The defence of this strongly fortified place was very obstinate. On the 8th of November Marlborough writes to Harley, "Our people are entire masters of the counterscarp, from whence we are now firing with near sixty pieces of cannon at the breach."‡ He was impatient to go to Berlin, to conclude an agreement with the King of Prussia for a large addition to the allied forces. Meanwhile he had concluded a treaty with the Electress of Bavaria, who was left regent, by which she agreed that all her troops should be disbanded. Honors were coming thick upon the conqueror. He was admitted a prince of the Roman Empire by the Emperor of Germany, and is addressed by him as "Most Illustrious Cousin and dear Prince." A principality was created for him. Leaving what he calls "this tedious siege" of Landau, he posts to Berlin, and concludes his treaty with the king. On the 3d of December he receives, at Hanover, the news of the capitulation of Landau. Trierbach, another strong place, also fell. On the 16th of December he is at the Hague, preparing to sail for England, with Marshal Tallard and others, his distinguished prisoners. On the 22d he embarked at Rotterdam; and on the 26th he dates from St James's.

The Duke of Marlborough took his seat on his arrival in the House of Peers. When he stood up to answer the congratulatory address of the lord keeper, who ascribed everything to the general and nothing to his troops, he wisely and modestly replied: "My lords, I am extremely sensible of the great honor your lordships are pleased to do me. I must beg, on this occasion, to do right to all the officers and soldiers I had the honor of having under my command. Next to the blessing of God, the good success of this campaign is owing to their extraordinary courage. I am sure it will be a great satisfaction, as well as an encouragement to the whole army, to find their services so favorably accepted." He replied in very similar terms to the complimentary address of the House of Commons. A reward more solid than congratulations was immediately bestowed upon him. Soon after the Commons had unanimously voted their address, the queen sent a message to the effect that her majesty having taken into her consideration their address, "relating to the great services performed by the Duke of Marlborough, does incline to grant the interest of the crown in the honor and manor of Woodstock, and hundred of Wootton, to him and his heirs"—desiring the assistance of the house to clear off the incumbrance of the property, the rents and profits having been granted for two lives. Upon this noble estate of Woodstock—the ancient palace of the Plantagenets—the favorite haunt of Chaucer—the retreat of Elizabeth in her early days of fear and sorrow—was built the palace of Blenheim.

While Marlborough had been conducting his wonderful campaign of 1704, it had been felt by the violent Tory party in England that he had ceased to belong to them. The triumphant resistance to the power of France was not in harmony with their ancient hopes, which led them to look to some day when the great Louis should give them back a king with a more legitimate title, in their eyes, than any title that could be conferred by an Act of Settlement. The wife of Burnet had written to the Duchess of Marlborough, after the news of the great day of Blenheim, that certain people said, "It was true a great many men were killed and taken, but that to the French king was no more than to take a bucket of water out of a river." The duchess transmitted this to her lord, and he replied, "If they will allow me to draw one or two such buckets more, I should think we might then let the river run quietly, and not much apprehend its overflowing and destroying its neighbors."* With this manifestation of contempt, we nevertheless find the equability of the duke disturbed by the acrimony of the party at home, who were still powerful in the House of Commons. He writes to the duchess, in October, "I will endeavor to leave a good name behind me in countries that have hardly any blessing but that of not knowing the detested names of Whig and Tory. . . . I shall certainly not care what any party thinks of me, being resolved to recommend myself to the people of England, by being, to the best of my understanding, in the true interest of my country."† When Marlborough came home he found the people of England ready enough to give him the heartiest welcome, without reference to the passionate quarrels of factions. The standards that had been taken in the campaign were carried in a grand military procession from the Tower to Westminster Hall, and there hung up, with the whole population of London shouting for Anne and Marlborough as a hundred and twenty pikemen each carried one of these tattered emblems of victory. When the hero was entertained by the city, the roofs and windows of the houses sent forth as hearty shouts of gratulation as when Raleigh and Drake went to St. Paul's to return thanks for the defeat of the Spanish Armada. The factions of the Commons cared nothing for a national triumph—they sought only the triumph of a party. They had for a third time brought forward the factious bill against occasional conformity, before Marlborough returned home; and they had made the most strenuous efforts to tack it to a money bill which was to enable the war to be continued. The scheme was defeated. The tackers, as they were called, became ridiculous to the nation. The Commons then passed the bill, without tacking it to a money bill. Marlborough arrived in time to vote against it in this amended form. It was thrown out by the Lords. On the 14th of March the queen, in proroguing the parliament, spoke of "unreasonable humor and animosity," and exhorted to prudence and moderation. "When this session," says Burnet, "and with it this parliament, came to an end, it was no small blessing to the queen and to the nation that they got well out of such hands. They had discovered, on many occasions, and very manifestly, what lay at bottom with most of them; but they had not skill enough to know how to manage their advantages, and to make use of their numbers. The constant successes with which God had blessed the queen's reign put it out of their power to compass that which was aimed at by them; the forcing a peace, and of consequence the delivering all up to France."‡ Marlborough, though he still affected to be of no faction, saw the time had passed

* "Dispatches," vol. i. p. 417. † Ibid., p. 420. ‡ Ibid., p. 531.

* Coxe, vol. ii. pp. 42–44. † Ibid., pp. 45–47.
‡ "Own Time," vol. v. p. 494.

by when he could have the support of the party which the queen had first marked by her favor. Those who had attempted to stop the supplies by tacking to their vote the Occasional Conformity Bill were the High Tories, with whom he long conspired to make the life of King William a burden to him, by disturbing all his designs for the independence of nations. Marlborough, after the session was ended, wrote to Godolphin, "As to what you say of the tackers I think the answer and method that should be taken is what is practised in all armies—that is, if the enemy give no quarter they should have none given to them." Godolphin's mode of giving no quarter was to deprive every man of public employment "who had given his vote for the tack." Whigs gradually were called by Godolphin into the public service, and political aspirants began to see that there was not only a virtue in moderation, but that it was a virtue which brought its own reward.

CHAPTER CXXXVI.

The war in Spain—Expedition to Catalonia—Gibraltar taken by Sir George Rooke and the Prince of Darmstadt—Sea-fight off Malaga—Siege of Gibraltar by the Spaniards—Expedition to Spain under Peterborough—Siege of Barcelona—Peterborough surprises Montjouich—Barcelona taken—Peterborough's rapid successes in Valencia—Philip V. besieges Barcelona—It is relieved—The allies enter Madrid—Supineness of the Austrian king—Disgust of Peterborough—He leaves Spain—Prince Eugene drives the French out of Italy.

While Marlborough was leading the army of the allies to the Rhine—an army upon whose success depended the great issue between the King of France and the Emperor of Germany—the Archduke Charles, who had assumed the title of King of Spain, had landed at Lisbon, and was prepared to head the troops on the western frontier of the kingdom to which he laid claim. But instead of carrying the war into Spain, the army of English, Dutch, and Portuguese were completely held in check by the Duke of Berwick; and the allies were unable to prevent several of the Portuguese towns being taken by the Spaniards. At the opposite extremity of the peninsula an attempt was made to rouse the Catalans to declare for King Charles. The Prince of Darmstadt was sanguine of success, and a little army of five or six thousand men was put under his command. They embarked at Lisbon in May, in a fleet of which Sir George Rooke was the admiral. The expedition landed at Barcelona; but receiving very little support from the people, it re-embarked, and Rooke sailed down the Mediterranean, and passed through the Straits, where he effected a junction with a fleet under Sir Cloudsley Shovel. It was not in the nature of English sailors willingly to return to port without effecting anything; and so the admirals planned an attack upon Gibraltar, in which the Prince of Darmstadt agreed to join. The famous rock on which the Saracens had built their castle in the eighth century, and which they held till the middle of the fifteenth century, was strongly fortified by the Spaniards; but its vast importance as the key of the Mediterranean was not estimated as in more recent times. In 1704 there were not more than a hundred men within the works; but they were commanded by a brave veteran who rejected with disdain the summons to surrender. Two thousand marines, under the command of the Prince of Darmstadt, landed on the isthmus, now known as the Neutral Ground, and the supplies from the mainland were thus cut off. On the 2d of August Rooke commenced a bombardment from his ships, which was continued on the next day. That day was a great festival, and a part of the garrison went to pray to their saint, instead of standing by their guns. The eastern part of the rock was thus imperfectly defended, and the English sailors scaled the precipice. At the same time the South Molehead was stormed, with a heavy loss to the assailants by the springing of a mine. But they gained the ramparts, and all resistance was at an end. The brave governor made honorable terms for himself and his garrison; and upon the rock which has defied every besieger through a century and a half, the English flag floated in an easy victory. Sir George Rooke took possession in the name of the Queen of England; although the Prince of Darmstadt would have hoisted the Spanish standard and proclaimed King Charles.*

* Mahon, "War of the Succession," p. 100.

The Prince of Darmstadt remained at Gibraltar with a force of two thousand men. The English fleet then went in search of a French fleet that had been equipped at Toulon, and was under the command of the high-admiral of France, the Count de Toulouse. Rooke had been joined by some Dutch vessels; the French admiral had also been joined by some Spanish vessels. These two armaments, formidable in the number of their ships, met off Malaga. They fought all day; but not a ship of the hundred vessels engaged was sunk, or burned, or taken, on either side. Nothing exhibits a more striking contrast to the naval engagements of the days of Nelson than this drawn battle. And yet we must not conceive that little damage was done, or that it was a bloodless action. Sir Cloudsley Shovel describes the fight as "very sharp." He says, "There is hardly a ship that must not shift one mast, and some must shift all."* The French fleet was even more disabled. The Count de Toulouse sailed away to Toulon, and Rooke made for Gibraltar. Te Deum was sung in Paris for a great victory, and thanksgivings were offered up at St. Paul's for the blessing upon her majesty's arms. Three thousand English and Dutch were killed and wounded, and the estimated loss of the French was four thousand—a terrible slaughter of brave men without any decisive results.

The capture of Gibraltar was considered a very serious blow by the court of Madrid, and before the autumn of 1704 was passed eight thousand men, under the Marquis of Villadaria, commenced a siege. The Earl of Galway, who in 1704 was appointed to the command of the troops in Portugal, sent four regiments to the aid of the garrison of Gibraltar, with supplies of ammunition and provisions.† The Prince of Darmstadt made a brave and judicious resistance. The Captain-General of Andalusia, whose energy had saved Cadiz in 1702, was unable to make any impression upon those who now held the rock with an adequate force. The English fleet constantly threw in fresh supplies to the besieged, which the French admiral, De Pontis, was powerless to prevent. The besiegers were ill supplied with necessaries. A French commander was sent to supersede Villadaria, but matters were not improved by the change. Sir John Leake, in March, attacked De Pontis, and swept away what remained of the French naval power. The siege was raised; and the Spaniards saw with dismay that a fortress which they had neglected properly to defend had been rendered impregnable. It was some time before the English government appreciated the true value of Gibraltar; but during the war of the succession it was always vigorously defended against many attempts to retake it, and in 1713 its possession was confirmed to England by the Peace of Utrecht.

In our brief relation of the great campaign of 1704 we have exhibited, however imperfectly, those wonderful qualities of Marlborough by which he appears, in all his movements, to have left nothing to accident. The most enduring patience; a temper never to be disturbed; a caution that allowed no surprise; a foresight that left no contingency unprovided for—these were qualities even more remarkable than his daring and courage when the hour arrived for their display. It has been said of Marlborough—by a writer who has succeeded in the very difficult task of presenting the broadest aspects of history with the clearness and precision that are rarely obtained without minute detail—"for the first time, in English history at least, a march was equivalent to a battle. A change of his camp, or even a temporary retreat, was as effectual as a victory; and it was seen by the clearer observers of his time, that a campaign was a game of skill, and not of the mere dash and intrepidity which appeal to the vulgar passions of our nature."‡ As if to exhibit, upon a different theatre of the same great warfare, the most remarkable contrast to the character and actions of Marlborough, Charles Mordaunt, Earl of Peterborough, took the command of an expedition to Spain. He has come upon the scene at times in various characters. He has accompanied William of Orange to England in 1689. He has lost his position as a statesman; has been sent to the Tower; has been deprived of his places and emoluments, in carrying on a system of intrigues in the proceedings against Fenwick in 1696. He attempted to save the life of the accused—endeavoring to implicate two of the leading

* Letter printed in Tindal, vol. iv. p. 665.
† Galway's Narrative. "Parliamentary Hist." vol. vi. col. 941.
‡ "Eighteen Christian Centuries," by the Rev. James White, p. 485.

Whigs in the conspiracy, by inducements to Fenwick to accuse them; and then he turned round upon the unhappy man when the scheme broke down, and was strenuous for his attainder. Restless and changeable, vain and flighty, too adroit to be wise, all parties became afraid of him. But with all his eccentricities, his genius commands the admiration of the cleverest, and his profusion buys the flattery of the meanest. He adores the ladies with the homage of a knight-errant; and he rushes into war as if he were to be the first lance in a tournament. His craving for excitement kept him always in motion; and it was said that he had seen more kings and more postilions than any man in Europe. Pope declared of him, with sound judgment, "He has too much wit as well as courage to make a solid general." What he did in Spain is one of the marvels of history—a series of exploits beside which romance may "pale its uneffectual fire." When Peterborough sailed from Portsmouth, in June, 1705, having the command of five thousand men, and with general directions "to make a vigorous push in Spain," he had precisely that commission which suited his character. It was a service of hazard which was agreeable to his chivalric nature; for he scarcely did justice to his own courage when he said that it proceeded from his not knowing when he was in danger. He had very inadequate resources of men and money, and thus he had difficulties to overcome which pleasurably tasked all his mental energies. He was left unfettered by minute instructions, and had unlimited authority over the land forces and a divided command with Sir Cloudesley Shovel at sea—which circumstances gave him, as he imagined, free scope for the pursuit of his own road to fame, by the shortest and steepest path. Macaulay calls Peterborough "the most extraordinary character of that age, the King of Sweden himself not excepted. . . . a polite, learned, and amorous Charles the Twelfth."* Swift pointed to some such comparison in well-known lines on Peterborough:

> "Ne'er to be match'd in modern reading
> But by his namesake, Charles of Sweden."

The wit, the learning, the accomplished manners, the very faults of Peterborough made him a favorite with the most celebrated men of his time. "I love the hang-dog dearly," wrote Swift to Stella. Johnson, with the same feeling of respect for Peterborough's brilliant qualities, was curious in the later years of his life to learn more about him, saying, "He is a favorite of mine, and is not enough known."

It is remarkable that the most trustworthy as well as the most interesting account of Peterborough's actions in Spain was for some time thought to be a fictitious narrative. "The Military Memoirs of Captain George Carleton" have been unhesitatingly ascribed to Defoe—chiefly because "we are reminded of him by the plain matter-of-fact, and off-handed manner of telling a story"—and because the events, which are "matters of history, are related with all the minuteness and personality of an eye-witness, and an actor upon the spot."† The very existence of Captain George Carleton has been questioned. Lord Stanhope [Mahon] has settled this doubt;‡ and he believes, as Dr. Johnson believed, in the perfect authenticity of this, "the most valuable, perhaps, because the most undoubtedly faithful and impartial, of all our materials for this war."§ We may safely follow this guide, in tracing the actions of a man who, "by a course of conduct and fortune almost miraculous, had nearly put us into the possession of the kingdom of Spain; was left wholly unsupported; exposed to the envy of his rivals; disappointed by the caprices of a young inexperienced prince, under the guidance of a rapacious German ministry; and at last called home in discontent."‖

When Peterborough with his troops arrived at Lisbon he was reinforced by two regiments of dragoons—men without horses, which the earl, who never made difficulties, had to provide. He here took on board the Archduke Charles and a numerous suite. At Gibraltar he received two veteran battalions, in exchange for the same number of recruits which he had brought from England. The Prince of Darmstadt also here joined Peterborough. That prince had one dominant idea—a siege of Barcelona. Peterborough opposed the plan. The archduke upheld his countryman, in the scheme of attempting, with seven thousand men, the reduction of a place which was far better prepared for defence than when the expedition of the previous summer had resulted in a complete failure, and which required thirty thousand men for a regular siege. With the squadron under Sir Cloudesley Shovel, the fleet sailed from Gibraltar. Making Altea Bay, a landing was effected near Valencia; and here the people were found favorable to the cause of the Austrian prince, who was proclaimed, upon the surrender of the Castle of Denia, as Charles III., King of Spain and the Indies. Peterborough, encouraged by this reception, conceived an enterprise, "which would in all probability have brought that war to a much more speedy conclusion, and at the same time have obviated all those difficulties which were but too apparent in the siege of Barcelona."* King Philip was at Madrid with few troops. All the Spanish forces were on the frontiers of Portugal, or in Catalonia. It was only a march of fifty leagues from Valencia to Madrid, and the centre of Spain was undefended. Such an exploit had every chance of success, if Peterborough could have dashed upon the capital without being fettered by the hesitation of Charles or the preconceptions of Darmstadt. He was overruled. The Valencians were left to shout "Viva Carlos" in vain. The expedition went on, under the pressure of weak and timid, but truly rash counsels, to attack "one of the largest and most populous cities in all Spain, fortified by bastions, one side secured by the sea, and the other by a strong fortification called Montjouich."† A council of war had decided against Peterborough's plan of a march to Madrid; but when the expedition arrived before Barcelona, another council thought the undertaking of a siege too formidable. Charles, however, pressed the enterprise with a tenacity that could not be resisted, and to which Peterborough at length yielded. The troops were landed on the 27th of August.

In three weeks there was nothing but dissensions among the great men of this expedition. Peterborough had received new instructions from home to respect the opinions of the princes and of councils of war. They were all differing in opinion. The Prince of Darmstadt and the earl had come to an open rupture. The Dutch officers said their troops should not join in an enterprise so manifestly impossible of success for a small force. It was considered by them an act of madness to attack the town from the eastern plain where the troops were encamped—a position which involved the necessity of making regular approaches under the fire of heavy batteries. Peterborough conceived a plan of attack totally opposed to all the routine modes of warfare. The citadel of Montjouich, built on the summit of a ridge of hills skirting the sea, commanded the town. Peterborough went out secretly from the camp, viewed the ground, and determined upon attempting a surprise of a garrison that considered themselves safe in an impregnable place. He gave notice that he should raise the siege, sent his heavy artillery on board the ships, and made every preparation for embarking the troops. With twelve hundred foot soldiers and two hundred horse he marched out of the camp on the evening of the 13th of September, and, passing by the quarters of the Prince of Darmstadt, told him that if he chose to come with him he might see what troops could do that had been subjected to his reproaches. The prince took him at his word. They marched all night by the side of the mountains, and before daybreak were under the hill of Montjouich, and close to the outer works. Peterborough's officers thought that their general would make the attack in the dark. He showed them that when they were discovered at daylight the enemy would descend into the outer ditch to repel them, and that then was the time to receive their fire, leap in upon them, drive them into the outer works, and gain the fortress by following them close. The scheme succeeded, and the English were soon masters of the bastion. A similar attack on the opposite side of the fortress was also successful. But the governor of the fort, having obtained some reinforcements from Barcelona, the men were welcomed with shouts by their comrades, which the Prince of Darmstadt mistaking for a signal of surrender, he incautiously advanced, lost two hundred of his party as prisoners,

---

* Essays. † Wilson's Defoe, vol. iii. p. 590.

‡ "Carleton states in his 'Memoirs,' that he was taken prisoner, with the garrison, at the petty siege of Denia, in 1708. After some search I found in a large heap of military accounts and returns for that year a list of the officers taken at Denia, and among them 'Captain Carleton.'" § "War of Succession in Spain," p. 133.

‖ Swift, "Conduct of the Allies."

* Carleton. † Ibid.

and was himself killed at the moment when Peterborough came to his rescue. Intelligence then arrived that three thousand men were marching from Barcelona. Peterborough rode out to reconnoitre. As he returned he was told by Carleton that the men were flying out of their posts, in one general panic, with Lord Charlemont at their head. "Immediately upon this notice from me," says Carleton, "the earl galloped up the hill, and alighting when he came to Lord Charlemont, he took his half-pike out of his hand, and turning to the officers and soldiers, told them, if they would not face about and follow him they should have the scandal and eternal infamy upon them of having deserted their posts and abandoned their general." All the posts were regained; and the three thousand Spaniards returned alarmed to Barcelona. The citadel held out for several days, but was finally reduced by a bombardment from the hills, the cannon having been relanded from the ships. The reduction of Montjouich by this extraordinary act of daring was very soon followed by the surrender of Barcelona. Success gave spirit to those who had before been hopeless. The sailors dragged heavy guns up the hills, and joined the land-troops in forming intrenchments. The town was so fiercely bombarded that a breach was soon effected; and the besiegers were preparing to storm, when the governor beat a parley, and agreed to surrender with all honors of war. His soldiers had mutinied; the people of the city were in a state of riot; and the governor, who was unpopular, was in danger of his life. Peterborough, with the same indomitable courage that he had shown in the assault of Montjouich, being apprised of the tumult, demanded admittance at one of the gates. Carleton, who accompanied him, describes a scene very characteristic of this modern Amadis. He met a lady of extraordinary beauty flying from the fury of the Miquelets—the armed peasants of the province—who implored his protection. Peterborough took the lady by the hand—she proved to be the Duchess of Popoli—and conveyed her through the wicket by which he entered, to a place of safety without the town. "I believe it was much the longest part of an hour," says Carleton, "before he returned." When he did return he saved the governor, got him on board one of the ships, and by that extraordinary ascendency which a determined will and the total absence of fear have over the passions of a multitude, "wherever he appeared the popular fury was in a moment allayed."

The possession of Barcelona, in which King Charles III. was proclaimed with great solemnity, was followed by the adhesion to his cause of the chief towns of Catalonia. Peterborough was for following up his wonderful success by other daring operations. The German ministers and the Dutch officers opposed all his projects. At length a pressing request came to Charles to send assistance to San Mateo, which was besieged by the Count of Las Torres. There were twelve hundred troops at Tortosa, to which Peterborough sent orders to cross the Ebro. He was with them as soon as his messenger, expecting to find a large army of peasantry ready to join him, as he had been informed. The army was a mere illusion. But there was a small force only, he was told, before San Mateo. He found seven thousand; and yet, by a series of daring efforts, he raised the siege and entered the town in triumph. But for him there was no repose. He determined to follow Las Torres. "His foot were marching on the stony mountains, and in a winter season, without clothes or shoes, and his few dragoons were upon horses that could hardly go on." * He received an express, commanding him to send his troops back to Barcelona, for the safety of the king's person. He sent back his infantry, and followed the retreating army of Las Torres with only two hundred cavalry. What would have been mere desperation in another man, was, in his conduct of such a warfare, the most perfect strategy. By his rapid marches, his confident tone, his disguise of his real strength, he kept up the terror of the thousands who were flying before his two hundred, and towns opened their gates to him without a blow. But a more important service awaited Peterborough. The magistrates of Valencia, which city had thrown off its allegiance to King Philip, sent messengers to implore the aid of Peterborough; for a body of ten thousand men was approaching to invest their city. He managed to recall the infantry which he had sent back to Barcelona, and obtained some other reinforcements. On the 1st of February, 1706, Peterborough had about three thousand men under his command. The Duke of Arcos, the Spanish general, was encamped upon a wide plain, over which Peterborough must pass on his way to Valencia. Between him and the plain was a formidable pass under the walls of Murviedro, built under the hill upon which Carleton saw "the ruins of the once famous Saguntum; famous sure to eternity, if letters shall last so long, for an invincible fidelity to a negligent confederate against an implacable enemy." The classic mind of Peterborough might have thought of Hannibal's eight months' siege of Saguntum; but he was not to be stopped by any such tedious process. The commander at Murviedro, Mahoni, was of Irish extraction, and was not unknown to Peterborough, having been related to his first wife. By a stratagem of no very worthy character—more resembling some of his old political manœuvres than the frank honesty of a soldier—he succeeded in throwing Mahoni off his guard, and then in inspiring the Duke of Arcos with suspicion of his faithful officer at Murviedro. Peterborough requested a conference with Mahoni; endeavored in vain to induce him to join the cause of King Charles; drew from him an admission of the advice which he meant to give to Arcos, which was to remain in the plain; and then contrived to send the duke an intimation, through two of his men, who pretended to be deserters, that Mahoni had undertaken to betray his post, and to advise the duke to remain in his position, that he might there be sacrificed. When the frank Irishman's letter of advice was delivered to Arcos, he determined to move precisely in an opposite direction to that which was advised. He thus left the way open to Peterborough to march to Valencia; for Mahoni was arrested, and as Arcos was gone, the pass of Murviedro was undefended.* Peterborough had not long rested in this pleasant city when he sallied forth to attack a body of four thousand horse; came upon their encampment with a force not a third of their number, and returned to Valencia with six hundred prisoners, having utterly routed the troops of King Philip. "Here," says Carleton, "the Earl of Peterborough made his residence for some time. He was extremely well beloved; his affable behavior exacted as much from all; and he preserved such a good correspondence with the priests and the ladies that he never failed of the most early and best intelligence."

While Peterborough was carrying on this astonishing warfare in Valencia, the news of the fall of Barcelona had reached England, and the queen had gone to parliament in great exultation, to recommend the Commons especially "to improve the opportunity which God Almighty is pleased to afford us, of putting a prosperous end to the present war." † Such was the estimation in which the deeds of Peterborough were then regarded. A sum of two hundred and fifty thousand pounds was voted, "for her majesty's proportion of the charge of prosecuting the successes already gained by King Charles III., for the recovery of the monarchy of Spain to the house of Austria." It was soon found that King Charles was incompetent to follow up the successes which Peterborough had accomplished for him. The young Bourbon king, Philip V., took a vigorous resolution. He marched from Madrid with a force which, being joined by that of Marshal Tessé, enabled him to enter Catalonia with twenty thousand men. Charles in April was shut up in Barcelona, while a large army was investing the city by land, and it was blockaded by a French fleet. The officers of Charles exhorted him to fly. Though he wanted energy he had passive courage; and he remained in the beleaguered city, animating the population with appeals to their superstitious feelings, for he declared that the Holy Virgin had manifested herself to him, and told him that the Catalans would never forsake him. Nevertheless Montjouich fell, after being bombarded for twenty-three days. Peterborough, meanwhile, had rapidly marched from Valencia, with two thousand foot and six hundred horse, and from the mountains above Barcelona he kept the besieging forces in perpetual alarm. But he had a project of more importance than this partisan warfare, however suited to his genius. A fleet was coming from England under Admiral Leake, on board of which was General Stanhope with reinforcements. Leake, whose caution

* Friend's Account, quoted by Lord Mahon, p. 163.

* Carleton's "Memoirs" relate this strange story in considerable detail. The captain does not appear to think that his general was doing anything beyond his duty in carrying out this complicated deception. It is satisfactory to know that honest Mahoni, though sent a prisoner to Madrid, was acquitted and promoted.

† "Parliamentary History," vol. vi. col. 477.

was in signal contrast to Peterborough's daring, would not risk an encounter with the French squadron before Barcelona until he was joined off the Spanish coast by another fleet, under Admiral Byng. Stanhope, by an ingenious device agreed upon with Peterborough—that of transmitting a blank sheet of paper cut in a particular form—apprised him of the junction which had been so long delayed. Peterborough had a commission to command at sea. He immediately marched to a small seaport, Stiges; made every preparation for his troops to embark; and for two nights, to the amazement of his officers and men, went out to sea in an open boat. He at last discerned the fleet; leaped on board one of the ships, and hoisted his flag; sent orders to Leake and Stanhope; had his men soon on board; hoped to reach Barcelona in time to fight the Count de Toulouse. But the Frenchmen had sheered off. The English troops were, however, thrown into Barcelona, and the French general Tessé, filled with apprehensions of defeat if he should attempt to storm the city, raised the siege, and the great army moved off, leaving their heavy cannon behind. King Philip retired to Madrid. But he had little time for resting there. The allies from the Portuguese frontier were marching upon the capital, and the court having fled, they entered Madrid on the 25th of June. Here they wasted their time, instead of marching after the Duke of Berwick, who had been joined by Philip. In the same way Charles lingered at Barcelona when it was no longer in danger. But success still followed the house of Austria. Arragon had imitated Catalonia and Valencia in acknowledging King Charles. It seemed as if the dominion of Spain was melting away from the house of Bourbon.

At this crisis, if one tenth of the energy of Peterborough, and even a smaller portion of the common-sense of Stanhope, could have been infused into the slow and formal Austrian prince, the contest might have been decided. Charles was urged by them to take the road to Madrid through Valencia, whither Peterborough had gone by sea with his men. Charles lingered at first, without showing any inclination to move at all. His equipage was not ready, he said, to enable him to enter the capital with proper state. "Sir," said Stanhope, "our William III. entered London in a hackney, with a cloak-bag behind it, and was made king not many weeks after." * When Charles did move, he went into Arragon and loitered at Saragossa. Peterborough was disgusted that his advice was not followed, and he gave himself up to the same inaction, which appeared a fatality in this summer. When he was sailing to Valencia he wrote a letter to Halifax, "aboard the Somerset," which sufficiently shows his gay temper under the most serious responsibilities: "There cannot be worse company than a beggarly German and a proud Spaniard, particularly to my humor; and were it not for the revenge we seek in the disagreeable men with the agreeable ladies, our condition were intolerable, black eyes and wit in the wives being what alone can make us endure the husbands." † But a cloud was to come over even Peterborough's gayety. All that he had accomplished was to be thrown away.

Whether any energy on the part of Peterborough could have made effectual resistance against the spirit which was rising up in Spain may be doubted. Charles had done nothing to identify himself with the nation. The majority of the nation felt that foreign invaders had come against them. The Castilians took up the cause of Philip as if it were a national cause. The western provinces were imbued with the same spirit. Charles advanced toward Madrid. Peterborough was ordered to join him. But Berwick, knowing the full value of the enthusiasm which had gone so thoroughly in favor of Philip, compelled the allies to evacuate the capital. Peterborough saw that the game was up; and declared "that all the force of Europe would not be sufficient to subdue Castile." ‡ Charles and he met as the one was leading his forces from Saragossa and the other from Valencia. They were unsuited to act in unison. The impetuosity of the one and the frigid obstinacy of the other made them natural antagonists. Peterborough resolving, or affecting to resolve, upon transferring his services to another field, proposed that he should go to the relief of Turin. He was taken at his word. Charles and his advisers were left to their own ruinous course. What Peterborough's feelings were at this juncture may be collected from a letter of singular interest, addressed by him on the 25th of August to Admiral Wassenaer: "Our circumstances, in a few words, are brought to this: from being sure of the monarchy of Spain without a blow, without further expense or hazard, it is now not only a doubtful case, but I fear worse. Our army in the midst of an enemy's country (as it has been managed) without magazines, without any place of strength, without bread, or a farthing of money, the communication being cut off with Portugal, the enemy stronger in horse, and almost equal in foot: we lost Madrid like fools, with our army superior in number, without a blow, and such confusion and want of discipline was never known, the troops subsisting upon nothing but rapine. These are the effects of a young prince's giving ear to such wretched creatures who, contrary to such solemn councils of war, and measures so unanimously agreed to, contrary to the protestations of ambassadors and ministers, the repeated instances of generals and all mankind, have lost, perhaps, such an empire to their prince, by carrying him up and down, selling offices, and picking up little sums of money in exchange for Peru and Mexico." * From this time we do not find Peterborough in any of the more important transactions of the war. He returned early in 1707 to Spain as a volunteer; and he offered judicious advice which was rejected. He then received his formal recall to England; rushed about Europe, sometimes on public business and oftener for his private pleasures; seems to have looked with something like contempt upon his military vocation, when he said, "A general is only a hangman in chief;" † and exhibited the versatility of his talents in dictating to nine amanuenses at once, and in superintending Pope's horticulture at Twickenham.

> "He whose lightning pierced the Iberian lines,
> Now forms my quincunx, and now ranks my vines."

Peterborough, we have seen, had proposed to go to the relief of Turin. The Duke of Savoy, having been enabled through the subsidies of England and Holland to expend large sums in preparations for the defence of his capital, treated with contempt the summons to surrender of La Feuillade, the French general, who invested the city with an immense army. The successes of the French in the early part of the campaign had been very great; and though Victor Amadeus lost not heart, even when he left Turin with a part of his forces, while the siege was carried on for three months with a fearful loss of life, it appeared very doubtful whether Savoy could be saved. Prince Eugene was beyond the Adige with an army of Imperialists. By a series of movements, in which he displayed that skill and energy which fitted him to be the colleague of Marlborough, he united his forces with the cavalry of the Duke of Savoy in September; attacked the French in their intrenchments, obtained a complete victory, and finally drove them out of Italy.

The great campaign of Marlborough in 1706, which we shall have to relate in the next chapter, completed a series of triumphs for the allies, which made this year one of the most memorable of the great War of the Succession.

CHAPTER CXXXVII.

Marlborough's campaign of 1705—His disappointments and anxieties—He forces the French lines—Retreat of the French under Villeroy—New parliament—State of parties—The Regency Bill—Cry of the Church in danger—Marlborough's campaign of 1706 in the Netherlands—The French and Bavarian armies under Villeroy pass the Dyle—The battle of Ramilies—Results of the victory.

"I NEVER knew the Duke of Marlborough go out so full of hopes as in the beginning of this campaign," says Burnet. ‡ He embarked at Harwich on the 31st of March. His ardent expectations were soon cooled by the opposition which the Dutch made to his plans. It was a month before he could get the States to agree to his design of leading the English and Dutch troops to the Moselle, there to co-operate with the forces under Prince Louis of Baden, and, marching from Treves between the Moselle and the Saar, to penetrate into Lorraine and thus carry the war into the French territory. Without waiting for the force of Baden, Marlborough crossed the Moselle and the Saar

* Mahon, p. 99.
† Kemble, "State Papers and Letters," p. 445. ‡ Mahon, p. 207.

* Kemble, "State Papers and Letters," p. 452.
† Spence's Anecdotes, edit. 1858, p. 116.
‡ "Own Time," vol. v. p. 203.

on the 3d of June. The French armies under Villars and Marsin had united. Marlborough was anxious to give them battle; but they retreated, and he followed, though ill-provided with artillery. He encamped at Elft, and there waited for reinforcements. On the 9th he wrote to Harley that he had not one man with him but those in the English and Dutch pay. He was desirous to begin the siege of Saar-Louis; yet for want of the troops under the Prince of Baden and the Prussians, "we are obliged to be idle a good part of the campaign, while the enemy are pursuing their designs without any manner of interruption."* Such was the essential disadvantage of an army composed of the various contingents of allied powers, compared with an army of one great military state. In the campaign of the Danube the English commander, by wonderful exertions, contrived to make a compact body out of many heterogeneous parts. In the campaign of 1705 he had to prove the full difficulty of divided counsels and petty jealousies. While in camp at Elft the weather was bitterly cold; and to this circumstance he attributes in some measure the desertions which weakened his army. On the 15th of June he writes to the States-General that the season is so inclement that there is nothing on the earth—that all the grass and oats have been destroyed by the cold—that he has no horses or carriages for the conveyance of heavy artillery, the German princes having utterly failed in their engagements.† Villeroy and the Elector of Bavaria were rapidly advancing so as to threaten Holland; and the States, in great alarm, sent express upon express to Marlborough to march with all haste to their succor. Villeroy had taken Huy, and was investing Liège. Marlborough apprehended that the Dutch would be frightened into a negotiation for peace. The imperturbable general is very nearly broken down with anxiety. He writes to Godolphin on the 16th, "I have for these last ten days been so troubled by the many disappointments I have had, that I think if it were possible to vex me so for a fortnight longer, it would make an end of me. In short, I am weary of my life."‡ A vigorous resolution roused Marlborough out of this despondency. On the 17th of June, at midnight, he broke up the camp at Elft, and marched back to the position which he had occupied a fortnight before. By a series of rapid movements he united his army with that of the Dutch general, D'Auverquerque, and Villeroy retreated within the formidable lines which the French had constructed, extending from the Meuse, near Namur, to the Scheldt at Antwerp. Marlborough's first object was to regain possession of Huy, in which he succeeded by the capitulation of the garrison on the 11th of July. But this success was accompanied by a bitter mortification. Upon the approach of a French detachment, the Palatine general, D'Aubach, abandoned Treves and Saarbruch, and burned the magazines which contained stores that were essential to the further prosecution of the operations on the Moselle. Marlborough's disappointments in the campaign were matters of rejoicing to the High Tories in England, who were now distinguished as "the tackers." The great general took this so to heart that he writes to Godolphin, "This vile enormous faction of theirs vexes me so much that I hope the queen will after this campaign give me leave to retire."§ In answer to a consolatory letter from the queen, he writes to her majesty that he has received a list of the new parliament, by which he sees that there are enough tackers returned to stir everything that may be uneasy to the government; "to prevent which, I think your majesty should advise with lord treasurer [Godolphin], what encouragement may be proper to give the Whigs." But Marlborough does not want the Whigs to be in power. The lord treasurer, he writes, "is the only man in England capable of giving such advice as may keep you out of the hands of both parties, which may at last make you happy, if quietness can be had in a country where there is so much faction."‖

The great operation of this campaign was the forcing of the French lines on the 17th of July. This formidable barrier between Dutch Brabant and the Austrian Netherlands had been three years in construction. In part of their extent the lines followed the course of the river Gheet, and the river Demer; and, at various intervals, were fortified posts of considerable strength. Distributed along convenient parts of the lines was the French army of seventy thousand men. Marlborough maintained his usual secrecy, confiding his plans to no one but Auverquerque. He had determined to attack the lines by passing the Gheet near Leuwe—a part where the greatest difficulties appeared to present themselves. The weaker part of the lines was to the south of the Mehaigne; and thither D'Auverquerque was directed to march, "to give the enemy a jealousy that they were to be attacked on that side, and so oblige them to draw their greatest strength that way."* The feint had its effect. Villeroy collected his main strength on that weak part where D'Auverquerque had crossed the Mehaigne. "But the bridges prepared over the Mehaigne served equally to bring back Auverquerque's troops to the left of that river, and to unite them to the army of Marlborough; and the movements being all made under cover of night, the object aimed at was attained before the enemy could discover which was the real point of attack. The lines were, however, of the most formidable description: for, besides the height of the ramparts and the largeness of the ditch, they were further defended by the difficulties of the ground over which they were to be approached; and by the River Gheet, which could not be crossed without laying bridges over it, and which was near enough to the lines to be defended by the fire from the parapet. All these obstacles would have been sufficient to have rendered the lines unassailable, though defended by a very inferior body against a whole army, but for the ability with which the attention and the main force of the enemy was diverted from the real point of attack, and the energy with which that attack was conducted."†

During the day of the 17th Villeroy was employed in watching the movements of Auverquerque. At eight o'clock at night a detachment of Marlborough's army began its march toward the Little Gheet River; and at the same time Auverquerque recrossed the Mehaigne, and connected his vanguard with the rear of Marlborough. When the morning dawned, the English and Dutch were approaching the French works, concealed by a thick fog. They carried the Castle of Wange, and without waiting for the construction of bridges, the troops scrambled through the marshy ground, crossed the Gheet, mounted its slippery banks, rushed into the trench, and were within the enemy's lines. They were encountered by the Marquis d'Allegre with twenty battalions of infantry and fifty squadrons of horse. Marlborough himself headed a charge of cavalry, and for a short time, having only a trumpeter and a servant with him, was surrounded as the French repulsed his charge. But the English troops rallied to his rescue, and a second charge left them masters of the lines. Villeroy came up too late, and had no resource but a retreat. Marlborough was anxious to pursue, but the Dutch thought a pursuit hazardous, and he encamped near Tirlemont. L'Allegre was taken prisoner, with four other general officers and a thousand men. Harley wrote to Marlborough, after the news of his success, "Your friends and servants here cannot be without concern upon your grace's account, when we hear how much you expose that precious life of yours upon all occasions, and that you are not contented to do the part of a great general, but you condescend to take your share as a common soldier."‡ Harley's friend, Swift, ventured to insinuate, after a few years, that Marlborough wanted courage.

Villeroy retreated beyond the Dyle, and there established a strong position near Louvain. Marlborough was prevented taking any immediate offensive measures through the constant interference of the deputies of the States. The English general was indignant, and sent an officer to the Hague, to represent "that unless the command be more absolute in one person, we shall hardly be able to do anything." Councils of war, he said, were called on every occasion, "which entirely destroys the secrecy and dispatch upon which all great undertakings depend."§ He wanted to force the passage of the Dyle; and he traversed ground which, somewhat more than a century after, became familiar to every Englishman. On the 27th of August he writes to the Duke of Shrewsbury, "I had at the camp at Meldert with great difficulty brought together a provision of about ten days' bread; and having marched four days together through several defiles, and part of the Bois des Soignies, the army came the 18th instant into a spacious plain, with only the Yssche between us and the enemy. About noon we were formed in order of battle, and having visited the posts with M. D'Auverquerque, we had resolved upon

* "Dispatches," vol. ii. p. 87.
† Ibid., p. 103.
‡ Coxe, vol. ii. p. 122.
§ Ibid., p. 127.
‖ Ibid., p. 132.

* Bulletin in "Dispatches," vol. ii. p. 174.
† Sir George Murray's Account, in "Dispatches, vol." ii. p. 177.
‡ Coxe, vol. ii. p. 149.
§ "Dispatches, vol." ii. p. 197.

making the attack, thinking there was no more to do but to order the troops to advance, when the deputies of the States, having consulted their other generals, would not give their consent, so that I was with great regret obliged to quit the enterprise, which promised all imaginable success." * There was a skirmish on the plain of Waterloo. But for the interference of the Dutch deputies there might have been a decisive battle on that ground, of which Byron wrote, after the eventful day of the 18th of June, 1815, "Waterloo seems marked out for the scene of some great action, though this may be mere imagination." The opportunity was lost of anticipating the later glories of that plain. Marlborough wrote to Harley on the 2d of September, entreating that the government should not take any formal notice at the Hague of his "late disappointment," for "I am persuaded if an opportunity should now offer before our leaving the field, the greatest part of the generals who were against engaging the enemy are so sensible of their error that they would not obstruct anything that might be proposed for our advantage." He was looking forward to a new pleasure when he returned home. Mr. Vanbrugh had informed him that "the first stone at Woodstock" had been laid, and he compliments the architect upon his plans, saying, "The greatest satisfaction I enjoy on this side is from the hopes I have of finding the house in good forwardness at my return in the winter." †

The elections of 1705 roused up a bitterness of party feeling that had rarely been equalled in England. It is difficult to look back upon these times and not to be moved to pity, if not to despise, the people that could be stirred into the most violent wrath against each other by the cry that was raised from the Land's End to Berwick. That cry was, "The Church in danger." The queen had manifested less disinclination to transfer a portion of her favor to the Whigs. The high-churchmen gave out the rallying-cry from their pulpits. The Jacobite and Tory pamphleteers told the nation "that the Church was to be given up; that the bishops were betraying it; that the court would sell it to the dissenters." ‡ The elections seemed to have been managed in a most extraordinary way, if we may judge from Defoe's description of the election which he saw at Coventry. Mobs, drawn up in battle array, were fighting in the streets; while freemen, or pretended freemen, went up to vote, without any examination of their qualifications—no list of voters—no oath tendered—no books kept. "The dissenters," says Burnet, "who had been formerly much divided, were now united entirely in the interests of the government, and joined with the Whigs everywhere." It was seen that the Whigs would have a parliamentary majority; so Godolphin declared in their favor "more openly than he had done formerly." The Duke of Newcastle was made lord privy seal in the place of the Duke of Buckingham. The incapable and violent Sir Nathan Wright was removed from the office of lord keeper, and Mr. William Cowper was appointed to that high place.

When the parliament met at the end of October, the contest of the Commons began with the election of speaker. The Whig candidate, Mr. John Smith, had a majority. The queen's speech complained of the malicious insinuations that the Church was in danger. "I will always affectionately support and countenance the Church of England as by law established. I will invariably maintain the Toleration. I will do all I can to persuade my subjects to lay aside their divisions, and will study to make them all safe and easy." This was plainer language than had been spoken since the time when William uttered what he thought from that throne. The Tories were angry with the queen, and they took a course which they judged would annoy her. Anne looked with little real complacency upon the Act of Settlement. Lord Haversham, one of the Tory leaders, moved in the Lords that the Princess Sophia of Hanover should be invited to reside in England, as presumptive heir of the crown. The motion was negatived, although very strongly supported by Buckingham, Rochester, and other Tory peers. The queen was indignant, for "these very persons, having now lost that interest in her and their posts, were driving on that very motion which they had made her apprehend was the most fatal thing that could befall." § So Queen Anne writes to the Duchess of Marlborough, "I believe dear Mrs. Freeman and I shall not disagree as we have formerly done; for I am sensible of the services that those people have done me that you have a good opinion of, and will countenance them; and am thoroughly convinced of the malice and insolence of them that you have always been speaking against."

The question of the succession being thus stirred again by the Tories, the Whigs proposed a measure which had some practical utility. They brought forward a bill for appointing a regency, which should carry on the government, in the case of the demise of the queen, until the arrival of her successor. The regents were to consist of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the lord keeper, the lord chief justice, and four great officers of state. The bill was carried. Halifax moved in the Lords that an inquiry should be made into the alleged danger of the Church. After a long debate it was voted by a majority of 61 peers against 30, that the Church was not in danger. The Lords and Commons then subsequently agreed in the following resolution: "Resolved by the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons in parliament assembled, that the Church of England, as by law established, which was rescued from the extremest danger by King William III., of glorious memory, is now, by God's blessing, under the happy reign of her majesty, in a most safe and flourishing condition, and whosoever goes about to suggest and insinuate, that the Church is in danger under her majesty's administration, is an enemy to the queen, the Church, and the kingdom." The queen then issued a proclamation, at the instance of parliament, declaring that "we will proceed with the utmost severity the law should allow of, against the authors or spreaders of the said seditious and scandalous reports"—namely, that the Church is in danger. To us at the distance of a century and a half, the whole affair seems ludicrous and beneath the gravity of parliamentary proceedings. In three years more we shall see the nation stirred to a temporary frenzy by the same spirit of ecclesiastical controversy, displaying itself in absurdity still more outrageous, as it now must appear. But, after all, we cannot regard these things with the eyes of our forefathers, and must judge the actors in them with that charity in which they appear to have been themselves deficient.

Godolphin and Marlborough are dining in perfect cordiality with Halifax, Cowper, and Sunderland, at Harley's house; and Harley drinks "to love and friendship and everlasting union, and wishes he had more Tokay to drink it in." * Marlborough is setting his face against jobbery with exemplary fortitude. Lord Albemarle wants a commission for some lower-school boy of Eton or Westminster. The queen, replies Marlborough, "has lately shown so much aversion to anything of that kind, upon notice taken in parliament, of children's being commissioned in the troops, that she has given me repeated orders to the contrary." † Disinterested is he also in the management of one of the corruptions of that day, which still flourishes in its original luxuriance—the sale of commissions. Mrs. Selwin is unreasonable enough to be "dissatisfied with the offer I have made Mr. Selwin of a company in the guards, upon his laying down eight hundred pounds. . . . I could wish Mr. Selwin might have it for nothing, but there is a necessity of applying this sum at least in charity to the widows, and to satisfy other pretensions." ‡ Such are the occupations of the great captain, before he gets out of England to his accustomed battle-ground. He goes at last, and is at the Hague on the 27th of April. His notion of a campaign in 1706 was to shift his ground; to go to the relief of the Duke of Savoy, who was expecting to be besieged, and to co-operate with Prince Eugene in freeing Italy from the French armies. This plan had the countenance of the English ministry. But the Elector of Hanover would not consent that his troops should assist in Marlborough's project; and the Danes and Hessians also refused their co-operation. Meanwhile the French on the Upper Rhine had obtained some successes; and thus the Dutch again became alarmed for their own safety. Marlborough consented to remain in the command of the English and Dutch armies, provided that his power was unfettered. To this the States consented; and the troops began to march from the Hague on the 7th of May. They were to be joined by various garrisons, and to encamp near Maestricht. On the 15th Marlborough wrote to the duchess to inform her that, in all likelihood, he should make the whole campaign in the Netherlands—not such a campaign as would

* "Dispatches," vol. ii. p. 237.
‡ Burnet, vol. v. p. 218.
† Ibid., p. 207.
§ Ibid., p. 227.

* Lord Cowper's "Diary."—Hardwicke Papers.
† "Dispatches," vol. ii. p. 437.
‡ Ibid., p. 441.

please him. "Let me say for myself that there is more credit in doing what is good for the public than in preferring our private satisfaction and interest; for my being here in a condition of doing nothing that shall make a noise has made me able to send ten thousand men to Italy, and to leave nineteen thousand more on the Rhine."* The great general scarcely saw the opportunity of "making a noise," that he would be able to insure in little more than a week after he had reluctantly turned away from the plan that would best promote his "private satisfaction and interest." On the 20th of May he wrote to Harley to express his hope that he might bring the enemy to a battle, for the French had drawn all their garrisons together, had passed the Dyle, and were posted at Tirlemont. In a letter of the next day to M. Hop, at the Hague, he says that this movement of the enemy "has quite broken the measures we were projecting at Maestricht. . . . We design to advance to gain the head of the Gheet, to come to the enemy if they keep their ground. For my part, I think nothing could be more happy for the allies than a battle; since, I have good reason to hope, with the blessing of God we may have a complete victory."† There is nothing more remarkable than the unswerving confidence of Marlborough in his own happy fortune. Here were no particular circumstances to inspire him with this confidence. He had no superiority of numbers; for his English, Dutch, and Danes amounted to sixty thousand men, while Villeroy's army of French and Bavarians amounted to sixty-two thousand. He had no superiority in the distribution of his forces in his advance to battle; and in the same way as at Blenheim, he found the enemy in possession of the ground which he had hoped to take up. The famous novelist, who has described the men and manners of these times with a rare fidelity, has truly said, "The great duke always spoke of his victories with an extraordinary modesty, and as if it was not so much his own admirable genius and courage which achieved these amazing successes, but as it he was a special and fatal instrument in the hands of Providence, that willed irresistibly the enemy's overthrow. . . . And our army got to believe so, and the enemy learned to think so too."‡

It was Whitsunday, the 23d of May, when Marlborough began his march, at three o'clock in the morning, to gain the open space between the Mehaigne and the Great Gheet.§ That position was found to be occupied by the enemy. The allies, in eight columns, passed the once formidable lines which had been demolished in the preceding year; and having cleared the village of Mierdorp, formed in order of battle in the plain of Jandrinœuil. The enemy was posted in two lines on eminences above the marshes, stretching from the Little Gheet to the Mehaigne, having the village of Ramilies in the centre. It was a formidable position. From Mierdorp, near which the allies crossed the lines, to Ramilies, was a distance of nearly three miles. The whole plain, about three miles in breadth, is bounded on the north by the Little Gheet, on the south by the Mehaigne. The plain narrows toward the west, being bounded by the rising ground through which the Little Gheet flows from its sources near Ramilies.‖ Villeroy waited for the attack in his camp, on the rising ground of Mont St. André, a plain with gentle undulations and interspersed with coppices. Behind this rising ground is the Great Gheet. The allies formed their order of battle in the plain, between the village of Boniffe, on the Mehaigne, and the village of Foulaz, on the Little Gheet—having two lines, the infantry in the centre, the cavalry on the wings, with twenty squadrons of Danes to support the left of the infantry. In this order Marlborough advanced to the western extremity of the plain. Ramilies, an inclosed village, was defended by twenty battalions of French. Between Ramilies and the marshes of the Mehaigne were posted nearly the whole of the French cavalry. Their centre and left, composed of infantry, extended from the village of Autre-église to the village of Offuy, and thence behind Ramilies. Marlborough determined to make a demonstration of attack upon the left of the French, at Autre-église and Offuy. Villeroy immediately drew his troops from the centre to support his left. Marlborough had the advantage of moving in a smaller space than the enemy, whose position formed an arc on the hills, while the allies could traverse the chord of the plain. Directly Villeroy had weakened his centre, Marlborough ordered the second line of the troops that were advancing to Autre-église to defile to the left, by a hollow way that concealed them. The first line of his right wing ascended the rising ground at Autre-église and opened their fire. But the main brunt of the battle was on his left, where the French were attacked at Ramilies and at Tavieres, a village on the Mehaigne. The assault on Tavieres by the Dutch infantry was successful. But the French cavalry then came into conflict with the Dutch cavalry under Auverquerque, and repelled them in great disorder. This was the crisis of the battle. The vast body of French and Bavarian horse had every chance of taking in the rear the allied infantry who were attacking Ramilies. Marlborough saw the danger. He put himself at the head of seventeen squadrons, and charged the French cavalry. This was indeed a fight of horse to horse, to be decided by main strength more than strategy. Marlborough, who was recognized, was surrounded and nearly made prisoner. He cut his way through; his charger fell; his equerry had his head shot off by a cannon-ball as he held the stirrup for his general to mount another horse. But now a reserve of cavalry that Marlborough had sent for came up; and an irresistible charge determined the battle on the left. The allies mounted the heights above Ramilies, and the shout of victory announced that the position had been gained which insured an ultimate success. The conflict was not over in and around the village of Ramilies. The fight among the cottages was long and doubtful. But the ever-watchful general ordered up a reserve of infantry, and the allied horse descending from the heights, their united force completed the triumph of the left and centre. Three hours had been occupied in these terrible encounters. But the changes of fortune had been so various—the confusion of onset and retreat so great—the disorder attendant upon troops of all arms being mixed in one common effort so extreme, that Marlborough was compelled to form his forces again upon the ground they had won. Villeroy now endeavored to take up a new line, but was impeded by his own baggage. Before he could get his battalions formed, Marlborough ordered a general advance to the sources of the Little Gheet; but before the morasses were crossed the French began to fly, and one headlong panic and slaughter closed that fearful evening. Onward went the pursued and the pursuers toward Louvain. Marlborough did not halt till the had reached Mildert, thirteen miles from the battle-field. The Elector of Bavaria and Villeroy reached Louvain at two o'clock on the morning of the 24th; held a council in the market-place by torch-light; and determined to abandon their fortified towns, and save the remnant of their force by a hurried retreat. The French and Bavarians lost seven thousand men, killed and wounded, and six thousand prisoners. The allies lost nearly four thousand men. The artillery, baggage, and eighty standards, were the spoil of the victors.

On the 3d of June Marlborough wrote to St. John, "It is very astonishing that the enemy should give up a whole country, with so many strong places, without the least resistance." He had entered Louvain without meeting any obstacle. Malines, Alost, and other places had submitted. The estates of Brabant assembled at Brussels had acknowledged the authority of King Charles III., and they sent out their commands to other fortified towns to make a like submission. Antwerp, Ghent, Bruges, and Oudenarde were surrendered without a shot being fired. In his exultation Marlborough exclaimed in his letters home, "Now is the time, certainly, to reduce France to reason." St. Simon says, "with the exception of Namur, Mons, and a very few other places, all the Spanish Low Countries were lost." The king, he tells us, felt this misfortune to the quick, however tranquilly he appeared to sustain it. But there was work still to do, before that campaign was ended. Ostend was besieged by a powerful land force and by nine ships of the line. The garrison of five thousand men capitulated on the 7th of July. Menin, one of the greatest fortresses of Vauban, was carried by assault, with immense loss, on the 22d of August. Dendermonde surrendered on the 5th of September. It might long have held out, had there not been seven weeks of excessive drought, which enabled the besiegers to approach, without being held back by the inundation which the besieged could command in ordinary seasons. Ath was the last fortress to fall on the 4th of October.

Marlborough returned home to receive the thanks of parliament, and to take part in the great event of the session of 1706–7—the

* Coxe, vol. ii. p. 335. † Dispatches," vol. ii. p. 118.
‡ Thackeray, "Esmond," chap. xii.
§ Letter to Eugene, "Dispatches," vol. ii. p. 525.
‖ There is an excellent plan in the atlas to Coxe; and another, not very dissimilar, in Tindal.

union of England and Scotland into one kingdom. But the victor at Ramilies had already done far more for this object than anything he could do by his political influence. "If it were to be asked what one man did most for the accomplishment of the union, it would not be unreasonable to say it was the Duke of Marlborough." * At the precise juncture when the campaign of 1706 had inflicted a blow upon France that left her in dread of her own dismemberment, instead of holding the fate of Europe in her hands, the Jacobites of both kingdoms, and some not so honest as the Jacobites, were looking to the aid of the great Louis to prevent the ruin of Scotland, by preventing her entering upon an equal partnership in the liberties, the power, and the glory of England. The King of France was invited to invade Scotland. The invitation was not responded to, for the very obvious reason that the policy of William III. and the victories of the Duke of Marlborough had saved England from being a tributary of France, and now stood between Scotland and the real degradation which some of her children would have regarded as independence.

CHAPTER CXXXVIII.

Scotland—New parliament assembled in 1703—Irritation against England—Proposal for a treaty of union—Meeting of commissioners of each nation—Articles agreed upon by the commissioners—Charges of corruption—Demonstrations against the union—Debates in the Scottish parliament—Lord Belhaven's oration—Material interests of Scotland—Views of the union by Seton of Pitmedden—Provision for the Church of Scotland—Riots—Demonstration of the Cameronians—The Act of Union passed in Scotland—The act passed in England.

"It may be done, but not yet," said King William to Defoe, speaking of that union which he so fervently desired.† When commissioners were appointed in 1702 by an act of the English parliament, and the Scottish parliament responded by also appointing commissioners, each body being empowered to negotiate for a union, the difficulties of accomplishing this great measure were, probably, not correctly estimated. The "not yet" was not sufficiently manifest. These commissioners debated for six months without any result. The demands of the Scotch for a participation in the colonial trade were treated with indifference, as well as the demand for other commercial privileges that were to rest upon a perfect equality.

The Scottish parliament, or convention of estates, had sat from the time of the revolution. A new parliament was assembled in May, 1703. All the old feudal usages were strictly observed in the procession on this occasion called a "Riding." Every member was on horseback—the Commons in dark mantles, the nobles in splendid robes. Lackeys walked by the side of every horse, numerous in proportion to the rank of the rider. The regalia of Scotland were borne in solemn state, amid a cluster of heralds, and pursuivants, and trumpeters, guarding the crown, the sceptre, and the sword.‡ This wondrous pageantry was not without its significance at this period.

This parliament of 1703 was not in a temper of conciliation toward England. Glencoe and Darien were still watchwords of strife. The failure of the negotiations for union necessarily produced exasperation. While Marlborough was fighting the battles of the allies, the Scottish parliament manifested a decided inclination to the interests of France, by removing restrictions on the importation of French wines. The "Act for the Security of the Kingdom" was a more open declaration not only of the independence of Scotland, but of her disposition to separate wholly from England—to abrogate, on the first opportunity, that union of the crowns which had endured for a century. The Act of Settlement, by which the crown of England was to pass in the Protestant line to the Electress Sophia and her descendants, was not to be accepted; but on the demise of Queen Anne without issue, the estates of Scotland were to name a successor from the Protestant descendants of the Stuart line, and that successor was to be under conditions to secure "the religious freedom and trade of the nation from English or any foreign influence." For four months this matter was vehemently debated in the Scottish parliament. The Act of Security was carried, but the lord high commissioner refused his assent. Following this legislative commotion came what was called in England the Scottish plot—a most complicated affair of intrigue and official treachery, with some real treason at the bottom of it. The House of Lords in England took cognizance of the matter, which provoked the highest wrath in Scotland, that another nation should interfere with her affairs; and this embroilment led to a dispute between the two houses of the English parliament about their privileges. When the Scottish estates reassembled, in 1704, they denounced the proceedings of the House of Lords as an interference with the prerogative of the Queen of Scotland; and they again passed the Security Act. The royal assent was not now withheld; whether from fear or from policy on the part of the English ministry is not very clear. The parliament of England then adopted a somewhat strong measure of retaliation. The queen was addressed, requesting her to put Carlisle, Newcastle, Tynemouth, and Hull in a state of defence, and to send forces to the border. A statute was passed which in the first place provided for a treaty of union, and then enacted that until the Scottish parliament should settle the succession to the crown in the same line as that of the English Act of Settlement, no native of Scotland, except those domiciled in England, or in the navy or army, should acquire the privileges of a natural-born Englishman; and prohibiting all importations of coals, cattle, sheep, or linen from Scotland. It was evident that there must be union or war.

One other circumstance of national rivalry filled the cup of bitterness to the brim. The Darien company was making efforts to trade to the East Indies; and one of their vessels going into an English harbor to obtain seamen was seized and condemned for a violation of the chartered privileges of one of the two East India companies. An opportunity of revenge soon occurred. A vessel of the other East India Company went into the Frith of Forth for repairs; and the Darien company, having a power under their charter to make reprisals, seized this vessel by stratagem. A suspicion arose, out of some incoherent talk, that the captain of this vessel, named Green, and his crew had been guilty of crimes on the high seas. One of the Darien company's vessels had not returned from its voyage, and Captain Green and some of his men were prosecuted, upon the belief that they had murdered Captain Drummond and his men, on board the Speedy Return, as the Darien ship was named that had not returned at all. Green and two of his crew were convicted; and they were executed, in defiance of the queen's desire that the execution should be postponed. The privy council of Scotland were terrified by the Edinburgh mob, who threatened the magistrates and rabbled the chancellor; and the three sailors were hanged at Leith. "The poor men were sacrificed, not to penal laws, but to national hostility—they were victims of war rather than of justice." Mr. Burton adds to this expression of his opinion, "there was afterward abundant reason for believing that Captain Drummond, whom they were charged with murdering, was alive in a distant land." *

In this defiant attitude toward England stood Scotland in 1704 and in 1705. Her mobs were howling for English blood before her courts of justice; her patriots were hooting and hissing when the name of the Princess Sophia was uttered in the parliament house. "If a member said anything that could be construed as a leaning to England, cries to take down his words, or to send him to the Castle, imported that scornful denunciation of his sentiments for which his opponents could not find argumentative expressions sufficiently powerful." † This temper, which had lasted for several years, had filled the northern population of England with apprehensions of a Scottish war. The zealots of Scotland talked loudly of girding on their swords, and thought of Bannockburn. The rumors of border-feuds revived, and the stout borderers of Cumberland and Northumberland thought of Dunbar. There were words of common-sense uttered in the English parliament by Lord Haversham: "There are two matters of all troubles; much discontent, and great poverty; and whoever will now look into Scotland will find them both in that kingdom. It is certain the nobility and gentry of Scotland are as learned and as brave as any nation in Europe can boast of; and these

* Burton, "History of Scotland," vol. i. p. 438.
† "History of the Union," p. 64.
‡ Burton, "History of Scotland," vol. i. p. 348.

* Burton, "History of Scotland," vol. i. p. 378.
† Ibid., vol. i. p. 360.

are generally discontented. As to the common people, they are very numerous, and very stout, but very poor. And who is the man that can answer what such a multitude, so armed, so disciplined, with such leaders, may do, especially since opportunities do so much alter men from themselves. And there will never be wanting all the promises and all the assistance France can give." * These apprehensions were happily averted by a show of moderation in the Scottish parliament, and by a consummate exercise of prudence on the part of Godolphin, who, as the head of a ministry chiefly composed of moderate Whigs, had greater power than he had possessed when reconciling the divided opinions of the first years of his administration. In August, 1705, the draft of an Act for a Treaty of Union was brought into the Scottish parliament. Violent were the debates; but it was at last passed, by a majority of two, but accompanied by a resolution that the commissioners for the treaty should not meet those in England until an offensive statute of the English parliament which had been recently passed should be repealed. It was proposed that this resolution should form part of the Scotch statute for a treaty; but the more moderate members carried that the resolution should be embodied in an address to the queen. In the new English parliament of 1705 the address of the Scots' parliament, "against any progress in the treaty of union, till the act which declared them aliens by such a day should be repealed," was laid before the two houses; and to the surprise of all parties the ministers of the queen advocated the repeal, not only as regarded the question of denying the Scots the privileges of native-born subjects, but as to the restrictions of that statute upon commercial intercourse. The friendly hand was cordially held out; and if it were not as cordially grasped—if, at some stages of the coming negotiations it were roughly pushed aside—it is to the immortal credit of the English statesmen that they went calmly forward with their great work, and accomplished it by honest perseverance, without trickery and without coercion. The reflecting politicians in both countries saw the perils that would result to both from being swayed by national prejudices and popular jealousies. There were old wounds to be healed, old injuries to be forgiven, existing injustice to be redressed, friendship to be established upon conditions of equal rights and liberties. The people of both countries were not wholly insane. Defoe has said, with a vigor which sometimes bursts forth out of the dry details of his history of the union, "God's providence unravelled all the schemes of distinction, which madmen had drawn for the ruin of their native country: and as many times things evil in their design are overruled by an invisible hand, and bring to pass that very good which they were prepared to destroy, even so it was here; for these confusions were the very things that brought both the nations to their senses; I mean, brought them both to better temper. The consequences of a bloody war just breaking out in the bowels of their native country, in the ruin and certain desolation of which they must necessarily have a great share, opened the eyes of the most thinking people on both sides, even of those who in themselves had no real inclination to the conjunction of the kingdoms, and thus the necessity of taking new measures began to appear both ways." †

In the spring of 1706 thirty-one commissioners were nominated on the part of each kingdom, for negotiating the terms of union. The nomination of the Scottish commissioners was left to the queen, after a violent opposition by those who desired the nomination to be in the estates of parliament. To the surprise of many, that nomination included several violent opposers of the union—a "courageous policy," as Mr. Burton truly observes. On the 16th of April the commissioners assembled in the cockpit at Whitehall. The lord keeper, Cowper, delivered an address on the part of England, and the Scottish chancellor on the part of Scotland. The success of these negotiations may be attributed in no small degree to the wisdom and justice of Lord Somers, one of the commissioners, although he held no office. His ruling principle was that of acting with perfect fairness to Scotland. The commission sat till the 22d of July, when the articles of union were finally agreed upon.

A complete union of two independent nations, to be brought about by common consent, and the terms to be settled as in a commercial partnership, was an event which seems natural and easy when we look to the geographical position of the two nations, and to the circumstance that they had been partially united for a century, under six sovereigns wearing the crown of each kingdom. But when we look to the long-standing jealousies of the two nations—their sensitive assertions of ancient superiority—the usual haughty condescension of the wealthier country—the sturdy pride of the poorer—the ignorance of the bulk of each people of the true character of the other—the differences of the prevailing forms of religion—the more essential differences of laws and their modes of administration—we may consider the completion of this union as one of the greatest achievements of statesmanship. "If those continental nations which had been for centuries accustomed to see annexations, partitions, and the enlargement of empires by marriage and succession, had been told how many different parties and interests it was necessary to bring to one set of conclusions, before the desired end could be accomplished, they would have deemed the project utterly insane, as, indeed, it would have been, if laid before two nations less endowed with practical sense and business habits." * At the very outset of the treaty, the vital principle of union was to be debated—that fundamental article upon which all other articles were to be based—an entire union of the two kingdoms—one kingdom, one crown, one parliament. This article was proposed, at the opening of the negotiations, by the English commissioners. The Scottish commissioners demurred. The descent of the crown of Scotland might go according to the Act of Settlement; mutual free-trade—mutual rights—a federal union. The English commissioners declined to proceed upon such terms, "convinced that nothing but an entire union of the two kingdoms will settle perfect and lasting friendship." The Scottish commissioners yielded, but at the same time demanded reciprocity of citizenship and of privileges of trade. Unquestionably so, replied the English commissioners. It was "a necessary consequence," they said, of the first great condition.

The fundamental principle of the union was thus settled, in the words of the resolution of the English commissioners, to be "an entire and incorporating union, by which the two nations should be formed into one government, be under one sovereign head, in one represented body, standing upon one foundation, enjoying equal privileges, and in common bearing one general proportion of burdens, the same in end and mean, having but one common interest, one name, and being forever hereafter but one people." † How to carry out this amalgamation, in the several relations of "one represented body"—"one general proportion of burdens"—might have presented insuperable difficulties to any set of negotiators who were not thoroughly convinced of the necessity of making a compromise of many supposed particular interests. The question of "proportion of burdens" claimed precedence of that of "one represented body." The English commissioners cleared away many objections, by proposing an equivalent to Scotland in a money payment, for any disadvantages she might be subjected to in a joint principle of finance. By a system of equal duties upon imports and exports, the freedom of trade was established, and to that system no objection could be rationally offered. There were long discussions about duties of excise—about malt, and salt, and ale—which were satisfactorily adjusted. The land tax was arranged in a manner eminently favorable to Scotland. All these matters were got over, when the complex question of representation arose. The English commissioners proposed that Scotland should have thirty-eight members in the united House of Commons. The Scottish commissioners proposed fifty. The number was settled at forty-five—about one twelfth of the whole house. The system of electing peers to sit in parliament was also settled; sixteen being taken out of the hundred and fifty-four who were then peers of Scotland. The laws of Scotland, with the exception of those relating to trade, customs, and excise, were to remain in force, though subject to alterations by the parliament of Great Britain, as the united kingdom was to be called; it being provided "that laws relating to public policy are alterable at the discretion of the parliament; laws relating to private right are not to be altered, but for the evident utility of the people of Scotland." ‡ The standards of the coin, of weights, and of measures,

* "Parliamentary History," vol. vi. col. 370.
† "History of the Union," p. 80.

* Burton, vol. i. p. 398.
† Defoe, "History of the Union," p. 107.
‡ Blackstone, Kerr's edit. vol. i. p. 79.

were to become uniform with those of England. For removing national distinctions, the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew were to be conjoined when used in flags, banners, standards, and ensigns. "The coat armorial was to be quartered according to heraldic rules, so that in its employment for Scottish national purposes the arms of Scotland might have the dexter, or pre-eminent side—a privilege for some time adopted, and not lightly esteemed."* In the negotiations of the commissioners all matters relating to the Church of Scotland were excluded. The preservation intact of the constitution and rights of that church was provided for in the acts of parliament under which the union was established.

The history of these negotiations has been told by Sir Walter Scott with a bias which can only be attributed to that nationality which, in its intensification, may cease to be a virtue. He, who in the political questions of his own time was strenuously opposed to what may be called democratic principles, complains that the population of Scotland being as one to six, if the rule of population, "which seems the fairest that could be found, had been adopted, Scotland would have sent sixty-six members to the united parliament," instead of forty-five.† The Whig, Hallam, takes a very different view from the Tory, Scott: "The ratio of population would indeed have given Scotland about one eighth of the legislative body, instead of something less than one twelfth; but no government, except the merest democracy, is settled on the sole basis of numbers; and if the comparison of wealth and of public contributions was to be admitted, it may be thought that a country which stipulated for itself to pay less than one fortieth of direct taxation, was not entitled to a much greater share of the representation than it obtained."‡ Scott, again, takes occasion to accuse the Scottish commissioners of having "sold their own honor and that of Scotland," upon "being given to understand that a considerable sum out of the equivalent money would be secured for their especial use." He then goes on to state, in the most precise way, from the papers of Lockhart, a furious Jacobite, the names of the many recipients of the sum distributed, being £20,540 17*s.* 7*d.*; and says, "it may be doubted whether the descendants of the noble lords and honorable gentlemen who accepted this gratification, would be more shocked at the general fact of their ancestors being corrupted, or scandalized at the paltry amount of the bribe. One noble lord accepted of as low a sum as eleven guineas." Mr. Burton has shown that the sum which was unquestionably advanced by the English government was "employed in paying arrears of salary, or other debts. . . . The general fact that at that time all classes of public creditors in Scotland were in arrear is too palpably notorious." The mere circumstance that arrears were paid out of an advance by England does not imply that there was a previous promise to pay, if the statesman should give a vote against the interests of his country. We lament with the more sober historian of Scotland, that "Sir Walter Scott's national pride seems to have been so entirely overwhelmed by his prejudice against the union that no tale against its supporters is too degrading to secure his belief."§

It was on the 12th of October, 1706, when the estates of Scotland began to consider the articles of union. Immense pains had been taken by the opponents of the measure to rouse the people to a tumultuous opposition. They were in some degree successful. There was a riot in Edinburgh on the 23d of October, when the populace broke the windows of Sir Patrick Johnson, who had been lord provost, and one of the commissioners of the treaty. They were dispersed without any loss of life. Those who consider that the outbreak of a mob—that appears to have been really very harmless—is evidence of the opinions of a nation, may agree with Lockhart that this midnight riot made "it evident that the union was crammed down Scotland's throat."‖ Unprecedented pains had been taken to rouse the passions of the people; and yet any tumult making an approach to insurrection cannot be traced, even in the most exaggerated narratives of those who represent the union as hateful to the Scottish people. Addresses, indeed, came from many places to the parliament against the incorporating principle of the union. Defoe, who was busily engaged in Edinburgh, in a sort of semi-official capacity—chiefly from his knowledge of commercial matters, on which he had made useful suggestions—had represented these addresses as got up by the political opponents of the treaty. Lockhart writes: "That vile monster and wretch, Daniel Defoe, and other mercenary tools and trumpeters of rebellion, have often asserted that these addresses, and other evidences of the nation's aversion to the union, proceeded from the false glosses and underhand dealings of those that opposed it in parliament;" and then he admits that "perhaps this measure had its first original as they report."* Such arts were natural to be used, especially by the Jacobites. They saw that the union would go far to destroy their hopes of a Stuart king for Scotland, if England persisted in her resolution of having no more right-divine sovereigns. The Cameronians held that the wicked union was a breach of the Solemn League and Covenant, they having been sworn to do their endeavor to reform England in doctrine, worship, and discipline. But these were very far from representing the opinions of the dispassionate middle classes. Edinburgh shopkeepers were alarmed at the possible loss of customers; but calculating merchants saw very clearly the opening for successful enterprise, when the commerce of the two nations should be put upon an equal footing. The popular arguments against the union were chiefly appeals to nationality, which has always its amiable side, however it may sometimes exhibit a want of judgment in exact proportion to its enthusiasm.

There was an interval in the proceedings of the Scottish parliament when the parties for or against the union were gathering up their strength for a mortal conflict. The first great oratorical display was made by a young man, Lord Belhaven—a speech, says Defoe, "which, being so much talked of in the world, I have also inserted here."† It was, indeed, "much talked of in the world," being wholly addressed to "the world;" and not very much fitted for a sober Scottish audience. Yet the "bended knees," and the choking passion of tears, of this orator, have had imitators in other solemn assemblies. The speech "was circulated in all known shapes among the people, passed through unnumbered editions, and was so plentifully dispersed that a book-collector seldom buys a volume of Scottish political pamphlets of the early part of the eighteenth century, which does not contain 'The Speech of the Lord Belhaven on the subject-matter of an Union betwixt the two Kingdoms of Scotland and England.'"‡ This singular production has many of the characteristics of a noble eloquence; it has also not a few of those qualities which are most acceptable to a false taste. But it not our province here to criticise this oration. It is desirable, however, to look at it, as indicating the topics which were then best calculated to rouse and embitter the popular passions and prejudices. We therefore print the exordium, which will at least amuse our readers. It may, perhaps, incline most of them to say, as Lord Marchmont said when the speaker sat down, "Behold he dreamed, but lo, when he awoke, he found it was a dream." Lord Belhaven thus commenced his oration:

"My Lord Chancellor: When I consider the affair of an union betwixt the two nations, as it is expressed in the several articles thereof, and now the subject of our deliberation at this time, I find my mind crowded with variety of melancholy thoughts, and I think it my duty to disburden myself of some of them, by laying them before, and exposing them to, the serious consideration of this honorable house. I think I see a free and independent kingdom delivering up that which all the world hath been fighting for since the days of Nimrod; yea, that for which most of all the empires, kingdoms, states, principalities, and dukedoms of Europe are at this time engaged in the most bloody and cruel wars that ever were, to wit, a power to manage their own affairs by themselves, without the assistance and counsel of any other. I think I see a national Church, founded upon a rock, secured by a claim of right, hedged and fenced about by the strictest and most pointed legal sanction that sovereignty could contrive, voluntarily descending into a plain, upon an equal level with Jews, Papists, Socinians, Arminians, Anabaptists, and other sectaries, etc. I think I see the noble and honorable peerage of Scotland, whose valiant predecessors led armies against their enemies, upon their own proper charges and expenses, now divested of their followers and vassalages, and put upon such an equal foot with their

* Burton, vol. i. p. 423.
† "Tales of a Grandfather," chap. lx.
‡ "Constitutional History," chap. xvii.
§ Burton, vol. i. p. 494.
‖ "Lockhart Papers," quoted by Scott.

* Quoted in Burton, note vi. p. 447.
† "History of the Union."
‡ Burton, vol. i. p. 450.

vassals, that I think I see a petty English exciseman receive more homage and respect than what was paid formerly to their quondam Macallamores. I think I see the present peers of Scotland, whose noble ancestors conquered provinces, overran countries, reduced and subjected towns and fortified places, exacted tribute through the greatest part of England, now walking in the Court of Requests like so many English attorneys, laying aside their walking swords when in company with the English peers, lest their self-defence should be found murder. I think I see the honorable estate of barons, the bold assertors of the nation's rights and liberties in the worst of times, now setting a watch upon their lips and a guard upon their tongues, lest they be found guilty of scandalum magnatum. I think I see the royal state of boroughs walking their desolate streets, hanging their heads under disappointments, wormed out of all the branches of their old trade, uncertain what hand to turn to, necessitate to become 'prentices to their unkind neighbors; and yet after all, finding their trade so fortified by companies and secured by prescriptions that they despair of any success therein. I think I see our learned judges laying aside their practiques and decisions, studying the common law of England, gravelled with Certioraries, Nisi Priuses, Writs of Error, Verdicts, Indovar, Ejectione Firmæ, Injunctions, Demurs, etc., and frighted with appeals and avocations, because of the new regulations and rectifications they may meet with. I think I see the valiant and gallant soldiery, either sent to learn the plantation trade abroad, or at home petitioning for a small subsistence, as a reward of their honorable exploits; while their old corps are broken, the common soldiers left to beg, and the youngest English corps kept standing. I think I see the honest industrious tradesman loaded with new taxes and impositions, disappointed of the equivalents, drinking water in p'ace of ale, eating his saltless pottage, petitioning for encouragement to his manufactures, and answered by counter-petitions. In short, I think I see the laborious ploughman, with his corn spoiling upon his hands for want of sale, cursing the day of his birth, dreading the expense of his burial, and uncertain whether to marry or do worse. I think I see the incurable difficulties of the landed-men, fettered under the golden chain of equivalents, their pretty daughters petitioning for want of husbands and their sons for want of employment. I think I see our mariners delivering up their ships to their Dutch partners, and what through presses and necessity, earning their bread as underlings in the English navy. But above all, my lord, I think I see our ancient mother Caledonia, like Cæsar, sitting in the midst of our senate, ruefully looking round about her, covering herself with her royal garment, attending the fatal blow, and breathing out her last with an '*Et tu quoque, mi fili.*'" *

The Scottish orator was a bold imitator of him who "fulmin'd over Greece." But his rhetoric and his logic would appear to have been ill companions. He contrasts England and Scotland. Our neighbors in England are great and glorious; provinces and kingdoms are the results of their victories; the royal navy is the terror of Europe; their trade and commerce extends through the universe, encircling the whole habitable world, and rendering their own capital city the emporium for the whole inhabitants of the earth. Scotland, he says, is quite otherwise. We are an obscure, poor people, though formerly of better account; removed to a remote corner of the world, without name and without alliances; our posts are mean and precarious. "Our all is at stake," he then exclaims: "Hannibal is at our gates. Hannibal is come within our gates. Hannibal is come the length of this table. He is at the foot of this throne; he will demolish this throne. If we take not notice, he'll seize upon these regalia; he'll take them as our *spolia opima;* and whip us out of this house never to return again." Hannibal did some of these terrible things. But Caledonia did not, "ruefully looking about her, covering herself with her royal garment," sit idly upon the oak-chest in which the *spolia opima* were locked up. She bestirred herself to make her obscure poor people great and glorious as their neighbors; to make their joint trade and commerce extend through the universe in a generous rivalry; to change the mean and precarious posts of Scottish administration into a more than equal participation in the greatest offices and distinctions of the British commonwealth; to divest, indeed, the peerage of Scotland of feudal jurisdiction, of followers and vassalages, and thus to make them truly noble and honorable in their obedience to laws which should override the old local tyrannies; to inspire the soldiery of Scotland with the true patriotism that has survived the false glory of border hatred, and made the Abercrombies, and Moores, and Campbells fight for the island as the heritage of one free people; to make the artisans and tradesmen of decayed royal burghs, instead of walking their desolate streets, or becoming 'prentices to their unkind neighbors, raise up factories that might rival the proudest of Lancashire and Yorkshire, and fill the Clyde and the Forth with forests of masts; to cure the difficulties of the landed men by increasing their rents ten-fold, and twenty-fold; to convert the laborious ploughman, with his patch of oats, into the most flourishing, because skilful, farmer on the face of the earth. Caledonia, with a few occasional heart-burnings, has been smiling to see this process going forward for a century and a half; and though she duly believes that her youngest sister had the best of the bargain of 1706, she rejoices with her inmost heart that, under that partnership, enmity gradually passed into mutual confidence, and then into reciprocal esteem and firm friendship.

Standing as we now do upon the platform of a hundred and fifty years' experience, it would be manifestly unwise and unjust to speak of the convictions of such minds as those of Belhaven and Fletcher, and others of the honest patriots at this great crisis of their country's destiny, as manifesting their incapacity of looking beyond their own immediate times. They rested their opposition to an incorporating union upon their belief that it would destroy the nationality of Scotland, without any corresponding public benefits. "Should not the memory of our noble predecessors' valor and constancy rouse up our drooping spirits?" ejaculated Belhaven. "Are our noble predecessors' souls got so far into the English cabbage-stock and cauliflowers that we should show the least inclination that way?" Their watchword was "our ancient kingdom"—a kingdom with a long uninterrupted line of kings, even a hundred and twelve kings, whose veritable portraits are in Holyrood. Belhaven had a right to be proud of the great memories of his nation—of its historical prowess blending with its mythic glories. The fables of such a nation are not to be despised. England could match Scotland in traditions of

"Brutus' sacred progeny,
Which had seven hundred years this sceptre borne." *

She could match Scotland also in "fathers of war-proof." But it was the mistake of the Scottish patriots to believe that Englishmen were degenerate—wholly given up to money-getting and luxurious gratification—"epicures," as they were called of old—devoted to Dutch cabbages and wheaten bread, and despising honest kale and oatmeal. Yet if the Scots had their prejudices, so had the English. Defoe told his countrymen, "Those who fancy there is nothing to be had in Scotland but wild men and ragged mountains, storms, snows, poverty, and barrenness, are quite mistaken." † John Taylor, the Water Poet, had maintained, a century before, that in his "Pennilesse Pilgrimage" he had never seen "more plenty or more cheap" than in Scotland. But both English and Scots knew full well that the superiority of England was not in the fertility of her land, but in the activity of her commerce. Her capital, from the days of the Tudors, had been steadily devoted to the extension of her trade. In truth, the strongest argument which the advocates of the union could present to the sober Scottish mind—an argument which overthrew all appeals to "free and independent kingdom," "national church," "noble ancestors"—was that the trade of the world should be as open to the Scot as to the Englishman. This was a concession which the Englishman long grumbled against. "It was a common apprehension in England, before the union," says Hume, "that Scotland would soon drain them of their treasure, were an open trade allowed." ‡ The Scots were somewhat amazed when Godolphin at once consented to renounce most of the rubbish of prohibitory statutes, and when the Scotch woollen manufacture was absolutely to receive encouragement. Yet when the articles of union agreed to by the commissioners were known, there were many in Scotland who maintained that the commercial advantages might be equally gained

* Lord Belhaven's Speech is printed at length in "Parliamentary History," vol. vi., and in Defoe's "History of the Union."

* "Faery Queen." † Review.
‡ Essay, "Of the Balance of Trade."

by a federal, instead of an incorporating union. Mr. Seton, of Pitmedden, who was one of the commissioners, contended in the Scottish parliament that this notion was a delusion: "This nation is behind all other nations of Europe, for many years, with respect to the effect of an extended trade. This nation being poor, and without force to protect its commerce, cannot reap great advantages by it, till it partake of the trade and protection of some powerful neighbor nation that can communicate both these." He then shows that, "supposing an entire separation from England," the established commerce of the English and Dutch, especially, would prevent any successful rivalry. The alliance of a neighbor nation was therefore essential. There was no chance of such an alliance with Holland, for they were each dealers in the same goods. With France "few advantages can be reaped, unless the old offensive and defensive league be revived between France and Scotland," and then there would be war with England. The possible results of such a war are thus gravely stated by Seton: "Allowing the Scots, in such a juncture, with the assistance of France, to conquer England, Scotland, by that conquest, could not hope to better its present state; for it is more than probable the conqueror would make her residence in England, as formerly the northern people used to do in their southern expeditions." The conquering Scot could not "quaff the pendent vintage as it grows;" but when the commerce of the Thames poured into his lap all the treasures of the East and of the West, he would leave the port of Leith to the petty gains of her fleet of herring-busses, and would drink "the blude-reid wine" with his king at Westminster, who would scorn to sit "in Dumferling toune." It was long the dream of the Jacobites that Scotland, with the assistance of France, might conquer England. The dreamers awoke, in 1745, to the dirge of "Mourn, hapless Caledonia, mourn." The strong common-sense of Seton of Pitmedden sums up the benefits to Scotland of an incorporating union, in words which sound more like a true prophecy than the rhetorical visions of the young seer, Belhaven: "I may assert that by this union we will have access to all the advantages in commerce which the English enjoy: we will be capable by a good government to improve our natural products for the benefit of the whole island; and we will have our liberty, property, and religion, secured under the protection of one sovereign, and one parliament, of Great Britain." * It is satisfactory to contrast the manifestations in the Scottish parliament of an enthusiastic exclusiveness, and of a less self-satisfied patriotism. It is satisfactory, because out of the fervid nationality and the practical wisdom have been formed that Scottish character, which has tardily but surely amalgamated with the English character, "for the benefit of the whole island"—a character upon which the old English belief in the real and the stage Macsycophants has left no enduring taint—which has survived the growls of Johnson and the libels of Churchill; which has ceased to be violently combative when any assimilation of the laws and institutions of the northern and southern sides of the Tweed is proposed; which calls up all the old fire of as true a nationality when a common enemy of the whole island is to be fought, a common injustice to be redressed, or a common reform to be struggled for.

When the vote was taken upon the first article of the Treaty of Union, viz., "That the two kingdoms of Scotland and England shall, upon the first day of May next ensuing the date hereof, and forever after, be united into one kingdom by the name of Great Britain," there was a majority of thirty-three in favor of this fundamental proposition. There was a majority in each estate—of peers, of barons or representatives of counties, of representatives of towns. The second article for the succession of the monarchy, and the third for representation by one parliament, were also carried within the next fortnight. The question which was excepted from the treaty, that of the Church of Scotland, was then agitated; and it was resolved in a way which abated the fears of the Presbyterians, by passing a separate act to provide for the security of the Church; which act was to be repeated as a part of any act of the Scottish or English parliament adopting the union. Under this statute every sovereign of Great Britain, upon his or her accession, is to take an oath to protect the government, worship, discipline, rights, and privileges of the Church of Scotland. The estates then proceeded to the consideration of the minute details of the remaining twenty articles of the treaty. This discussion lasted till the middle of January, 1707.

The opposition to the union beyond the walls of the Scottish parliament could scarcely be called national, in a large sense of the word. But it was nevertheless a formidable opposition, manifesting itself among very various parties and conditions of society. The Duke of Queensberry, the queen's high commissioner, was instrumental in disarming the violence, both within the parliament and without, by his patience and moderation. "The duke, in all the heats and animosities of the party, in all the convulsions of the kingdom, carried on the treaty with easiness, temper, and extraordinary conduct, not taking advantage of the rashness and madness of the people, pitying rather than apprehending danger from their folly." * Queensberry was threatened with assassination. He was told that two and twenty had subscribed an oath with their blood, by which they were bound together to assassinate him. No attempt was made to commit this crime. There was a second outbreak in Edinburgh, but there was no bloodshed. Those who have been described as the fiercest mob in Europe were singularly harmless during the three months of excitement which preceded the passing of the Act of Union. There was a more serious riot at Glasgow on the 7th of November, which lasted several days. Those who had been fighting at Bothwell Brig with a fury which Claverhouse and Balfour have impersonated for history and romance, were now united to hunt after an obdurate provost who had declined to sanction a city address against the union. Jacobites and Cameronians, papists and hill-preachers were masters for a time of the city of Glasgow. "They ranged the streets and did what they pleased; no magistrate durst show his face to them; they challenged people as they walked the streets with this question, Are you for the union? and no man durst own it but at his extremest hazard."† They searched for arms in private houses; and their rudeness, says Defoe, is not to be described. But this rude mob took no life away. "Except that there was no blood shed, they acted the exact part of an enraged ungoverned multitude." A few of the leaders of these riots were taken, and the Glasgow baillies were soon relieved of their fears.

There is a grave record of an important demonstration of this period, in a work which might pass for such an ingenious fiction as the famous "Gil Blas de Santillane," or "The History of the Life of Mr. Jonathan Wild, the Great," if the author were not a distinguished personage known by "his several transactions and negotiations in Scotland, England, the courts of Vienna, Hanover, and other foreign parts," as the title-page of his book duly sets forth.‡ John Ker describes the three great parties of Scotland—the Presbyterian, the Cameronian, and the Episcopal. The Presbyterian were divided into the complying and the nonjuring; the nonjurors taking exception to the oath which referred to the English statute under which the sovereign was required to be of the communion of the Church of England. He paints the Cameronians as cleaving to the form of church government established in 1648; despising the indulgence of Charles II., the toleration of James II., and the revolution establishment; they continue to preach in the fields, still retaining the doctrine of resistance, and self-defence, however peaceable. The Episcopal party, he says, "are generally in the pretender's interest, and are near one half of the nation," among whom are to be reckoned the most part of the Highland clans. John Ker was considered as one of great influence among the Cameronians. But, as he himself professes, he was strenuously opposed to the schemes of the Jacobites, who were endeavoring to engage the Presbyterians and Cameronians on their side, to prevent the union. "I soon perceived," says the man of influence, "abundance of private transactions in favor of the pretender; for it was impossible for the Jacobites to carry them on without my knowledge, considering the great interest I had with the Cameronians." The Duke of Queensberry sent for Mr. Ker, for the government had advices that the Cameronians and Jacobites were to meet in arms on the river Nith, near Sanquhar, to put an end to the parliament, and that the French king would send over troops, "to improve the opportunity." The Laird

* Seton's statesmanlike speech is given in Defoe's "History of the Union," and in "Parliamentary History of England," vol. vi.

* Defoe, "History of the Union," p. 212. † Ibid., p. 272.
‡ "The Memoirs of John Ker, of Kersland, in North Britain, Esqre." 2 vols. 3d edit., 1737.

of Kersland said he was always an enemy to popery and the pretender; but then was he able to dissuade the Cameronians from their purpose? He could not resist the duke's "rhetorical arguments;" and so an ingenious device occurred to the loyal man: "If I purposed to do any effectual service, I must enter into all their measures, and then probably they would honor me with the chief command, and by being at their head in rebellion against the queen and government I should expose myself to their displeasure; and therefore it would be proper I should have a privy seal, authorizing me to act as I found convenient." * So John Ker wends his thoughtful way from Edinburgh to Killoch Side, near Sanquhar, where the Cameronian leaders were assembled; and they admitted him forthwith into their general meeting. He gives his harangue to this meeting. Matters are now brought to a crisis. All that is dear to us as Protestants is likely to be rendered precarious by the proposed union. Are we to oppose this union or not? "If you agree in the affirmative, then what sort of opposition this shall be; for it is very evident that the parliament resolves to ram it down our throats." Prevail upon them, said Queensberry, to decline their desperate resolutions. The eloquence of Ker produced a determination to do something more decided. "I pretended—and would to God I had dealt more sincerely—to join with them in all their measures, and offered to fortify their resolutions with some arguments of my own." Then they resolved to burn the articles publicly at the Market Cross of Dumfries, and to publish their declaration that all who supported the union were enemies and traitors to their country. On the 20th of November the burning was "very solemnly performed, by a considerable party of horse and foot under arms, with sound of trumpet and beat of drum." The worthy orator of Killoch Side quieted the apprehensions of the government that horse and foot and beat of drum meant insurrection: "I dispatched an express to the Duke of Queensberry, and told him, though I had given way to such a solemn execution of the union articles, that he might be easy notwithstanding, for it was necessary to keep up to the decorum they expected, in order to prevent their prosecution of such measures as must infallibly disappoint him. And further, I told him, it might be found expedient to burn the houses of some that had been most instrumental in carrying on the union; but nevertheless, I doubted not to order matters so, as that nothing was to be feared from the Cameronians upon this conduct, which looked very like earnest. I am convinced the whole body of the Cameronians were resolved, my unworthy self only excepted."

John Ker, of Kersland, is the type of many an intriguing spy, who, in dangerous times, has encouraged the agitation which he was employed to watch. It was fortunate that the Cameronians were not driven to carry their zeal beyond the Market Cross at Dumfries. Vast things were expected from the junction of the true League and Covenant men with the Jacobites, Papists and Episcopalians. They were to march to Hamilton, seven thousand in number. The Duke of Athol was to lead his Highlanders through the famous pass where Dundee scattered six thousand veterans. The Duke of Hamilton was to head this motley army. The duke was wiser. He sent orders to the Highlanders and Cameronians to disperse and return home. The duke was unstable in his modes of opposition to the union. All parties began to look with suspicion upon his alternations of a hot and cold policy, and upon the blandishments of his mother toward the Presbyterians. "It was suggested," says Burnet, "that she and her son had particular views, as hoping that if Scotland should continue a separated kingdom, the crown might come into their family, they being the next in blood after King James's posterity." †

Despite the Jacobites and the Cameronians, the timid Presbyterians and the semi-papist Episcopalians, the Act of the Scottish Estates for the Union was finally passed on the 16th of January, by a hundred and ten votes against sixty-nine. "And there's an end o' an auld sang," said the chancellor. It was an insult, cries the chivalrous Sir Walter Scott, "for which he deserved to be destroyed on the spot by his indignant countrymen." ‡ Belhaven complained that the union would compel the peers of Scotland to "lay aside their walking-swords when in company with the English peers, lest their self-defence should be called murder." We have outgrown the use of walking-swords, even for the self-defence which the Scottish thought a privilege of his order; certainly so for such homicid the Scottish poet thought a fitting propitiation to the shades of hundred and fourteen kings whose line began when Cheops wa unborn.

Before the Scottish parliament separated, they regulated the election of the representative peers, and the proportion of county and borough members of the Commons. They had to arrange the division of the equivalent money, of which the Darien or African Company had a large share. The last meeting of the Scottish Estates was on the 26th of March, 1707.

The Order of the Thistle, which had been revived by Queen Anne in 1703, was not filled up by elections till some few years had elapsed. James II. had contemplated the restitution of the order, but no patent for this object had passed the great seal. There was now in the possession of the crown the means of bestowing a great distinct n, essentially national; for in the statutes of 1703 the number of knights was limited to twelve peers of Scotland, the sovereign being the head. This number somewhat profanely kept in view the precedent of our Saviour and the twelve apostles. George I. broke through the principle of exclusive nationality by bestowing the honor upon a few English peers. George IV. overturned the scriptural character by raising the number of knights to sixteen.

The parliament of England had met in December, during the anxious discussion in Scotland of the articles of the Treaty of Union. At the end of January the queen sent to the House of Peers, and announced that the treaty for an union had been ratified by act of parliament in Scotland, with some alterations and additions. The articles were then presented. In the Lords a bill was brought in for the security of the Church of England as by law established; the movers having, of course, a slight apprehension that the sovereign's oath to preserve the Church of Scotland might be liable to misconstruction unless thus qualified. The debates in the English parliament on the principle of the union were animated, but were not violent. The ministry were anxious to pass the bill for the union, without making any alteration in the articles as adopted by the Scottish parliament. They succeeded in preventing a debate on each clause by inserting the articles in the preamble of the bill, with the two acts for the security of the churches of each country. By this device the measure was to be accepted or rejected as a whole. It was passed without difficulty, and on the 6th of March the queen gave the royal assent in these words: "My Lords and Gentlemen: It is with the greatest satisfaction that I have given my assent to a bill for uniting England and Scotland into one kingdom. I consider this union as a matter of the greatest importance to the wealth, strength, and safety of the whole island; and, at the same time, as a work of so much difficulty and nicety in its own nature, that till now all attempts which have been made toward it in the course of above a hundred years have proved ineffectual; and, therefore, I make no doubt but it will be remembered and spoke of hereafter, to the honor of those who have been instrumental in bringing it to such a happy conclusion. I desire and expect from all my subjects, of both nations, that from henceforth they act with all possible respect and kindness to one another, that so it may appear to all the world they have hearts disposed to become one people. This will be a great pleasure to me, and will make us all quickly sensible of the good effects of this union. And I cannot but look upon it as a peculiar happiness, that in my reign so full provision is made for the peace and quiet of my people, and for the security of our religion, by so firm an establishment of the Protestant succession throughout Great Britain."

CHAPTER CXXXIX.

Warlike addresses of parliament—Reverses—Battle of Almanza—Marlborough's visit to Charles XII. of Sweden—Indecisive campaign of 1707—Siege of Toulon—Wreck of Sir Cloudesley Shovel—Naval miscarriages—Complaints in parliament—Discontents in Scotland—Jacobite plots—Attempted invasion—Dismissal of Harley and St. John from the ministry—Campaign of 1708—Ghent surrendered to the French—Battle of Oudenarde—Sardinia and Minorca surrendered to the allies—Death of the Prince of Denmark—Surrender of Lille—Proposals of France for peace—Campaign of 1709—Surrender of Tournay—Battle of Malplaquet.

* Memoirs, p. 31.
† "Own Time," vol. v. p. 277.
‡ Note in Burton, p. 482.

by a parliament which met in December, 1706, is chiefly memorable for its ratification of the Treaty of Union. The ministry was all-powerful, chiefly through the splendid successes of Marlborough in the Netherlands, and from the favorable aspects of the war in Spain and Italy. An indirect overture for peace had been made by Louis; but the English parliament was in no pacific attitude. The queen called for supplies, "sufficient for carrying on the war next year in so effectual a manner that we may be able to improve everywhere the advantages of this successful campaign." The Lords congratulated her majesty upon "the ever-memorable victory of Ramilies," and expressed what they called "the universal satisfaction of your people," at the public declaration which the queen had made "that no negotiations for peace should be entered into, but in conjunction with all the members of the Grand Alliance." The Commons promised "such speedy and effectual supplies as, by the continuance of God's blessing upon your majesty's arms, may establish the balance of power in Europe, by a safe, honorable, and lasting peace." The supplies were granted with unusual rapidity; and the pension of 5000*l.* per annum to the Duke of Marlborough was settled upon his posterity. When the parliament was prorogued, it was renewed by proclamation, declaring that the first parliament of Great Britain should be held on the 23d of October.

The warlike successes of the allies during this year were by no means commensurate with the expectations of the government. In Spain there was a fatal reverse. We have already seen how the insurrection of Catalonia and Valencia had utterly failed, through the incompetency of the Austrian prince and his generals. When Peterborough no longer animated their courage by his daring, and combated their hesitation by his energetic sagacity, the good fortune which gave the allies Barcelona utterly forsook them. Madrid had been retaken by Marshal Berwick, and King Philip was again seated in the Escurial. The so-called King Charles, instead of remaining with the army in Valencia, to lead them against Berwick, returned to Barcelona. In April Lord Galway and the Portuguese general, Das Minas, took the field, with about seventeen thousand men. The French and Spanish army was superior in numbers, especially in cavalry. They met on the plain of Almanza; and there a battle was fought, in which the allies were utterly routed. Four thousand of the English, Dutch, and Portuguese were slain on that fatal Easter Monday, the 25th of April, and eight thousand were taken prisoners. A letter from Mr. Methuen, the English minister at Lisbon, to the Duke of Marlborough, says, "Our infantry is wholly taken or destroyed; but of the horse three thousand five hundred are saved, the greater part of which are Portuguese, who, being on the right, gave way upon the first shock of the enemy, and abandoned the foot." * The towns of Valencia and Arragon were surrendered to the victor. Peterborough's exploits were nearly fruitless. In Catalonia alone had King Charles any adherents. That province continued the seat of warfare, with English assistance, for three more years; but the spirit which only could secure success was gone. It was no longer an insurrection in favor of the house of Austria against the house of Bourbon; it was a national demonstration for King Philip against a foreign enemy. The terrible defeat of Almanza went to the heart of the humblest in England, if we may judge from Addison's amusing essay upon omens. The salt is spilt by an unlucky guest, and the lady of the house says to her husband, "My dear, misfortunes never come single. Do not you remember that the pigeon-house fell the very afternoon that our careless wench spilt the salt upon the table?" "Yes, my dear, and the next post brought us an account of the battle of Almanza." †

Marlborough the diplomatist was more busy in 1707 than Marlborough the general. There was a young King of Sweden, with a passionate desire for war and conquest, who would not take the orthodox course of heartily joining the Grand Alliance against France, or of throwing his weight into the scale of France against the Grand Alliance. Charles XII. had plans of his own, which he pursued with a self-will which had very little respect to the power or influence of any state or confederacy of states. He had defeated the Russians in 1700. He had first conquered, and then deposed, King Augustus of Poland, and had set up a man of noble family, Stanislaus, as king; Augustus was also Elector of Saxony. Charles led his army into Saxony, held its elector in a sort of honorable captivity, and from his camp at Alt Ranstadt, near Leipsic, demanded the submission of Europe to his decrees. Louis XIV. in the reverses of 1706 turned his views to Charles as an ally, bribed his ministers, even solicited him to become the mediator between the Bourbons and the allies. The English government had also its alarms; and Marlborough was in communication with General Grumbkow, who had been sent on a mission to Charles by the King of Prussia. The Prussian gave the young Swede a glowing account of Marlborough and his actions, which was duly reported to him whom the general styles "his hero:" "Among other particulars, he asked me if your highness yourself led the troops to the charge. I replied, that as all the troops were animated with the same ardor for fighting, your highness was not under the necessity of leading the charge; but that you were everywhere, and always in the hottest of the action, and gave your orders with that coolness which excites general admiration. I then related to him that you had been thrown from your horse; the death of your aide-de-camp, Brinfield, and many other things. He took such pleasure in this recital that he made me repeat the same thing twice. I also said that your highness always spoke of his majesty with the highest esteem and admiration, and ardently desired to pay your respects. He observed, 'That is not likely, but I should be delighted to see a general of whom I have heard so much.'" * The general of whom Charles had heard so much was not slow to gratify him. On the 27th of April Marlborough was at Alt Ranstadt. He writes to Harley that he had that day his audience of the king; delivered the queen's letter; and that his majesty seemed very well inclined to the interest of the allies. † Lediard, the biographer of Marlborough, who was in the camp of Alt Ranstadt, gives us a more precise view of the courtly management of the duke at this audience. "He presented to his Swedish majesty a letter from the Queen of Great Britain, and, at delivering it, made him the following compliment in French: 'Sir, I present to your majesty a letter, not from the Chancery; but from the heart of the queen, my mistress, and written with her own hand. Had not her sex prevented it, she would have crossed the sea, to see a prince admired by the whole universe. I am, in this particular, more happy than the queen; and I wish I could serve some campaigns under so great a general as your majesty, that I might learn what I yet want to know in the art of war." ‡ Charles was very gracious in return. He said he would do nothing to prejudice the common cause in general, or the Protestant religion in particular. He cared very little for the common cause. Voltaire has shown what he did really care for. Marlborough, Voltaire says, "fixed his eyes attentively upon the king. When he spoke to him of war in general, he imagined that he saw, in his majesty, a natural aversion toward France, and that he took a secret pleasure in speaking of the conquests of the allies. He mentioned the czar to him, and took notice that his eyes kindled whenever he was named, notwithstanding the moderation of the conference. He, moreover, remarked that the king had a map of Muscovy lying before him on the table. This was sufficient to determine him in his judgment, that the King of Sweden's real design and sole ambition were to dethrone the czar, as he had already done the King of Poland." Marlborough promised pensions to the Swedish minister, Count Piper, and other functionaries, paying one year in advance; and then he returned to the Hague, to go to his accustomed fighting-ground.

Marlborough wrote from Brussels to Harley, in the middle of May, "All our troops are in motion. . . . Since their success in Spain the enemy talk very big, and pretend to give us battle; for my part, I think nothing could be more for the advantage of the allies." § But there was no battle in the Netherlands during that campaign. Vendôme commanded the French army, and he was content with defensive operations. The States controlled Marlborough's plans. Thus the two generals were constantly occupied in watching and counteracting each the strategy of the other. But if Marlborough was unable to strike any decisive blow, he had consulted with Prince

* "Dispatches," vol. iii. p. 353.

† Lord Macaulay, in his "Essays," has quoted this passage, to observe that much clearer omens indicated disaster in Spain. We quote it to show the impression which public disasters made upon the popular mind at home.

* Coxe, vol. iii. p. 159. † "Dispatches," vol. iii. p. 347.

‡ Lediard, "Life of Marlborough," vol. ii. p. 166.

§ "Dispatches," vol. iii. p. 369.

Eugene for the accomplishment of a plan that was calculated to injure France in a vital part. An attempt was to be made, by land and sea, to penetrate into the south-eastern part of Louis's own territory. The land forces, under the Duke of Savoy and Prince Eugene, were to invade Provence. An English and Dutch fleet, under Sir Cloudesley Shovel, were to co-operate in this bold attempt. In the beginning of July Victor Amadeus and Eugene crossed the Alps by the pass of the Col di Tende; on the 11th they made the passage of the Var; dislodged the French from their intrenchments on the right bank of that river; and on the 25th encamped near Toulon. The difficulties of this attempt at invasion are described by a high military authority. The fortifications of Toulon were "respectable;" the neighboring heights presented many strong positions, difficult to be acquired or to be retained; the force of the allies was wholly incompetent to invest the place, so that the communication between the garrison and the army of Marshal Tessé could not be impeded; the besiegers were wholly dependent upon the fleet for provisions and military stores.* In less than one month the object of the expedition was abandoned. To revenge, it is said, the bombardment of Turin, the Duke of Savoy resolved to bombard Toulon, in which act of destruction the fleet was the chief agent. The "diversion," as it was called, drew off some of the forces of France from other quarters; but the fires of Toulon blazed for no sufficient object, unless success in war is to be measured by the amount of havoc and misery which man can inflict on man.

All that naval daring could effect in the siege of Toulon was accomplished by the fleet under the command of Sir Cloudesley Shovel. This admiral was faithful and incorruptible, at the time when James II. employed every art to seduce the commanders of the English fleets to betray their trusts. "He was not a man to be spoken to," was the tribute of a Jacobite emissary to the character of Sir Cloudesley Shovel. Returning home from the siege of Toulon, with fifteen ships of the line, his flag-ship was wrecked on the rocks of Scilly, with two other vessels, on the night of the 22d of October. The crews of the Association, the Eagle, and the Romney all perished. The body of the admiral, supposed to be cast ashore by the waves, was found after some days, and was brought to Westminster Abbey for interment with all honor; and in that house of the illustrious dead may be seen his sumptuous monument. But there is a remarkable story connected with his fate, which was published under the authority of the Earl of Romney, grandson to Sir Cloudesley Shovel. Many years after the wreck an aged woman confessed to the parish minister, on her death-bed, that, exhausted with fatigue one man who had survived the wreck reached her hut, and that she had murdered him to secure the valuable property on his person. This worst of wreckers then produced a ring taken from the finger of her victim, and it was afterward identified as one presented to Sir Cloudesley Shovel by Lord Berkeley. Burnet has described the catastrophe of the wreck: "When Sir Cloudesley Shovel was sailing home with the great ships, by an unaccountable carelessness and security, he, and two other capital ships, ran foul upon those rocks beyond the Land's End, known by the name of the Bishop and his Clerks, and they were in a minute broke to pieces, so that not a man of them escaped. It was dark, but there was no wind, otherwise the whole fleet had perished with them: all the rest tacked in time, and so they were saved. Thus one of the greatest seamen of the age was lost, by an error in his own profession and a great misreckoning; for he had lain by all the day before and set sail at night, believing that next morning he would have time enough to guard against running on those rocks; but he was swallowed up within three hours after."† There was another disaster at sea, which in the ensuing session of parliament led, with other accidents, to serious complaints of naval miscarriages. A convoy of five ships of the line were to guard a fleet of merchantmen to Lisbon, chiefly laden with stores and horses for the King of Portugal. Fourteen sail of French ships from Brest and Dunkirk met the English ships off the Lizard; and of this convoy one vessel was blown up and three taken. Most of the merchantmen escaped, and reached their destination. The posture of affairs was not agreeable; and the first parliament of Great Britain met on the 23d of October, in no very placable temper. The Prince of Denmark was lord high admiral; and against his management, or rather that of his council, to whom he deferred in all things, were the complaints of parliament openly or covertly directed. Lord Haversham's denunciations spoke, to some extent, the murmurs of the people: "Your ships have been taken by your enemies, as the Dutch take your herrings, by shoals, upon your own coasts; nay, your royal navy itself has not escaped. And these are frequent misfortunes, and big with innumerable mischiefs. Your merchants are beggared, your commerce is broke, your trade is gone, your people and manufactures ruined. . . . My lords, the face of our affairs is visibly changed in the space of one year's time, and the temper of the nation too."* In all wars the English have ever been impatient of misfortune, and even of the absence of success. It was time that Marlborough and the Whigs should make some strenuous exertions to recover their popularity. They turned out Harley, and compelled St. John to resign; for these very able but not very scrupulous coadjutors were intriguing against them. Two more years of fierce warfare, in which the national excitement was abundantly kept up; and then a season of polemical fury, of court intrigue, an outcry for peace, and a total change of men and measures.

The union, as might be expected, has not worked very smoothly in Scotland. The general taxation of the two countries being assimilated, there were perpetual differences about the collection of the excise. The Scots had been accustomed to have their duties farmed, upon a system of composition for the tax-payers. When the gauger came with his accurate measurements, and the loose system would no longer prevail, the indignation was very general, though very unreasonable. The customs were also obnoxious, and a contraband trade was very soon established. The equivalent money, too, was delayed in its arrival, from the somewhat low state of the English exchequer. When it was paid there were only a hundred thousand pounds sent in specie, and the remainder in bills. Even the specie was not welcomed; for the populace of Edinburgh were incited to stone the carters who conducted the precious deposit to the castle. The people at first refused to take the bills; but regularity of payment soon removed the difficulty. There had been a year of grumbling on both sides of the Tweed; for the English merchants looked with aversion upon the system that had been attempted, of sending foreign goods to the Thames as Scottish merchandise. There were seizures of French wine and brandy, which were held to be smuggled from abroad. The interference of the government prevented a collision, by remitting the penalties which the Board of Customs would have exacted. But there was mutual exasperation, and very angry commercial jealousy.

After the discussions in the Scottish parliament upon the question of union, a Jacobite agent from France hid been busy in stirring up the disaffected to an insurrection. This ambassador from St. Germains was Colonel Hooke; and he came with offers of French assistance, to unite with the Scots to whom the union was held to be hateful, for the invasion of England. The legitimate king was to lead the conquering forces of his ancient realm; and he should wear the two crowns, as his royal ancestor, the sixth James, had worn them. This enthusiastic agent had communications with several peers of well-known Jacobite principles. He was also endeavoring to work among the Cameronians; and he received assurances from our amusing friend, John Ker, of Kersland, that five thousand of these fighting zealots should take the field. This worthy patriot had again seen the Duke of Queensberry, and told him that there was a project to bring in the pretender. "The duke was much surprised when he understood a French power was to land in Scotland, and desired me to go into their measures in order to discover the plot." Ker had scruples: "I told him I was afraid I had gone through too much dirty work already." The duke went to London. "I retired," he says, "to Kersland, to breathe some honest air in the country." But "the bugbear of popery" still troubled his head. The agents came from St. Germains; let him into the whole affair; promised that nothing should be wanting to secure the Protestant religion; settled that five thousand troops should be sent from France; and forthwith, says the candid autobiographer, "I acquainted the Duke of Queensberry with what had passed." In this juncture Ker exercised his influence with the Cameronians, not to excite them to in-

* Sir George Murray, in "Dispatches," vol. iii. p. 380.
† "Own Time," vol. v. p. 324.

* "Parliamentary History," vol. vi. col. 599.

surrection, and then betray them, but in persuading them not to rise. His information, however, from the Jacobite agents was correct, and his warnings to the government were useful. But he received small personal benefit for his "good services;" and he adds, out of the depth of his frank soul, "Truly I dare say, I was rewarded just as I deserved."*

In January, 1708, the British government, with a full knowledge of the contemplated invasion, was carefully observing preparations for an armament at Dunkirk. Sir George Byng was cruising in the Channel with sixteen men-of-war. At the beginning of March fifteen French battalions and three hundred volunteers were embarked; and Prince James Edward, known as the pretender, having gone on board a fleet of twenty-eight vessels, commanded by the French admiral Fourbin, came out of Dunkirk. At Ostend Byng learned that they had evaded him; and from the state of the wind and tide, they had eight hours' start of him in their voyage toward Scotland. The French admiral overshot the Frith of Forth, but returned southward from the coast near Montrose, and lay off May Island. When the English squadron appeared, Fourbin sailed in hot haste into the North Sea, without making any attempt to land his troops. The Scots, it was said, made no response to his signals. Byng did not make any pursuit, and the troops and their leader were relanded at Dunkirk.

Had the French expedition made a descent, the government might have been seriously embarrassed, for the queen's troops in Scotland were very few, and there was little preparation for resistance. Previous to the attempt there had been a serious disorganization in the ministry. Harley was carrying on, through his influence over the queen, schemes for the construction of a party opposed to the powerful ministers, Godolphin and Marlborough, with whom he had been serving. A clerk of Harley, named Gregg, was detected in a correspondence with the French secretary of state, to whom he had communicated important secrets of office. He was tried, and convicted of treason on his own confession; but he persisted to the end in averring that Harley had no part in his treachery. Various revelations were made of the subtle minister's intrigues at court; and Godolphin and Marlborough insisted on his dismissal. The queen would not consent. The lord treasurer and the commander-in-chief did not appear at the cabinet council, refusing to meet Harley. The queen reluctantly yielded to necessity, and the secretary resigned the seals. St. John and other official persons also resigned. The wretched Gregg was executed. The dismissal of Harley was the prelude to that change in the councils of Anne which divided the nation more completely into Whig and Tory factions, and produced a struggle for political ascendency as remarkable as any in the history of parties. The Whigs, for a time, were in the ascendant. The resignation of St. John opened the important office of secretary at war to Robert Walpole.

It was not till the beginning of July, 1708, that the war in the Netherlands assumed any decisive character. There was a French army of a hundred thousand men advancing to Brabant, under the command of the Duke de Vendôme. The Dutch had conducted themselves with so much harshness in the fortified places which had been surrendered after the battle of Ramilies that the inhabitants had become thoroughly adverse to the cause of the allies, and they looked with joy at the advance of the French. Marlborough was inactive through June, waiting for Prince Eugene and his army, marching from Vienna. In the mean time the gates of Ghent and Bruges had been opened to the French; and Marlborough wrote to Godolphin, on the 9th of July, "The States have used this country so ill that I no ways doubt but all the towns in it will play us the same trick as Ghent has done, whenever they have it in their power."† At the date of this letter Marlborough was marching day and night, to come up with the French, who were preparing to invest Oudenarde. Prince Eugene had joined him alone, having hurried on before his troops. They immediately determined to attack Vendôme, and to take a line of march that would interpose between him and the French frontier.

But Marlborough, at this most important juncture, would have been little fitted for conducting a great battle had he been formed of the same yielding materials as ordinary men. In the letter to Godolphin of the 9th of July, in which he attributes the surrender of Ghent to the harsh conduct of the Dutch to the people of the Spanish Netherlands, he says, "I should answer two of your letters, but the treachery of Ghent, continual marching, and some letters I have received from England, have so vexed me, that I was yesterday in so great a fever, that the doctor would have persuaded me to have gone to Brussels; but I thank God I am now better, and by the next post I hope to answer your letters." This impassive man can feel then. His plans of warfare are disconcerted; he is exhausted by wearisome marches; but, worst of all, he has the agitation of letters "received from England." The future greatness of the ambitious commander, who has more of the dizzy heights of fortune yet to scale, may altogether depend upon those letters. He had written at the end of May to Godolphin, "I am very glad to find by yours of the 11th that you have hopes that Mrs. Morley, though late, will do what you desire. Nothing else can make us happy in serving her well; for though I should have success, that might give safety abroad, but could not hinder disagreeable things at home."* Mrs. Morley (the queen), though she had dismissed Harley from her councils, kept up her correspondence with him, through her new favorite, Mrs. Masham. Mrs. Freeman (the duchess) had not yielded up her old influence without an attempt to subdue Mrs. Morley entirely to her will, not by blandishments, but by an imperial contempt of her majesty's understanding and conduct. The duchess when, in the autumn of 1707, she remonstrated against the appointment of two high-churchmen to vacant benefices, employed the following extraordinary language: "I hope your majesty will not be so much offended with me as you have lately been, if I believe those things for your good that are thought so by those that have served you with so much success—men that have a view of all things and all sorts of people, whereas your majesty has had the misfortune to be misinformed in general things. Even from twelve years old you have heard in your father's court strange names given to men by flatterers in these former reigns, for no reason in the world but that they would not continue to carry on popery. That, and many other things too long to repeat in a letter, has given your majesty very wrong notions, and you are like people that never read but one sort of books—you can't possibly judge unless you heard all things stated fairly."† The ascendency of Mrs. Masham was, under the tuition of Harley, rapidly driving Mrs. Morley to cast off her dear friend, Mrs. Freeman, who used such plain speaking. Upon such slight things do the fates of nations depend. Marlborough had a fever fit: but he roused himself, and, three days after, won the great victory of Oudenarde.

Those letters to the ministry at home in which Marlborough relates the results of a battle rarely contain any precise military details. In the instance of his victory at Oudenarde, he sends a note of a few lines to the secretary of state, referring him to the aide-de-camp he has sent "to give the queen an account of his great success." But five days after this battle of the 11th of July he writes a letter of very minute information to Count Piper, the minister of Charles XII. of Sweden, in which he describes his operations, for the information of that king, to whom fighting was the great object of existence. We translate a few passages of this letter, written in French, which may still be read with interest. Having described the occupation of Ghent by the enemy, after they had remained some weeks in their camp of Braine-la-Leude, he says, "Their army marched at the same time to make assurance of their new conquest, believing that by that they would become masters of all Flanders. They first desired to besiege Oudenarde, which they had invested on the 9th, and to cover the siege their army marched on the 10th to seize on the camp of Lessines. They were only two leagues from it, when they found that we had anticipated them by forced marches. Seeing that we had already begun to pass the Dender at Lessines, they recalled their forces from before Oudenarde, to fall back upon Gavre, upon the Escaut [Scheldt], previous to passing that river. This passage they commenced at four o'clock on the morning of the 11th; and the same day we continued our march toward Oudenarde, five leagues distant from our camp."‡ It was this march of unexampled rapidity that gave Marlborough his triumph. The French were quite unprepared for the sudden presence of his army, ready to give immediate battle, after a fatiguing march through a close coun-

* "Memoirs," p. 40 to p. 61. † Coxe, vol. iv. p. 132, edit. 1820.

* Coxe, vol. iv. p. 108.
† Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough.
‡ Dispatches, vol. iv. p. 114.

try, with a great river to cross at the end of that march. Saint Simon relates that when it was reported to the French commander, the Duke de Vendôme, that all the army of the allies was in sight, having crossed the Scheldt, he maintained that it could not be true. An officer arrived to confirm the news; but Vendôme still continued obstinate in his opinion. A third messenger, and then he mounted his horse, saying "that all this was the work of the devil, and that such diligence was impossible." He soon was relieved of his incredulity. We turn again to Marlborough's own narrative. Bridges had been constructed by an advanced detachment. The main body of the army reached these bridges at noon. "The enemy moved forward, and took their ground, which obliged our detachment, about three or four o'clock in the afternoon, to attack their advance, which was executed with success. A brigade, having defeated and killed or taken seven battalions, had thus given time to a part of our army to join them, while the enemy formed in lines. Although many of our troops were not yet come up, between five and six o'clock the battle commenced, principally between the infantry; and it lasted till night, when the enemy retreated toward Ghent in great confusion." In this battle scarcely any use was made of artillery. Marlborough's march had been too rapid to allow him to bring more than a few pieces of cannon into the field; and the French appear to have been equally short of this great arm of war. In a dispatch to M. de Thungen, Marlborough says, "If we had had two more hours of day, it is probable that the enemy would have been entirely defeated. We have, however, about seven thousand prisoners, besides more than seven hundred officers, many of distinction, with a great number of colors and standards."* The great general was very far from considering the battle of Oudenarde a total victory. He wrote, indeed, to Godolphin, "I hope I have given such a blow to their foot, that they will not be able to fight any more this year."† But Marlborough had work still to do before that campaign was finished. On the 26th of July he wrote to Godolphin, that although the success at Oudenarde had lessened the French army by at least twenty thousand men, he was uneasy. He had difficulty in getting cannon; he was in a country where the people had been commanded to abandon their dwellings and retire to the strong towns. He had a notion, it is related, of penetrating into France by the northern frontier, having masked Lille. Even Prince Eugene, with his fiery courage, regarded the attempt as too dangerous. The siege of Lille was therefore to be undertaken. That siege lasted till the winter. Meanwhile the fortified lines of the French near Ypres were destroyed, and Ghent again fell into the power of the allies. There were successes of importance in other quarters. The island of Sardinia was taken by the English admiral, Sir John Leake; and the same enterprising commander, in conjunction with General Stanhope, who had retrieved the fortunes of the allies in Catalonia, carried Port Mahon by storm; and thus the island of Minorca came into the possession of the English, who retained it for half a century. Other triumphs, in the Mediterranean and in South America, again established the naval superiority of England.

At the end of October died the husband of Queen Anne, Prince George of Denmark. For some time previous to his decease there had been a struggle on the part of some of the great Whig leaders to remove him from his office of lord high admiral, for which he was certainly incompetent. His death settled the dispute, and opened the way to the completion of a more decided Whig ministry. Upon the pedestal of a statue of Prince George, in a niche at one end of the town-hall of Windsor, it is recorded, in flattering falsehood, such as many another Latin inscription has recorded of the living and the dead, that he was "a hero in every age to be venerated." The sarcasm of Charles II., that he "had tried him drunk and sober, and could find nothing in him," would probably outlive the incense of Sir Christopher Wren, who erected the statue in 1713. The great architect could certainly do no less than make Prince George "a hero," when in the inscription under the statue of the queen at the opposite end of the same hall, the sculptor is told that his art is vain, for if he would exhibit the likeness of Anne, he must carve "a goddess." In the eyes of the Duchess of Marlborough, whose ascendency over the queen was gone, the goddess was now something less than Mrs. Morley; for the spiteful Mrs. Freeman says, "Her love to the prince seemed, in the eyes of the world, to be prodigiously great; and great as was the passion of her grief, her stomach was greater, for that very day he died she ate three very large and hearty meals." Dire had been the offence which the queen had given to the haughty duchess during this summer and autumn. Harley had been dismissed, but in the small house at Windsor which she had purchased Anne "stayed all the sultry season, . . . because, from the park, such persons as Mrs. Masham had a mind to bring to her majesty could be let in privately by the garden." After the death of the prince the queen spent many hours every day in the closet where he had been wont to sit. "The true reason of her majesty's having this closet to sit in was, that the back-stairs belonging to it came from Mrs. Masham's lodgings, who by that means could secretly bring to her whom she pleased. And that a correspondence was thus carried on with Mr. Harley became every day more and more manifest, by the difficulties and objections which her majesty had learned to raise against almost everything proposed by her ministers." Such is the testimony, no doubt in great part true, which the Duchess of Marlborough has handed down, of the commencement of that system of political intrigue which is so difficult to unravel, for the remainder of this reign. There is only one clew to this labyrinth, which must be steadily kept in view if we would wish to escape from its mazes. Queen Anne was secretly hostile, with all the zeal of which her cold nature was capable, to the settlement of the crown upon the Electress Sophia of Hanover and her descendants. She is believed to have cherished a natural, although dangerous, wish that her brother should be her successor, in spite of solemn acts of parliament. Whoever would adroitly foster this humor would have her real favor; and Harley was precisely the man to carry his Jacobitism to the point where it might be safe and profitable. The duplicity of too many of the statesmen of England and Scotland was of the same character; and with those of more ambition than honesty, it was merely a matter of calculation whether the Elector of Hanover should come to the throne upon revolution principles, or the Chevalier St. George by divine right, when that queen, who was something like a compromise of the two principles, should be no more—an event not generally regarded as very distant.

The temper of the queen, during the summer and autumn of 1708, nearly drove Marlborough to a resolution which certainly must have been the most ungenial to his nature, whether we regard his love of power or his avarice. He resolves, about six weeks after his victory of Oudenarde, to "take the first occasion that can be practicable to retire from business." Yes: his homely phrase is "to retire from business." He writes to the duchess in much the same way as a junior partner in a commercial house would write to his wife, complaining of the obstinacy of the head of the firm: "I can't with patience think of continuing much longer in business, having it not in my power to persuade that to be done which I think is right."* It was worth while to pause before the dissolution of partnership was announced—for to him, at least, the business was a very profitable one. Exclusive of Blenheim, the duke's fixed yearly income, from offices and emoluments, was very nearly fifty-five thousand pounds; and the income of the duchess, from her offices at court, was nine thousand five hundred pounds. The vast income of the duke principally depended upon the continuance of the war. The income of the duchess depended upon her possession of the favor of the queen.† We shall have to note how, in a very short period, the eminent services of the victor at Blenheim and Ramilies were forgotten, and the people became persuaded—to use the somewhat prejudiced language of Johnson, in noticing the most successful of the bitter pamphlets of Swift—"that the war was unnecessarily protracted to fill the pockets of Marlborough; and that it would have been continued without end if he could have continued his annual plunder."‡

The siege of Lille was one of the most sanguinary operations of the war in the Netherlands. It was an enterprise of great difficulty, not only from the extreme strength of the place, which had been fortified with all the skill of Vauban, but from the difficulty of the allied armies in obtaining supplies of provisions and military stores.

* "Dispatches," vol. iv. p. 111. † Coxe, vol. iv. p. 154.

* Coxe, vol. iv. p. 200.

† The details are given in Lord Stanhope's "History of England from the Peace of Utrecht," vol. i. p. 27.

‡ "Lives of the Poets," Cunningham's edit., vol. iii. p. 170.

Prince Eugene directed, and Marlborough covered, the siege. The defence was intrusted to Marshal Boufflers. The covering forces of the besiegers had to contend with the constant determination of the French to intercept their supplies. One of the most gallant actions of the campaign was that of General Webb. He was conducting a large convoy from Ostend, with a detachment of six thousand men, when he was attacked at Wynendale, by a French force of more than twenty thousand. For two hours Webb fought with admirable skill and resolution; compelled the French to retreat, with immense loss; and brought his convoy in safety to the camp before Lille. The speaker of the Commons, in conveying the thanks of the house to the general, said, "We are all sensible how much the reducing the fortress of Lille is owing to your courage and conduct." This must have been painful enough to Marlborough, who, with almost incredible meanness, had attributed Webb's victory to General Cadogan, who had a very small share of the responsibility of the action. Webb left the army in just indignation; published an account of the matter; and received the thanks of the Commons in his place in the house. Lille finally capitulated on the 29th of December. Its loss to France was considered almost irreparable. A real desire for peace was now manifest in the court of Versailles. During the protracted siege of nearly five months the allies lost at least twelve thousand men. The sufferings of the troops were very great. The veteran Auverquerque closed the last of fifty campaigns in the camp before Lille, worn out by age and sickness. In the besieged citadel the brave Boufflers and his garrison were, at the last extremity, subsisting upon horse-flesh.

The first session of the second parliament of Great Britain was opened by commission on the 16th of November. The Whig interest preponderated, and Sir Richard Onslow was chosen speaker. The session was continued till the 24th of April, 1709. In the proceedings of this session there was one public act passed, which is still of effect. The ambassador of the Czar of Russia having been arrested for a debt to a London tradesman, the czar resented the offence against the privileges of the representatives of sovereignty; and the statute was passed by which all process against an ambassador, or any of his domestic servants, is declared null and void.* Another statute presents a curious illustration of the habits of the people. The "Act to prevent the laying of wagers relating to the public" declares that "all wagers to be laid upon any contingency relating to the present war, and all policies of assurance, etc., payable upon any such contingency, shall be utterly void;" and that all persons making such wagers, etc., or their notaries or agents, shall forfeit double the sum for which the wager is laid.† Whether for the issue of a battle or a horse-race, we have been ever a betting people, since we passed out of barbarism into the civilization of which gambling is a feature.

The practice of laying wagers about matters of war and government, according to the preamble of the act, "hath been found inconvenient to the public." This allegation is not very precise. When the frequenters of Will's Coffee-house, or White's Chocolate-house, were staking their guineas or their crowns upon the doubtful fortunes of Godolphin or Harley, of the Elector of Hanover or the king over the water, their brawlings might have disturbed the wits and courtiers, but they could very slightly affect the general convenience of the public. Nevertheless, the betting was a form in which the opinions of Englishmen displayed themselves; and the odds given might indicate sentiments not very agreeable to the official mind. The war was beginning to be unpopular; the French were making advances for peace. A treaty, or another campaign, was a question of chance rather than of calculation at the beginning of 1709; for if France was suffering and exhausted, Marlborough was flourishing. Let us turn from the betting politicians of London to the suffering population of Paris. Let us, while we behold at home public credit so high that the Bank of England obtained subscriptions in four hours of more than two millions for the purpose of doubling their stock and of circulating two millions and a half of exchequer-bills for the aid of the government—let us look upon a picture of misery in France, and learn the price which a people has to pay for the mistaken ambition of its rulers; and for that absolute authority upon which some Englishmen looked with envy and admiration.

The winter of 1709 was unusually severe in France. There was an intense frost of long duration; then a sudden thaw; and then again a frost. By this second frost the grain in the earth, the vines and olive-trees, were destroyed. The price of bread rose enormously. But the natural price of corn was further raised by the interference of the government. Royal commissioners bought up the corn, and the official monopolists sold it at a great advance. The sums which this scheme produced, says Saint Simon, "were innumerable, and innumerable were the people who died literally of hunger." The depopulation of Paris in this terrible year offers sufficient evidence of the condition of the kingdom. The average annual number of deaths in the capital was sixteen thousand; in 1709 they were above twenty-nine thousand. The number of marriages decreased one fourth.* Dividends upon public loans were unpaid; taxes were exacted with extreme rigor; the coin was depreciated; everything rose in price. "The king," says Saint Simon, "had no resources except in terror and in his unlimited power, which, boundless as it was, failed also for want of having something to take and to exercise itself upon." In this state, when the realm was nearly exhausted, envoys were sent into Holland to negotiate for peace.

If the rulers of nations were ordinarily moved with pity for suffering humanity, the ministers of the allied powers might have held out the hand of friendship to France, without any compromise of their just pretensions. If Marlborough had taken a generous and lofty view of public affairs, instead of urging upon Godolphin the necessity for another campaign, a far better peace might have been accomplished than their political enemies at last effected. "Marlborough," says his biographer, "was apprehensive that the King of France was not yet sufficiently humbled to agree to the terms which the allies were entitled to demand; and consequently represented the expediency of obtaining such an augmentation of force as might enable him to dictate the conditions of peace."† The advice of Marlborough resulted in the most sanguinary and most useless of his battles; with the conditions of peace less under his dictation than before he had lost eighteen thousand killed and wounded in the slaughter of Malplaquet. And yet so complicated were the interests of the States-General, of the emperor, of the Duke of Savoy, of Great Britain—in some cases those interests were so conflicting—that it would be unjust to represent Marlborough as the adviser of the harsh and humiliating terms which the allies thought it politic to demand from France. It is difficult, however, to believe that if he had counselled the ministry at home to treat with Louis in a magnanimous spirit, they would have stood out against the advice of their own negotiator. Marlborough had the grace to refuse enormous bribes from France; but he had also the want of decency to sanction the demand, that if Louis gave up Spain and the Indies to the house of Austria, which he stipulated to do, he should join the allies in dethroning his own grandson, if Philip should be obstinate in holding a throne in the possession of which he was supported by the Spanish people. The pride of the magnificent despot was roused by this demand. He condescended to recollect that he had subjects, who were interested in the national honor. He appealed to their patriotism, in a circular letter addressed to all local authorities. It was no longer a war for courtly interests. The country was threatened with dismemberment; and the king and the people roused their drooping courage, even in the midst of their domestic miseries, and a harder campaign had to be fought, with loftier resolution on the side of France, than had ever been called forth by the proud delusions of the world-grasping Bourbon. Voluntary contributions for the support of the war had been freely bestowed upon the court. Louis sent his silver plate to the mint to be coined. The rich, whether nobles or traders, followed his example. There was specie to pay the forces; and recruits flocked to the army, glad to obtain that subsistence which the visitation of providence had denied to their peaceful labors.

On the 21st of June a hundred thousand men, under the command of Marlborough and Eugene, were encamped in the plain before Lille. Marshal Villars had thrown up intrenchments between Douay and the Lys, which probably interrupted a design of penetrating into France. The allies then commenced the siege of Tournay. The

* 7 Anne, c. 12. † Ibid. c. 16.

* Buffon. Quoted in Somerville's "History of the Reign of Anne," p. 339.

† Coxe, vol. iv. p. 370.

city surrendered in three weeks. The citadel held out during July and August. During this siege four thousand of the allies were killed and wounded. Immense slaughter was occasioned by the system of mining and countermining—a mode of warfare which was then rarely practised to the same extent as in this siege. Service in the trenches was always faced by the English soldier with alacrity; but to burrow like a mole, while the sound of the enemy's pickaxe was close to his ear—to believe he was treading upon firm earth, and then in a moment to be blown into the air—these were strange dangers which required an unaccustomed exercise of courage and fortitude.

The allied army, after the fall of Tournay, was proceeding to the siege of Mons, when Marshal Villars followed them, and took up a strong position at Malplaquet. His wings were protected by two thick woods. His centre was placed on rising ground between the woods, with intrenchments thrown up in front of the camp. The allies had about eighty thousand men; the French ten thousand less. Marlborough was encamped in the plain, fronting the opening between the woods. His determination to attack the enemy in so commanding a position has been considered rash; but he had only the alternative of a battle or the abandonment of the siege of Mons. At eight o'clock on the morning of the 11th of September that attack was made. The right of the French was covered by a morass; but this obstacle was rapidly overcome by Marlborough's left wing; and that portion of the enemy was driven back. Villars was himself commanding the left wing of the French, and was to a great extent successful, when he was wounded; and according to the French accounts, that accident was the main cause of the retreat from their position. The French were dislodged from their wooded height after a most sanguinary struggle of four hours, when the conflict was renewed in the plain. At three o'clock they retreated; and the allies encamped on the field of battle, amid thirty thousand of their fellow-men dead or wounded. When the British parliament met two months afterward, the queen was congratulated "upon the continued successes of the last campaign, particularly the victory obtained near Mons."

In the year 1709 no great comet burns

> "In th' arctic sky, and from his horrid hair
> Shakes pestilence and war;"

but never was war among civilized nations more general or more destructive. There is desperate fighting in the Netherlands; a smouldering flame of battle in Spain and Portugal; and a northern war as terrible and more decisive than the War of the Succession. It is the year of the fatal death-struggle of Pultowa, when the old dominion of Sweden in the north was struck down by one great blow, and the czar, whose rule over hordes of half-savage tribes was little heeded in the struggle for the balance of power, first planted his foot upon the Baltic, and bequeathed to the world a new balance to settle from generation to generation. In April, 1707, Marlborough was propitiating the victorious Charles the Twelfth with the most transparent flattery; but the wily negotiator of the allies has seen the map of Muscovy on the young Swede's table, and he guesses to what point his ambition is directed. In 1698 Peter of Muscovy was learning the trade of a shipbuilder in England. He had gone home to build ships; to discipline barbarians into soldiers; to pant for an outlet from his shut-up wastes into the great highways of the world; and so he went to war with the King of Sweden, a lad of eighteen, from whom he and other northern powers hoped to win possessions which had been wrested from them by the Sweden of Gustavus and Christina. The czar was left to fight single-handed for the provinces which had been lost. In 1700 he was signally defeated by Charles at the battle of Narva; but in 1702 he had won territory in Livonia, and in 1703 had founded St. Petersburg on the banks of the Neva. There were five or six years of very doubtful warfare, during which time Peter was forming armies and teaching them how to fight. Charles would no longer endure this teasing and obstinate rival. He had dethroned Augustus of Poland; he would march to Moscow, and treat with the czar in his capital. Five months after Marlborough's visit to the camp at Alt Ranstadt, Charles set out with his army for the invasion of Russia. He traversed Poland, and he wintered at Grodno. In June he defeated the Russians upon the Beresina, and in September he was again victorious at Smolensko. Peter was alarmed, and made proposals of peace. The Swede rejected them, and marched into the Ukraine, to effect a junction with the Cossack chief, Mazeppa. In the Ukraine the Swedish army sustained the severest privations. But the resolution of Charles was unshaken:

> "He comes, nor want nor cold his course delay—
> Hide blushing glory, hide Pultowa's day." *

In the spring the Swedish army invested the strong town of Pultowa, on the Vorskla. The fortifications protected the military stores of Peter. The place commanded the passes to Moscow. In June the czar advanced to the relief of Pultowa, with an army of about sixty thousand men. Charles had only twenty-four thousand, not half of whom were Swedes. He despised the security of his intrenched lines, and on the 8th of July he marched out to attack the Russian redoubts. He thought that nothing had changed since he had won the battle of Narva with a similar disparity of numbers. The two kings were in the battle; and the troops on both sides fought with desperation. In two hours ten thousand Swedes lay dead or wounded in the field; hundreds perished in the Vorskla and Borysthenes; the Swedish army was annihilated; and Charles, having swam over the Borysthenes with a few hundred followers, at length reached the Turkish frontier, and for five years was a troublesome fugitive in the dominions of the sultan.

CHAPTER CXL.

Impeachment of Dr. Sacheverel—Proceedings in Westminster Hall—Articles of the impeachment—Passages from the speeches of the managers—Popular manifestations—Sentence upon Sacheverel—Sentence regarded as a triumph of the High Church—Prosecutions of rioters for high treason—Trials of rioters—Progress of Sacheverel—His character.

The well-known hypothesis that a deaf man, looking for the first time upon a ball-room, and hearing no note of the music which inspired the quadrille or the waltz, would think the company mad, may be paralleled by him who, reading of some mighty national ferment, and vainly endeavoring to trace the latent causes of senatorial declamation and popular fury, concludes that a general lunacy can only account for the frantic gallopade. Nevertheless, there is always the piper to direct this sort of dance—sometimes to lead it to a tragical end, as the Pied-piper of Hamelin piped the town rats into the Weser. Such a piper was Henry Sacheverel, Doctor of Divinity, who, on the 5th of November, 1709, having to preach at St. Paul's before the lord mayor and aldermen of London, laid his magic pipe to his lips, and speedily had half the nation dancing like drunken satyrs to the tune of "The king shall enjoy his own again," and breaking heads and burning conventicles amid their pious cry of "God save the Church."

The famous impeachment of Dr. Sacheverel, which for a time absorbed all other public questions, may be regarded as an inexplicable demonstration of party madness, or a grand assertion of party principle. Lord Campbell tells us that the Whigs "probably would have continued undisturbed in their offices till their tenure had been confirmed by the accession of the house of Hanover, had it not been for their most preposterous prosecution of the contemptible sermon preached before the lord mayor of London." † In another place the chief justice delivers his judgment that the Whigs "seem to have been deprived of their understanding, and they were given as a prey into the hands of their enemies." ‡ Against this authority may be cited that of one to whom the historian is bound to listen with profound respect—Edmund Burke. The greatest of philosophical politicians says, "It rarely happens to a party to have the opportunity of a clear, authentic, recorded declaration of their political tenets upon the subject of a great constitutional event like that of the revolution. The Whigs had that opportunity, or, to speak more properly, they made it. The impeachment of Dr. Sacheverel was undertaken by a Whig ministry and a Whig House of Commons and carried on before a prevalent and steady majority of Whig peers. It was carried on for the express purpose of stating the true grounds and principles

---

* Johnson, "Vanity of Human Wishes."
† Life of Somers, "Chancellors," vol. iv. p. 204.
‡ Life of Cowper. Ibid., p. 317.

of the Revolution; what the Commons emphatically called their *foundation*. It was carried on for the purpose of condemning the principles on which the revolution was first opposed, and afterward calumniated, in order by a juridical sentence of the highest authority to confirm and fix Whig principles, as they had operated both in the resistance to King James and in the subsequent settlement; and to fix them in the extent and with the limitations with which it was meant they should be understood by posterity." * If this view of the matter be correct, the impeachment of Sacheverel was not the act of a party "deprived of their understanding;" although, looking at it as a mere question of expediency, it might have led to the party being "given as a prey into the hands of their enemies." The temporary removal of a ministry from power is a small question compared with the question of the principles which were brought into conflict on this occasion. It is the business of the historical inquirer to endeavor to trace what may have a real and abiding interest in this extraordinary proceeding. One great and permanent lesson may be derived from the contemplation of this battle of opinions—a lesson which has been briefly but emphatically proclaimed by him who, "thinking the ecclesiastical history of our country might advantageously be presented to view in verse," has touched on the great controversial points in a truly Christian spirit:

"High and Low,
Watchwords of party, on all tongues are rife:
As if a church, though sprung from Heaven, must owe
To opposites and fierce extremes her life—
Not to the golden mean and quiet flow
Of truths that soften hatred, temper strife."†

About a month after the session of parliament had been opened, without any very manifest signs of a party conflict, Mr. Dolben, the member for Liskeard, son to the late Archbishop of York, complained that two sermons preached by Dr. Sacheverel, one at Derby and one at St. Paul's, contained dangerous matter. Printed copies having been laid upon the table of the Commons, the house voted that "the two sermons were malicious, scandalous, and seditious libels, highly reflecting on the queen and her government, the late happy revolution, and the Protestant Succession." The preacher was ordered to attend at the bar the next day, when it was resolved that he should be impeached of high crimes and misdemeanors. The puppets are in action; but who is pulling the strings? It is told of Harley, that he, being one of those who spirited Sacheverel to undertake an enterprise so suited to his vain and turbulent nature, "having an entertainment one day at his house in Herefordshire, there came in after dinner a packet of expresses from London; which having read, he looked with an air of joy upon his friends, and snapping his fingers, cried out in exultation, 'The game is up! get the horses ready immediately.'"‡ No lover of "woodcraft" in the Shakesperean age, singing "Hunt's up to the day," could show more eagerness for a run than Harley, one of the most famous professors of statecraft. If Swift is to be believed, the impeachment of Sacheverel "arose from a foolish passionate pique of the Earl of Godolphin, whom this divine was supposed, in a sermon, to have reflected on, under the name of Volpone, as my Lord Somers, a few months after, confessed to me; and, at the same time, that he had earnestly, and in vain, endeavored to dissuade the earl from that attempt. . . . Mr. Harley, who came up to town, during the time of the impeachment, was, by the intervention of Mrs. Masham, privately brought to the queen; and in some meetings easily convinced her majesty of the dispositions of her people, as they appeared in the course of that trial, in favor of the Church, and against the measures of those in her service."§ Here, then, we have the two great rivals face to face to fight the battle for office. Neither Godolphin nor Harley cared very much for the great principles that were called forth in the proceedings against Sacheverel. A keen observer of English politics, Baron von Steinghens, Minister at London from the Elector Palatine, thus describes the factions of the latter years of Anne: "Give them whatever name you will, they will at all times be reducible under two principal heads, namely, those who are in office, and those who want to be. In short, it may be asserted that office is the source of the animosities of the most envenomed divisions of this nation." * Unquestionably there was a higher class of politicians at this time than the meroe office-seekers. But the title of the reigning sovereign was so peculiar, and the principle of the succession so open to controversy, that the holders of office and the strugglers for office had to deal with party questions of more than ordinary vitality; and hence "the most envenomed divisions of this nation" were represented in their strongest force by the great men in place and the great men out of place. The controlling power of public opinion over public men was as yet imperfectly formed. The multitude might be stirred to fury by party leaders; but political knowledge was too little diffused to give the people, properly so called, any effectual influence over those who claimed to be the guardians of the national interests. People and mob were synonymous terms with the oligarchs of the eighteenth century.

The preliminary debates, meetings of committees, preparations of articles of impeachment, answers of the accused, messages between the two houses, and other formal proceedings, occupied ten weeks, before the day of trial came. The metropolis and the country were now in a ferment. On the 27th of February Westminster Hall was filled with as gorgeous an assembly as when Strafford stood at the bar. The queen was there in a private box. The peers were seated in the centre of the hall. The Commons were ranged on one side. A galaxy of ladies filled the other side. The commonalty, described as "the populace," were also accommodated with seats in galleries. The crowd without the doors was unusually large and noisy. The articles of impeachment, Dr. Sacheverel's answer, and the replication of the House of Commons, being then read, Mr. Lechmere opened the charges of the managers. The sermon on the 5th of November was next read. It was described by Harley as "a circumgyration of incoherent words without any regular order."† Of real eloquence the pulpit demagogue had no conception. But he had the power of stringing sentences together which appeared to have some logical sequence, but which were meant to stand alone as axioms of a party. The sermon defies analysis. Its separate dogmas were taken as texts by the managers of the impeachment to refute the principles thus proclaimed as the bases of the constitution.

The reading of the doctor's sermon closed the proceedings of the first day. Wearisome must these proceedings have been, especially to "the noble ladies who attended the trial." We are told that these ladies who came "to see or be seen," were troubled by a matter even more serious than their apprehension "that the Church of England would be ruined by the punishment which was to be inflicted upon this one priest." They "were very much afraid lest somewhat in their dress or behavior there should give occasion to the 'Tatler' or 'Observater' to turn them into ridicule in their papers."‡ The great masters of humor had found a fit vehicle for their good-natured pictures of social follies. Bickerstaff was in his chair, and fashion, usually so bold, was afraid of his laugh. But Steele and Addison wisely kept their charming little paper clear of the prevailing madness of this time, and we have few traces of the great trial in their lucubrations. Defoe says that Sacheverel stopped all lighter matters of social interest: "The women lay aside their tea and chocolate, leave off visiting after dinner, and, forming themselves into cabals, turn privy-councillors, and settle the affairs of state. . . . Nay, the 'Tatler,' the immortal 'Tatler,' the great Bickerstaff himself, was fain to leave off talking to the ladies, during the doctor's trial, and turn his sagacious pen to the dark subject of death and the next world."§ This is exaggeration. Steele did talk to the ladies, and very agreeably, after the 27th of February, "although the attention of the town is drawn aside from reading us writers of news."‖ He laughs to think "how many cold chickens the fair ones have eaten since this day sevennight for the good of their country;" for Westminster Hall, while the court adjourned, had become "a dining-room."¶ Addison did not "turn his sagacious pen" to Homer's description of a future state till the trial of Sacheverel was over, and his sermon was burned by the common hangman.

The managers of the impeachment divided themselves into groups, each group to take charge of one of the four articles into which the

* "Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs."
† Wordsworth, "Ecclesiastical Sketches."
‡ Nichols's "Literary Anecdotes," vol. i. p. 68.
§ "Memoirs relating to the change in Queen Anne's Ministry."

* Kemble, "State Papers," p. 509.
† Cunningham, vol. ii. p. 285.
‡ Ibid., p. 290.
§ "Review," quoted in Wilson, vol. iii. p. 125.
‖ "Tatler," March 4.
¶ Ibid., March 6.

charge was divided. The first article set forth that Doctor Sacheverel in his sermon maintained, "That the necessary means to bring about the revolution were unjustifiable; that his late majesty, in his declaration, disclaimed the least imputation of resistance; and that to impute resistance to the said revolution is to cast black and odious colors upon his late majesty and the said revolution." * Sacheverel, with a cunning that was evidently prompted by professional statesmen, pretended to vindicate the revolution—for to hold it altogether odious was to compromise the title under which Queen Anne reigned. But, on the other hand, to say it was founded upon resistance was to shake the doctrine of absolute non-resistance, the belief of which he asserted to be the pillar upon which the government of England stands. He therefore pretended that when the Prince of Orange disclaimed that he came for conquest, he disclaimed the principle of resistance. "The managers of the impeachment," says Mr. Hallam, "had not only to prove that there was resistance in the revolution, which could not, of course, be sincerely disputed, but to assert the lawfulness, in great emergencies, or what is called in politics necessity, of taking arms against the law—a delicate matter to treat of at any time, and not least so by ministers of state and law officers of the crown, in the very presence, as they knew, of their sovereign."† They asserted that all the opposition to the measures of King William, and during the reign of the queen, had come "from those who had questioned the lawfulness of the resistance made use of in the revolution; that the principle of unlimited non-resistance had been revived by the professed and undisguised friends of the pretender." ‡ The great doctrine of constitutional government is then set forth by the same speaker. "To make out the justice of the revolution, it may be laid down, that as the law is the only measure of the prince's authority, and the people's subjection, so the law derives its being and efficacy from common consent: And to place it on any other foundation than common consent is to take away the obligation this notion of common consent puts both prince and people under to observe the laws. And upon this solid and rational foundation the lawyers in all ages have placed that obligation, as appears by all our law-books. But instead of this, of later times, patriarchical and other fantastical schemes have been framed to rest the authority of the law upon; and so questions of divinity have been blended with questions of law; when it is plain that religion hath nothing to do to extend the authority of the prince, or the submission of the subject, but only to secure the legal authority of the one, and enforce the due submission of the other, from the consideration of higher rewards and heavier punishments."

The principle of resistance, as justified by the revolution, was necessarily held to be an exceptional case to the general doctrine of the subject's obedience. Robert Walpole put this as forcibly as any other of his fellow-managers; and we may quote his argument, especially as it lies in a short compass: "Resistance is nowhere enacted to be legal, but subjected, by all the laws now in being, to the greatest penalties; it is what is not, cannot, nor ought ever to be described or affirmed, in any positive law, to be excusable: when, and upon what never-to-be-expected occasions, it may be exercised, no man can foresee, and ought never to be thought of, but when an utter subversion of the laws of the realm threatens the whole frame of a constitution, and no redress can otherwise be hoped for: it therefore does, and ought forever to stand, in the eye and letter of the law, as the highest offence. But because any man, or party of men, may not, out of folly or wantonness, commit treason, or make their own discontents, ill principles, or disguised affections to another interest, a pretence to resist the supreme power, will it follow from thence that the utmost necessity ought not to engage a nation in its own defence for the preservation of the whole?" § Walpole then adds, with the sagacity of a practical statesman dealing with an abstract question, "The doctrine of unlimited, unconditional, passive obedience was first invented to support arbitrary and despotic power, and was never promoted or countenanced by any government that had not designs some time or other of making use of it: what then can be the design of preaching this doctrine now, unasked, unsought for, in her majesty's reign, where the law is the only rule and measure of the power of the crown, and of the obedience of the people?"

Major-General Stanhope was even more practical than Walpole in his application of the question of Sacheverel's impeachment to the High Church doctrines which had so long been the cause of national disgust, and which continued to prevail for half a century, till the common-sense of the people had become too strong for their reception: "There is such an affinity, my lords, between this sermon and the doctrines which are preached and propagated by a certain set of men that I cannot but observe to your lordships on this occasion, how industrious they have been, ever since the revolution, to prepare a way for another. They are the pure and undefiled Church of England! The only men of loyal and steady principles! They never took the oaths to the government; never bent their knee to Baal! They have their own archbishops, bishops, and pastors, and constitute the only true and pure Church of England! We are all schismatics, that is, all the rest of England are schismatics, heretics, and rebels! Now, pray, my lords, what are the peculiar and distinguishing characteristics, the favorite and darling tenets of these men? What else but passive obedience, Jus Divinum, an hereditary, indefeasible right of succession, which no necessity, no act of parliament, no prescription of time, no natural or legal incapacity, can ever invalidate or set aside? If they are in the right, my lords, what are the consequences? The queen is not queen; your lordships are not a House of Lords, for you are not duly summoned by a legal writ; we are no House of Commons, for the same reason; all the taxes which have been raised for this twenty years have been arbitrary and illegal extortions; all the blood of so many brave men, who have died (as they thought) in the service of their country, has been spilt in defence of an usurpation; and they were only so many rebels and traitors."*

If the egregious doctor felt that he was on dangerous ground when he was opposing the principle of the revolution, he had no hesitation when he had to deal with one of the best consequences of the revolution, the toleration of dissenters. The second article of the impeachment imputed to Sacheverel that he maintained that the toleration granted by law was unwarrantable, and that he was a false brother, with relation to God, religion, or the Church, who defends toleration or liberty of conscience. This view of dissent was set forth in a spirit quite worthy of the darkest ages of persecution: "Whoever presumes to innovate, alter, or misrepresent any point in the articles of the faith of our church ought to be arraigned as a traitor to our state; heterodoxy in the doctrines of the one naturally producing, and almost necessarily inferring, rebellion and high treason on the other, and consequently a crime that concerns the civil magistrate as much to punish and restrain, as the ecclesiastical." The charitable man denounced Bishop Grindall as "a false son of the Church,"—"a perfidious prelate," who had advised Queen Elizabeth to tolerate the "Genevan discipline," the professors of which she was afterward obliged utterly to suppress "by wholesome severities." It is unnecessary to follow out the arguments by which the second article of the impeachment was supported, or to detail the equivocations of those who had the charge of Sacheverel's defence. The tendency of these extreme high church principles was sufficiently exhibited in the events which followed the third day of the proceedings in Westminster Hall.

"Sacheverel," says Burnet, "was lodged in the Temple, and came every day, with great solemnity, in a coach to the hall. Great crowds ran about his coach, with many shouts, expressing their concern for him in a very rude and tumultuous manner." † On the third day the manifestation of the populace was more remarkable. "Money was thrown among them; and they were animated to such a pitch of fury that they went to pull down some meeting-houses, which was executed on five of them, as far as burning all the pews in them. This was directed by some of better fashion, who followed the mob in hackney-coaches, and were seen sending messages to them. The word upon which all shouted was the Church and Sacheverel." ‡ These outrages were made the subject of several trials for high treason, of which we shall have presently to give some account, especially as the law upon which the rioters were indicted has been

* "State Trials," vol. xv. col. 38.
† "Constitutional History," chap. xvi.
‡ Sir Joseph Jekyll, "State Trials," vol. xv. col. 96.
§ "State Trials," vol. xv. col. 115.

* "State Trials," vol. xv. col. 131.
† "Own Time," vol. v. p. 426. ‡ Ibid., p. 430.

very justly called in question. These trials have also a more popular interest, as the evidence furnishes a vivid picture of what one of the witnesses terms a "mobbish night."

The third article of impeachment against Sacheverel was that he had asserted, contrary to a resolution of parliament, that the Church was in a condition of great peril and adversity under her majesty's administration. In the fourth article he was charged with keeping up factions, instilling groundless jealousies, and exciting the queen's subjects to arms and violence. It is unnecessary that we should enter upon any details connected with these points. They have ceased to have a permanent interest. Nor is it essential that we should attempt any analysis of the defence of Sacheverel, which was conducted with great ability by Sir Simon Harcourt and four other counsel. Burnet has fairly stated their course of argument. "They very truly acknowledged the lawfulness of resistance in extreme cases, and plainly justified the revolution, and our deliverance by King William. But they said it was not fit in a sermon to name such an exception; that the duties of morality ought to be delivered in their full extent, without supposing an extraordinary case; and therefore Sacherevel had followed precedents, set by our greatest divines, ever since the reformation, and ever since the revolution."* In his reply to Sir Simon Harcourt, the concessions made by the counsel for Sacheverel were received by Sir Joseph Jekyll as the triumph of free principles: "My lords, the concessions are these, that necessity creates an exception to the general rule of submission to the prince; that such exception is understood or implied in the laws that require such submission; and that the case of the revolution was a case of necessity. These are concessions so ample, and do so fully answer the drift of the Commons in this article, and are to the utmost extent of their meaning in it, that I cannot forbear congratulating them upon this success of their impeachment; that in full parliament this erroneous doctrine of non-resistance is given up and disclaimed. And may it not, in after ages, be an addition to the glories of this bright reign, that so many of those who are honored with being in her majesty's service have been, at your lordships' bar, thus successfully contending for the national rights of her people, and proving they are not precarious or remediless."

After very animated debates in the House of Lords, sixty-nine peers voted Dr. Sacheverel guilty of the high crimes and misdemeanors charged on him by the impeachment of the House of Commons, and fifty-two found him not guilty. His sentence was, that he was enjoined not to preach during the term of three years, and that his two sermons should be burned by the common hangman. On the 21st of March Godolphin wrote to Marlborough: "Our sentence against Dr. Sacheverel is at last dwindled to a suspending him for three years from preaching, which question we carried but by six; and the second, which was for incapacitating him during that time to take any dignity or preferment in the Church, was lost by one; the numbers were sixty to fifty-nine. So all this bustle and fatigue ends in no more but a suspension of three years from the pulpit, and burning his sermons at the Royal Exchange."† Not altogether so, my lord treasurer. The Whigs will be driven from power; the queen will bestow her smiles upon those who would rest her title upon hereditary right; the managers of the impeachment have scorned to adopt the falsehood that the birth of the queen's brother was supposititious, and have therefore cut away the popular argument against his claim to the throne. But they have asserted the principles upon which the Act of Settlement rests. When the sober-thinking people of England shall have read in the report of this trial, circulated among them in numbers unparalleled, the manly arguments by which the rights of a nation to civil and religious freedom are upheld, they will turn from the exile of St. Germains who claims to rule upon the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance, and will think it fortunate that another house, with a parliamentary title, may continue the security which they have enjoyed under the revolution of 1689. We of the present time, when no one disputes the principles which the managers of the impeachment of Sacheverel upheld, have still to cherish their assertion, and to be grateful to their assertors. These principles have an enduring interest for us beyond their historical importance. They live and reign in our constitution. The great orator and temperate reformer, who has lived to see the full value of these principles, thus maintained them when the best victories of the people had been won—many of them by his own exertions. "The national resistance was not only, in point of historical fact, the cause of the revolutionary settlement, it was the main foundation of that settlement; the structure of the government was made to rest upon the people's right of resistance as upon its corner-stone; and it is of incalculable importance that this never should be lost sight of. But it is of equal importance that we should ever bear in mind how essential to the preservation of the constitution, thus established and secured, this principle of resistance is; how necessary both for the governors and the governed it ever must be to regard the recourse to that extremity as always possible—an extremity, no doubt, and to be cautiously embraced as such, but still a remedy within the people's reach; a protection to which they can and will resort as often as their rulers make such a recourse necessary for self-defence." *

The lenient sentence upon Sacheverel was received by his passionate adherents as a matter of national rejoicing. When the impeachment of the high-church doctor was resolved upon by the Commons, they also carried a resolution to address the queen "to bestow some dignity in the Church upon Mr. Benjamin Hoadley, rector of St. Peter's Poor, London, for having often justified the principles upon which her majesty and the nation proceeded in the late happy revolution." Her majesty never found the opportunity to comply with the desires of her faithful Commons. The reverend author of "The Measure of Obedience to the Civil Magistrate" was the type of low-church politics; and as the sermons of Sacheverel were burned by the hangman at the Royal Exchange, the treatises of Hoadley were burned by the mob at Exeter and Oxford. Bonfires and bell-ringing were universal. In some towns the health of Sacheverel was drunk with bended knees. At Cirencester an effigy of King William was carried upon a horse; the rider of straw was jerked off the steed's back, and then committed to the flames. Mr. Burgess, the dissenting preacher, was also burned with great solemnity by enthusiastic churchmen, who imitated, as much as was in their power, the patriots who had gutted his chapel in Lincoln's Inn-fields. But to the honor of the English rabble, in town or country, they had no taste for bloodshed, and a very national sense of fun. The Cirencester folk, who appear to have been most conspicuous in the demonstrations, had a cock-match, in which one cock was called Sacheverel, and the other Burgess. Unhappily, as is recorded, "the cock-match issued in their confusion; for, after a long and hard battle, Cock Burgess killed Cock Sacheverel."†

On the 18th of April there stood three men at the bar of the sessions-house, in the Old Bailey—Daniel Dammaree, a waterman; Francis Willis, a footman; and George Purchase, a sheriff's officer—against whom a bill of indictment had been found for high treason, in levying open war against her majesty. They were charged that they, with a great multitude of men, armed and arrayed in a warlike manner, with colors flying, swords, clubs, and other weapons, did, on the 1st of March, make war against our lady the queen. The evidence upon the trials of these men shows that they were principals in a riotous destruction, or attempted destruction, of meeting-houses. The Riot Act, by which such offences may be met as felony, without resorting to the law of constructive treason, was not in existence in 1710. It was passed in the first year of George I. Nevertheless, Blackstone holds that an insurrection, with an avowed design to pull down *all* inclosures, *all* brothels, and the like, is a levying of war, "the universality of the design making it a rebellion against the state, usurpation of the powers of government, and an insolent invasion of the king's authority." ‡ The attorney-general upon these trials averred that it was a general design to pull down all the meeting-houses. Lord Campbell severely blames these prosecutions for high treason, and very justly says, "No government would now direct such a prosecution to be instituted." In these trials all the judges agreed that the intention of the prisoners to pull down meeting-houses, and their partial destruction of several, was an overt act of levying war. This construction of the law, as we see, is still regarded as authority, and it has been cited in later cases. Lord

* "Own Time," vol. v. p. 427. † Coxe, vol. v. p. 156.

* Lord Brougham, "The British Constitution," 1844, p. 103.
† "Compleat History of the Affair of Dr. Sacheverel," 1713.
‡ Vol. iv. p. 78, Kerr's edit.

Campbell, who has the happiness to live in times when law and common-sense have more affinity, holds that in these prosecutions for high treason, "the Whigs showed the infatuation or dementation under which they were laboring." The dementation appears rather to have been in the Whig lawyers than in the Whig statesmen, if we may judge from the marvellous case which they got up, for a jury to try the most solemn issue known to English law. Two of the silly rioters were convicted, and were sentenced to the horrible penalties of high treason. But neither of them was executed; which, says Mr. Hallam, "might probably be owing to an opinion, which every one but a lawyer must have entertained, that their offence did not amount to treason." We are glad thus to premise that Dammaree and Purchase were reprieved, and afterward pardoned; for, in giving a sketch of these riots as a picture of society presenting some ludicrous aspects, it is well to know that no blood was shed by the fanatic multitude, and that no life was sacrificed to offended justice.

It is Wednesday, the 1st of March, when one Captain Edward Orrel, who seems to have been gifted with an almost preternatural curiosity to behold all that is going forward, first gazes upon the queen returning through the park from Westminster Hall, and is then attracted by a man dispersing bills about a prize-fighting. "I thought," says he, "they had been the common papers that are dispersed about such prizes, but I found it was about a prize between Sacheverel and Hoadley."* At Oliver's coffee-house he hears that the mob are gone from the Temple to Mr. Burgess's meeting near Lincoln's Inn-fields. "I will go up," cries the captain, "and see what is doing." There he saw pews pulled down, and a little man in the pulpit very busy in its destruction. In and out Orrel runs to watch how the work goes on; and the destructives take him, very naturally, for a spy. He flits about between Holborn and Lincoln's Inn-fields; for in both places fires are lighted, and pews and pulpits are burning. In Lincoln's Inn-fields the fun is fast and furious. Dammaree is there—the waterman, "in the queen's livery, and with his badge." The soldier immortalized by Goldsmith, who exclaims with a fervor of blasphemy that our religion would be utterly undone if the French should come over, is but a feeble copy of the queen's pious waterman. The mob are in council. The cheers of Dammaree are heard above every other voice. "I'll lead you on, boys; huzza! High Church and Sacheverel! G—— damn them all; we will have them all down." He pulls off his wig, and shouts, and superintends the burning of a bedstead, and is "mightily rejoiced." It would have been more than cruel to have hanged Dammaree; for he had capital witnesses in his defence, especially two young ladies, who had been at the fire in Lincoln's Inn-fields. The fire was burned to a coal when they were going home, and meeting with Dammaree, one of them exclaimed, "Lord bless me! here is one of the queen's watermen." "What have you to say to the queen's waterman?" quoth he. "Nothing, but God bless the queen, and her waterman too." "You are a jolly girl, and I will kiss you," cries honest Dammaree. Queen Anne must certainly have read this evidence, when she very quickly promoted her orthodox servant to be the master of her own barge, after he had escaped the peril of the hurdle to Tyburn.

If drunken Dammaree were not the exact type of a leader who "falsely, unlawfully, devilishly, and traitorously, did compass, imagine, and intend open war, insurrection and rebellion," what shall we say to Francis Willis, the doughty footman, levying war? He lives with a lady in Greville Street, who has a laudable curiosity to know how the bonfires are going on in Holborn and Hatton Garden; and she sends her man Frank to learn all about it. Frank stays out till midnight; and, if the witnesses are to be believed, makes good use of his time. He is the only traitor against whom the terms of the indictment apply, that the rebels were "armed and arrayed in a warlike manner, that is to say, with colors flying." Willis is the one standard-bearer. The attorney-general asks a witness whether any colors were carried before the assembly of five or six hundred people. "Yes, there was a curtain, and he that carried it cried, High Church standard! He stopped many coaches, and got money from them, and made them cry, High Church. He brought the curtain from Mr. Bradbury's meeting in Fetter Lane." The transformation of this rag of dissent into the banner of orthodoxy was a feat of military genius that can scarcely be equalled. It was intuitive in simple Frank, who told his mistress, in excuse for his staying out so long, that "he never saw a mob in London before." The bold footman escaped, for the witnesses were puzzled between one captain of the bonfire-makers in green livery and red buttons, and another captain in blue livery and black buttons.

George Purchase had been a soldier, and had seen service abroad, in the third troop of guards. He is now a sheriff's officer, and he begins his professional day on the first of March by taking a man at nine o'clock in the morning. But Dr. Sacheverel stops all regular occupation; and so, when the bailiff has dined with a follower in Chancery Lane they say, "Here is a sad noise and rout; no business is to be done; let us sit and smoke a pipe." After two hours of repose Purchase adjourns to a brandy-shop in Long Acre, the drawer of which place of resort accounts for the deeds of the ex-guardsman up to a late hour of the night. "My master gave him a business to dun a gentleman; and then they went to the Horseshoe tavern, and staid there till eight; then he came back again, and drank with us, and was very drunk." He is sent for, late as the hour is, to assist a brother officer to execute a writ; but he is too fuddled "to go about business." The mob is up in Drury Lane, and the two friends go forth. The discreet brother-bailiff gets into a chair to go home; for, as he tells the court, "I am not a man that engage myself in mobs, for those of my employment generally suffer in mobs." Purchase has no fear of anything. He has lived with those who "swore terribly in Flanders." The guards have arrived about half past eleven, at the arch in Lincoln's Inn-fields. The mob are pulling down a meeting-house in Drury Lane, and the captain of the guards gives orders to his men to disperse them. The bold bailiff is, "with his sword drawn, hallooing and flourishing his sword in the middle of the street, just by the kennel in Drury Lane, and fronting the guards." Captain Orrel is the ubiquitous witness: "Says I to him, do you know what you do in opposing the guards? You oppose the queen's person. Says he, G—— damn you, are you against Sacheverel? I am for High Church. I will be for High Church and Sacheverel. I will lose my life in the cause." Drunken Purchase then strikes at an officer with his sword, but his sword is beaten down, and he hides behind a bulk. That forbearance which has on most occasions of riot marked the behavior of the British soldier to his fellow-citizens was conspicuous on this occasion. The officer that was struck at merely said, "You are mad—you are distracted; go home to your lodgings." The jury found a special verdict that George Purchase, at the bonfire made by the mob in Drury Lane, of the seats and pulpit of the meeting-house, "came there, and with his sword drawn did then defend the said people, and did greatly encourage them to burn the materials of the said house." They also find him guilty as to his assault upon the captain of the guards. But they return no general verdict of guilty of high treason, leaving that to the determination of the judges. They add "that the general cry of the people aforesaid, while they rifled the meeting-houses and burned the materials of the same, was, universally, High Church and Sacheverel."

This, then, was the expression of that public opinion which Swift says convinced her majesty of the dispositions of her people in favor of the Church, and against the measures of those in her service. Vast exertions were made throughout the country to get up addresses to the queen, "in which the absolute power of our princes was asserted, and all resistance was condemned, under the designation of anti-monarchical and republican principles."* Defoe, in his "Review," asks a question, somewhat difficult of answer: "Would any man that had seen the temper of this people, in the time of the late King James, believe it possible, without a judicial infatuation, that the same people should reassume their blindness, and rise up again for bondage?" The parliament was prorogued on the 5th of April, with the expression of this sentiment by the queen: "I could heartily wish that men would study to be quiet, and do their own business, rather than busy themselves in reviving questions and disputes of a very high nature, and which must be with an ill-intention, since they can only tend to foment, but not to heal, our divisions and animosities." The symptoms of a great change were manifest, what-

* We pick out this narrative wholly from the evidence upon the trials of Dammaree, Willis, and Purchase. "State Trials," vol. xv. col. 550 to col. 702.

* Burnet. vol. v. p. 436.

ever was the official tone of the royal speech. Doctor Sacheveral, early in the summer, went upon what is called his progress. This puppet of faction had been rewarded by a presentation of a living in Wales, and his progress was ostensibly to take possession of his benefice. According to one set of authorities, "nobility, gentry, clergy, and people vied in their demonstrations of joy and exultation; cavalcades escorted him from town to town and from village to village; the roads were lined, the hedges covered with spectators; steeples were illuminated, and sumptuous feasts prepared in every quarter for the triumphant guest." * There is another mode of viewing the same circumstances: "Wherever he went, his emissaries were sent before with his pictures; pompous entertainments were made for him, and a mixed multitude of country singers, fiddlers, priests and sextons, and a mob of all conditions, male and female, crowded together to meet and congratulate him; among whom drunkenness, darkness, and a furious zeal for religion extinguished all regard to modesty." † So, even in the medals issued in commemoration of the great trial, there were two sets of opinion to be propitiated. The medal for the Tories had the head of the doctor, with the inscription "H. Sach., D.D.," with the reverse a mitre, and the legend "Is firm to thee." The medal for the Whigs had the same head of Sacheverel, with the same legend on the reverse, accompanying the head of the pope.

The Duchess of Marlborough has left a characteristic description of Sacheverel, with which we may dismiss the man to the oblivion, as far as his own merits are concerned, which, sooner or later, is the fate of every charlatan: "He had a haughty, insolent air, which his friends found occasion often to complain of; but it made his presence more graceful in public. His person was framed well for the purpose, and he dressed well. A good assurance, clean gloves, a white handkerchief well-managed, with other suitable accomplishments, moved the hearts of many at his appearance; and the solemnity of a trial added much to a pity and concern, which had nothing in reason or justice to support them. The weaker part of the ladies were more like mad or bewitched than like persons in their senses. . . . Everybody knows that he was afterward sent about several counties, where, with his usual grace, he received as his due the homage and adoration of multitudes; never thinking that respect enough was paid to his great merit, using some of his friends insolently, and raising mobs against his enemies, and giving ample proof of how great meanness the bulk of mankind is capable, putting on the air of a saint upon a lewd, drunken, pampered man; dispersing his blessings to all his worshippers, and his kisses to some; taking their good money as fast as it could be brought in; drinking their best wines, eating of their best provisions without reserve and without temperance. And, what completed the farce, complaining in the midst of this scene of luxury and triumph, as the old fat monk did over a hot venison pasty, in his barbarous Latin, 'Heu, quanta patimus pro ecclesiâ!' Oh, what dreadful things do we undergo for the sake of the Church!"

CHAPTER CXLI.

Conferences at Gertruydenberg—Negotiations for peace broken off—Despotism and limited monarchy—The Whigs dismissed from office—New parliament—Duchess of Marlborough dismissed from her offices—Disasters in Spain—Surrender of General Stanhope—Hostility to Marlborough—Party use of the press—Swift, the great party writer—Property qualification for members of parliament—Harley stabbed by Guiscard—Marlborough's last campaign—Parliament—Prospect of peace—The ministry defeated in the House of Lords—Marlborough dismissed from all his offices—New peers created—Negotiations at Utrecht—Note to chapter xxiv.—Table of treaties.

The negotiations for peace which were broken off in 1709 were renewed in 1710. Conferences were opened at Gertruydenberg. Each of the allied powers was endeavoring to gain some peculiar advantage; but all eventually concurred in pressing upon Louis the one humiliating condition which he had rejected in the previous year—namely, that he should assist in dethroning his grandson. Lord Chancellor Cowper seems to have stood alone among the British ministry in having no confidence of a peace, and to have offended his colleagues in doubting whether "France was reduced so low as to accept such conditions." * Marlborough was the representative of England at these conferences; and he took the course which the selfish man ordinarily thinks the safest and most profitable. He was "white paper," he said, upon which the cabinet might write their instructions, but he would not have the responsibility of giving advice. The negotiations were broken off; and the great general has the invariable resource of another season of battles and sieges: "I hope God will be pleased to bless this campaign," he writes to the duchess, "for I see nothing else that can give us peace, either at home or abroad." † He believed that another Oudenarde or another Malplaquet would have quieted the popular ferment about Sacheverel, and have disposed the queen to have confidence in her Whig advisers. "Yet," he says, "I have never, during this war, gone into the war with so heavy a heart as I do at this time. . . . The present humors in England give me a good deal of trouble." Louis le Grand was also troubled at this precise juncture; but his trouble had no relation to the bellowings of the hydra-headed monster. Saint Simon tells us that the exhaustion of the realm and the impossibility of obtaining peace had caused the king severe anguish. He really doubted whether it was right to consummate all the schemes of taxation proposed by his ministers, by taking at once the tenth of every man's substance. He was at last relieved of his scruples, when he had unbosomed himself to the Père Tellier. The considerate ecclesiastic required a few days to reflect upon the reasonableness of the king's hesitation, but finally restored his majesty to his wonted tranquillity by informing him that, having consulted the ablest doctors of the Sorbonne, they had decided that all the wealth of the nation was the king's, and that when the king took it from his subjects he only took what belonged to himself.

The ways of despotism have a fascinating simplicity for some minds, even in our own day. Here is the magnificent Louis, the Jupiter of Versailles, approaching mere mortals in having a slight qualm of conscience, but is quickly the godhead again, when he knows that all of France is his. The edict for the tax was issued; the thought of peace was again postponed; the armies of France again took the field with new strength. The workings of the machine of a limited monarchy are far more complicated and unintelligible than the caprices of absolute power. Marshal Villars, at the end of May, came with a great army to the relief of Douay, which was invested by the allies under Marlborough and Eugene. The general of the absolute king and the general of the limited monarchy are face to face. Villars is commanded to do a certain work—and he has but one course to take—he has one master to serve. Marlborough has the terror of parliamentary critics and of unscrupulous office-seekers, to make him groan under his responsibilities. On the 26th of May he writes to Godolphin, "I am this day threescore; but I thank God I find myself in so good health that I hope to end this campaign without being sensible of the inconveniences of old age." ‡ On the 12th he writes again to the treasurer, "I can't say that I have the same sanguine prophetic spirit I did use to have; for in all the former actions I did never doubt of success, we having had constantly the great blessing of being of one mind. I cannot say it is so now; for I fear some are run so far into villainous faction that it would give them more content to see us beaten." § Douay was surrendered to the allies. But Marlborough now has no pleasure in success. "I must drudge," he writes to the duchess, "for four or five months longer, and venture my life for those who do not deserve it from me." The allusion is evidently to the queen. Mrs. Morley had entirely given up Mrs. Freeman. Their sweet eternal friendship has become the bitterest hate. They parted, with these last words from the haughty duchess to her sovereign: "I am confident you will suffer in this world or the next for so much inhumanity." While Marlborough was before Douay this pleasant information reached him. The next blow was the news that his son-in-law, Lord Sunderland, had been dismissed from his office of secretary of state, the seals being given to Lord Dartmouth. The most influential of the Whigs, still retaining office, wrote an earnest letter to Marlborough, in which they urged him not to let his private mortification interfere with his public duty: "We conjure you by the glory you have

* Coxe, vol. v. p. 345. † Cunningham, "History," vol. ii. p. 306.

* Diary, in "Hardwicke Papers." † Coxe, vol. v. p. 179.
‡ Ibid., p. 195. § Ibid., p. 197.

already obtained, by the many services you have done your queen and country, by the expectation you have justly raised in all Europe, and by all that is dear and tender to you at home, whose chief dependence is upon your success, that you would not leave this great work unfinished, but continue at the head of the army." Cowper, Godolphin, Somers, Newcastle, Devonshire, Orford, Halifax, and Boyle, who signed this letter, had probably no very strong apprehension that their own fall was so near at hand. The ascendency of Mrs. Masham and the manœuvres of Harley were triumphant. Godolphin was first dismissed, and his office was put in commission. Harley was then made chancellor of the exchequer. The queen announced to the council that it was her pleasure there should be a dissolution of parliament. The Whigs were all thrust from power. There ensued four years of party contests, and of strange measures growing out of them, which must have been perplexing enough to all the honest, industrious, and quiet portion of the community; but which, to those who attempt to trace the secret springs of these political agitations, offer cause for thankfulness as well as wonder that we escaped without a convulsion into comparative safety and tranquillity. Swift says that Queen Anne "did appear, upon all occasions, as desirous of preserving reputation with posterity as might justly become a great prince to be," and that he proposed to accept the offer of historiographer "to write her majesty's reign," and especially desired to be furnished with materials for writing an account of "that great transaction," the change in the ministry. He thought that, in the next reign, incorrect views would be taken of the queen's proceedings: "For instance, what would be more easy to a malicious pen than to charge the queen with inconstancy, weakness, and ingratitude, in removing and disgracing the Duke of Marlborough, who had so many years commanded her armies with victory and success; in displacing so many great officers of her court and kingdom, by whose counsels she had, in all appearance, so prosperously governed; in extending the marks of her severity and displeasure toward the wife and daughters, as well as the relations and allies, of that person she had so long employed and so highly trusted; and all this by the private intrigues of a woman of her bedchamber, in concert with an artful man, who might be supposed to have acted that bold part only from a motive of revenge upon the loss of his employments, or of ambition to come again into power?" * What, indeed, could be easier than to assume all this from the patent facts! What, indeed, could be more difficult than to overturn these assumptions by the subsequent disclosures of a century and a half! The revelations of what is called secret history are not such as materially to change these views. We doubt whether our readers will care to follow the political schemers into all their holes and corners. "The private intrigues of the woman of the bedchamber" have little interest for us now beyond the fact that we have arrived at that happier condition when public opinion has a direct influence upon courts and cabinets, and when the days of back-stairs councils are at an end.

The campaign of Marlborough in 1710 had no effect upon the state of affairs at home. There was no brilliant success to justify the war policy of the Whigs. The parliament was dissolved on the 26th of September. "The practice and violence used in elections," says Burnet, "went far beyond anything I had ever known in England." He attributes the Tory preponderance to the efforts of the clergy: "Besides a course for some months of inflaming sermons, they went about from house to house, pressing their people to show, on this great occasion, their zeal for the Church, and now or never to save it." † Extraordinary efforts were made to prevent the election of the managers of the Sacheverel impeachment; but Jekyll, King, Lechmere, and Walpole were returned. In 1734 Walpole, in his speech upon the Septennial Bill, looks back upon this time of agitation with painful recollections: "That there are ferments often raised among the people without any just cause is what I am surprised to hear controverted, since very late experience may convince us of the contrary. Do not we know what a ferment was raised in the nation toward the latter end of the late queen's reign? And it is well known what a fatal change in the affairs of this nation was introduced, or at least confirmed, by an election coming on while the nation was in this ferment." * The new parliament assembled on the 25th of November. There was as great a change in the language which the queen addressed to the "Lords and gentlemen" as in the composition of the House of Commons. The usual topic of congratulation for the conduct of the war in Flanders was no more to be adverted to, although the campaign had been successful in holding France in check, in spite of the vast efforts that had been made to recover her lost ground. The queen announced her determination "to support and encourage the Church of England as by law established;" but the dissenters had to hear the revival of the term which was so offensive to them—the term which implied that all they held of spiritual freedom was conceded as a favor, and not as a right: "I am resolved to maintain the indulgence by law allowed to scrupulous consciences." Her majesty had adopted the language of Sacheverel in substituting "indulgence" for "toleration." Marlborough returned to London in December. The queen took care to inform him that it was no accidental omission that no vote had been proposed in either house for his services in the campaign. While expressing her desire that the duke should continue to serve her, she also said, "I must request you would not suffer any vote of thanks to you to be moved in parliament this year, because my ministers will certainly oppose it." Harley, and especially St. John, had made up their minds to humiliate him whom they called "the great man." He had to endure indignities from those he had been accustomed to command. St. John writes a private letter to his friend Drummond, in which he exults at the duke's abasement. The queen, he says, and her advisers wished that Marlborough should command the army, and that he should have everything which as a general he could expect; but "he has been told that he must draw a line between all that is passed and all that is to come, and that he must begin entirely upon a new foot; that if he looked back to make complaints, he would have more retorted upon him than it was possible to answer. . . . What is the effect of all this plain dealing? He submits, he yields, he promises to comply." † Swift says of Marlborough, "We are not to take the height of his ambition from his soliciting to be general for life. I am persuaded his chief motive was the pay and perquisites by continuing the war; and he had *then* no intentions of settling the crown in his family." Marlborough was at the summit of royal favor and of popular applause when he asked to be general for life, and was very properly refused. Could Swift be serious in thus covertly imputing to the duke that he was aiming at the crown at any time, and especially at the time of his declining popularity? And yet St. John insinuates the same thing, in another letter to Drummond, who was in Holland: "I dare say he is convinced by this time that he cannot lead either his mistress or any one else as he used to do. We shall send him over a subject. Take care you do not put royalty into his head." This notion continued to be a real or an affected belief of St. John, when, in 1713, upon the performance of Addison's "Cato," "he called Booth to his box, and gave him fifty guineas for defending the cause of liberty so well against a perpetual dictator;" ‡ or, as the story is told by Spence, "for so well representing the character of a person who rather chose to die than see a general for life." §

There is something still more bitter for the great conqueror to endure than the loss of political influence. "He was told," says St John, "that his true interest consisted of getting rid of his wife, who was grown to be irreconcilable with the queen, as soon as he could, and with the best grace which he could." In the royal closet, on the 17th of January, there is a scene which tells us of something more pitiable even than the "last scene of all," when

"From Marlborough's eyes the tears of dotage flow."

He presented to the queen a humble letter from the duchess, expressing her apprehension that her lord could not live six months, if some end was not put to his sufferings on her account. "I really am very sorry that I ever did anything that was uneasy to your majesty." The duke them implored her majesty not to renounce the duchess; not to discharge her from the great office she held. "I cannot

* "Change in Queen Anne's Ministry."
† "Own Time," vol. vi. p. 14.

* Coxe's "Walpole," vol. i. p. 425.
† Astle Papers in Coxe's "Walpole," vol. i. p. 36.
‡ Johnson's "Lives," Cunningham's edit. vol. ii. p. 137.
§ "Anecdotes," p. 35.

change my resolution," said the queen. Again he entreated. "Let the *key* be sent me within three days." The victor of Blenheim is now on his knees imploring for a respite of *ten* days. Monmouth praying for his life to James was not more earnest and more abased. "Send me the key in *two* days," cried the inexorable queen. The duchess had more spirit than her lord, and the key was sent the next day. "When the duke told her the queen expected the gold key, she took it from her side, and threw it into the middle of the room, and bid him take it up and carry it to whom he pleased."* Her office of lady of the wardrobe was bestowed upon the Duchess of Somerset: that of keeper of the privy purse upon Mrs. Masham. The haughty Sarah was turned out of her apartments in the palace. We almost blush to record the mode in which the duchess is revenged upon the queen. "She ordered the locks, placed on the doors at her expense, to be taken off, and the marble chimney-pieces to be removed."† The counter-revenge of the royal mistress winds up this story of the degradation of greatness: "The queen is so angry that she says she will build no house for the Duke of Marlborough, when the duchess has pulled hers to pieces, taken away the very slabs out of the chimneys, thrown away the keys, and said they might buy more for ten shillings."‡ The "house for the Duke of Marlborough" was to be the reward of his services to the nation.

At the beginning of the new year, 1711, the queen sent a message to parliament, stating that "her majesty having received notice that there has been an action in Spain, very much to the disadvantage of King Charles' affairs, which having fallen particularly on the British forces, the queen immediately gave directions for sending and procuring troops to repair this loss." Never was a victory more opportune to a government than was this defeat to the ministry of Harley and Bolingbroke. The defeated commander of the British forces was General Stanhope, who, having signalized himself by his eloquence in the impeachment of Sacheverel, had returned to his command in Catalonia, with large reinforcements and an ample supply of money. He induced Charles once more to put himself at the head of an army, and to meet his rival Philip in the field. Charles and his general, Staremberg, appear to have been very unwilling to fight, and it required all Stanhope's determination to induce them to hazard an attack. The battle of Almenara, on the 27th of July, was a victory for the allied forces, and it was followed up by other successes. On the 20th of August another battle was fought under the walls of Saragossa. The allies were here signally victorious, and the often repeated wish of Stanhope was realized, that there might come "a day to retrieve Almanza."§ Charles made good use of the victory by announcing to the Saragossans the restoration of the peculiar rights of the people of Arragon—a measure which had upheld his cause in Catalonia under every disaster. Philip, after his defeat, had returned to Madrid, to which capital he was ever welcome, whether a conqueror or a fugitive. But he again quitted his faithful city, for Stanhope had induced Charles to march again into Castile. The vanguard of the allies entered Madrid on the 21st of September, and when Charles made his public entry shortly after he found the streets empty and the houses shut up. He immediately left in deep indignation, exclaiming, "This city is a desert." Stanhope wrote home, "The country is our enemy, and we are masters in Castile of no more ground than we encamp on." The allies lingered at Madrid till the beginning of November, waiting for reinforcements from Portugal, which never came. Meanwhile the Duke of Vendôme had arrived to take the command of the army of King Philip. The Castilians were enthusiastic in furnishing the means of organizing a powerful force, and he soon marched to the Tagus to prevent the possible junction of the Portuguese with the other portions of the allied army. Charles now determined to return himself to Catalonia, with an escort of two thousand horse. The allies, thus weakened in an important arm—their commanders differing in opinion—at last began to retreat to Arragon, at the beginning of December. The country was so destitute of supplies, chiefly through the hostility of the people, that the army was divided into three separate bodies, English, Germans, Spaniards and Portuguese, each taking different lines of march. On the day when the allies were thus compelled to abandon that concentration which was their safety, Philip and Vendôme entered Madrid in triumph. But the energetic Frenchman lost no time in festivities and ceremonials. He, with the king, joined the Spanish army, which had been returning along the Tagus by forced marches; and crossing the bridge at Guadalaxara with his infantry, and swimming the river with his cavalry, came up with the British portion of the allies. Stanhope was posted at Brihuega, a small town on the river Taguna. The English general had been watching the movements of some partisan cavalry on the hills, and was confiding in his belief that the Spanish infantry was not within some days' march of him. As he afterward learned, the army decamped from Talavera on the 1st of December; and they reached Brihuega on the 8th, a distance of "forty-five long leagues;" and such was the disposition of the population that the allies had not the slightest intimation of the approach of the thousands of cavalry and infantry that Stanhope had now to fight single-handed. He did his best. He threw up barricades and intrenchments in the town, and made the old Moorish wall which surrounded it a formidable defence. Through the next day the British fought with desperation against forces of four times their number. At seven in the evening their ammunition was nearly exhausted, and Stanhope then asked and obtained honorable terms of capitulation. Speaking in the highest terms of his brave men, he wrote to the secretary of state, "Whatever other things I may have failed in through ignorance, I am truly conscious to myself that, in the condition we were reduced to, I could not do a better service to the queen than endeavor to preserve them by the only way that was left."* General Stanhope, his officers, and his men, remained prisoners in Spain till a little time before the peace of Utrecht. The next day, the 10th of December, a great battle was fought at Villa Viciosa by Vendôme with the other portions of the allied army under Staremberg. The fortunes of the combatants were long doubtful; the losses of each were very great. But Staremberg had no resource but a retreat, which he commenced toward Arragon, the next day, before sunrise. He was harassed and followed by partisan cavalry; sustained severe losses; was unable to defend Saragossa, where Philip established his court; and finally reached Barcelona, with forces dwindled to half their number before the battle of the 10th. The cause of King Charles in Spain was henceforth hopeless.

The news of the disasters in Spain was received by the triumphant party in parliament in the way that the baseness of faction, whether Tory or Whig, has too often applied itself, not to the regress of a national calamity, but to derive advantages of party out of the calamity. The Lords, now having a majority of the partisans of the ministry, told the queen, in answer to her message, "as this misfortune may have been occasioned by some previous mismanagement, we take the liberty to assure your majesty we will use our utmost endeavors to discover it, so as to prevent the like for the future." They entered into an examination of the whole history of the war, going not only back to the battle of Almanza, but to the time of the early exploits of Peterborough. Lord Galway and Lord Tyrawley were placed at the bar to give an account of affairs long since passed. Marlborough said, "It was somewhat strange that generals who had acted to the best of their understandings, and had lost their limbs in the service, should be examined like offenders, about insignificant things." The Lords carried a vote that "the late ministers were justly to be blamed, for contributing to all our disasters in Spain;" and the thanks of the house were given to the Earl of Peterborough for his great and eminent services. The party object of the just commendation of Peterborough was sufficiently marked by the terms in which the lord chancellor, Harcourt, delivered the thanks of the house: "Such is your lordship's known generosity and truly noble temper, that I assure myself the present I am now offering to your lordship is the more acceptable as it comes pure and unmixed, and is unattended with any other reward, which your lordship might justly think might be an alloy to it." Swift's famous "Examiner" of the previous 23d of November was to be echoed from the woolsack, to give a new sting to the sarcasms of the coffee-houses. There was a general by whom "pure and unmixed" praise, without "any other reward," would have been counted as dust in the balance. The bitter

* Dartmouth's note on Burnet, vol. vi. p. 30.
† Coxe, vol. v. p. 417.
‡ Ibid., p. 419. Letter detailing a conversation with Harley.
§ Mahon, "War of Succession," p. 312.

* Mahon, p. 337.

satirist of the "Examiner" says, "the common clamor of tongues and pens for some months past has run against the baseness, the inconstancy, and ingratitude of the whole kingdom to the Duke of Marlborough;" and he then states an account, "to convince the world that we are not quite so ungrateful either as the Greeks or the Romans; and in order to adjust the matter with all fairness I shall confine myself to the latter, who were much more generous of the two." Here is the account; and we may easily believe the effect it would produce among grumbling Englishmen:

A Bill of Roman Gratitude.

Imprimis.	£	*s.*	*d.*
For frankincense, and earthen pots to burn it in	4	10	0
A bull for sacrifice	8	0	0
An embroidered garment	50	0	0
A crown of laurel	0	0	2
A statue	100	0	0
A trophy	80	0	0
A thousand copper medals, value half-pence apiece	2	1	8
A triumphal arch	500	0	0
A triumphal car, valued as a modern coach	100	0	0
Casual charges at the triumph	150	0	0
	£994	11	10

A Bill of British Ingratitude.

Imprimis.	£
Woodstock	40,000
Blenheim	200,000
Post-office grant	100,000
Mildenheim	30,000
Pictures, jewels, etc.	60,000
Pall Mall grant, etc.	10,000
Employments	100,000
	£540,000

The ministers of state who, from the time when the influence of opinion was thought of importance to the one object of gaining or holding power, have directly associated themselves with public writers, have generally made mistakes in the choice of their literary allies. The authors of real knowledge and ability have been too proud to become the tools of a government, when the association has been considered to be that of the superior with the inferior. The hacks only would take the great man's pay; and, doing his work as hirelings, would earn for themselves and their employers a fitting measure of general contempt. Not so was the connection of Harley and St. John with the great apostate, the Reverend Jonathan Swift—of all party writers that ever really influenced public opinion the most unscrupulous, the most unjust, the most uncharitable; but incomparably the most able. He is not the mere rhetorician who desires to manifest his own cleverness. Apparently he is the simplest of advocates, speaking nothing but his own earnest convictions, and employing no weapon but the severest logic. He has no tricks of fence to exhibit the skill that can disarm an adversary when he pleases. He does disarm him at once; beats him down; strikes the poisoned dagger into his heart, without the slightest compunction. Against such a combatant the genial frankness of Steele, the amiable decorum of Addison, had no chance. The Tories secured the Vicar of Laracor, when he came up to London, at the beginning of September, 1710, deputed by the Irish primate and clergy to obtain a remission of the first-fruits of livings, as in the case of the English Church. He cherished bitter resentment against the Whigs for not having given him any valuable preferment. "The Whigs were ravished to see me, and would lay hold of me as a twig while they are drowning, and the great men making me their clumsy apologies."* He has not yet quite separated himself from his old friends. He dines in company with Addison and Steele. He writes a paper for the "Tatler." He is entertained by Halifax, but refuses to drink a toast proposed by him, "The Resurrection of the Whigs," unless he would add "their reformation." On the 7th of October he dines with Harley, drinking good wine for two hours, and for two hours they were alone; and the great minister charged the great satirist to come to him often, for his levee was not a place for friends to come to. Still he keeps up his old intimacy with Steele and Addison for a week or two; but at length he finds party had so possessed Mr. Addison "that he talked as if he suspected me." Swift professed a desire to use his new Tory intimacies to retain Steele in one of his employments, he having been turned out of his place of gazetteer for writing a "Tatler" against Mr. Harley some months ago. Mr. Harley does not approve of satire when it is directed against himself. We turn to the "Tatler," No. 191, which lost Steele his place when the Tories came in, and we find it a very mild satire indeed, describing "a cunning man" under the name of Polypragmon, who "fears the imputation of want of understanding much more than the abuse of it;" having "the monstrous affectation of being thought artful." The description of Polypragmon is evidently copied from the life, and most persons probably knew the portraiture: "It is certain Polypragmon does all the ill he possibly can, but pretends to much more than he performs. He is contented in his own thoughts, and hugs himself in his closet, that though he is locked up there and doing nothing, the world does not know but that he is doing mischief. To favor this suspicion he gives half-looks and shrugs in his general behavior, to give you to understand that you don't know what he means. He is also wonderfully adverbial in his expressions, and breaks off with a perhaps and a nod of the head upon matters of the most indifferent nature." A wise man would have laughed at the satire, and not have taken a miserable revenge. Swift was not one who would be content to wound in this delicate way. Nor would he be won over by small bribes. The treasurer and the secretary have found out his weak side: "It is hard to see these great men use me like one who was their betters, and the puppies with you in Ireland hardly regarding me."* Harley, a man of second-rate capacity; St. John, a man of high talent, but one who possessed his faculties chiefly as the instruments of his ambition, made Swift their tool by deference to his intellectual greatness. The pride of intellect is a higher thing than the pride of birth, far higher than the pride of wealth; but it is a pride that, ill-regulated, degenerates into tyranny and uncharitableness. It did not prevent Swift from going all lengths in doing what was really dirty work, that any of the pamphleteers at whom he sneers as Grub Street would have done for a lower price than he set on his services. A bishopric in prospect was a grander thing than an immediate fee of secret-service money. To be so paid was degrading. Another sort of price was a just reward of merit. Harley, in spite of his blandishments and his dinners, mortally offended Swift by offering him fifty pounds; and then Swift said, "If we let these great ministers pretend too much, there will be no governing them."† Swift had sold himself in spite of his pride. In a few weeks after his first coquetting with "these great ministers," the "Examiner," the literary organ of St. John and Harley, is handed over to his conduct; and one of the first uses of his new weapon is the savage attack upon Marlborough. Of real principle in his junction with the Tory ministers there was as little as there was any real love for religion in their exuberant zeal for the Church.

The session of 1711 was remarkable for the passing of a statute which, having continued as law for a hundred and fifty-seven years, was swept away by a brief act of repeal in 1858. The Tory ministry desired to propitiate what was called the country party by bringing in a bill by which every knight of the shire was to have the property qualification of a real estate of six hundred a year, and every member for a borough a similar qualification of half the value. The wealth and influence of that large portion of the community employed in liberal professions and in commerce were rapidly increasing. The landowners and agriculturists had not yet discovered that capital applied to improvements in cultivation might yield as large a profit as capital applied to the extension of trade. The landed interest would not bestir itself for its own advantage, and it opened its half-shut eyes to gaze with envy and dislike upon the mercantile interest that was up and doing. Burnet says of the Qualification Bill, "Our gentry was become so ignorant and so corrupt that many apprehended the ill effects of this, and that the interest of trade, which indeed supports that of the land, would neither be understood nor regarded. But the new minister resolved to be popular with those who promoted it, so it passed." Like all other expedients for setting the interests of one class above those of another class, this measure for making the land paramount was defeated in practice by fabricated qualifications at which all parties connived; and it was finally repealed as utterly useless for good or evil, beyond the encouragement of a debasing system of chicanery.

Harley labored hard to please "the country gentlemen of his

* Journal to Stella, Sept. 9.

* "Journal," November 11.
† Ibid., February 7th, 1711.

party ;"* but, as the case has ever been, an English minister has more difficulty with his violent supporters than with those who are thoroughly adverse to him. "In the House of Commons there appeared a new combination of Tories of the highest form, who thought the court was yet in some management with the Whigs, and did not come up to their height, which they imputed to Mr. Harley ; so they began to form themselves in opposition to him."† Lord Nottingham, at a conference with the ministers, which is recorded by Lord Dartmouth, the secretary of state, urged them to prosecute the Whigs, so as "to make it impracticable for them ever to rise again." They said "the queen would never be brought into such measures," and from that day Nottingham "was most indefatigable in persecuting the queen and all her servants with all the art that he was master of."‡ Swift saw the storm coming : "The ministry is upon a very narrow bottom, and stands like an isthmus between the Whigs on one side and violent Tories on the other. They are able seamen, but the tempest is too great, the ship too rotten, and the crew all against them." This keen looker-on upon the game in which he had sometimes to fag for the upper boys, wrote, on the 14th of March, the above dolorous comment upon the low spirits which Harley displayed. Four days after an event occurred which changed the face of affairs as regarded Harley. "An odd accident, that had been almost fatal, proved happy to him."§ On the 8th of March he was stabbed at a sitting of the privy council. The assassin, whom Swift calls "a desperate French popish villain," conferred such a benefit upon Harley that the partisans of his rival St. John insisted that the blow was meant for the secretary and not for the chancellor of the exchequer. The minister who had to bear the pain had a fair right to whatever compensations were to follow. But it seems somewhat unreasonable that the random stroke of a suspected traitor should have made Mr. Harley Earl of Oxford and lord high treasurer ; and, to use the words of a historian of these times, should have "blasted the hopes of his ministerial rivals, fixed his presidency in the cabinet, and have given firmness to an administration which had been tottering from inherent jealousies and dissensions."‖ The accident which produced such results may be briefly related. The Marquis de Guiscard, who had been an abbé séculier in France, and who is represented as having committed enormous crimes which compelled him to fly his country, came to England, and appears to have had a command in an expedition, in 1707, connected with the discontents of the Huguenots in the Cévennes. In a book which he then published he calls himself "lieutenant-general of the forces gone upon the present descent." Burnet says, "He had a pension assigned him for some years, but it did not answer his expense ; so when he was out of hope of getting it increased he wrote to one at the court of France, to offer his services there."¶ His services consisted in his acting as a French spy. Dartmouth relates that Guiscard had been with the queen on the evening of the 7th, "and nobody in the outer room but Mrs. Fielding, or within call but Mrs. Kirk, who was commonly asleep." He says, "If Guiscard had any design upon the queen his heart failed him." Very mysterious it seems that such a person should have had access to the queen, although he was one of St. John's boon companions. Her majesty told Dartmouth that "he was very pressing for an augmentation of his pension, and complained that he was ill paid."** He was arrested in St. James's Park on the morning of the 8th ; for a letter which he had written having been opened at the post-office, his communications with the French court were discovered. He was taken to the office where the council were sitting ; and having given up his sword he contrived to secrete a penknife which was upon the table of an outer room. Dartmouth, who was present, says, "He behaved himself with great confidence before the council, and denied everything, till he was shown one of his own letters, which he endeavored to snatch out of Lord Harcourt's hand." He asked to speak in private with St. John, who very wisely refused. "When," says Dartmouth, "Mr. St. John refused to speak with him, he bent down, as if he would have whispered with Mr. Harley, and gave him two or three violent blows upon the breast before anybody could stop him." Harley, bleeding, rose up, and St. John and the other counsellors drew their swords, and inflicted many wounds upon the assassin. Swift, in his Journal of the 17th, writes, "Guiscard died this morning at two, and the coroner's inquest have found that he was killed by bruises received from a messenger, so to clear the cabinet counsellors, from whom he received his wounds." What a sight was there now to be seen in London, where, of old, "not a holiday fool there but would give a piece of silver" to gaze upon any strange beast. "When they will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian."* How much more exciting to see a dead French papist, who was killed by noble English Protestants ! "We have let Guiscard be buried at last, after showing him pickled in a trough this fortnight for twopence apiece ; and the fellow that showed would point to his body, and 'See gentlemen, this is the wound that was given him by his grace the Duke of Ormond ; and this is the wound, etc.,' and then the show was over, and another set of rabble came in."† Both houses went up with an address to the queen, to express how deeply they were affected "to find such an instance of inveterate malice against one employed in your majesty's council, and so near your royal person ; and we have reason to believe that his fidelity to your majesty and zeal for your service have drawn upon him the hatred of all the abettors of popery and faction." Harley slowly recovered. When he attended in his place on the 11th of March the speaker congratulated him upon his escape and restoration to health. His attempted assassination was an undeniable evidence of his extraordinary merits. This was party logic, very agreeable to Harley, but not equally gratifying to one who had a lurking contempt for his fortunate brother in office. "Mr. St. John affected to say in several companies that Guiscard intended the blow against him." Swift adds, "I am apt to think Mr. St. John was either mistaken or misinformed. However, the matter was thus represented in the weekly paper called 'The Examiner,' which Mr. St. John perused before it was printed, but made no alteration in the passage. This management was looked upon at least as a piece of youthful indiscretion in Mr. St. John ; and perhaps was represented in a worse view to Mr. Harley."‡ Strange, that two great statesmen should have their "first misunderstanding" about the honor which was proposed to be conferred upon one of them by a stab from a French spy ! Singular, that the man of the greatest intellect in that period of political dishonesty should grudge the white staff and a peerage, to him who had the lucky misfortune to have a penknife blade broken upon the rib beneath his embroidered waistcoat, and should envy the fulsome addresses of parliament about papists and factions, of the utter falsehood of which he was perfectly conscious. Was it thus ? Swift says, "I remember very well that, upon visiting Mr. Harley as soon as he was in a condition to be seen, I found several of his nearest relatives talk very freely of some proceedings of Mr. St. John." Was he intriguing to be first minister—at which Swift hints—during the time when Harley's recovery was somewhat doubtful ? St. John's great power and influence in the House of Commons as its best orator might have commanded this, without seeking to assume what Swift terms "the merit" of Guiscard's attempt. "This accident," says Burnet, "was of great use to Harley ; for the party formed against him was ashamed to push a man who was thus assassinated by one that was studying to recommend himself to the court of France." It averted suspicion from the secret correspondence that Harley was himself carrying on with that court, if not directly with the court of St. Germains. St. John would be equally desirous to have the same cover for his own designs, and to smother the fact mentioned by Dartmouth, that the correspondence of Guiscard, which was read at the council, contained "intelligence which few of the cabinet had any knowledge of before they read his letters ; and he was never asked who he had it from, the answer being evident." St. John was doubtless the discloser of secrets thus pointed at. A clandestine negotiation for peace was at that time going forward with the French minister, Torcy, under the immediate direction of St. John, through the Abbé Gautier, while the queen was made to pledge herself to the Dutch government that no step toward a pacification should be taken but in concert with them. How far St. John was at that time concerned in the schemes which the Jacobite party had for setting aside the Act

* Onslow, Note on Burnet, p. 36.
‡ Note on Burnet, ibid.
‖ Somerville, p. 129.
¶ "Own Time," vol. vi. p. 38.
† Burnet, vol. vi. p. 37.
§ Burnet, ibid.
** Note, ibid., p. 39.

* "Tempest," act ii. scene 2.
† Journal to Stella, March 25.
‡ "Change in Queen Anne's Ministry."

of Settlement, and for bringing back the pretender, in connection with these advances for peace, is a matter of inference from his subsequent conduct. "It is remarked by Sir James Mackintosh in one of his note-books (we know not on what authority) that the first introduction of Bolingbroke into the secret negotiation was during the illness of Harley after he had been stabbed by Guiscard." * It was for the interest of both these unscrupulous ministers that their undoubted duplicity to the allies and their possible treason to the constitution should be covered by the pretence that each was meant to be assassinated by a French agent, for their zeal and fidelity to their sovereign and their country. They became rivals even for the honor of this miserable delusion.

The attempt of Guiscard upon the life of Harley led to the passing of the statute, by which it was enacted that if any person or persons "shall unlawfully attempt to kill, or shall unlawfully assault, or strike or wound, any person, being one of the most honorable privy council of her majesty, her heirs or successors, when in the execution of his office of a privy councillor in council, or on any committee of council, that then the person or persons so offending, being thereof convicted in due form of law, shall be and are hereby declared to be felons, and shall suffer death as in cases of felony, without benefit of clergy." †

On the 4th of March Marlborough left England, to resume his command of the allied forces in the Netherlands, but without a remnant of the political power which had once been intrusted to him. Yet the weakness of the ministry had induced Harley and Bolingbroke to relax somewhat in their hostility to the great general, and Swift evidently had his cue, when he wrote thus on the 15th of February: "Nobody that I know of did ever dispute the Duke of Marlborough's courage, conduct, or success; they have been always unquestionable, and will continue to be so, in spite of the malice of his enemies, or, which is yet more, the weakness of his advocates. The nation only wishes to see him taken out of ill hands and put in better." ‡ Three weeks after the attempt upon Harley's life St. John wrote a letter to Marlborough, full of professions of respect: "Your grace may be assured of my sincere endeavors to serve you; and I hope never again to see the time when I shall be obliged to embark in a separate interest from you." § Marlborough was too experienced in the value of such professions not to be on his guard. He wrote to beg the duchess not to name any of the ministers in her letters to him, all of which he had certain assurance that they opened. "The concern you have for me must in kindness oblige you never to say anything of them which may give offence; since while I am in the service I am in their power, especially by the villainous way of printing, which stabs me to the heart." ‖ This moral cowardice is a curious revelation of human inconsistency. "The villainous way of printing" was ever a terror to the man who would charge a redoubt with the utmost coolness. "Paper-bullets of the brain" were far more terrible to him than a volley of grape-shot. But Marlborough very speedily had far more serious embarrassments than the discomfort produced by his dreaded enemies, the London pamphleteers. The Emperor Joseph was attacked by small-pox, and died on the 17th of April, in his thirty-fourth year. His brother Charles would succeed to the hereditary dominions of Austria, and all the political interests of Germany would be concentrated upon the election to the empire. The British cabinet instantly sent orders to Marlborough to co-operate with the States of Holland and with Eugene, in forwarding the election of the Austrian prince, in preference to that of the King of Bavaria. Louis secretly promoted the same object. The governments of England and France saw that the great obstacle to a separate peace would be removed if Charles were elected emperor; for the danger to the balance of power from the emperor being King of Spain was really greater than the danger of the crowns of France and Spain being in the family of the Bourbons. Peace would assuredly arise out of these complications, however unwilling the Austrian family might be to withdraw their pretensions to the Spanish monarchy. But the uncertainty of the future was too great to cause any essential difference in the conduct of the war in the Netherlands. Marlborough never stood in a loftier attitude than in the campaign of 1711. The expected co-operation of Prince Eugene in the command of the allied troops was interrupted by the necessity of his presence on the Upper Rhine. A portion of the British force was withdrawn from the Netherlands, to take part in a hopeless renewal of the war in Spain, or to be sent upon an ill-concerted expedition against Quebec. Marlborough, having lost the favor of the queen, distrusted and hated by the ministry, grown odious in the eyes of the people as the supposed obstacle to peace and relief from taxation, went about the performance of his military duties with a vigor and sagacity truly admirable. Marshal Villars, during the preceding autumn and winter, had constructed a series of fortified lines, which appeared well calculated to defy any irruption of the allies upon the French frontier. They were boastfully asserted to be the *ne plus ultra* of Marlborough. The French army was also declared to be far stronger than that of the allies. "The Marshal de Villars was pleased to tell my trumpet yesterday that the death of the emperor would occasion great disorders among the allies, and that he should be thirty thousand stronger than we." Thus Marlborough writes to Godolphin on the 4th of May, and adds, "If their superiority be as great as he says it will be, I should not apprehend much from them, but that of their being able to hinder us from acting, which, to my own particular, would be mortification enough; for since constant success has not met with approbation, what may I not expect when nothing is done!" * Marlborough was not hindered from acting by the French superiority of numbers, or by their impregnable lines. He had determined to invest Bouchain; but to do this it was necessary that he should pass those lines. By rapid changes of position; by taking an important post in one day, and suffering the enemy to concentrate their attention by its recapture, while he carried forward his ultimate design; by inducing Villars to fancy that the allies were about to give him battle, and then suddenly marching away at nightfall—this wonderful strategy produced a result as great as if Marlborough had added one more to his roll of victories. On the 6th of August he wrote to Secretary St. John that the whole army had passed the lines on the previous day, and were drawn up in order of battle. The reply of St. John offers the highest tribute to the strategy of the general: "My Lord Stair had indeed opened to us the several steps which your grace intended to take in order to pass the enemy's lines in one part or other; it was, however, hard to imagine, and too much to hope, that a plan which consisted of so many parts, wherein so many different corps were to co-operate punctually together, should entirely succeed, and no one article fail of what your grace had projected. I most heartily congratulate with your grace on this great event, of which no more needs, I think, be said than that you have obtained, without losing a man, such an advantage as we should have bought with the expense of several thousand lives, and have reckoned ourselves gainers." † On the 24th of August Marlborough writes to St. John to apprise him of his proceedings in the siege of Bouchain. The answer of the secretary is again a tribute to the genius of Marlborough: "I shall be very glad to have the plan of the situation of both armies, which your grace has promised to send me. I expect indeed that it should be very extraordinary, since I believe there is hardly one instance of an inferior army posting themselves so as to be able to form a siege and keep the communication open with their own country, in sight of an enemy so much superior." ‡ On the 14th of September the successful general announces to the sceptical secretary that the difficulties had been overcome—that Bouchain had surrendered: "Thus you see a place, which is of such consequence to either party, has, by the blessing of God, been reduced even in the sight of a superior army, that has left nothing unattempted toward relieving it, and who, being apprehensive of our success, have for some days past been burning and destroying all the forage about Quesnoy and Valenciennes to hinder our further progress, by endeavoring to make it impossible for us to subsist." §

On the 8th of October Charles of Austria was elected Emperor of Germany. He had previously left Spain, where, although troops were sent by the British government, nothing was done to retrieve the disasters of the previous year. In England the conduct of the campaign by Marlborough was systematically disparaged. He was assailed for not having taken occasion to hazard battle with Villars;

* *Edinburgh Review*, vol. lxii. p. 19.
† 9 Annæ, c. 21.
‡ "Examiner." § Coxe, vol. vi. p. 7. ‖ Ibid., p. 8.

* Coxe, vol. vi. p. 24.
† "Marlborough Dispatches," vol. v. p. 429.
‡ Ibid., p. 462. § Ibid., p. 490.

his passage of the French lines was termed crossing the kennel; and the capture of Bouchain was called the taking of a dove-cot, with the loss of sixteen thousand men. Marlborough was writhing under these attacks, and had the weakness to write to Harley, now Lord Oxford, complaining that he "should be reviled in such a manner." Oxford replied that he was himself every day the subject of some libel or other, and says, "I would willingly compound that all the ill-natured scribblers should have license to write ten times more against me, on condition that they would write against nobody else." * St. John informs the queen in a note that Marlborough's chaplain, Dr. Hare, had "published libels against your majesty's government," and is particularly angry against a sermon preached before the duke, and afterward printed. He calls it "seditious." It merely deprecated the conclusion of a precipitate and dishonorable peace. This was the sore point. Oxford and St. John had for some time been carrying on their secret negotiation with France for a peace, as if England were the sole party; and had been writing to Marlborough as if there could only be one policy—that of vigorously conducting the war till a general peace could be accomplished, in concert with the allies. They knew that the notion which Marlborough and the allies had of a general peace was, that it should contain a provision that no Bourbon prince should ever wear the crown of Spain. The ministry had signed a preliminary treaty with France, in which it was agreed that the crowns of France and Spain should not be worn by the same prince. It would be easier to destroy Marlborough than to convert him; and the ministers vigorously set about his destruction.

The army went into winter quarters, and Marlborough came home, landing at Greenwich on the 17th of November. He heard that London was in some confusion. The usual procession on the birth-day of Queen Elizabeth, when it was customary to burn the effigies of the pope, the devil, and other illustrious personages, was conceived by the ministry to be as dangerous to the public peace as the similar procession in the time of Titus Oates. † A quantity of puppets was seized in a house in Drury Lane, on the night of the 16th, one of which, representing the lord treasurer, was a fearful libel. "I am assured," says Swift, "that the figure of the devil is made as like lord treasurer as they could." It was a capital occasion to get up a squib against the Whigs, and the reverend counsellor of the Tories says, "I have put an understrapper upon writing a twopenny pamphlet, to give an account of the whole design." ‡ The "understrapper" was the great ally of the lord treasurer and the secretary; and one object of the twopenny pamphlet is clear enough from this passage: "The Duke of Marlborough was to make his entry through Aldgate, where he was to be met with the cry of 'Victory! Bouchain! the lines, the lines!'" Marlborough had as little to promise himself from mob favor as from court favor. The lines and Bouchain were worthless to his immediate fame, and did not save him from ungenerous reproach in the highest place. The parliament was opened by the queen on the 7th of December, and the application of the opening words of her speech could not be mistaken: "I have called you together as soon as the public affairs would permit; and I am glad that I can now tell you that, notwithstanding the arts of those who delight in war, both place and time are appointed for opening the treaty of a general peace." In the debate which ensued Marlborough spoke with an animation and solemnity which rarely marked his course in parliamentary proceedings. The queen was in the house: "He could declare with a safe conscience, in the presence of her majesty, of that illustrious assembly, and of that Supreme Being who is infinitely above all the powers upon earth, and before whom, according to the ordinary course of nature, he must soon appear, to give an account of his actions, that he ever was desirous of a safe, honorable, and lasting peace; and that he was always very far from any design of prolonging the war for his own private advantage, as his enemies had most falsely insinuated. That his advanced age and the many fatigues he had undergone made him earnestly wish for retirement and repose, to think of eternity the remainder of his days; the rather because he had not the least motive to desire the continuance of the war, having been so generously rewarded, and had honors and riches heaped upon him, far beyond his desert and expectation, both by her majesty and her parliaments. That he thought himself bound to this public acknowledgment to her majesty and his country, that he should always be ready to serve them, if he could but crawl along, to obtain an honorable and lasting peace: but that, at the same time, he must take the liberty to declare that he could, by no means, give in to the measures that had lately been taken to enter into a negotiation of peace with France, upon the foot of the seven preliminary articles; for he was of the same opinion with the rest of the allies, that the safety and liberties of Europe would be in imminent danger if Spain and the West Indies were left to the house of Bourbon; which, with all humility, and as he thought himself in duty bound, he had declared to her majesty, whom he had the honor to wait on after his return from Holland; and, therefore, he was for inserting in the address the clause offered by the Earl of Nottingham." * The amendment of Nottingham was to the effect "that no peace could be safe or honorable to Great Britain, or Europe, if Spain and the West Indies were allotted to the house of Bourbon." The amendment was carried by a majority of 62 against 54. A similar amendment in the Commons was rejected by a majority of 232 against 106. In the address of the lower house to the queen the feeling against Marlborough was kept up by an especial reference to "the arts and devices of those who, for private views, may delight in war."

The ministers of Queen Anne put a falsehood into her mouth in her answer to the address of the Lords: "I should be sorry any one could think I would not do my utmost to recover Spain and the West Indies from the house of Bourbon." The ministerial duplicity was a result of the terror which they felt at their probable ejection from power, and at the prospect of Whig revenge upon the discovery of their clandestine dealings with France. Swift has related that the most bitter of their opponents, the Earl of Wharton, "was observed in the house to smile, and put his hands to his neck when any of the ministry was speaking, by which he would have it understood that some heads were in danger." † Swift begged St. John to send him abroad "before a change." He says, "I took him aside after dinner, told him how I had served them, and had asked no reward, but thought I might ask security." ‡ We doubt if he was altogether in a jocular mood, when he thus manifested his fears to Oxford: "I told lord treasurer I should have the advantage of him; for he would lose his head, and I should only be hanged, and so carry my body entire to the grave." § Party hatreds were becoming so intense that heading and hanging were not altogether out of the question. But lord treasurer and secretary kept their places, and with their majority in the Commons, and their better management of the queen—who had been somewhat impatient of their attempts to govern her—they turned their thoughts to the mode in which they could best damage and destroy their adversaries. Marlborough was the first victim. The "falcon" Churchill, was "hawk'd at and killed" by "the mousing owl," Harley. On the 31st of December the following entry was made in the minutes of the cabinet council: "Being informed that an information against the Duke of Marlborough was laid before the House of Commons by the commissioners of the public accounts, her majesty thought fit to dismiss him from all his employments, that the matter might undergo an impartial investigation." The prelude to "an impartial investigation" was to load the object of it with disgrace. On the 1st of January Swift enters in his Journal, "Marlborough is turned out of all. . . . If the ministry be not sure of a peace, I shall wonder at this step, and do not approve it at best. The queen and lord treasurer mortally hate the Duke of Marlborough, and to that he owes his fall, more than to his other faults. . . . Opinion is a mighty matter in war, and I doubt the French think it impossible to conquer an army that he leads, and our soldiers think the same; and how far even this step may encourage the French to play tricks with us no one knows." The one-sided pamphleteer could think impartially in the private record of his feelings and opinions.

The information against the Duke of Marlborough would, in another generation, have properly consigned a great public servant to the lowest depth of ignominy, and have called for exemplary punish-

* Coxe, vol. vi. p. 123.
† See *ante*, vol. iv. p. 562.
‡ Journal to Stella.

* "Parliamentary History," vol. vi. col. 1038.
† "Four Last Years of Queen Anne."
‡ Journal, December 9.
§ Ibid., December 8.

ment. He was an avaricious man; he clutched at all the gold he could safely touch, and he kept it tightly buttoned up, to his own undisguised satisfaction. Peterborough measured his character pretty accurately when, being mistaken by a truculent mob for Marlborough in the wane of his popularity, he exclaimed, "I am not the duke, and I will prove it. I have only five guineas in my pocket, and you shall have them." But Marlborough was too cautious to seize upon perquisites and appropriate funds for which he had not strict precedent. The charges against him were under two heads, and were declared established by large majorities in the House of Commons: 1. "That the taking several sums of money, annually, by the Duke of Marlborough from the contractors for furnishing the bread and wagons in the Low Countries, was unwarrantable and illegal." This charge against him came to the knowledge of the duke before he returned to England in November, and he at once wrote to the commissioners of public accounts, not denying the information which Sir Solomon de Medina had given them, that he had made such payments, but saying, "this is no more but what has been allowed as a perquisite to the general, or commander-in-chief, of the army in the Low Countries, even before the revolution, and since." He added his assurance that whatever had been so received had been "constantly employed for the service of the public, in keeping secret correspondence, and getting intelligence of the enemy's motions and designs." * The second resolution of the Commons was, "that the deduction of 2½ per cent from the pay of the foreign troops in her majesty's service is public money, and ought to be accounted for." Marlborough, in his letter to the commissioners, had anticipated this second charge by informing them that, as the plenipotentiary of William III., he had negotiated with the foreign states that 2½ per cent should be deducted from the pay of their troops, to cover all charges for secret service; and that when he succeeded to the command, the queen, by warrant, authorized his receipt of the same percentage, which he had strictly applied "for procuring timely and good advices." The question of Marlborough's criminality may long remain an open one. But we cannot have a stronger proof of the growth of good government than the certainty that no such temptation to dishonesty could now be presented to any high public servant, and that no one who has now the conduct of civil or military affairs would incur the fearful responsibility of disbursing large sums of money without being accountable for them. Marlborough's defence was certainly very incomplete, as judged by the opinions of our own times; but it seems to have satisfied all but the furious partisans of the ministry, to whom his high influence, especially in foreign courts, was a serious obstacle to their policy. When the queen dismissed him by an insulting letter, he boldly replied he would not "join in the counsel of a man who, in my opinion, puts your majesty upon all manner of extremities. And it is not my opinion only, but the opinion of all mankind, that the friendship of France must needs be destructive to your majesty, there being in that court a root of enmity, irreconcilable to your majesty's government and the religion of these kingdoms." †

The discomfiture of the ministry in the House of Lords was stopped from going farther by a bold but dangerous manœuvre. They created twelve new peers. Lord Dartmouth has given an interesting account of what came to his knowledge with regard to this measure: "I was never so much surprised as when the queen drew a list of twelve lords out of her pocket, and ordered me to bring warrants for them; there not having been the least intimation before it was to be put in execution. I asked her if she designed to have them all made at once. She asked me if I had any exceptions to the legality of it. I said no, but doubted very much of the expediency, for I feared it would have a very ill effect in the House of Lords, and no good one in the kingdom. She said she had made fewer lords than any of her predecessors, and I saw the Duke of Marlborough and the Whigs were resolved to distress her as much as they could, and she must do what she could to help herself. I told her I wished it proved a remedy to what she so justly complained of, but I thought it my duty to tell her my apprehensions, as well as execute her commands. She thanked me, and said she liked it as little as I did, but did not find that anybody could propose a better expedient. I asked Lord Oxford afterward what was the real inducement for taking so odious a couse, when there were less shocking means to have acquired the same end. He said the Scotch lords were grown so extravagant in their demands that it was high time to let them see they were not so much wanted as they imagined; for they were now come to expect a reward for every vote they gave." * There was no decided notice taken of this proceeding in the House of Lords. Lord Wharton took occasion to say one of the humorous things recorded of an age of humorists. He asked one of the twelve new peers whether they voted by their foreman.

The opposition of the peers being in some degree disarmed by this new creation, and the Commons being decidedly with the ministry, the queen sent a message to parliament on the 17th of January, which contained the important announcement that "her majesty's plenipotentiaries are arrived at Utrecht, and have begun, in pursuance of their instructions, to concert the most proper ways of procuring a just satisfaction to all in alliance with her, according to their several treaties, and particularly with relation to Spain and the West Indies."

* Coxe, vol. vi. p. 124. † Ibid., p. 154.

NOTE TO CHAPTER XXIV.

The constant references in historical works to the treaties between nations, which are briefly mentioned as "The Peace of Ryswick," "The Partition Treaties," "The Peace of Utrecht," etc., etc., have induced us to reprint the following table, which appeared in the "Companion to the Almanac for 1831," a work edited by the author of the "Popular History of England." The present table is brought down to the Alliance of Vienna, 1731, and it will be continued to a more recent period in a subsequent volume.

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE *of the more* IMPORTANT TREATIES *between the principal civilized Nations; with Notices of the* WARS *and other Events with which they are connected: from the beginning of the Fourteenth Century.*

EDWARD II.

1326 War between England and France, on the subject of a fortress in Guienne, which Edward II. claimed as his of right.

EDWARD III.

1327 Peace between Robert Bruce and Edward III. The independence of Scotland acknowledged.
1336 Edward III. renews his pretensions to the crown of France, and enters into a league with the revolted Flemings.
1356 The German Constitution, known by the name of the *Golden Bull*, sanctioned, and the mode of electing the emperor determined.
1360 May 8: peace concluded with France, at Bretigny near Chartres, whereby England retained Gascony and Guienne, acquired Saintonge, Agenois, Perigord, Limosin, Bigorre, Angoumois, and Rovergne, and renounced her pretensions to Maine, Anjou, Touraine, and Normandy; England was also to receive 3,000,000 crowns, and to release King John, who had been long prisoner in London.
1370 War recommenced between France and England.

RICHARD II.

1381 Peace ratified between Venice and Genoa.
1385 The French united with the Scotch against England, upon which Richard II. invaded Scotland and burned Edinburgh.
1390 Sultan Bajazet ratified a treaty with the Greek emperor, John Palæologus.

HENRY IV.

1412 Henry IV. of England leagued with the Duke of Orleans, regent of France, in order to oppose the Duke of Burgundy.

HENRY V.

1415 August: Henry V. of England commences war against France.
1420 May 21: *Treaty of Troyes* between England, France, and Burgundy, whereby it was stipulated that Henry V. should marry Catherine, daughter of Charles VI., be appointed regent of France, and after the death of Charles should inherit the crown.

HENRY VI.

1423 Treaty between England and Burgundy.
1435 September 22: *Treaty of Arras* between France and Burgundy. Several towns annexed to the duchy of Burgundy.
1439 The *Pragmatic Sanction* settled in France, regulating the election of bishops, and moderating the power of the pope.
1453 The first alliance entered into between the French and Swiss.

* Note on Burnet, vol. vi. p. 87.

EDWARD IV.

1464 A league, designated "*For the public good*," formed between the Dukes of Burgundy, Brittany, and Bourbon, and others, against Louis XI. of France.
1465 *Treaty of Conflans*, between Louis XI. and the chiefs of the above league. Normandy ceded to the Duke of Berri.
1468 Louis XI., having placed himself in the power of the Duke of Burgundy, was forced to sign a treaty at Peronne, confirming those of Arras and Conflans, with some other stipulations.
1474 Peace concluded between Edward IV. of England and Louis XI. of France.
1475 The *Peace of Picquigni*.
1475 Charles the Bold, of Burgundy, concluded a treaty with the French king, but speedily afterward leagued against him with Edward IV. of England and the Duke of Brittany. Louis XI., on the other hand, entered into a treaty with the Switzers, and succeeded ultimately in becoming an ally of England, which unexpected change determined the Duke of Burgundy to conclude a truce at Vervins for nine years.
1476 Charles of Burgundy commenced war against the Switzers, in which he eventually lost his life.
1482 The *Treaty of Arras*, between Maximilian of Austria, the husband of Mary of Burgundy, and Louis XI. of France, whereby Margaret, daughter of the former, was espoused to the dauphin, son of the latter, with Artois and Burgundy as a dowry.
1482 Peace concluded at Edinburgh between England and Scotland.

HENRY VII.

1494 War commenced by France for the possession of Naples, bequeathed to the king by Charles du Maine, which was opposed by the pope, the emperor, the King of Spain, the Venetians, and the Duke of Milan—France being ultimately forced to abandon her claim.
1497 Treaty between England and Scotland, by which Perkin Warbeck was compelled to quit the latter kingdom.
1501 Treaty between Louis XII. of France and Ferdinand of Spain for the kingdom of Naples; this partition, however gave rise to a war between those powers, and eventually Naples remained in possession of Spain.
1508 December 10: the *League of Cambray* against the Republic of Venice, comprising the pope, the emperor, and the kings of France and Spain. Venice forced to cede to Spain her possessions in the kingdom of Naples.

HENRY VIII.

1510 *Holy League* against Louis XII. of France.
1514 France obliged to sue for peace, which was obtained from the pope, by promising to abolish the Pragmatic Sanction; from the King of Spain, by uniting his grandson, the Duke of Ferrara, to Renée, daughter of the King of France; and from England, by Louis XII. espousing Mary, sister of Henry VIII.
1515 On the accession of Francis I. a war was commenced by France for the recovery of the Milanese.
1516 August 16: the *Treaty of Noyon*.
1521 *Edict of Worms*, proscribing Luther and his adherents.
1521 First war between France and Charles V.; France endeavoring to reinstate Henry d'Albret in the kingdom of Navarre.
1521 The Emperor Charles V. prevailed upon Henry VIII. to declare war against France.
1522 War commenced between France and Scotland, and also between France and England.
1525 A treaty concluded between Francis I. and England.
1526 Francis I., to release himself from captivity, signed a treaty with Charles V., surrendering Burgundy, Artois, Flanders, etc., and renouncing all pretensions to Italy.
1527 Second war between Francis I. and Charles V. The pope taken prisoner at Rome.
1527 A treaty of mutual obligation entered into between France and England; and in the same year a fresh treaty, for the purpose of carrying war into Italy to restore the pope to liberty.
1529 August 5: the *Peace of Cambray*.
1529 December: the *League of Smalcald* in Franconia, entered into between the Elector of Brandenburg and other princes of Germany, in defence of Protestantism.
1532 June 23: a new treaty of alliance ratified between the kings of England and France.
1532 August 2: the *Treaty of Nuremburg* ratified.
1536 Third war between Francis I. and Charles V. for possession of Milan.
1538 June 18: *Treaty of Nice* between Francis I. and Charles V.
1541 Fourth war between Francis I. and Charles V.
1542 Henry VIII. of England attacked Scotland, in order to force an alliance between the young Queen Mary and his son Prince Edward, which was terminated by a peace the following year. This attempt was as unsuccessfully renewed in 1547, after the accession of Edward VI.
1544 League between England and the Emperor Charles V. against France; shortly after which peace was concluded with France, and signed at Cressy in Valois.

EDWARD VI.

1548 May 15: the *Interim* granted by the Emperor Charles V. to the Protestants of Germany.
1549 Peace ratified between France and England. Boulogne restored to France.
1551 October 5: *Treaty of Friedwald*, between France and the Protestant princes of Germany.
1552 January 15: *Treaty of Chambord*, confirming the league between France and the Protestant princes of Germany.
1552 August 12: *Treaty of Passau*, ratified between Charles V. and the Protestant princes of Germany. Freedom of religion established.

MARY.

1554 *Treaty of Naumburg*, between Augustus, Elector of Saxony, and the deposed elector, John Frederic—the electorate to descend to John Frederic and his heirs, in default of heirs male of Augustus.
1555 *Peace of Religion*, concluded at Augsburg—a confirmation of the treaty of Passau, establishing the free exercise of the Protestant religion.
1556 England entered into an alliance with Spain against France.
1558 February: the French took Calais, which had been in the possession of the English since 1347.

ELIZABETH.

1559 *Peace of Chateau Cambresis*, between France, Spain, and Piedmont. France ceded Savoy, Corsica, and nearly 200 forts in Italy and the Low Countries.
1560 Peace ratified between England, France, and Scotland.
1561 *Treaty of Wilna*, between the Northern Powers.
1562 The French Protestants having had recourse to arms, Elizabeth sent over succors to their assistance.
1563 War between Sweden and Denmark.
1564 April 29: peace ratified between France and England.
1570 *Peace of St. Germain*.
1570 December 13: *Peace of Stettin*, between Sweden and Denmark.
1571 Spain, Venice, and the pope combine against the Turks, who were endeavoring to subdue Cyprus.
1572 Peace concluded between England and France.
1576 The United States of the Netherlands send deputies to the Hague, who declared Philip II. divested of his principality, and appoint William, Prince of Orange, for their governor or stadtholder.
1576 November 8: *Pacification of Ghent*, by which foreign troops were expelled from the Netherlands and the Inquisition abolished.
1576 The *League* begins in France.
1579 January 22: the *Union of Utrecht*, formed by Holland, Utrecht, Zealand, Friesland, and Guelderland, by which the Republic of Holland was constituted. Overyssel joined in 1580, and Groningen in 1594.
1595 War declared by France against Spain.
1595 May 18: *Peace of Teusin*, between Russia and Sweden, which powers had been at war, with an interval of seven years' truce, from 1572.
1598 May 2: peace ratified at Vervins between France and Spain; Spain restores her conquests of Calais, Amiens, etc.

JAMES I.

1603 A treaty between James I. of England and Henry IV. of France, in order to support the States-General against the Spanish branch of the house of Austria.
1604 August 18. peace between England and Spain ratified.
1609 April 4: the truce of 12 years between the Spaniards and Dutch.
1610 *Treaty of Halle*, between the Protestant princes of the empire.
1610 *League of Würzburg*, between the Catholic princes of the empire.
1613 *Peace of Störöd*, concluding a war of two years between Sweden and Denmark.
1619 Peace between France and Spain; marriage of Louis XIII. with Anne of Austria, infanta of Spain.
1619 September 5: the elector palatine, Frederic V., son-in-law of James I., accepted the crown of Bohemia offered to him by the Protestant states. This was the beginning of the Thirty Years' War.
1620 July 3: *Peace of Ulm*, by which Frederic V. lost Bohemia.
1622 Conquest of the Palatinate by the Emperor Ferdinand II.
1625 *Danish period* of the Thirty Years' War, when Christian IV. became the head of the Protestant party. Treaty between Denmark, England, and Holland.

CHARLES I.

1626 League of the Swedes, Dutch, and the Protestant princes of Germany, against the emperor.
1627 War commenced by England against France, in favor of the distressed French Protestants.
1629 War commenced by the King of France against the emperor, the King of Spain, and the Duke of Savoy, in favor of the claims of the Duke of Nevers to the territory of Mantua.

1629 April 14 : peace ratified with France.
1629 May 22 : *Peace of Lubeck*, between the emperor and King of Denmark.
1630 France joined the Protestant princes of Germany, Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, and Holland, against the house of Austria, in Germany and Spain.
1630 England also acceded to the above alliance, with a view of procuring the restoration of the elector palatine.
1630 June 24 : *Swedish period* of the Thirty Years' War, when Gustavus Adolphus made a descent on the Isle of Rügen.
1630 October 13 : *Peace of Ratisbon*, between France and the emperor ; terminating the war for the Mantuan succession.
1630 November 27 : peace proclaimed between England and Spain.
1631 January 13 : subsidizing alliance of France with Sweden.
1631 April : *Alliance of Leipzig*, between the Elector of Saxony and the Protestant princes.
1631 *Treaty of Chierasco*, by which the Duke of Nevers finally takes possession of his Mantuan territories.
1633 March : *Treaty of Heilbron* between Sweden and the Northern Protestant states of Germany, after the death of Gustavus Adolphus.
1635 February 28 : alliance between France and Holland.
1635 May 30 : *Peace of Prague* between the emperor and the Elector of Saxony.
1635 May 19 : war declared by France against Spain. France entered actively into the Thirty Years' War, forming *the French period*.
1640 Civil wars in England commenced ; the Scotch army take Newcastle.
1641 The Duke of Braganza, having been declared King of Portugal, entered into an alliance with France, in their contest against Spain.
1648 January 30 : *Peace of Munster* between Spain and the Dutch. Independence of Holland fully recognized.
1648 October 24 : the *Peace of Westphalia* signed at Munster and at Osnaburg, between France, the emperor, and Sweden ; Spain continuing the war against France. By this peace the principle of a balance of power in Europe was first recognized : Alsace given to France, and part of Pomerania and some other districts to Sweden ; the elector palatine restored to the Lower Palatine ; the civil and political rights of the German states established ; and the independence of the Swiss Confederation recognized by Germany.

COMMONWEALTH.

1651 October : war commenced between the English Commonwealth and the Dutch.
1654 April 5 : peace ratified between the Dutch and the Commonwealth of England.
1655 November 3 : articles of peace signed between England and France.
1656 February 15 : Spain declared war against England.
1656 November 10 : *Treaty of Liebau*, which annulled the feudal subjection of the duchy of Prussia to the crown of Sweden.
1657 March 23 : treaty of alliance between England and France against Spain.
1657 May 27 : alliance of Vienna between Poland, Denmark, and the emperor, against Sweden.
1659 May 21 : *Treaty of the Hague* between England, France, and Holland, to maintain the equilibrium of the north.
1659 November 7 : peace concluded between France and Spain, by the *Treaty of the Pyrenees ;* Spain yielding Roussillon, Artois, and her rights to Alsace ; and France ceding her conquests in Catalonia, Italy, etc., and engaging not to assist Portugal.
1660 May 3 : the *Peace of Oliva* ratified between Sweden, Poland, Prussia, and the emperor. Esthonia and Livonia given up to Sweden.
1660 September : a proclamation issued at London for the cessation of hostilities with Spain.
1660 May 27 : *Peace of Copenhagen* between Sweden and Denmark.

CHARLES II.

1661 June 23 : treaty of alliance between England and Portugal.
1663 France entered into a defensive alliance with Holland and Switzerland.
1664 November : the second war commenced between England and Holland.
1664 War between the Turks and the Emperor of Germany ; after the Turks had been defeated the *Truce of Temeswar* was concluded, on September 7th, for twenty years ; the emperor ceding Great Waradein and Neuhäusel.
1666 January 26 : France declared war against England ; the Danes also entered into a league with the Dutch against England.
1666 October : war declared by England against Denmark.
1667 July 25 : *Peace of Breda* concluded between England, France, Holland, and Denmark.
1668 January 28 : a treaty of alliance ratified between the States-General and England, against France, for the protection of the Spanish Netherlands ; Sweden afterward joining the league, it was known as the *Triple Alliance*.
1668 February 13 : *Peace of Lisbon* concluded between Spain and Portugal through the mediation of England. Independence of Portugal acknowledged by Spain.
1668 May 2 : *Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle* between France and Spain signed. France yields Franche Comté, but retains her conquests in the Netherlands.
1669 May 7 : *Treaty of the Hague* between Holland and Portugal : the Dutch allowed to retain their conquests in India.
1672 Treaty between France and England (12th February), and Sweden (14th April) against Holland.
1672 August 30 : an alliance entered into between the emperor, Spain, and Holland, against France.
1673 June 16 : *Peace of Vossem* between the Elector of Brandenburg and France, the former engaging not to assist the Dutch.
1673 France declared war against Spain.
1674 February 19 : *Peace of Westminster* between England and Holland.
1674 June : The empire declared war against France.
1678 January 10 : treaty concluded between England and Holland, by which Holland detached Charles II. from the interests of France.
1678 August 11 : *Peace of Nimeguen* concluded between France and Holland. Spain accedes to the peace 17th September, giving up Franche Comté, etc. ; the emperor on the 5th February following ; and Sweden on March 29th.
1679 June 29 : *Peace of St. Germain en Laye* concluded between France, Sweden, and the Elector of Brandenburg.
1679 eptember 2 : *Peace of Fontainebleau* between France and Denmark.
1683 March 31 : *Alliance of Warsaw*, between Austria and Poland, against Turkey, in pursuance of which John Sobieski assisted in raising the siege of Vienna, on September 12th.
1684 August 15 : truce of Ratisbon concluded by France with Spain and the empire, terminating the war of the previous year.

JAMES II.

1686 *League of Augsburg* entered into by Holland and other European powers, for the purpose of causing the treaties of Munster and Nimeguen to be fulfilled on the part of France.
1688 France commences hostilities against the Confederated States and ravages the Palatinate.

WILLIAM III

1689 May 7 : war declared by England against France.
1689 May 12 : the *Grand Alliance* signed at Vienna between England, the emperor, and the States-General ; to which Spain and the Duke of Savoy afterward acceded.
1696 August 29 : the Duke of Savoy quitted the coalition, and entered into a treaty with France.
1697 September 20 : *Peace of Ryswick*, between France, England, Spain, and Holland ; signed by Germany, 30th October.
1698 October 11 : *First Treaty of Partition* signed between France, England, and Holland, for the purpose of regulating the succession of the territories of the King of Spain. Joseph Ferdinand, Electoral Prince of Bavaria, declared presumptive heir.
1699 January 26 : *Peace of Carlowitz*, between Turkey and Germany, Poland, Russia, and Venice.
1700 March 13 : *Second Treaty of Partition* between France, England, and Holland, declaring the Archduke Charles presumptive heir of the Spanish monarchy, Joseph Ferdinand having died in 1699.
1700 October 2 : Charles II., last male branch of the house of Austria reigning in Spain, bequeaths the kingdom to Philip of Anjou.
1700 November 1 : Charles II. of Spain died, and the claim of Philip of Anjou was recognized by the court of France.
1701 September 7 : England and Holland conclude a formal alliance at the Hague, to resist the claim of Philip of Anjou, to which almost all the European states successively accede.
1701 November 16 : King James II. dying, his son was proclaimed King of England by France, upon which William III. commanded the return of his ambassadors from France, and ordered the departure of the French ambassador from London.

ANNE.

1702 May 4 : war declared against France and Spain by England, the empire, and Holland.
1703 The *Methuen Treaty* between England and Portugal, principally for the regulation of commerce.
1706 September 24 : *Peace of Alt Ranstadt*, between Charles XII. of Sweden and Augustus of Poland.
1711 July 2 : *Peace of Falczi* concluded between Russia and Turkey, the Russians giving up Azoff and all their possessions on the Black Sea to the Turks ; in the following year the war was renewed, and terminated by the *Peace of Constantinople*, on April 16th, 1712.
1713 April 11 : *Peace of Utrecht*, signed by the ministers of Great Britain and France, as well as of all the other allies, except the

ministers of the empire. The most important stipulations of this treaty were the security of the Protestant succession in England, the disuniting the French and Spanish crowns, the destruction of Dunkirk, the enlargement of the British colonies and plantations in America, and a full satisfaction for the claims of the allies.

1713 April 17 : the Emperor Charles VI. published the *Pragmatic Sanction*, whereby, in default of male issue, his daughters should succeed in preference to the sons of his brother Joseph I.

1713 July 13 : the *Treaty of Utrecht* signed by Spain.

1714 March 6 : *Peace of Radstadt* between France and the emperor.

GEORGE I.

1714 September 7 : *Peace of Baden*, between France and the emperor. Landau ceded to France.

1715 November 15 : the *Barrier Treaty* signed at Antwerp, by the British, the imperial, and Dutch ministers. Low Countries ceded to the emperor.

1717 January 4 : the *Triple Alliance of the Hague* between France, England, and Holland, to oppose the designs of Cardinal Alberoni, the Spanish minister.

1718 July 21 : *Peace of Passarowitz* between the emperor, Venice, and Turkey.

1718 August 2 : the treaty of alliance between Great Britain, France, and the emperor, signed at London. This alliance, on the accession of the States of Holland, obtained the name of the *Quadruple Alliance*, and was for the purpose of guaranteeing the succession of the reigning families in Great Britain and France, and settling the partition of the Spanish monarchy.

1718 November 18 : the Duke of Savoy joined the Quadruple Alliance, signing the treaty by his envoys at Whitehall.

1718 December 16 : war declared by England against Spain.

1718 December 22 : war declared against Spain by France, under the administration of the regent, Duke of Orleans.

1719 November 20 : *Peace of Stockholm* between the King of Great Britain and the Queen of Sweden, by which the former acquired the Duchies of Bremen and Verden as Elector and Duke of Brunswick.

1720 January 26 : the King of Spain accepts and signs the Quadruple Alliance.

1721 August 30 : *Peace of Nystett*, in Finland, between Sweden and Russia, whereby Livonia and Ingria were ceded to Russia.

1724 March 24 : *Treaty of Stockholm* between Russia and Sweden in favor of the Duke of Holstein Gottorp.

1725 April 30 : the *Vienna Treaty*, signed between the Emperor of Germany and the King of Spain, by which they confirmed to each other such parts of the Spanish dominions as they were respectively possessed of, and by a private treaty the emperor engaged to employ a force to procure the restoration of Gibraltar to Spain, and to use means for placing the pretender on the throne of Great Britain. Spain guaranteed the Pragmatic Sanction.

1725 September 3 : the *Hanover Treaty*, concluded between the Kings of England, France, and Prussia, as an act of self-defence against the provisions of the Vienna treaty.

1726 War between England and Spain commenced.

1726 August 6 : treaty of alliance between Russia and the emperor.

1727 May 31 : preliminary articles for a general pacification, signed at Paris by the ministers of Great Britain, the emperor, the King of France, and the States-General.

GEORGE II.

1727 October 21 : *Treaty of Nipchoo* (Nerchinsk) between Russia and China, by which the boundaries of the two empires were settled, a Russian residence at Pekin allowed, and 200 merchants allowed to trade to China once in three years. Not ratified until June 14th, 1728, in consequence of the death of Catherine.

1728 June 14 : a congress commenced its sittings at Soissons.

1729 November 9 : the *Peace of Seville*, between the courts of Great Britain, France, and Spain ; and a defensive alliance entered into : to this treaty the States of Holland afterward acceded November 21.

March 16 : the *Treaty of Alliance of Vienna*, between the emperor, Great Britain, and Holland by which the Pragmatic Sanction was guaranteed, and the disputes as to the Spanish succession terminated ; Spain acceded to the treaty on the 22d of July.

CHAPTER CXLII.

Prince Eugene in London—Opening of the campaign under Ormond and Eugene—Ormond's secret instructions—The allied army deserted by the British forces—Subsequent disasters of the allies—The Lords' protest published—Laws proposed against the press—The first stamp duty on periodical works—Terms of peace announced to parliament—Bolingbroke's embassy to Paris—Treaty of Utrecht completed—Treaty of commerce with France rejected by parliament—Dissolution of parliament—Jacobite intrigues—The new parliament—Libels—Swift—Steele—Death of the Princess Sophia of Hanover—The Schism Act—Oxford dismissed from office—Death of the queen.

THE dismissal of Marlborough from all his offices, the hostile vote of parliament, and a prosecution threatened by the ministry to compel him to refund nearly half a million of that money which he said he had employed in the public service—these adversities in the closing years of a life signally prosperous appear to have been borne by him with a philosophical calmness. He wrote, on the 22d of February, to M. Schuylembourg, who had served under him as a general of cavalry, "Provided that my destiny does not involve any prejudice to the public, I shall be very content with it ; and shall account myself happy in a retreat in which I may be able wisely to reflect on the vicissitudes of this world."* There are several other letters, breathing the same sentiment of resignation—a sentiment which was perhaps as real as in any other case of fallen greatness. But Marlborough's public virtue must have been more exalted than that of most great ones of the earth in the day of humiliation, if he did not inwardly rejoice at the degradation of England when he was thrust out of her service. His constant friend, Prince Eugene, had arrived in London at the beginning of January. He witnessed the fall of Marlborough, and testified in the most public manner his sense of the injustice and impolicy of palace intrigues and parliamentary hatreds. Oxford invited Eugene to dinner, and thus complimented him : "I consider this day as the happiest of my life, since I have the honor to see in my house the greatest captain of the age." Eugene replied, "If it be so, I owe it to your lordship." The "greatest captain of the age" was put aside ; and the future associate with Eugene in the approaching campaign was to be the Duke of Ormond. Conferences were opened at Utrecht ; but the real negotiations for peace between Great Britain and France were being secretly carried on at Paris. The mission of Eugene to the court of St. James's was to prevent any such separate negotiation, by offering a guarantee that the emperor would double his contingents, if necessary, to carry the war, in concert with all the members of the alliance, to a successful conclusion. A few months of vigorous exertion might accomplish that object, and complete the series of triumphs which the allies had won under English generalship. The propositions of the emperor were coldly listened to, mentioned to parliament, and then laid aside. Eugene went back to conduct the campaign as the commander of the allied armies ; for the States would not intrust those powers to Ormond which they had intrusted to Marlborough. Eugene could expect no hearty co-operation from the ministry of Queen Anne ; but he could scarcely expect an amount of duplicity and treachery, happily unparalleled in the future conduct of our country in her foreign affairs. On 26th of May Eugene and Ormond, with a far larger force than had been brought into the field under Marlborough in the previous year, passed the Scheldt below Bouchain. A French army of inferior force, under Villars and Montesquiou, was nearer the French frontier. The position of the allies indicated an intention to make a forward movement, and a probable advance into the French territory. But Ormond had a letter in his pocket from Secretary St. John, dated the 10th of May, containing these instructions : "Her majesty, my lord, has reason to believe, that we shall come to an agreement upon the great article of the union of the two monarchies, as soon as a courier, sent from Versailles to Madrid, can return. It is, therefore, the queen's positive command to your grace that you avoid engaging in any siege, or hazarding a battle, till you have further orders from her majesty. I am, at the same time, directed to let your grace know that the queen would have you disguise the receipt of this order ; and her majesty thinks that you cannot want pretences for conducting yourself, so as to answer her ends, without owning that which might at present have an ill effect, if it was publicly known. The queen cannot think with patience of sacrificing men when there is a fair prospect of obtaining her purpose another way ; and, besides, she will not suffer herself to be exposed to the reproach of having retarded by the events of the campaign a negotiation which might otherwise have been as good as concluded in a few days."† On the 28th of May Eugene proposed to attack the French camp, which was open and exposed. Or-

* "Dispatches," vol. v. p. 577. † Coxe, vol. vi. p. 187.

mond equivocated and requested delay. Eugene was indignant; but at length brought the English general to agree to co-operate in the siege of Quesnoy. The trenches were opened in the night of the 18th of June, and on the 4th of July the garrison surrendered as prisoners of war. This was the last military operation in which the British forces were engaged. In the middle of July, there having been for some time a secret correspondence between Ormond and Villars, Ormond proclaimed an armistice for four months between England and France. He withdrew his British troops from those of the allied army; and called upon the foreign contingents in the pay of England to follow the example. With a trifling exception they all refused, and became a part of the army of the empire, and of the States, under the command of Eugene. This infamous abandonment of the alliance—this base desertion of the common cause without notice or explanation—left the field open for France to recover all the ground she had lost. Eugene, weakened in his force, the plans of the campaign altogether paralyzed, was beaten at Denain by Villars on the 24th of July. One by one the fortified posts and towns which had been won by the allies were retaken by the French. There may be differences of opinion as to the policy of the English ministry in relinquishing the original object of the war, and ultimately separating the interests of their country from those of the house of Austria; but there can be no difference in viewing their duplicity to their allies as one of the disgraces of party-government. The ministry of Anne "were afraid of some brilliant success in Flanders that might derange their plans; and to prevent such a calamity they gave secret information to the enemy of the military projects of the allies, and at the most critical moment of the campaign they withdrew their troops from the contest."* The cold-blooded scoundrelism of St. John goes beyond most recorded examples of the extent to which "low ambition"—even more than "the pride of kings"—will degrade a man of lofty intellect into the basest political profligacy. When the secretary sent to Ormond the order to avoid engaging in any siege or battle, he communicated this private direction to Gautier, his agent in the correspondence with Torcy, the French minister. "When I asked him," says Gautier in his dispatch, "what Marshal Villars was to do, in case Prince Eugene and the Dutch attacked him, he replied, there was only one thing to do—to fall upon him and cut him in pieces, him and his whole army."†

It could scarcely be expected that, even for mere party purposes, such flagrant violations of national faith should pass unnoticed. Halifax in the House of Lords, and Pulteney in the House of Commons, made impressive speeches against the dishonor of the refusal of Ormond to co-operate with Eugene. But they were defeated by large majorities. A very effective protest was signed by many peers, and it was printed and circulated in several languages. The ministry endeavored to repress it, and would have prosecuted the printer, could they have discovered him. The practice of secret printing was one of the means in those days by which prosecutions against libel were evaded. Very shortly after the publication of this protest, a report was presented from a committee of the whole house, upon "the great license taken in publishing false and scandalous libels." In this report it was proposed that printing-presses should be registered, with the names of their owners, and their places of abode; that the name of the printer and of the publisher should be attached to every book, pamphlet, or paper; and that no bookseller should sell or disperse any printed paper without the name of the author, printer, and publisher. The Commons ordered a bill to be brought in accordingly. The bill dropped through. To suppress anonymous writing would have deprived the government of one of its strongest allies. Swift, in his posthumous work, "The Four Last Years of Queen Anne," looks back with horror upon the provision that would have made him utterly useless to lord treasurer and secretary. "In this bill there was a clause inserted (whether industriously with design to overthrow it) that the author's name and place of abode should be set to every printed book, pamphlet, or paper; to which I believe no man who has the least regard to learning would have given his consent." Pious men, he says, conceal their names, out of a humble Christian spirit; "persons of true genius have an invincible modesty and suspicion of themselves upon their first sending their thoughts into the world." There was something besides the "humble Christian spirit," and "the invincible modesty," that made Swift always an anonymous writer. Under that form of publication alone could he defame and misrepresent; and, what is of more importance to us, could he leave to the world the most remarkable examples of the power of influencing public opinion by fearless argument and withering sarcasm, expressed in the simplest language. The benefits of anonymous writing have far outweighed its evils. The scheme for restricting the press in this mode broke down. The other scheme of the ministry for taxing it was successful. In 1711 one of the longest acts in the statute-book was passed, which imposed duties upon soap, paper, silks, linen, and many other articles, and upon "certain printed papers, pamphlets, and advertisements."* Those taxes which came under the denomination of "new stamp duties," were to be in force for thirty-two years, commencing on the 1st of August, 1712. They endured, with various large additions and modifications, for more than a century and a half; till the public opinion, which they were meant to hold in check, swept them away. The well-known passage in Swift's "Journal to Stella" tells how the stamp duty operated: "Do you know that Grub Street is dead and gone last week? No more ghosts or murders now for love or money. I plied it pretty close the last fortnight, and published at least seven penny papers of my own, besides some of other people's; but now every single half-sheet pays a halfpenny to the queen. The 'Observator' is fallen; the 'Medleys' are jumbled together with the 'Flying Post;' the 'Examiner' is deadly sick; the 'Spectator' keeps up, and doubles its price; I know not how long it will hold. Have you seen the red stamp the papers are marked with? Methinks it is worth a halfpenny the stamping." We shall have to return to the subject of the beginnings of journalism and of periodical literature in a subsequent chapter.

On the 17th of June the queen informed the parliament, in a speech from the throne, of the terms upon which "a general peace may be made." Her majesty had no authority from her allies to announce their consent to such terms; and this statement was only a continuance of the duplicity that had attended the secret negotiations with France. The Protestant succession as by law established in the house of Hanover was to be acknowledged. There was to be "an additional security, by the removal of that person out of the dominions of France who has pretended to disturb this settlement." As "the apprehension that Spain and the West Indies might be united to France was the chief inducement to begin this war," that union was to be effectually prevented by the Duke of Anjou and his descendants renouncing all claim to the crown of France, and a similar renunciation was to be made by the King of France, his heirs and successors, of all claim to the crown of Spain. Certain cessions of territory in America were to be made to Great Britain. Gibraltar, Port Mahon, and Minorca were to be secured to her; and Dunkirk was to be demolished. Various announcements of territorial arrangements connected with the allied powers were also made. An amendment was moved to the complimentary address of the Lords, in reply to this communication, recommending a general guarantee of the allies to the conditions of peace. This was rejected by a large majority; but a protest was signed by many peers, in which the objections to the proposed treaty, and to the separate negotiations, were very forcibly put. The chief objection, which long continued to be a source of alarm to Europe, was in these terms: "A perfect union among the allies seems to us to be more necessary in the present case, because the foundation upon which all the offers of France, relating to Great Britain, as well as to the allies, are built, viz., a renunciation of the Duke of Anjou to that kingdom, is, in our opinion, so fallacious that no reasonable man, much less whole nations, can ever look upon it as any security. Experience may sufficiently convince us how little we ought to rely upon the renunciation of the house of Bourbon, and though the present Duke of Anjou should happen to think himself bound by his own act, which his grandfather did not, yet will his descendants be at liberty to say, that no act of his could deprive them of their birthright, and especially when it is such a right as, in the opinion of all Frenchmen, ought inviolably to be maintained, by the fundamental constitution of the kingdom of France."†

* *Edinburgh Review*, vol. lxii. p. 8. † Ibid.

* 10 Annæ, c. 18. † "Parliamentary History," vol. vi. col. 1149.

The lapse of time has produced some changes of opinion as to those terms of pacification which were finally concluded by the Peace of Utrecht; but there can be little doubt that the dangers set forth in this protest were present to the minds of all that portion of the nation who were not clamorous for peace upon any terms, and who were not infected with that political insanity which hailed the friendship of France as the preliminary condition to the re-establishment of the throne upon the sole principle of hereditary right. Nevertheless, the people were not in a temper to make any very strenuous opposition to any negotiation for peace which would bring them an immediate reduction of taxation. Moreover, a peace would put an end to those advantages which the moneyed interest derived from the necessities of the government—advantages which made the landowners believe that "power, which, according to the old maxim, was used to follow land, is now gone over to money, so that if the war continue some years longer, a landed man will be little better than a farmer of a rack-rent to the army and to the public funds."* The landed interest was still paramount in parliament; but it saw with dread that the new power was making some inroad upon its supposed exclusive right to legislate for the whole community—"to force the election of boroughs out of the hands of those who had been the old proprietors and inhabitants."†

The withdrawal of the British troops, under Ormond, from that co-operation with Eugene upon which the plan of the campaign had been arranged, was preceded by the announcement to parliament of the terms upon which peace might be made. But the congress at Utrecht had been no party to these terms; and therefore the surprise and indignation of the allies was as great as if the British abandonment of their cause had taken place without any announcement that a separate negotiation had been proceeding between the courts of Versailles and St. James's. An old soldier, Sergeant Milner, has described the separation from their companions in arms of the twelve thousand brave fellows that were compelled to obey the orders of Ormond, on the 16th of July: "As they marched off that day, both sides looked very dejectfully on each other, neither being permitted to speak to the other, to prevent reflections that might thereby arise; being there was then made a strange revolution between us and our allies, by our cessation of arms, or entrance on an odd peace with France." Ormond, amid the contempt of his men as "a stupid tool and a general of straw," made his inglorious way to Ghent and Bruges, the Dutch governors refusing to let him pass through the fortified towns which Marlborough had won. St. John, who had now been created Viscount Bolingbroke—to his great indignation at not receiving an earldom—was dispatched to Paris, to settle some points that were still in dispute. He was accompanied by Matthew Prior, who had previously been an agent in the clandestine correspondence between the two courts. Although the wily secretary remained only about a fortnight in Paris and the neighborhood—amply engaged with his negotiations and his pleasures—it is asserted that he had two private interviews with the Chevalier St. George. In discussing with Torcy the absolute necessity of the removal of the pretender from the French territory, he said the time might come when the well-disposed [les bien intentionnés] would be sorry if the chevalier were at a distance from the British Isles. The plenipotentiaries of the emperor at Utrecht had not hesitated to say that the great end of the English management was to bring in the pretender; and the Dutch had expressed the same belief. The abilities of Bolingbroke were sufficiently tasked to keep Louis firm to his engagements. Torcy says that if the success of Villars at Denain had occurred earlier, the king would not have consented to the renunciation which separated the French and Spanish crowns. When the allies were afterward discomfited, Louis rose in his demands as regarded the fortresses to be retained as a barrier by the Dutch. Bolingbroke accomplished one special object of his embassy—to secure the interests of the Duke of Savoy. How far he may have yielded some points to the personal address of Louis XIV., who had the kingly faculty of winning men by politeness, is not evident. He was not directly won after the old French fashion of bestowing "gratifications" upon English ministers. But the present of a ring of the value of four thousand pounds from the magnificent king was not a compliment which a statesman of later and better times would have accepted. Before Bolingbroke left Paris a suspension of arms was proclaimed between Great Britain and France. The States refused to accede to this armistice; and their first inclination was to continue the war, in conjunction with the emperor and the smaller German powers. But they saw themselves deserted; they saw that Eugene could not stand up against the military resources of France and the genius of her commanders. They finally in December accepted the propositions made in concert between France and England. But in the proportion that concessions were made to France her plenipotentiaries became more captious and evasive. The treaty would probably have fallen through, and have left its English negotiators exposed to the vengeance of their political rivals, had not the ministers issued peremptory orders to their plenipotentiaries to sign it at all hazards.

On the 11th of April, 1713, the Treaty of Utrecht was signed by the representatives of Great Britain, France, Savoy, Portugal, Prussia, and the States-General. The emperor refused to be a party to it. Those points which affected Great Britain have been already mentioned in general terms. Those which affected the other powers were accomplished by this Treaty of Utrecht, and by subsequent treaties of 1714.* We subjoin a very brief view of the entire arrangement. Spain and the Indies were given to Philip; the French king recognized the Protestant succession, and engaged to make the pretender withdraw from the French dominions; he renounced for himself, his heirs, and his successors, the succession to the throne of Spain, while Philip renounced in like manner the succession to the throne of France; the fortifications of Dunkirk were to be demolished, and the harbor filled up, an equivalent being first given to France by Great Britain; Hudson's Bay and Straits were to remain to Great Britain, and satisfaction was to be made by France to the Hudson's Bay Company for all damages sustained; St. Christopher's, Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland were given to Great Britain, with certain rights of fishing off Newfoundland reserved to France, and, by a separate treaty with Philip, as King of Spain, Minorca and Gibraltar were retained by Great Britain; the Emperor of Austria received the kingdom of Naples, the duchy of Milan, and the Spanish Netherlands; Sicily was separated from Naples and given to the Duke of Savoy, with the title of king, and the succession to the throne of Spain, in default of descendants from Philip, was settled in the house of Savoy; Luxembourg, Namur, Charleroy, Ypres, and Nieuport were assigned to the Dutch, in addition to the places already possessed by them.

Upon the assembling of parliament the queen announced in general terms the conclusion of the treaty of peace. On the 9th of May her majesty sent a message to the effect that as it is the undoubted prerogative of the crown to make peace and war, she had ratified the treaties of peace and commerce with France, and had concluded a treaty with Spain. The treaties were then laid before the houses. The treaty of commerce contained two articles which had been agreed to by the British plenipotentiaries, upon the condition that they should be binding if they received the sanction of parliament. They were conceived in a spirit of liberality which was far before the age in which they were propounded. The negotiators proposed that reciprocal advantages should be enjoyed by the subjects of Great Britain and France, by putting the trade of each upon the footing of that of the most favored nations; and that the laws made since 1664 for the prohibition of French imports should be repealed. The mercantile public clamored against the proposal as destructive of British commerce. The balance of trade would be annually a million and a half against Great Britain; which was held to be equivalent to the actual loss, according to the absurd delusion of those days, of a million and a half. The manufactures of silk, linen, and paper would be destroyed. France would not buy our wool or woollen stuffs. We should drink her wines, to the injury of Portugal, who had become our best customer under the Methuen treaty, actually paying us half a million in good, hard, unconsumable dollars. Burnet expresses the popular philosophy when he says, "We were engaged by our treaty with Portugal that their wines should be charged a third part lower than the French wines; but if the duties were, according to the treaties of commerce, to be made equal, then, considering the difference of freight, which is more than double from Portugal, the

* "Examiner," October, 1710.
† "Four Last Years of Queen Anne."

* See the Table of Treaties, *ante*, p. 732.

French wines would be cheaper, and the nation liking them better, by this means we should break our treaties with Portugal," and lose that wonderful balance in our favor.* It never entered into the reasonings of the advocates of prohibition and forced consumption that a supply at the cheapest rate of what a nation liked and wanted was preferable to a supply at a dearer rate of what a nation did not like and did not want. The treaty of commerce with France was rejected by a small majority of the Commons; and though much has been since done for the removal of prohibitory duties, there still remains much to be accomplished before the two nations, each producing what the other would willingly take in exchange, shall have wholly cast aside the prejudices of 1713.

On the 7th of July there was a public thanksgiving for the peace, and both houses of parliament went in procession to St. Paul's. The Commons had sufficiently manifested their adhesion to the principles which placed Harley and St. John in power, by appointing Sacheverel to preach before them on the 29th of May. Yet this uncompromising body of so-called representatives of the people, who would gladly have annihilated all that the revolution bestowed upon the people, was happily limited in its term of existence by the Triennial Bill. The parliament was prorogued on the 16th of July, and very shortly afterward was dissolved. The elections were conducted with more than usual party-violence. The Tory wore a green bough in honor of the restoration of the Stuarts; the Whig placed a lock of wool in his hat to mark how he had supported the good old principles of exclusive trade. But the Jacobites were working steadily at their great object of preparing the way for their legitimate shadow of a king, who had, according to the letter of the treaty with France, been removed out of the dominions of Louis, to be seated in Lorraine, which was equally convenient for any enterprise, either before or after the decease of the queen. The Jacobites had great encouragement in their schemes through the ascendency of Bolingbroke. Oxford had become comparatively powerless; and the bold secretary, in conjunction with the Duke of Ormond, reduced the army, particularly the regiments which had been raised by William III.; and they placed their own instruments in the command of various strongholds. The Chevalier St. George was in his own person the greatest obstacle to the success of the plans of his adherents. Bolingbroke and other Jacobites who knew how firmly the people clung to the principle of Protestantism, had repeatedly urged him to change his religion, or at least to make a pretended renunciation of his faith. His determination was honorable to himself and a severe rebuke to his unscrupulous friends. He wrote a letter in 1711, which was shown to many persons, containing this honest sentence: "Plain dealing is best in all things, especially in matters of religion; and as I am resolved never to dissemble in religion, so I shall never tempt others to do it; and as well as I am satisfied of the truth of my own religion, yet I shall never look worse upon any persons because in this they chance to differ from me; nor shall I refuse, in due time and place, to hear what they have to say upon this subject. But they must not take it ill if I use the same liberty I allow to others, to adhere to the religion which I, in my conscience, think the best; and I may reasonably expect that liberty of conscience for myself which I deny to none." † The son of James inherited the inflexibility of his father in his adherence to the Church of Rome, also inheriting the family likeness. Horace Walpole says, "Without the particular features of any Stuart, the chevalier has the strong lines and fatality of air peculiar to them all. From the first moment I saw him, I never doubted the legitimacy of his birth." ‡

The new parliament met in February, 1714. The queen in her speech said, "There are some who are arrived to that height of malice as to insinuate that the Protestant succession in the house of Hanover is in danger under my government." Her majesty called upon parliament to suppress "seditious papers and factious rumors." Both houses went to work in this congenial duty, according to their respective party tendencies. The Lords had the printer and publisher of "The Public Spirit of the Whigs" called to their bar. They were committed to the custody of the Black Rod. Swift was the author of this libel against the Scotch nation, but Oxford professed indignation against such libels. Oxford had caused a hundred pounds to be presented to the anonymous writer. Steele had written a pamphlet called "The Crisis," to which he had affixed his name. He was expelled the house by a large majority of his fellow-representatives. Steele made an able defence, in which he was assisted by Addison; and Walpole, in a speech of unanswerable truth, showed the atrocious tyranny of this proceeding. "In former reigns the audacity of corruption extended itself only to judges and juries. The attempt so to degrade parliament was, till the present period, unheard of. The liberty of the press is unrestrained. How then shall a part of the legislature dare to punish that as a crime which is not declared to be so by any law framed by the whole." *

On the 28th of May an event occurred which, although highly probable, and therefore likely to be familiar to men's thoughts, gave more distinctness to the question of the Protestant succession. The Princess Sophia fell dead in an apoplectic fit while walking in the garden of the palace of Herrenhausen. She was in her eighty-fourth year. Her son was therefore, under the Act of Settlement, the heir-apparent to the British crown. George, Elector of Hanover—or more properly Elector of Brunswick and Lunenburg—was born on the 28th of May, 1660. He had therefore reached his fifty-fourth year on the day of his mother's death. There could be no enthusiasm in England for the succession of an elderly foreign gentleman, who spoke no English, had the reputation of being reserved and morose, and was singularly unhappy in his domestic relations. But he was also known to be a man of courage and honesty; and he was the rallying-point for that great principle of freedom, civil and religious, which was endangered under the Stuart dynasty, and could never be secure if one of that race were carried to the throne upon the shoulders of those who shouted for divine right and non-resistance. Bolingbroke, with a daring which formed a part of his mysterious character, took the occasion, while the public mind was necessarily directed to the question of the succession, to bring forward his Schism Bill, the object of which was to trample on the dissenters, by enacting that no person should keep a public or private school, or act as a tutor, who had not subscribed the Declaration of Conformity, and received a license from the diocesan. This detestable measure was passed by a majority of a hundred in the Commons, and by a majority of fourteen in the Lords. Bolingbroke moved the second reading. Wharton flung a telling sarcasm at the secretary: "He was agreeably surprised to see that some men of pleasure were, on a sudden, become so religious, as to set up for patrons of the Church." The keen old debater hit both lord treasurer and secretary very hard when he said, "He could not but wonder that persons who had been educated in dissenting academies, whom he could point at, and whose tutors he could name, should appear the most forward in suppressing them." †

On the 9th of July the parliament was prorogued by the queen in person. A violent rupture had taken place between Oxford and Bolingbroke. On the 27th of July there was a protracted dispute in council between the two rivals, at which Anne was present till a late hour of the night. It ended in the dismissal of Oxford. Bolingbroke was now supreme. The agitation of the queen brought on a sudden illness. On the 30th she had a seizure of apoplexy. Bolingbroke had no time to carry through his schemes for the house of Stuart; and when the queen, in an interval of consciousness, delivered the staff of the highest office to the Duke of Shrewsbury—who had been in concert with the Dukes of Somerset and Argyle—her death, on the morning of the 1st of August, gave the power of the government to the friends of the house of Brunswick.

CHAPTER CXLIII.

Literature and manners of the earlier part of the eighteenth century—The "Tatler"—News-writers and pamphleteers—Dunton's "Athenian Gazette"—Defoe's "Review"—The "Spectator" and the "Guardian"—Influence and objects of the essayists—Low state

* "Own Time," vol. vi. p. 146.
† "Macpherson Papers," vol. ii. p. 225.
‡ "Memoirs of George II.," vol. i. p. 285.

* Coxe's "Walpole," vol. i. p. 44.
† The act was to come into operation on the 1st of August. On that day Queen Anne died, and its execution was suspended by the new government.

of education—The essayists diffusers of knowledge—Joint labors of Steele and Addison—The Spectator's Club—Fiction—Reading for females—Literary piracy—Copyright Act—Literature as a profession—The poets—Alexander Pope.

Addison has shadowed out an "imaginary historian, describing the reign of Anne I.," some two or three hundred years after his time, "who will make mention of the men of genius and learning who have now any figure in the British nation." He fancies a paragraph which he has drawn up "will not be altogether unlike what will be found in some page or other of this imaginary historian." It runs thus: "It was under this reign that the 'Spectator' published those little diurnal essays which are still extant. We know very little of the name or person of this author, except only that he was a man of a very short face, extremely addicted to silence, and so great a lover of knowledge that he made a voyage to Grand Cairo for no other reason but to take the measure of a pyramid. His chief friend was one Sir Roger de Coverley, a whimsical country knight, and a templar, whose name he has not transmitted to us. He lived as a lodger at the house of a widow woman, and was a great humorist in all parts of his life. This is all we can affirm with any certainty of his person and character. As for his speculations, notwithstanding the several obsolete words and obscure phrases of the age in which he lived, we still understand enough of them to see the diversions and characters of the English nation in his time." * It was a bold effort of imagination to believe that any historian would turn from Marlborough and the Pretender, from Mrs. Masham and Dr. Sacheverel, to "little diurnal essays;" or bestow any attention upon "the diversions and characters of the English nation." Tindal wholly leaves such frivolous matters to their own perishableness. Smollett merely notices the expulsion of Mr. Steele from the House of Commons, and only mentions Mr. Addison as secretary of state. Our readers will pardon us in going farther than the "imaginary historian"—in turning aside from battles and sieges, from lord treasurers and ladies of the bedchamber, to linger with some of "the men of genius and learning" who illustrated this period, in companionship with the short-faced man "who was a great humorist in all parts of his life," and with his brother humorist who rejoiced in the name of Bickerstaff. We cannot look at one of these agreeable moralists as separated by superiority of intellect or refinement from the other. Never were two men more fitted than Addison and Steele to be fellow-laborers in the works which have associated their names for all time. These works form a broad and safe foundation for a general outline of the minuter characteristics of the national mind and manners, in the three, and partially in the four, first decades of the eighteenth century. We offer this outline as supplementary to the graver views of England's industrial and social condition, which we have given at the beginning of this volume.

On Tuesday, the 12th of April, 1709, appeared a small folio half-sheet, of four columns, which professed to teach "politick persons what to think," and "moreover, to have something which may be of entertainment to the fair sex," in honor of whom the title of "Tatler" was chosen. Further it was said, "Forasmuch as this globe is not trodden upon by mere drudges of business only, but that men of spirit and genius are justly to be esteemed as considerable agents in it, we shall not upon a dearth of news present you with musty foreign edicts, or dull proclamations, but shall divide our relation of the passages which occur in action or discourse throughout this town, as well as elsewhere, under such dates of places as may prepare you for the matter you are to expect, in the following manner: All accounts of gallantry, pleasure, and entertainment shall be under the article of White's Chocolate-house; poetry, under that of Will's Coffee-house; learning under the title of Grecian; foreign and domestic news you will have from St. James's Coffee-house; and what else I shall on any other subject offer, shall be dated from my own apartment." This is a comprehensive scheme, and withal a very complex one. But the reason of these devices is obvious. The ingenious editor desired to avail himself of the advantages of his official appointment as gazetteer, to produce something like a newspaper; but the man of wit would also aim at something better than the conductors of newspapers proper aimed at, of which one of their fraternity said, "We read more of our affairs in the Dutch papers than in any of our own." * This complaint of newspapers was written in the year 1709—the year in which Isaac Bickerstaff was making provision against "a dearth of news;" the year of negotiations for peace, which ended in the carnage of Malplaquet; the year in which the adverse camps of High Church and Low Church, of Tory and Whig, were alive with the keenest excitement of preparation for a great coming struggle. "A dearth of news" at such a period! Yet if we consider of what materials the newspaper of the beginning of the eighteenth century was constructed, we shall cease to be surprised at the machinery which Steele devised to make his quasi-newspaper entertaining. Cumbrous as that machinery may now appear to us, it was contrived with considerable skill. The real news-writer was surrounded with a hundred difficulties and perils. The "Tatler" pretended that he was obliged to keep "an ingenious man" to go daily to the coffee-houses to pick up his intelligence; and no doubt such was the mode in which the greater part of the news of the "Observator," of the "Postboy," of the "Flying Post," of the "News Letter," was concocted. The news-writer was shut out of the House of Lords and out of the House of Commons; he never went into the law courts, for, except on great occasions, the people took no interest in their proceedings; he ran extreme risk in giving any political news, for the "publisher of false news" was a person for whom the pillory was an especial terror; he had no correspondents in distant parts of England; at the beginning of the century, Stamford and Norwich were the only towns that had their especial papers, from which he could transfer their meagre paragraphs about a murder or an execution; Scotland and Ireland had as little intelligence to furnish the London journalist as had the American colonies: and so the coffee-house, with its rumors about public events, became the "Staple of Newes," and the discreet reporter always prefaced his information with "We hear," "It is said," "There is a talk," "They continue to say." The cheap tract-writer tasked his imagination to produce much more exciting narratives than the dull paragraph-monger. The pamphleteer was the "penny-a-liner" of the time of the "Tatler." He had the same inexhaustible materials to work upon as the "penny-a-liner" of our own time; although the mode in which this form of genius is now developed is somewhat changed. He of the earlier day is thus described: "His brain, which was his estate, had as regular and different produce as other men's land. From the beginning of November until the opening of the campaign he writ pamphlets and letters to members of parliament or friends in the country. But sometimes he would relieve his ordinary readers with a murder, and lived comfortably a week or two upon strange and lamentable accidents. A little before the armies took the field, his way was to open your attention with a prodigy; and a monster, well writ, was two guineas the lowest price. This prepared his readers for his great and bloody news from Flanders in June and July." † Steele tried to interest the town in a different way. The worthy quidnunc, attracted by the name of Bickerstaff, to which name Swift had given popularity, gladly received the first number of the "Tatler," which was delivered without charge, or he expended a penny when the "gratis stock" of the first number was exhausted. But he must have been wonderfully surprised when reading the opening "relation of the passages which occur in action or discourse throughout this town," he found a brief narrative of "the deplorable condition of a very pretty gentleman," which article "may be of great instruction to all who actually are, or who ever shall be, in love."

The "Athenian Gazette" of the eccentric bookseller, John Dunton, had given the public of the time of William III. some notion of a weekly paper without politics. It professed to resolve "all the most nice and curious questions proposed by the ingenious;" but it fell far short of the magnificent intention of its projector, "to raise the soul, as 'twere, into daylight, and restore the knowledge of truth and happiness." ‡ It commenced in 1691, and was continued till 1696—a jumble of quaint nonsense with occasional gleams of meaning. The "Review" of Defoe appeared, in penny weekly numbers, five years before the "Tatler." It was subsequently issued twice a week. The "Review" was principally occupied by Defoe's earnest

* "Spectator," No. 101.

* Prospectus of "Evening Post."—Andrews' "History of British Journalism," vol. i. p. 103.

† "Tatler," No. 101. ‡ Dunton's "Life and Errors," p. 248.

speculations on political affairs. It also contained lighter matters, in describing the proceedings of a "Scandal Club." Some of these papers on manners are valuable, chiefly because their writer looked upon the town from another point of view than that of the wits and gossipers of the coffee-houses. But he saw only the broader aspects of society; felt little interest in its amusements; despised its frivolities; and confined his observation to the green pastures of virtue and wisdom, and the sands and morasses of vice and folly, without caring much for that great border-land which supplied "human nature's daily food." Defoe was no model for Steele, although the honor of being the leader in the march of the essayists has been assigned to him. Defoe was indeed the only writer of high talent who first saw the power of the periodical mode of publication. Dunton had preceded Defoe in this discovery, which ultimately revolutionized the entire system of our lighter literature, and turned an age of pamphlets into an age of magazines and miscellanies. The mode of continuous publication, under one title, converted the political tracts into Reviews and Examiners. Defoe saw the advantage of furnishing small quantities of printed thought to a nation not greatly advanced in the mere ability to read—to say nothing of the general indisposition of the gentry and the mercantile class to read anything which did not thoroughly address itself to their religious and political sympathies. Defoe would find his readers in the dissenting congregations, however some might differ from him. He found them, too, in those honest thinkers who took no lead in politics, with whom England has ever abounded. While there were too many tricksters in high places conducting the affairs of the nation, there were many who were taking that common-sense view of public measures which the opinion of a people habitually free very commonly takes — that the prosperity and happiness of communities is not wholly dependent upon which party is in or which party is out of office. Defoe addressed his "Review" to men who clung to the great principles of civil liberty and religious toleration, and were therefore essentially Whigs. But he offended Dissenters and Whigs by his differences with them upon many points; and he was, therefore, a better representative of the few who thought for themselves. Steele, on the other hand, addressed himself in the "Tatler," to the far larger class who had not very strong political or religious convictions, and who were glad to find a new kind of literature set on foot that, on the face of it, promised amusement rather than instruction. In a very short time the articles of foreign intelligence from "St. James's coffee-house" became rarer and rarer. With Tournay, and Malplaquet, and Mons, the news department of the "Tatler" seems to have been closed. The approaching return of the Duke of Marlborough to England is announced in its news on the 1st of November. There is an arrival of more importance to his interests which Mr. Bickerstaff does not announce. Addison has come to town from Ireland. He has made a few contributions to Steele's penny paper. He has discovered his true powers as a writer; and he will unite henceforward with honest Dick in making that half-sheet, which is dispatched from London three times a week, on every post day of Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, a vehicle for instructing the people without setting-up for instructors, and for amusing the people without condescending to be ribalds. We have it on record that the "Tatler" found its way into the fens of Lincolnshire, under the auspices of Maurice Johnson, a native of Spalding, who had some literary and antiquarian tastes. He labored to form a reading society in that very uncongenial district. "Taking care not to alarm the country gentlemen by any premature mention of antiquities, he endeavored at first to allure them into the more flowery paths of literature. In 1709 a few of them were brought together every post day, at the coffee-house in the abbey-yard; and after one of the party had read aloud the last published number of the 'Tatler,' they proceeded to talk over the subject among themselves." *

The "Spectator" was read in a similar manner by the gentlemen of Spalding. This successor of the "Tatler" commenced March 1st, 1711, and was published daily—a circumstance which at once exhibits the confidence of the writers in their power to interest a very miscellaneous class of readers, and the fertility of the soil, hitherto so barren, which they proposed to cultivate. The "Guardian" succeeded the "Spectator," and was also published daily. It was fortunate for the circulation of these works that the better regulation of the post had not been neglected by the government, amid their party conflicts. The statute of 1710 made the delivery of letters to Edinburgh and Dublin more regular, by establishing chief letter-offices in those cities, and having a more equal charge for England. Thus, with a blank leaf for adding private correspondence to the printed matter, the "Tatler" was circulated in English provincial towns. In Perthshire even, when "the gentlemen met after church on Sunday to discuss the news of the week, the 'Spectators' were read as regularly as the 'Journal.'" *

At the opening of the last parliament of the reign of Anne, when the member for Stockbridge rose to second the nomination of Sir Thomas Hanmer as speaker, he was saluted by some of the Tory squires with cries of "Tatler! Tatler!" It was not with the intent to honor the new Whig member that these knights of the shire, and patrons of decayed boroughs, uttered the one word which has associated his name with the memory of the pleasantest, the most influential, and on many accounts the most original, branch of the literature of what is called our Augustan age. By the side of Richard Steele sat, on the same opposition benches, his friend and fellow-laborer, Joseph Addison. He must have smiled to hear the race of fox-hunters yelping out in their ignorant pride such a reproach as this against one who, under the name of Bickerstaff, never designed to give any man any secret wound by his concealment; and who, at the close of his work, published his name to his writings, and gave himself up to the mercy of the town, with all his imperfections on his head.† Addison himself, Swift tells us, was so popular, that when he was elected to a parliament in which the Tories carried it six to one, his election passed "easy and undisputed; and I believe, if he had a mind to be king, he would hardly be refused."‡ What gave Addison to a great extent this popularity? That which the squires thought a reproach. He and his coadjutor Steele had opened for the people such fountains of playful humor, of gentle satire, of familiar criticism, of tolerant morality, that they had become to their readers as personal friends. The "Tatler," and "Spectator," and "Guardian," had appeared at a time when the High Churchmen were urging to religious hatred, and the right-divine parliament men were trying to back the old state coach into the sloughs from which the revolution had dragged it. Under their periodical companionship, many a fiery Templar was calmed by the pleasant lessons that he read as he sipped his morning chocolate; and many a court beauty was taught that there were more graceful and enduring charms than those of the female politician. Steele and Addison produced a permanent influence upon their age, because, in this new journalism, they mingled as little as possible with the temporary animosities of the age. They kept their politics for the "Whig Examiner" and the "Englishman." The Tory squires, who despise the penny literature which was the delight of old and young, of the London coffee-house and the provincial club, have passed to their natural obscurity. Steele has "Tatler" written upon his tomb as his greatest glory.

Johnson has said, and his opinion may be taken with very slight qualification, "Before the 'Tatler' and 'Spectator,' if the writers for the theatre are excepted, England had no masters of common life." He adds, "We had many books to teach us more important duties, and to settle opinions in philosophy and politics." Addison himself, in his "Freeholder," a series of "political essays," while maintaining that "papers of entertainment" might be advantageously mixed with graver speculations upon state topics, has recorded his own view of what he and his coadjutors accomplished in the "'Tatlers' and 'Spectators,'" which, he says, "were so generally dispersed in single sheets and have since been printed in so great numbers. . . . They diverted raillery from improper objects, and gave a new turn to ridicule, which for many years had been exerted on persons and things of a sacred and serious nature. . . . Our nation are such lovers of mirth and humor, that it is impossible for detached papers, which come out on stated days, either to have a general run, or long continuance, if they are not diversified, and enlivened from time to time, with subjects and thoughts accommodated

* "The Gentleman's Society at Spalding;" privately printed, 1851. See, also, Nichols's "Literary Anecdotes," vol. iv. p. 68.

* Bisset's "Life of Addison," quoted in Drake' Esssays.
† "Tatler," No. 271.—Concluding Address.
‡ "Journal to Stella."

to this taste, which so prevails among our countrymen. No periodical author, who always maintains his gravity, and does not sometimes sacrifice to the graces, must expect to keep in vogue for any considerable time." * Nothing but the remarkable talents of Steele and Addison, their knowledge of human nature, and their kindly dispositions, could have made their ridicule of transient follies of any permanent value. In avoiding the bitter exaggerations of the professed satirist, they give us real pictures of the every-day life of their time. In presenting what the old dramatists called humors, they offer us something of higher art than caricatures of individuals who have no features in common with their fellow-men. They exhibit to us the representatives of classes. But these first and greatest of the essayists have a further especial value in our eyes. They reflect the general character of the education of the people in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. "Papers of entertainment," said Addison, "are necessary to increase the number of readers, especially among those of different notions and principles." The "Tatler" and "Spectator," and "Guardian," addressed themselves to the largest number of those who had the ability and the leisure to read. The whole tone of these books shows how limited the number was, and how necessary it became to deal with the higher parts of knowledge in the most familiar manner, and to advocate the noblest interests of religion and morals in the pleasantest spirit. Johnson has truly said, speaking of the time when Addison and Steele hit upon their vocation as popular instructors, "Men, not professing learning, were not ashamed of ignorance; and in the female world any acquaintance with books was distinguished only to be censured." The cheap periodical literature of our own day, taken as a whole, does not address a less-educated class than those addressed in the same manner during the last four years of Anne. The difference is that with us the readers have been multiplied a hundredfold.

"It is a great pity," writes Addison in 1713, "there should be no knowledge in a family. For my own part, I am concerned, when I go into a great house where perhaps there is not a single person that can spell, unless it be by chance the butler or one of the footmen. What a figure is the young heir likely to make, who is a dunce both by father's and mother's side?" † There was a system of education for the humble then in progress, which gave the butler and the footman this advantage over the other inmates of the great house. The institution of charity-schools appeared to the essayist the most proper means to recover the age "out of its present degeneracy and depravation of manners;" and to promise that "there will be few in the next generation who will not at least be able to write and read, and have not had an early tincture of religion." ‡ How imperfectly this promise was realized during the eighteenth century, under the charity-school system, we had melancholy proofs. But we cannot look without admiration upon the judicious mode in which the first essayists endeavored to diffuse some desire for knowledge, and some taste for the higher efforts of genius, throughout a nation with whom superior rank and riches did not necessarily infer a more liberal cultivation of the mind than among those who labored for their bread. They pursued the only wise and safe course. They made no attempts to deal with the abstruse parts of learning, by addressing themselves to the few; nor to lower themelves to what the pedants would deem the popular capacity, in writing for the many. In an essay attributed to Gay we find how entirely the writings of the "Tatler" "have convinced our fops and young fellows of the value and advantages of learning;" and in a poem of 1712 we are told that the ladies, under the influence of Steele, "aspire to write correct, and spell;" and that in their familiar letters we no longer find "Wurthee Surr." §

Nothing would more surprise us in the contents of a periodical paper of our own time, not addressed exclusively to children, than to find the most familiar passages from the great poets presented to its readers as novelties. In the conduct of the early numbers of the "Tatler," Steele evidently assumed that the literary acquirements of his subscribers had not extended to Shakespeare or Milton; and that it was desirable to approach these obscure writers by a tentative process. As a help to a right judgment of actors for "the less learned part of the audience," we have Hamlet's instructions to the players given at length. * The description of Dover Cliff, in "Lear," "drawn with such proper incidents," is duly set forth. † Passages of "Henry IV.," of "Richard III.," of "Othello," are given as if they had all the charm of freshness for the greater number. And they really had this charm for most *readers*. The fourth folio edition of Shakespeare was published in 1685; the next edition, that of Rowe, appeared in the same year as the "Tatler." In very sensible and genial morsels of criticism upon "Macbeth" and "Julius Cæsar," Steele quotes from his stage memory, as if no printed copy of the tragedies was accessible to him. His enthusiastic commendation of Betterton, as the great interpreter of Shakespeare's characters, points to the sources of his criticism. Steele preceded Addison in calling attention to Milton. He frequently quotes from "Paradise Lost;" and he transcribes "a passage in a mask writ by Milton," which, he says, "made me forget my age, and renewed in me the warm desires after virtue, so natural to uncorrupted youth." ‡ But the first strenuous attempt to make the people of the reign of Anne fully impressed with the value of the great poet who had scarcely been heard in his own day, amid "the barbarous dissonance of Bacchus and his revellers," was reserved for Addison. Yet in his famous series of papers on the "Paradise Lost," he had approached his subject with evident disinclination to hazard any heterodox opinion of the comparative merits of the ancients and the moderns. If the "Paradise Lost" falls short of the "Æneid" or the "Iliad" in the power of working on the imagination, "it proceeds rather from the fault of the language in which it is written than from any defect of genius in the author." § Addison, however, did admirably what he undertook to do; and he very wisely avoided what the learned Doctor Hurd complained that he did not do. He avoided metaphysical criticism; he did not attempt "to lay open the more secret and hidden springs of that pleasure which results from poetical composition." What Addison did, this grand philosophical critic thinks to be a very poor thing: "For what concerns his criticism on Milton in particular, there was this accidental benefit arising from it, that it occasioned an admirable poet to be read, and his excellences to be observed." All honor be to him who left the pedants to their own proper labors, and set manfully about his great duty of elevating the tastes and refining the manners of the people. Addison had very early professed a contempt for "all men of deep learning without common-sense"—the "editors, commentators, interpreters, scholiasts, and critics"—such as "set a greater value on themselves for having found out the meaning of a passage in Greek, than upon the author for having written it; nay, will allow the passage itself not to have any beauty in it, at the same time that they would be considered as the greatest men of the age for having interpreted it." ‖ These were the natural haters of literature for the people. While they would "write volumes upon an idle sonnet that is originally in Greek or Latin, give editions of the most immoral authors, and spin out whole pages upon the various readings of a lewd expression," they sneered at Addison for pointing out the beauties of "The Children in the Wood" and of "Chevy Chase." The pedants were joined by "the little conceited wits of the age," in ridiculing discourses upon old ballads that had only been "the delight of the common people."

Taking a broad view of the objects and tendency of these works, so especially characteristic of their age, we believe that they produced a far greater effect upon the intellectual and moral progress of the community by their cultivation of a taste for agreeable and healthful literature, than by their direct attacks upon vice and folly. Not the least of their services was to meet, in however limited a degree, that craving for fiction, which is even stronger among the imperfectly educated than among those of higher refinement. It has been said that "no novel, giving a lively and powerful picture of the common life and manners of England, had appeared" before the time of the "Spectator;" that the narrative which connects together these essays "gave to our ancestors their first taste of an exquisite and untried pleasure;" and that, in this point of view, Addison is entitled "to be considered as the forerunner of the great English novelists." ¶ The famous Club of the "Spectator" thus referred to, was, in its original features, the creation of Steele. It was for Addi-

* "Freeholder," No. 45. † "Guardian," No. 155.
‡ Ibid., No. 105. § See Drake's "Essays," vol. iii.

* "Tatler," No. 35. † Ibid., No. 117. ‡ Ibid., No. 98.
§ "Spectator," No. 417. ‖ "Tatler," No. 158.
¶ Macaulay's "Essay on Addison."

son to work out many of its most refined delineations of character; but Steele, who had a wider range of observation, first produced to the admiring world Sir Roger de Coverley. Addison mitigated some of the coarser features of this favorite of mankind; and in his picture we recognize few traces of the fine gentleman who "had often supped with my Lord Rochester and Sir George Etherege, fought a duel upon his first coming to town, and kicked Bully Dawson in a public coffee-house." Steele gave the outline of the member of the Inner Temple, "who was placed there to study the laws of the land, and is the most learned of any of the house in those of the stage." Steele created Sir Andrew Freeport, who "calls the sea the British common," and can prove "that diligence makes more lasting acquisitions than valor." It is to Steele we owe the brave and modest Captain Sentry, who "is never overbearing, though accustomed to command men in the utmost degree below him; nor ever too obsequious from a habit of obeying men highly above him." Steele called up Will Honeycomb, who has all his life dressed well, knows the history of every mode, and is proud to have "received a kind glance or blow of the fan from some celebrated beauty, mother of the present Lord Such-a-one." Lastly, it was Steele who conceived that beautiful sketch of the clergyman, who seldom comes to the club; "but when he does he adds to every one else a new enjoyment of himself;" who is of too weak health to accept preferment; but who, without obtruding serious reflections, excites in his associates "an earnestness to have him fall on some divine topic." The essayist exultingly says, "These are my ordinary companions."

Sir Roger de Coverley is by far the most renowned member of the Spectator's Club, but he is rarely produced *in* the club. It is in the country that the baronet is exhibited in his native glory. We are all familiar with his domestic establishment; with his description of his ancestors; with his deportment at church; with his adventure with the gypsies; with his field sports; with his importance at the assizes. We have ventured to suggest that the portrait of Sir Roger may be taken for as just a representation of the country gentleman of the reign of Anne and of William III. as some eloquent descriptions which exhibit his class as wholly steeped in ignorance and debauchery.* If Sir Roger had been a Whig we might have somewhat suspected the truth of the likeness. His Toryism, painted with the most delicate art, is not even made ridiculous. His prejudices are so natural that they almost command our respect. He is a much stronger Tory in the country than in town. He is brought into a gentle conflict of principles with Sir Andrew Freeport, who is naturally inclined to the moneyed interest, while Sir Roger as naturally leans to the landed interest. "This humor is so moderate in each of them, that it proceeds no farther than to an agreeable raillery, which very often diverts the rest of the club."† Sir Roger is a thorough patriot. He exults in the glorious names of Henry V. and Queen Elizabeth, when he sees their tombs in Westminster Abbey. When he is rowed to Vauxhall by the waterman who had lost a leg in the battle of La Hogue, "the knight, in the triumph of his heart, made several reflections on the greatness of the British nation: as, that one Englishman could beat three Frenchmen; that we could never be in danger of popery so long as we took care of our fleet; that the Thames was the noblest river in Europe; that London Bridge was a greater piece of work than any of the seven wonders of the world; with many other honest prejudices which naturally cleave to the heart of a true Englishman." There is not a more charming incident in the traits of character and manners which are evolved out of the Spectator's Club, than the description of the mode in which the members receive the news of Sir Roger de Coverley's death. He had, some weeks before he died, sent a book by the carrier, to be given to Sir Andrew Freeport in his name. "Sir Andrew, opening the book, found it to be a collection of Acts of Parliament. There was in particular the Act of Uniformity, with some passages in it marked by Sir Roger's own hand. Sir Andrew found that they related to two or three points which he had disputed with Sir Roger, the last time he appeared at the club. Sir Andrew, who would have been merry at such an incident on another occasion, at the sight of the old man's handwriting burst into tears, and put the book into his pocket."‡ Addison, speaking of the political and religious prejudices of his time, as exhibited in the country districts especially, says, "I am sometimes afraid that I discover the seeds of a civil war in these divisions." Gradually the extended intercourse of Whig and Tory, of churchman and dissenter, made the Sir Rogers and the Sir Andrews wiser than their ancestors; and it is not without reason that we may believe that such lay preachers as Addison and Steele had no inconsiderable influence in making their countrymen ashamed of "such a spirit of dissension" as rendered them "in a manner barbarous toward one another." Other animosities, other passions and prejudices, succeeded those of the generation in which these kindly moralists flourished. But their humanizing lessons have always been capable of a general application; and to the gradual spread of that education of high and humble, which they began by popularizing literature, we may attribute the fact that, although Englishmen differ as keenly upon public subjects, they have long ceased to hate, as their forefathers hated.

The little tales of Steele in the "Tatler" also gave "the first taste of an exquisite and untried pleasure." There is material in every one of these simple and touching stories capable of expansion into several chapters of the modern writers of fiction; and yet they are so perfect, according to their own theory of art, that they must have set many a young imagination shaping forth scenes and dialogues to fill up the well-defined outline. In Steele's six or seven tragical sketches, the absence of elaboration, the directness with which we reach the catastrophe, give an impression of reality, such as we receive from the best passages of Defoe. The oriental tales and the allegories of Addison have their own charm, and exhibit the elegance of his taste and the beauty of his style. But we must honestly confess that we would rather have been the writer of "Inkle and Yarico" than of the "Vision of Mirza."

Looking at the united labors of Steele and Addison as a whole, we are astonished not only at the variety of their productions, but at the continuity of their periodical contributions from the spring of 1709 to the autumn of 1713, with very slight cessation. Of the "Tatler," "Spectator," and "Guardian," Steele wrote five hundred and ten papers; Addison wrote three hundred and sixty-nine. What a void did these two associates fill up, when they opened the fountains of their learning, of their experience, of their humor, of their imagination, to delight a people who had almost forgotten the noble literature of a century earlier, and had very little to attract them, and less to improve, in the literature of their own time. For women, especially, studies "for delight, for ornament, and for use" were almost unknown. The "Tatler" proposed to take into serious consideration the means of forming "a Female Library"—to recommend "a collection of books that shall consist of such authors as do not corrupt while they divert."* Steele never carried out his notion. Addison took up the idea, designing "to recommend such particular books as may be proper for the improvement of the sex." His intention equally failed. But Addison gave a catalogue of books which he found in the library of a lady of more than common education. Some few she had bought for her own use, but most had been got together "either because she had heard them praised, or because she had seen the authors of them." This may account for "Sir Isaac Newton's works" being there; and "Locke on the Human Understanding, with a paper of patches in it." "The lady's own reading has lain very much among romances;" and accordingly we find in this curious library, "Cassandra," "Cleopatra," "Astræa," "The Grand Cyrus." These were the famous translations, each in enormous folios, or in a dozen duodecimo volumes, from the French of Monsieur Calprenede, or of Mademoiselle Scudery. Their interminable stupidity was scarcely driven out till Richardson and Fielding appeared. But common-sense dawned upon the readers for amusement when the essayists came; and from the publication of the "Tatler," "Spectator," and "Guardian," we may date the general taste for reading which has gradually spread throughout our land.

The "men of genius and learning" who were contemporaries of Addison and Steele rendered no considerable assistance to their admirable design of affording instruction and entertainment to a larger class of readers than "men of genius and learning" had previously thought worthy of their care. Swift only contributed two entire papers to the "Tatler" and "Spectator," with some dozen

* See *ante*, vol. iv. p. 618. † "Spectator," No. 126. ‡ Ibid., No. 517.

* Tatler," No. 248.

fragments. Congreve wrote one article in the "Tatler." Parnell furnished two essays to the "Spectator" and two to the "Guardian." Berkeley was a more diligent friend, having in the "Guardian" fourteen excellent papers on the sceptical opinions of the time. Of Pope's writing we find two articles in the "Spectator" and eight in the 'Guardian." Of men of inferior note there are here and there an essay. The organization of periodical literature was at that time very imperfect. Ephemeral verse-makers could obtain a guinea from a bookseller for an occasional ode, or a political satire. Two guineas for a "Letter to a Noble Lord" was the reward which Grub Street bestowed upon its patriots. Addison, in the "Tatler" already quoted, has a pleasant account of "a general dealer"—intended, we may guess, for Tom D'Urfey. "The merry rogue said, when he wanted a dinner, he sent a paragraph of Table Talk, and his bookseller, upon sight, paid the reckoning." The humble gains of these caterers for public taste were rendered more uncertain by the roguerie of piratical publishers, who were as unscrupulous toward authors using the same tongue as if the breadth of the Atlantic had legalized their frauds. The famous "Act for the encouragement of learning," under which the term and other conditions of copyright subsisted for a century, was passed in that session of the parliament of Anne which began on the 13th of November, 1709. On the 1st of December Addison, with the evident desire to promote this enactment for the benefit of literature, wrote a paper in the "Tatler," which thus commences: "The progress of my intended account of what happened when justice visited mortals, is at present interrupted by the observation and sense of an injustice against which there is no remedy, even in a kingdom more happy in the care taken of the liberty and property of the subject than any other nation upon earth." That injustice was perpetrated by "men who are rogues within the law, . . . a set of wretches we authors call pirates, who print any book, poem, or sermon, as soon as it appears in the world, in a smaller volume, and sell it, as all other thieves do stolen goods, at a cheaper rate." The statute which was passed a few months afterward sets forth the same fraudulent practice, and gives to authors a limited enjoyment of their own property, which, under the common law, was held to endure forever. But the common law did not give a prompt remedy against piracy, which was attained by the statute of Anne. It is from the passing of this act that we may date the slow but certain establishment of literature as a profession, deriving its support, like every other branch of industry, under the general laws of demand and supply. Addison, whose writings had procured for him lucrative offices, not only thinks that authors ought to have "the benefit that may arise from their writings, but that it has happened, and may often happen, that men of learning and virtue cannot qualify themselves for public employment or preferment." He therefore comes to this sound conclusion: "I have brought myself to consider things in so unprejudiced a manner that I esteem more a man who can live by the products of his understanding than one who does it by the favor of great men." * During the reign of Anne "the favor of great men" was the ruling idea of those who devoted their lives to authorship. Next to the service that was rendered to literature by passing the Copyright Act was the real elevation of the literary character by the contempt for letters of George I. and Sir Robert Walpole. The writer who attempted to "live by the products of his understanding" alone, had a terrible state of transition to pass through before he was equally free from "the patron and the gaol." But he finally rose above the condition of "the hirelings in garrets, at hard meat," described by Roger North; we even think far above the "artificial encouragement of a vast system of bounties and premiums," which supplied "the deficiency of the natural demand for literature." † We cannot conceive any more practical humiliation of genius and learning than the vaunted modes of their patronage in what is complacently called the Augustan age. Prior is sent abroad as an ambassador; Addison becomes an under-secretary of state; Swift obtains the deanery of St. Patrick. Congreve, Rowe, Hughes, Philips, Stepney, had lucrative appointments. How great the deserts! How munificent the rewards! The notion is that these eminent gainers of high prizes met their patrons upon thoroughly independent terms. Was it so? Swift, indeed, always affects to be greater than the men to whom he was paying court. He fancies he is standing up for the dignity of letters, when he takes Parnell to Oxford's levee, and the great lord treasurer is civil to him. "I value myself upon making the ministry desire to be acquainted with Parnell, and not Parnell with the ministry." * Yet what real meanness is there under all this show of independence! In 1709, before the fall of the Whigs, Swift assails Halifax for preferment in a style that would be ludicrous if it were not contemptible. He congratulates himself upon having "such a solicitor as your lordship." He has no timid reservations. He boldly asks his noble solicitor, "that if you think this gentle winter will not carry off Dr. South, or that his reversion is not to be compassed, your lordship would please to use your credit that, as my Lord Somers thought of me last year for the bishopric of Waterford, so my Lord President may now think on me for that of Cork, if the incumbent dies of the spotted fever he is now under." † There is far more independence in Steele's request to the same patron of letters, that he would be liberal in subscribing to the new edition of the "Tatler:" "If any that your lordship recommends shall think fit to subscribe more than the sum proposed for a book, it may be said that it is for so many more books. This will make the favor more grateful by being conferred in an oblique way, and at the same time save the confusion of the Squire [Bickerstaff], whom I know to be naturally proud." ‡ More honest than the impudent seeker of a prebend or a bishopric, or than the poor and proud essayist who desires a gift "in an oblique way," is Defoe, who tells Halifax that he "scorned to come out of Newgate at the price of betraying a dead master," but thanks him in a straightforward style for "the exceeding bounty I have now received;" and says, "I am a plain and unpolished man, and perfectly unqualified to make formal acknowledgments; and a temper soured by a series of afflictions renders me still the more awkward in the received method of common gratitude. I mean the ceremony of thanks." § The fate of Defoe was that of the great body of the men of letters. They sometimes had a purse tossed to them for a dedication; they had small pay from the booksellers; they starved; and their poverty, more than their dulness, consigned them to the tender mercies of "The Dunciad."

The poets of the reign of Anne, and of the reign of the first George, occupy the most considerable space in the literary history of those times. One half of Johnson's "Lives" is devoted to criticism upon the works of those who flourished in this period. Of that "body of English poetry" which the booksellers had determined to publish, and for which Johnson wrote these "Lives" as a series of prefaces, how much that belongs to this Augustan age is worth looking at, except for the gratification of a literary curiosity to know what was be praised and be-pensioned in those halcyon days? Of these thirty "heirs of fame," who occupy about seven hundred pages of Johnson's biographies, ‖ there are only about seven whom the world has not very "willingly let die." Rowe, Prior, Congreve, Gay, are still talked about. Addison and Swift are read for their prose. Pope is almost the sole name in poetry that is not partially or hermetically sealed up in "the monument of banished minds." Many of those who are rarely now "from the dust of old oblivion raked," were the lucky ones of the earth whom Halifax and Oxford were transforming from ill-paid verse-makers into flourishing commissioners, envoys, and secretaries. The ministers believed that patronage had made the poets—

"Un Auguste peut aisément faire un Virgile"—

and it was still easier to make the rhymers into sinecurists. These have left few abiding memorials of their age in their odes and epigrams, their songs and love verses, even in their tales, at which court ladies smiled and blushed behind the fan. We may glean from the one great poet of the time some illustrations of the national mind and manners, that are not the less real on account of the coloring which consummate art has bestowed upon them.

The circumstances of Pope's early life were eminently favorable to the attainment of his future excellence. His father, a Roman Catholic, had retired from business with a moderate competence. The

* "Tatler," No. 101.

† Macaulay, "Essay on Johnson."

* "Journal," Jan. 31st, 1713.

† "Letters of Eminent Literary Men," Camden Society, p. 343.

‡ Ibid., p. 345.

§ "Letters of Eminent Literary Men," Camden Society, pp. 321–323.

‖ In Mr. Cunningham's edit.

precocious boy, after the age of twelve, had to form his own mind, and work out his own aspirations, in his "paternal cell" at Binfield. In this modest dwelling the young poet wrote his "Pastorals," his "Windsor Forest," his "Temple of Fame," his "Essay on Criticism," his "Rape of the Lock." Here his mind was saturated with a love of nature and natural things, held in subjection, indeed, by the powerful acuteness of his reasoning faculties, but running over with imagery, and often with tenderness and passion. We are told, "He set to learning Latin and Greek by himself, about twelve; and when he was about fifteen he resolved that he would go up to London and learn French and Italian."* He received the first encouragement to cultivate his poetical talents from his neighbor Sir William Trumbull, who had been an ambassador and a secretary of state. At sixteen he formed an acquaintance with Wycherley, a man of seventy. He was known at that time to Congreve. At an earlier age he had been taken to a coffee-house to see Dryden. The wonderful lad was not a moping recluse in Windsor Forest, but went into the world, and talked with famous men, who were not mere authors, leaders in high life, qualified by their own experience to display to his eager curiosity some of the best and many of the worst aspects of that region of luxury and wit and profligacy in which they had lived. Pope had a very early training to afford him a far deeper insight into the realities of life than he could have attained in the seclusion of a college or the bustle of a profession. His religious disqualification for place, and his ardent thirst for distinction, sent him to authorship as his proper work for profit and for fame; but his refined tastes and his feeble health saved him from the social perils that attended upon the professional writer. His small patrimony kept him from the shifts and humiliations that then, and long after, were the hard destiny of those who wrote for their daily bread. His resolute application won him higher rewards than literature had ever before won in its own open market. At the beginning of George I.'s reign Halifax offered him a pension, saying that nothing should be demanded of him for it. The young poet had not then earned an independence by his Homer. "I wrote," he says, "to Lord Halifax to thank him for his most obliging offer, saying that I had considered the matter over fully, and that all the difference I could find in having and not having a pension, was, that if I had one I might live more at large in town, and that if I had not, I might live happily enough in the country. . . . So the thing dropped, and I had my liberty without a coach."†

CHAPTER CXLIV.

Female politicians—Female employments—Dress—The hoop-petticoat—Literary estimate of the female character—The stage estimate—Congreve—Swift's polite conversation—Pope—The Rape of the Lock—Prude and coquette—Puppet plays—The opera—The masquerade—Young—Fashionable vices—Drinking—Extravagant dinners—Duelling—The club life of London—Gaming—The bear-garden—Popular superstitions—Witchcraft—Ignorance of the lower classes—Sports—National taste for music gone out—The small-coal man.

THE "Tatler" and "Spectator" were issued at a time when the ladies of England were among the keenest and noisiest of politicians. One object of the essayists was to lead the fair ones into calmer and pleasanter regions; and we therefore find little notice in their non-political writings of the vagaries which the female mind exhibited about the Church and the Protestant Succession. In the "Freeholder" Addison has several pleasant papers, in which we see the temper that filled many a household with the strifes of unreasoning Tories in hooped petticoats. "Women of this turn," he says, "are so earnest in contending for hereditary right that they wholly neglect the education of their own sons and heirs, and are so taken up with their zeal for the Church that they cannot find time to teach their children the Catechism. . . . Such is our misfortune that we sometimes see a pair of stays ready to burst with sedition, and hear the most masculine passions expressed in the sweetest voices."‡ In another paper he says, "As our English ladies are at present the greatest stateswomen in Europe, they will be in danger of making themselves the most unamiable part of their sex, if they continue to give a loose to intemperate language, and to a low kind of ribaldry, which is not used among the women of fashion in any other country."* We must ascribe a great deal of this disposition to engage in party conflicts to the absence of occupations of an intellectual character, which might engage the women of the beginning of the eighteenth century. In condemning their political extravagances, the "Freeholder" does not attempt to address them as persons qualified to estimate the relative merits of opposite opinions. When he points out to the fair enemies of the Protestant Succession what they sacrifice by their disloyalty to the house of Brunswick, he tells them that they cannot go to court; that they forego the advantage of birthday suits; that they are forced to live in the country, and feed their chickens. "The women of England should be on the side of the Freeholder, and enemies to the person who would bring in arbitrary government and popery," because, "as there are several of our ladies who amuse themselves in the reading of travels, they cannot but take notice what uncomfortable lives those of their own sex lead where passive obedience is professed and practised in the utmost perfection." Arbitrary power spoils the shape of the foot in China; hurries the Indian widow to her husband's funeral pile; makes the daughters of Eve in Persia mere chattels; gives a woman the twelfth share of a husband in the dominions of the Grand Turk; and renders them the slaves of duennas and gouvernantes in Spain and Italy. The ladies of England ought not to encourage the Roman Catholic religion, because a fish diet spoils the complexion; and a "whole Lent would give such a sallowness to the celebrated beauties of this island as would scarce make them distinguishable from those of France."† Much of this, no doubt, is the banter of the great humorist; but the ladies deserved it, who set a mark upon their faces to proclaim their politics, the fair Tories being "obliged by their principles to stick a patch on the most unbecoming side of their foreheads."‡ They could scarcely be addressed in any other style, when the whole time of the greater number was engrossed by idle visiting and ridiculous amusements. "I think," says Steele, "most of the misfortunes in families arise from the trifling way the women have in spending their time, and gratifying only their eyes and ears, instead of their reason and understanding." It must be remembered that the domestic accomplishments of the English lady were then almost unknown. Not one house in ten thousand contained a harpsichord, while in our days a pianoforte is as common as a sofa. Pope had borrowed, or hired, a harpsichord; and during a temporary absence from his house at Twickenham, his fashionable neighbor, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, desired a loan from him of the same cumbrous box of wires, which request the poet was unable to grant. Of the arts of design the best educated female had no conception. The greater number of fashionable women "spend their hours in an indolent state of body and mind, without either recreations or reflections." Stimulants, if we may believe the censor, were sometimes restored to: "Palestris, in her drawing-room, is supported by spirits, to keep off the return of spleen and melancholy, before she can get over half of the day, for want of something to do; while the wench in the kitchen sings and scours from morning to night."§ We can scarcely impute the extravagances of female dress in Anne's reign to the defects of education; for in our age, when reading is universal, and every woman, not wholly condemned to be a domestic drudge, has other salutary modes of occupation always at hand, the absurdities at which the satirists unceasingly laughed a hundred and fifty years ago have again come round. Is it Mr. Bickerstaff, or is it Mr. Punch, who published "The humble petition of William Jingle, coachmaker," showing that the petticoats of ladies being too wide to enter into any coach in use before their invention, he has contrived "a coach for the reception of one lady only, who is to be let in at the top"? Is it in 1709, or in 1859, that the prevailing fashion is thus described? "The design of our great-grandmothers in this petticoat was to appear much bigger than the life, for which reason they had false shoulder-blades, like wings, and the ruff, to make the upper and lower parts of their bodies appear proportionable; whereas the figure of a woman in the present dress bears the figure of a cone, which is the same with that of an extinguisher.

* Spence. † Ibid., p. 231. ‡ "Freeholder," No. 26.

* "Freeholder," No. 23. † Ibid., No. 40.
‡ Ibid., No. 26. § "Tatler," No. 248.

with a little knob at the upper end, and widening downward till it ends in a basis of most enormous circumference." * There must be something of innate virtue in the hooped petticoat, now called by the pretty name of crinoline. It lasted in various forms through the reigns of the first and second Georges; kept its place, to the amusement of the profane vulgar, on court days, till a very recent period; and has now started up, to the terror of all those of the male creation who cannot afford "a coach for the reception of one lady only."

In the period from the restoration to the middle of the eighteenth century there was unquestionably a very low estimate of the female character. In theatrical representations of life there was scarcely an attempt to exhibit a woman of sense and modesty. The high ideal of female excellence which we find in Shakespeare, and which to a certain extent he must have derived from the realities of the age of Elizabeth, could scarcely be expected from the Drydens and Farquhars and Wycherleys and Congreves of the age of the revolution. We can scarcely look to the stage of their time for Perditas and Violas, and Imogens. If some of its women had the wit and address of Beatrice and Rosalind, they had the profligacy and cunning which made their cleverness hateful. Congreve, who did as much as any dramatist to render the female character odious, has a somewhat remarkable paper in the "Tatler," in which he says, "It is not to be supposed that it was a poverty of genius in Shakespeare that his women made so small a figure in his dialogues." How diligently must Congreve have studied Shakespeare to have made this discovery! He goes on to say, "But it certainly is, that he drew women as they were then in life; for that sex had not in those days that freedom of conversation; and their characters were only that they were mothers, sisters, daughters, and wives." Was it really true of the age of the author of the "Old Bachelor," "Double Dealer," "Love for Love," and "Way of the World," that, as he and others have shown, the mothers were careless of their children, that the sisters were plotting against each other, that the daughters were undutiful, that the wives were adulteresses? As an essayist he then draws the character of "the divine Aspasia," whose "countenance is the lively image of her mind, which is the seat of honor, truth, compassion, knowledge, and innocence"—a lady who "adds to the severity and privacy of the last age all the freedom and ease of this." It is pleasant to find one exception to the ladies of Congreve's own time—"shining wits and politicians, virtuosæ, freethinkers, and disputants." When Shakespeare "drew women as they were then in life," according to the creator of the Miss Prues and Lady Touchwoods, "vanity had quite another turn, and the most conspicuous woman at that time of day was only the best housewife." † It was some years before the domestic virtues as exhibited on the stage came to be regarded in any other point of view than as tiresome, if not ridiculous. But a sense of decency, denoting something more of respect for the female character, was slowly growing; and this is in some degree an evidence that the female character was itself improving. The great ladies ceased to be painted as profligate intriguers; and the citizens' wives as looking for licentious adventures in their masks. The "Tatler" originally professed to devote particular attention to the stage; and Steele had an especial relish for the theatre, with a keen sense of dramatic excellence. In the first week of the existence of the new journal, we have notices of two plays, whose wit, in the view of those times, redeemed them from the shame of their licentiousness. The "Love for Love" of Congreve and the "Country Wife" of Wycherley were tolerated for a century. We can scarcely, therefore, expect Steele to have condemned them, especially when he records that at the performance of "Love for Love," for Betterton's benefit, "there has not been known so great a concourse of persons of distinction: the stage itself was covered with gentlemen and ladies." ‡ There was a third drama which Mr. Bickerstaff notices in his eighth number in a way which absolves him from the charge of having gone along with his age in all its theatrical improprieties. He tells us that a play, whose name is by us scarcely mentionable, was acted "before a suitable audience, who were extremely well diverted with that heap of vice and absurdity;" and he makes "a gentleman of just taste" express his indignation, "upon occasion of seeing human nature fall so low in their delights." Yet that infamous comedy by Edward Ravenscroft, which was first acted in 1682, kept the stage till 1754, being annually performed at Drury Lane and Covent Garden, on Lord Mayor's Day, in ridicule of the London citizens. Garrick, in 1752, had the good taste to break through this custom of presenting, for the gratification of the ignorant and licentious, a picture of manners which was never other than exceptionally true; and which was originally devised to make the libertines of fashion believe that the households of the industrious and thrifty part of the community were as corrupt as their own exclusive circles.

Swift was not, habitually, a libeller of the female character. He was fond of the society of accomplished women. His "Journal to Stella," with much grossness, and some childish talk assuming her inferiority, is not far below what a man of high intellect would address to an intelligent woman who had his confidence. He wrote a paper on "The Education of Ladies," in which he says, "There is a subject of controversy which I have frequently met with in mixed and select companies of both sexes, and sometimes only of men—whether it be prudent to choose a wife who has good natural sense, some taste of wit and humor, able to read and relish history, books of travels, moral or entertaining discourses, and be a tolerable judge of the beauties in poetry? This question is generally determined in the negative by women themselves, but almost universally by we men." It is not banter when he observes "that in this debate, those whom we call men and women of fashion are only to be understood; not merchants, tradesmen, or others of such occupations, who are not supposed to have shared in a liberal education." The essay is incomplete; but Swift evidently inclines to the opinion that a better education of women would be preferable to "the modern way of training up both sexes in ignorance, idleness, and vice." He was a hard censor, and therefore we must receive what he says with much qualification. His "polite conversation" is a caricature. Like many other caricatures, it presents a coarser reality than an exact copy of persons and manners would give; but it may be nevertheless faithful in the same degree as Hogarth's exaggeration of the squint of Wilkes. Lady Smart, Miss Notable, and Lady Answerall would have lost half their raciness if they had been mere inventions of the humorist, and not highly colored recollections of the days when he feasted in the fashionable world of London. When the great ladies are not coarse they are foolish and insipid:

"*Lady Smart.* Madam, do you love bohea tea?
"*Lady Answerall.* Why, madam, I must confess I do love it, but it does not love me.
"*Miss Notable.* Indeed, madam, your ladyship is very sparing of your tea. I protest, the last I took was no more than water bewitched."

The modern kitchen would be ashamed of the trashy talk of the old drawing-room.

In 1712 Pope published his first sketch of the "Rape of the Lock." Though only in his twenty-fourth year, he had been long familiar with the world of letters and of fashion—with the coffee-houses and the saloons. Whether in town or country, Pope habitually lived among what is termed the best society. He was not humiliated by those occasional glimpses of the interior of her temple to which fashion, in our days, sometimes condescends to invite genius. He was an admirer of women, according to that mode which implies the superiority of the admirer in the exuberance of his flattery. His brilliant conversation made him a welcome companion; and his graceful homage, and perhaps even his freedoms, gave him the reputation of a charming correspondent. Ridiculous we know he must sometimes have been, when he appeared in the character of a gay tempter; but his diminutive figure and infirm health perhaps gave him a readier admission to female confidence than the handsome Congreves and Wycherleys had attained. His intimacy with the fair ones does not appear, on the whole, to have won them his respect. He walked by moonlight in the gardens of Hampton Court with the maid of honor, Mary Lepell; and he sat with duchesses in their barges on the Thames, listening to "music on the water." But he came to the conclusion that in women only two passions "divide the kind"—

"The love of pleasure and the love of sway."

Pope, in the dedication of the "Rape of the Lock" to its heroine, Miss Arabella Fermor, says "it was intended only to divert a few young ladies, who have good sense and good humor enough to laugh not only at their sex's little unguarded follies, but at their own.

* "Tatler," Nos. 113, 118. † Ibid., No. 42. ‡ Ibid., No. 1.

. . . The character of Belinda, as it is now managed, resembles you in nothing but in beauty." The guardian-sylph has hovered over Belinda in her morning-dream; and he has whispered in her ear words which are not complimentary to the modesty or sense of women; but they are meant as compliments. Belinda is waked by her lap-dog, and her "eyes first opened on a billet-doux." The toilet is completed with the aid of "Betty" and the sylphs. "Awful beauty puts on all its charms." In the company of "fair nymphs and well-dressed youths" Belinda is launched on the silver Thames. Ariel and his attendant sprites sit on the sails of "the painted vessel." Their province is to tend the fair; to guard their powder, their essences, and their washes; even in dreams to bestow invention—

"To change a flounce, or add a furbelow."

The gay company repair to Hampton Court:

"In various talk th' instructive hours they pass'd,
Who gave the ball, or paid the visit last;
One speaks the glory of the British queen,
And one describes a charming Indian screen;
A third interprets motions, looks, and eyes;
At every word a reputation dies;
Snuff, or the fan, supply each pause of chat,
With singing, laughing, ogling, and all that."

The game of ombre succeeds; and then comes coffee. The tempting lock is cut off Belinda's hair by an adventurous baron,

"As o'er the fragrant steams she bends her head."

She shrieks, as ladies shriek,

"When husbands or when lap-dogs breathe their last."

Rage, resentment, and despair take possession of her soul. The fierce Thalestris "fans the rising fire." Gnomes come from "the cave of spleen" to make her curse the detested day, when the favorite curl was snatched from her head. A wise monitor, the grave Clarissa, counsels forgiveness and a return to good-humor; but she counsels in vain. Good sense and good-humor are to "preserve what beauty gains"—

"That men may say, when we the front-box grace,
Behold the first in virtue as in face."

That men may say! This, then, was the reward of virtue. Duty had no charms of its own:

"Oh! if to dance all night, and dress all day,
Charm'd the small-pox, or chased old age away;
Who would not scorn what housewife's cares produce,
Or who would learn one earthly thing of use?"

Exquisite poem! Was it originally read as a gentle satire, or a true picture, of the ladies of the court of Anne? At twenty-four Pope was not a professed satirist. At forty-seven he wrote his "Epistle to a Lady on the Characters of Women," in which, out of his mature experience, he said,

"Men, some to business, some to pleasure take,
But every woman is at heart a rake."

False as this may be, no satirist would now dare to make the assertion, because a total change of manners has deprived him of such materials for the exercise of his art. We apprehend that there was no want in Pope's age of single figures and groups to be drawn at full length, as he has drawn his Rufa, and Silia, and Narcissa, and Flavia, and Chloe—exceptions to his general rule, that

"Most women have no characters at all."

The essayists have two very marked species of the genus *mulier*—the coquette and the prude. Steele describes the coquette as "a sect among women of all others the most mischievous." He says, "As a rake among men is the man who lives in the constant abuse of his reason, so a coquette among women is one who lives in continual misapplication of her beauty." According to the same authority, "the prude and the coquette, as different as they appear in their behavior, are in reality the same kind of women. The motive in both is the affectation of pleasing men. They are sisters of the same blood and constitution, only one chooses a grave and the other a light dress. The prude appears more virtuous, the coquette more vicious, than she really is." Addison, in his "Vision of Justice," is scarcely less severe upon the beautiful creatures who come to look into "the mirror of truth." When the real character was shown without regard to the external features, "multitudes started at their own form, and would have broke the glass if they could have reached it. . . . I observed that some few were so humble as to be surprised at their own charms." By way of apology, Addison concludes his paper by expressing his belief that his vision had "not done justice to the sex." He attempts, then, to repair "the partiality and extravagance of his vision," not in his own words, or by quotation from poet of his own age, but in a passage written by one who had formed his notions of woman upon the models of a more heroic time—that which produced Lucy Hutchinson and Anne Fanshawe:

"When I approach
Her loveliness, so absolute she seems
And in herself complete, so well to know
Her own, that what she wills to do or say
Seems wisest, virtuousest, discreetest, best;
All higher knowledge in her presence falls
Degraded; wisdom in discourse with her
Loses discountenanced and like folly shows;
Authority and reason on her wait,
As one intended first, not after made
Occasionally; and, to consummate all,
Greatness of mind, and nobleness, their seat
Build in her loveliest, and create an awe
About her, as a guard angelic plac'd." *

Addison has supposed that his "imaginary historian," in looking back upon the "Spectator's" representations of the "diversions and characters of the English nation," would "make allowance for the mirth and humor of the author." If his words (he says) were interpreted in their literal meaning, "we must suppose that women of the first quality used to pass whole mornings at a puppet-show;" and "that a promiscuous assembly of men and women were allowed to meet at midnight in masks within the verge of the court." We can scarcely imagine that the antiquity or the wit of the puppet-show attracted "women of the first quality." In Ben Jonson's time the puppet-show had a different name:

"'Twas a rare *motion* to be seen in Fleet Street."

Pepys saw the "puppet-plays" in Covent Garden; and the same performance was exhibited at Whitehall before Charles II. † In the days of the "Spectator," "one Powell" placed his show under the piazzas of Covent Garden. The sexton of the adjacent church of St. Paul complains that when he tolls in for week-day prayers, he finds that his congregation take the warning of the bell, morning and evening, to go to the puppet-show. "I have placed my son at the piazzas, to acquaint the ladies that the bell rings for church, and that it stands on the other side of the garden; but they only laugh at the child." Mrs. Rachel Eyebright has left the church for the puppet-show; and the sexton has lost the fees that gentlemen used to pay to be placed "over against" the fair lady. He has now "none but a few ordinary people, who come to church only to say their prayers." ‡ Powell exhibited Whittington and his cat; and he introduced a pig to dance a minuet with Punch. The town was divided between the attractions of the puppet-show and of the Italian opera. The wits of the time of Anne tried to laugh down what they treated as an absurdity—"that an audience would sit out an evening to hear a dramatical performance written in a language which they did not understand." In their view it was a monstrous practice. "But what makes it more astonishing, it is not the taste of the rabble, but of persons of the greatest politeness which has established it." Addison argues that "if the Italians have a genius for music above the English, the English have a genius for other performances of a much higher nature, and capable of giving the mind a much nobler entertainment." He bitterly complains that the tragedy of "Phædra and Hippolitus"—a dull mythological affair on the French model—was scarcely heard a third time, among a people "so stupidly fond of the Italian opera." The tragedy-writers strove in vain against the new attraction. Addison thought to supplant it by his opera of "Rosamond;" which poem had no success. It failed; because though the dialogue was intelligible, the music was heavy and spiritless. Gay wrote his "Beggar's Opera" in ridicule of the opera of fashion. Its object has long since been forgotten. Its popularity mainly rests upon the charming old English airs to which its songs are adapted.

The Italian opera, once planted in England, has survived the assaults of the witty and the prejudices of the vulgar. It is thoroughly acclimated. The interchange of taste has made that popular

* "Paradise Lost," book viii.

† "Diary," October 8th, 1662.

‡ "Spectator," No. 14.

which was once only genteel. It is fortunate that a promiscuous assembly of men and women in masks is now wholly confined to the disreputable portion of society. What the masquerade was has been told by Addison with such original humor, in that portion of his essays which is little known, that we may give its leading features without much curtailment.* The Tory fox-hunter comes to town in the second year of George II., and, having travelled all night, arrives about daybreak at Charing Cross. There, "to his great surprise, he saw a running footman carried in a chair, followed by a waterman in the same kind of vehicle. He was wondering at the extravagance of their masters, that furnished them with such dresses and accommodations, when on a sudden he beheld a chimney-sweeper, conveyed after the same manner, with three footmen running before him. During his progress through the Strand he met with several other figures no less wonderful and surprising. Seeing a great many in rich morning gowns, he was amazed to find that persons of quality were up so early; and was no less astonished to see many lawyers in their bar-gowns, when he knew by his almanac that term was ended." Four heads are popped out of a hackney-coach, and seeing the fox-hunter, "with his long whip, horse-hair periwig, jockey-belt, and coat without sleeves, fancied him to be one of the masqueraders on horseback, and received him with a loud peal of laughter." He concluded "that all the persons he saw in these strange habits were foreigners, and received a great indignation against them, for pretending to laugh at an English country-gentleman. But he soon recovered out of his error, by hearing the voices of several of them, and particularly of a shepherdess quarrelling with her coachman, and threatening to break his bones in very intelligible English, though with a masculine tone. His astonishment still increased upon him, to see a continued procession of harlequins, scaramouches, punchinellos, and a thousand other merry dresses, by which people of quality distinguished their wit from that of the vulgar." The worthy squire having observed half a dozen nuns, "who filed off one after another up Katherine Street to their respective convents in Drury Lane," asks a porter what religion these people were of. "The porter replied, 'They are of no religion; 'tis a masquerade.' Upon that, says my friend, I began to smoke that they were a parcel of mummers; and being himself one of the quorum in his own county, could not but wonder that none of the Middlesex justices took care to lay some of them by the heels." A drunken bishop gives dire offence to his spirit of magistracy." But his worship, in the midst of his austerity, was mollified at the sight of a very lovely milkmaid, whom he began to regard with an eye of mercy, and conceived a particular affection for her, till he found, to his great amazement, that the standers-by suspected her to be a duchess."

Young, whose genius as a satirist was munificently rewarded in his own day, scarcely attracts notice in our time, while Pope will never be obsolete. Young was not so finished an artist, but he had looked carefully upon the world around him, and in the last years of George I., when he wrote his "Universal Passion," he looked laughingly upon life—a mood very different from that in which the author of the "Night Thoughts" presents himself—perhaps a more natural mood. We may follow up the notice by the essayists of the puppet-show and the masquerade, by some lines of Young, which describe what women were at a time when the cultivation of their own minds, the education of their children, the attainment of what we call accomplishments, were not the employment of the higher class of ladies—certainly not of those who belonged to the middle ranks:

> "Britannia's daughters, much more fair than nice,
> Too fond of admiration, lose their price;
> Worn in the public eye, give cheap delight
> To throngs, and tarnish to the sated sight;
> As unreserved, and beauteous as the sun,
> Through every sign of vanity they run;
> Assemblies, parks, coarse feasts in city halls,
> Lectures, and trials, plays, committees, balls,
> Wells, Bedlams, executions, Smithfield scenes,
> And fortune-tellers' caves, and lions' dens,
> Taverns, exchanges, bridewells, drawing-rooms,
> Instalments, pillories, coronations, tombs,
> Tumblers and funerals, puppet shows, reviews,
> Sales, races, rabbits, and, still stranger, pews." †

* "Freeholder," No. 44.
† "Love of Fame, the Universal Passion," Satire V.

The gentle satire of the essayists against coquettes and prudes might have made affectation less conspicuous. Their laugh against female follies in dress might have somewhat abated the rage for patches, or somewhat diminished the rotundity of the petticoat. Fine ladies might have abstained from the masquerade till it was purified from low company. Persons of quality might have been more careful of the sharper with a pack of cards in his pocket, after Steele's denunciation of the tribe. Ladies at the Bath might have been a little more decorous, when their "ease of conscience" was inferred from the circumstance "that they go directly from church to the gaming-table; and so highly reverence play, as to make it a great part of their exercise on Sundays."* Flagrant vices were not likely to yield quickly to a mild censorship. Drunkenness is one of the objects of their reprehension: "A method of spending one's time agreeably is a thing so little studied, that the common amusement of our young gentlemen, especially of such as are at a distance from those of the first breeding, is drinking." Yet we have abundant evidence that "those of the first breeding" were often the most intemperate. The moralists were not exempt from the common vice of our young gentlemen. Hear Swift: "I dined with Mr. Addison and Dick Stuart, Lord Mountjoy's brother, a treat of Addison's. They were half fuddled, but not I; for I mixed water with my wine, and left them together between nine and ten." † An early hour to leave gentlemen half fuddled, according to our modern computation. "In my own memory," writes Steele, "the dinner has crept by degrees from twelve o'clock to three; and where it will fix nobody knows." ‡ After the wine came the cards. "I dined with Lord Montrath, and carried Lord Mountjoy and Sir Andrew Fountaine with me; and was looking over them at ombre till eleven this evening, like a fool." § The moralists, whether in earnest or not, began to complain, as our own moralists do, of extravagant dinners. Steele exhorts his readers to reconcile themselves to beef and mutton—the diet which bred the hardy race who won the fields of Cressy and Agincourt. The common people keep up the taste of their ancestors. "I would desire my readers to consider what work our countrymen would have made at Blenheim and Ramilies, if they had been fed with kickshaws and ragouts." Bickerstaff dines at a sumptuous table, but despises the larded turkey; turns with disgust from creams and sweetmeats; and could not but smile at the company "cooling their mouths with lumps of ice, which they had just before been burning with salts and peppers." He goes home to finish his dinner in his own fashion; and expresses the same rational wish that many a dinner-giver has expressed, too often without effect, a century and a half after him: "Two plain dishes, with two or three good-natured, cheerful, ingenious friends, would make me more pleased and vain, than all their pomp and luxury can bestow." ‖ The famous dish of the great epicure of his age is known to us through Pope—"Darty's ham-pie." Dartineuf, in Lyttleton's "Dialogues of the Dead," laments that he lived in an age before the glories of turtle. He must have despised Swift, who dined in his company, and afterward said, "We had such fine victuals I could not eat it." The travelled nobleman of the "Dunciad"

> "Tried all hors-d'œuvres, all liqueurs defined,
> Judicious drank, and greatly daring dined."

There are some evils which only the increasing good sense of society, under a healthful state of public opinion, will ever cure; and the moralist and the divine may preach against the particular enormity, and it is still as rampant. It was thus that Steele wrote, in his strongest tone, in reprobation of duelling. Again and again he denounced and he ridiculed this diversion of gentlemen. In 1712 the Duke of Hamilton and Lord Mohun fought in Hyde Park, and both were killed—without very great loss to the community. The fashion of duelling died out, when it ceased to be a peculiar privilege of the great to murder each other. When Mrs. Peachum, in the "Beggar's Opera," expresses her opinion that it is a great blessing that they have not had a murder among their gang for seven months, the more experienced Mr. Peachum replies, "What a dickens is the woman always whimpering about murder for? No gentleman is ever looked

* "Guardian," No. 174.
† "Journal to Stella," October 31st, 1710.
‡ "Tatler," No. 263.
§ "Journal," October 2d, 1710.
‖ "Tatler," No. 148.

upon the worse for killing a man in his own defence ; and if business cannot be carried on without it, what would you have a gentleman do ?"

The actual club life of London forms one of the most conspicuous features in the delineations of manners by the great essayists. Their fictitious clubs must have had a broad foundation in reality, to have been as welcome to their contemporaries as they unquestionably were, and to have had such an enduring vitality as they have so long enjoyed. We accept them as perfect representations of the mixed social intercourse of a period when the distinctions of classes were far less rigid than in later times. It was thus that in an age of strong political animosities, and of equally strong religious prejudices, a spirit of friendliness and mutual respect was preserved. There was a large class of non-combatants—the busy lawyer, the careful merchant, the idle man about town—who looked upon politics and polemics rather as a game which Whig and Tory statesmen, and high and low churchmen, and moderate and severe dissenters, were playing, than with much of the feeling of partisans. The clubs opened their arms to the gossipers. The clubs were carrying on the general spread of intelligence more effectually, perhaps, than books. They induced a comparison of thought with thought. The meagre facts of the journalist supplied the text upon which the club politicians argued. It was not an age in which men were indifferent to the great events that were passing around them. The poor and shabby upholsterer that Mr. Bickerstaff encounters in St. James's Park, who eagerly inquires about the King of Sweden, and who is anxious about the mysterious hints of the "Postboy," that a certain prince has been taking measures which time will bring to light, is undoubtedly a type of a large class who "deposed princes, settled the bounds of kingdoms, and balanced the powers of Europe." * The haberdasher at the coffee-house, who "has a levee of more undissembled friends and admirers than most of the courtiers and generals of Great Britain," is of the same genus. "Every man about him has, perhaps, a newspaper in his hand ; but none can pretend to guess what step will be taken in any court of Europe till Mr. Beaver has thrown down his pipe, and declares what measures the allies must enter into upon this new posture of affairs." † Such were the club-oracles of the humbler assemblies of the people, who left the nicer mysteries of state to the October club of the Tories and the Kit-cat club of the Whigs. Steele has delineated with exquisite humor the average club of "heavy honest men, with whom (he says) I have passed many hours with much indolence, though not with great pleasure." The conversation of the club at the Trumpet, in Shire Lane, "is a kind of preparation for sleep." Sir Jeoffrey Notch, a gentleman of an ancient family who has run out of a great estate, talks of hounds, horses, and cock-fighting. Major Matchlock discourses of battles, and "does not think any action in Europe worth talking of since the fight of Marston Moor." Honest old Dick Reptile says to his nephew, "Ay, ay, Jack, you young men think us fools, but we old men know you are." The bencher of the neighboring inn, the greatest wit of the company, has about ten distichs of Hudibras without book ; and when any town frolic is spoken of, "shakes his head at the dulness of the present age, and tells us a story of Jack Ogle." But even among such representatives of social life, who flourished in the reign of Anne, and will endure long after the reign of Victoria, their faculties are opened by conversation. The worthies of the Trumpet appeal to Mr. Bickerstaff for information as "the philosopher ;" and puzzled between the Old Style of England, and the New Style of other nations, Sir Jeoffrey, "upon a dispute what day of the month it was then in Holland, pulled his pipe out of his mouth and cried, 'What does the scholar say to it ?'" ‡

Gaming was the universal passion of the reign of Anne. In the first number of the "Tatler" it is said of Will's Coffee-house, "This place is very much altered since Mr. Dryden frequented it. Where you used to see songs, epigrams, and satires, in the hands of every one you met, you have now only a pack of cards." Into these places of public resort the lowest sharpers found their way ; and gentlemen were not ashamed to stake their money against the money of the most infamous of society. Steele carried on a persevering warfare against the gamesters, for which good service he was threatened with personal injury. Some military men of high rank stood up for him. When two swaggerers came into a coffee-house, and vowed they would cut Captain Steele's throat, Lord Forbes told them, "In this country you will find it easier to cut a purse than cut a throat," and the bullies were incontinently kicked out of the room. One of the reproaches against Steele by his political adversaries in the House of Commons was, that he had presumed to reflect on the manners of noblemen and gentlemen. In his published "Apology" there is a touch of covert satire highly amusing. "It would be a contradiction to all Mr. Steele's past writing to speak to the disadvantage of the nobility and gentry. The war that the 'Tatler' brought upon himself for stigmatizing and expelling sharpers out of their company, is a merit toward them that will outweigh this allegation. That gamesters, knaves, and pickpockets are no longer the men of fashion, or mingled with so good an air among them as formerly, is much owing to Mr. Steele." There never was a better illustration of the principle that vice levels all distinctions. The "people of quality" were not ashamed of their companions till the light of public opinion was let in upon them.

In looking at the general question of the amount of public enlightenment at this period, and indeed throughout the next quarter of a century, it is difficult to draw a line between the acquirements of "the common people" and those of "the persons of quality." The ignorant and dissipated of the upper classes were in no essentials different from the mass of the lower classes, except in their power of commanding a greater amount of vicious pleasures. The theatre, which was open to high and low, was scarcely yet redeemed from the licentiousness which came in with the restoration of the Stuarts. The licentious comedies were the delight of the side-boxes and of the galleries. The masquerade attracted the fair denizens of Arlington Street and of Drury Lane. The Bear Garden was equally the resort of the peer and the carman ; of the beau with his clouded cane and the porter with his knot. The genteel part of the company at the Bear Garden sat on high benches at half-a-crown a seat, while the rabble crowded and swore beneath them in their sixpenny standing-place. All ranks gathered to see "a trial of skill exhibited between two masters of the noble science of defence." The fights of the ring have been brutalizing enough ; but to behold two men cut at each other with broadswords, till one was disabled by severe wounds on the forehead and the leg, was a brutality that was at its height in the Augustan age. The "Spectator" describes the encounter between "James Miller, sergeant, lately come from the frontiers of Portugal," and "Timothy Buck of Clare Market ;" and he records that when the sergeant fell beneath the stroke of his more skilful antagonist, "his wound was exposed to the view of all who could delight in it, and sewed up on the stage." *

The small difference in the intelligence of very different ranks of society, in cases where they were led by traditionary opinions, as in popular superstitions, is very remarkable. High and low, of neglected education, had faith in omens. The belief in witchcraft in the eighteenth century is generally looked back upon as a superstition of the lowest part of the community. When Addison represents Sir Roger de Coverley as seriously puzzled about the true character of Moll White, the old woman "who had the reputation of a witch all over the country," we may be inclined to think that the humorist is a little hard upon the intellectual capacity of the country gentleman. When the knight and the spectator visit the old crone's hut, we can scarcely believe that a common delusion of the wealthier class is justly indicated, in Sir Roger's advice, as a justice of peace, to the poor creature, "to avoid all communication with the devil, and never to hurt any of her neighbor's cattle." Surely the writer must jest, when he says, "I have since found upon inquiry, that Sir Roger was several times staggered with the reports that had been brought him concerning this old woman, and would frequently have bound her over to the county sessions, had not his chaplain with much ado persuaded him to the contrary." † It was not always in those days that the chaplain was wiser than the justice of the peace. The statutes of Henry VIII. and of James I. against witchcraft and sorcery were in full force, and they were not repealed till the ninth year of George II. The superstition of Sir Roger was thus gently touched upon by Addison in July, 1711. In March, 1712, Jane Wen-

* "Tatler," No. 155. † "Spectator," No. 49.
‡ "Tatler," No. 132.

* "Tatler," No. 436. † "Spectator," No. 117.

ham, the witch of Walkerne, near Stevenage, was found guilty under the statute of James, and was condemned to die. The prosecutors of this unfortunate woman were not ignorant rustics—the constable or the overseer. One of them was the worshipful Sir Henry Chauncy, knight, the learned author of the "Historical Antiquities of Hertfordshire;" the other prosecutor was the reverend incumbent of Jane Wenham's parish. The judge, Powel, happily was a little in advance of his age. He reprieved the unhappy creature, very much to the scandal of the stupid jury and the learned prosecutors. That wise judge brought a cheerful nature to the discharge of his solemn duties. Swift passed a mirthful evening in his society at Harley's table, a few months before the Hertfordshire trial: "I went to lord treasurer, and among other company found a couple of judges with him. One of them, Judge Powel, an old fellow with gray hairs, was the merriest old gentleman I ever saw; spoke pleasant things, and laughed and chuckled till he cried again."* This was not the last conviction upon a charge of witchcraft. There is a "Relation" printed in London, that in 1716, Mrs. Hicks, and her daughter, aged nine years, were hanged at Huntingdon "for selling their souls to the devil; tormenting and destroying their neighbors by making them vomit pins; raising a storm so that a ship was almost lost, by pulling off her stockings, and making a lather of soap."† Though Judge Powel had the boldness to reprieve a convicted witch, in spite of the authority of Sir Matthew Hale, who left two poor wretches for execution in 1665, we may conclude, even from the language of the "Spectator," that it was not prudent to avow a disbelief in witchcraft. Addison manages his scepticism very adroitly: "When I consider the question, whether there are such persons in the world as those we call witches, my mind is divided between two opposite opinions; or rather, to speak my thoughts freely, I believe in general that there is, and has been, such a thing as witchcraft, but at the same time can give no credit to any particular instance of it."

That some of the most absurd superstitions and prejudices lasted through the eighteenth century can scarcely be matter of surprise, when we consider how entirely the instruction of the lower classes was neglected. It was neglected upon principle. It was not Squire Booby or Parson Trulliber only who believed that to educate the bulk of the people was to destroy the distinctions of rank. Great writers held the same opinion. Swift, discoursing of the wisdom of the institutions of Lilliput, says, "The cottagers and laborers keep their children at home, their business being only to till and cultivate the earth, and therefore their education is of little consequence to the public." We fear that it was somewhat of a melancholy period for the cottagers and laborers—unable to instruct or divert themselves with reading; the old sports very nearly extinct; wakes and Whitsun-ales kicked out by the Puritans, never to revive. The manly sport of our days that, in a limited degree, makes the young yeoman the associate on the village-green with the best bowler, was scarcely known even in the South of England. In one of D'Urfey's songs at the beginning of the century, "Shenkin," is celebrated as "the prettiest fellow at foot-ball or at cricket." No earlier notice of the game could be traced by the indefatigable Strutt. We fear that Hodge, in "the lovely bowers of innocence and ease" of the real English "Auburn," was too often "a-drinking at the Chequers." The old love of music of the peasant and the mechanic had yielded to the Puritanical tyranny, and had not revived in the bawling monotony of parochial psalmody. Musical taste and skill had died out for the bulk of the people. In Italy, writes Steele, a cobbler may be heard working to an opera tune; and "there is not a laborer or handicraftman that, in the cool of the evening, does not relieve himself with solos and sonatas." But, "on the contrary, our honest countrymen have so little inclination to music that they seldom begin to sing until they are drunk."‡ Sir John Hawkins has described, with some spirit, the musical entertainments which were offered to the middle classes at this period. The landlords of public-houses hired performers, and hither came very unrefined audiences, to drink and to smoke. This historian of music has described such an orchestra: "Half a dozen of fiddlers would scrape 'Sellenger's Round,' or 'John come kiss me,' or 'Old Simon the king,' with divisions, till themselves and their audience were tired; after which, as many players on the hautboy, would, in the most harsh and dissonant tones, grate forth 'Green Sleeves,' 'Yellow Stockings,' 'Gillian of Croydon,' or some such common dance tune, and the people thought it fair music."* Yet Purcell had lived among these harmonists. The fashionable world patronized foreign compositions and foreign performances. "Our English music is quite rooted out, and nothing yet planted in its stead," complains Addison. Nevertheless the old musical taste was not wholly rooted out. Before the palmy days of the "Academy of Ancient Concerts," established in 1710, there had been a signal example of what a man in humble life could do for the revival of that love of good music which had been sleeping for a century. Over his coal-shed in Clerkenwell, Thomas Britton, who literally carried a sack, assembled the best amateurs and professional musicians; and to his concert-loft, ascended by ladder-stairs from the exterior, came the high-born to listen, while the honest man exulted to have Handel sitting at the harpsichord, while he himself touched the viol-de-gamba. The humble tradesman was also a collector of rare books, and was as well known to Hearne, the antiquary, as to Pepusch, the doctor of music. Hughes, a poet, justly placed by Swift "among the Mediocribus, in prose as well as verse," has eight lines, "Under the Print of Tom Britton, the Musical Small-Coal Man," which thus conclude:

"Let useless pomp behold, and blush to find
So low a station, such a liberal mind."

* "Journal to Stella," July 5th, 1711. We are indebted to John Paget, Esq., the author of a valuable Inquiry into the Charges against Penn, for pointing out to us this case of the witch of Walkerne.
† Brand's "Popular Antiquities," by Ellis, vol. iii. p. 17, ed. 1842.
‡ "Tatler," No. 222.

* Hawkins, "History of Music."
† "Biographia Literaria," vol. i. p. 58. ‡ Ibid., p. 60.

CHAPTER CXLV.

Intellectual activity in every department of knowledge—A reading public—Poetical translations of classical authors—Pope's Homer—The popular element shown in the attacks of the wits upon some pursuits of learning—Battle of the books—Pope's ridicule of Dennis—Martinus Scriblerus—Small poets—The Dunciad—Commentators—Public schools—Universities—Travelling—Entomologists and florists—The abuses of knowledge only deserving the poet's ridicule—The popular element in the mental philosophy of the age—Locke—Character of Swift's genius—Tale of a Tub—Gulliver's Travels—Robinson Crusoe—Defoe.

However low, by comparison with modern times, might be the state of popular enlightenment in the reign of Anne, and in the reigns of the two first sovereigns of the house of Brunswick, the amount of intellectual activity in every department of knowledge was very remarkable. In literature there was evidently forming what Coleridge laughs at—"a reading public." He has well described the process of the change from books for the few to books for the many: "In times of old, books were as religious oracles; as literature advanced, they next became venerable preceptors; they then descended to the rank of instructive friends; and, as their number increased, they sank still lower to that of entertaining companions."† They were approaching this latter state in the early part of the eighteenth century. Again, Coleridge says: "Poets and philosophers, rendered diffident by their very number, addressed themselves to 'learned readers;' then aimed to conciliate the graces of 'the candid reader;' till, the critic still rising as the author sank, the amateurs of literature were erected into a municipality of judges, and addressed as 'the town.'"‡ Yet, whatever evils might result, or be supposed to result, in the comparative discouragement of the higher branches of learning by this enlargement of the circle of knowledge, the immediate consequence was to produce a very marked adaptation of the quality of literature to the wants of the purchasers in an extended market. We doubt very much if the quality were lowered, except in the opinion of some who thought that the "Pierian spring" was not to be tasted except by those who drank deep.

One of the most signal proofs of the extension of reading is furnished by the number of poetical translations of classical authors. Dryden had translated Juvenal and Virgil, just before the end of the seventeenth century. Creech had published his translation of Lucre-

tius in the same period, and had obtained the praise of Dryden. In 1715 Pope issued his first volume of Homer's "Iliad." It was then that Addison, in the true spirit of a scholar who desired no exclusive possession of the riches of knowledge, thus wrote: "When I consider myself as a British freeholder, I am in a particular manner pleased with the labors of those who have improved our language with the translation of old Latin and Greek authors, and by that means let us into the knowledge of what passed in the famous governments of Greece and Rome. We have already most of their historians in our own tongue: and what is still more for the honor of our language, it has been taught to express with elegance the greatest of their poets in each nation. The illiterate among our countrymen may learn to judge from Dryden's 'Virgil' of the most perfect epic performance: and those parts of Homer which have already been published by Mr. Pope give us reason to think that the 'Iliad' will appear in English with as little disadvantage to that immortal poem."* This generous praise was bestowed after there had been a difference between Pope and Addison as to Tickell's rival attempt at a version of Homer. In the same paper of the "Freeholder," it was stated that the translation of Lucan's "Pharsalia" "is now in the hands of Mr. Rowe, who has already given the world some admirable specimens of it." Between 1715 and 1725 Pope completed the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey." Never was literary labor in those times more abundantly recompensed. Pope received nearly nine thousand pounds from his subscribers and from his publisher, as his clear gain from these undertakings. The subscribers to his guinea volumes in quarto were the great and the wealthy. It was no humiliation to the poet to have much larger sums sent him than the price of his books, by the court and by some of his noble friends. But the bookseller would not have furnished all the subscription copies at his own expense, besides paying a large sum for the copyright, had there not been "a reading public." Homer was printed in duodecimo; and Bernard Lintot, we may hope, was paid in more substantial coin than Pope's gratitude for his liberality.

The controversial and sarcastic spirit in which Swift, Pope, Arbuthnot, and some lesser humorists and wits dealt with matters of literature and learning, of art and science, displays the popular element that had become a characteristic of authorship. Until the subjects upon which ridicule is exercised come to be somewhat known and talked about, the ridicule is pointless. But a very superficial acquaintance with the higher objects of knowledge and taste would enable the reader of the "Battle of the Books," of the "Memoirs of Scriblerus," of the "Dunciad," of Gulliver in Laputa, to laugh at the whole tribe of grammarians, virtuosi, critics, projectors. Pope told Spence that "the design of the "Memoirs of Scriblerus" was to have ridiculed all the false tastes in learning, under the character of a man of capacity enough, that had dipped into every art and science, but injudiciously in each. It was begun by a club of the greatest wits of the age."† This sort of ridicule went on for forty years, till "the greatest wits of the age" were all silenced by the greater "antic," who might say, "Where be your gibes now?" But the gibes are still read, while the matters which gave birth to the gibes are well-nigh forgotten. Few care for the controversy between Bentley and Boyle, about the comparative merits of the ancients and moderns, and the authenticity of the "Epistles of Phalaris." The critical student may have read with wonder the "Dissertation" in which Bentley demolished his antagonist with unbounded learning and irresistible logic. The popular reader cares nothing for the quarrel, except to laugh over the comic satire of Swift in the "Battle of the Books." The ancient and the modern volumes have been fighting in St. James's Library, when "the day being far spent, and the numerous forces of the moderns half-inclining to a retreat, there issued forth from a squadron of their heavy-armed foot a captain whose name was Bentley, the most deformed of all the moderns." Scaliger encounters Bentley, and thus assails him: "The malignity of thy temper perverteth nature; thy learning makes thee more barbarous; thy study of humanity more inhuman; thy converse among poets more grovelling, miry, and dull." This is sheer abuse; and if all were such, no one would now turn to the "Battle of the Books." But there are passages of exquisite force and humor, such as the dialogue between the spider and the bee; and of inimitable burlesque, such as the mortal fight in which Boyle slays Bentley and his ally Wotton:

"So Wotton fled, so Boyle pursued. But Wotton, heavy-armed, and slow of foot, began to slack his course, when his lover Bentley appeared, returning laden with the spoils of the two sleepy ancients. Boyle observed him well, and, soon discovering the helmet and shield of Phalaris his friend, both which he had lately with his own hands new polished and gilt, rage sparkled in his eyes, and, leaving the pursuit after Wotton, he furiously rushed on against this new approacher. Fain would he be revenged on both; but both now fled different ways; and, as a woman in a little house that gets a painful livelihood by spinning, if chance her geese be scattered o'er the common, she courses round the plain from side to side, compelling here and there the stragglers to the flock; they cackle loud, and flutter o'er the champaign; so Boyle pursued, so fled this pair of friends: finding at length their flight was vain, they bravely joined, and drew themselves in phalanx. First Bentley threw a spear with all his force, hoping to pierce the enemy's breast: but Pallas came unseen, and in the air took off the point and clapped on one of lead, which, after a dead bang against the enemy's shield, fell blunted to the ground. Then Boyle, observing well his time, took up a lance of wondrous length and sharpness; and, as this pair of friends, compacted, stood close side to side, he wheeled him to the right, and, with unusual force, darted the weapon. Bentley saw his fate approach, and, flanking down his arms close to his sides, hoping to save his body, in went the point, passing through arm and side, nor stopped or spent its force till it had also pierced the valiant Wotton, who, going to sustain his dying friend, shared his fate. As when a skilful cook has trussed a brace of woodcocks, he with iron skewers pierces the tender sides of both, their legs and wings close pinioned to the ribs; so was this pair of friends transfixed, till down they fell, joined in their lives, joined in their deaths: so closely joined that Charon would mistake them both for one, and waft them over Styx for half his fare. Farewell, beloved, loving pair; few equals have you left behind; and happy and immortal shall you be, if all my wit and eloquence can make you."

"The Battle of the Books" was published in 1704. There was a much younger genius at that time writing Pastorals, who listened to the noise of the fray, and perhaps panted for his own day of strife and victory. In 1711 Pope published his "Essay on Criticism." Calm, sensible, modest, as became an author of twenty-two, the poet went out of his way to attack the jealous and suspicious old John Dennis, who laid down laws to the company at Button's, among which he had sate in his more prosperous days as the intimate of Dryden and Congreve. Dennis was furious at his portrait—

> "Appius reddens at each word you speak,
> And stares tremendous, with a threatening eye,
> Like some fierce tyrant in old tapestry."

Addison, who had not yet come under the lash of the "fierce tyrant," gently rebuked the controversial spirit which Pope first displayed in this poem. In the "Spectator," the "Art of Criticism" is generously praised; but Addison, having said "in our own country a man seldom sets up for a poet without attacking the reputation of all his brothers in the art," adds, "I am sorry to find that an author, who is very justly esteemed among the best judges, has admitted some strokes of this nature into a very fine poem—I mean the Art of Criticism, which was published some months since, and is a masterpiece in its kind."* The systematic depreciation, not only of the reputation of "brothers in the art," but of the studies and pursuits in which they took no especial interest themselves, forms a large portion of the writings of Pope and Swift. Gay and Arbuthnot joined heartily in the fun. The wit and the invective, however amusing and occasionally just, present too often only the ridiculous characteristics of useful and honorable labors, and the one-sided view of men not wholly deserving of contempt.

Pope, in his talk with Spence upon the "Memoirs of Scriblerus," says, "The adventure of the shield was designed against Dr. Woodward and the antiquaries." Who has not laughed in reading that "adventure of the shield"? It presents the ludicrous side of studies of which we now know the full value, but of which the popular readers of the time of Arbuthnot could only see the ridiculous aspect. Dr. Cornelius could prove from "the color of the rust the exact chronology of the shield." The scullion "had scoured it as her hand-irons," and the rust was vanished. Laugh we must when the learned doctor cries out, "Where are all those beautiful obscurities, the cause of much delightful disputation, where doubt and un-

* "Freeholder," No. 40. † "Anecdotes," p. 8.

* "Spectator," No. 253.

certainty went hand in hand and eternally exercised the speculations of the learned?" The gossips who had come to the christening of the infant who was brought into the great antiquary's study upon the shield, exclaim "'Tis nothing but a paltry old sconce, with the nozzle broken off." Exquisite banter! Woodward, in 1707, had published "An Account of Roman Urns and other antiquities lately dug up near Bishopgate." There were few, perhaps, who would take much interest in the fact, that under the stones on which they daily trod there was a tesselated pavement; there were urns of Roman pottery; relics of unfading interest to those who could carry their minds beyond the material objects, to think of the wondrous changes of civilized life during fourteen centuries. The satire against the antiquary has not damaged such studies as he pursued with real advantage to learning; nor has it damaged his character as the philosopher who founded the professorship of geology at Cambridge. Woodward stands upon his own substantial merits; and though advancing knowledge may have disturbed some of his theories, he is entitled to reverence as one of the zealous and disinterested workers in the vast fields of science then lying waste.

"Middling poets," said Pope to Spence, "are no poets at all. There is always a great number of such in each age, that are almost totally forgotten in the next. A few curious inquirers may know that there were such men, and that they wrote such and such things; but to the world they are as if they had never been." * Pope has embalmed these dead of his own age. We admire his curious art, as we admire the mummy-cases of the Egyptians; but it is not worth while to unroll the mummies. In a paper written, it is believed, by Pope himself, under the name of Savage, it is said that after various falsehoods and scurrilities against him, he thought "he had now some opportunity of doing good;" and hoped, "by manifesting the dulness of those who had only malice to recommend them, either the booksellers would not find their account in employing them, or the men themselves, when discovered, want courage to proceed in so unlawful an occupation. This it was that gave birth to the 'Dunciad,' and he thought it an happiness that, by the late flood of slander on himself, he had acquired such a peculiar right to their names as was necessary to this design." † Johnson has assigned a higher motive to Pope than the miserable desire for revenge, which is thus acknowledged by himself or avowed by his authority. The talk was of Pope: Johnson said, "He wrote his 'Dunciad' for fame. That was his primary motive. Had it not been for that, the dunces might have railed against him till they were weary, without his troubling himself about them. He delighted to vex them, no doubt; but he had more delight in seeing how well he could vex them." ‡ In a previous conversation which turned upon Pope, Johnson "repeated to us, in his forcible melodious manner, the concluding lines of the 'Dunciad.' While he was talking loudly in praise of these lines, one of the company ventured to say, 'Too fine for such a poem, a poem on what?' 'Why, on Dunces. It was worth while being a dunce then. Ah, sir, hadst thou lived in those days!'" § These "concluding lines" are indeed noble lines; which Pope himself admired "so much that when he repeated them his voice faltered." The whole fourth book of the 'Dunciad' is a grand satire upon many of the remarkable characteristics of the poet's age. It was completed in 1742. Warburton was by the side of Pope when he produced what he called "The New Duncíad," in which the additional book was accompanied by the previous ones recast. The alterations were not judicious. The addition was a proof that the fruit of the sound mind in the feeble body had lost no particle of its spring-time pungency in its autumnal ripeness. With far higher objects than that of damaging authors who had wounded his self-love, Pope in this wonderful poem put forth all his power. We may bestow some care upon its examination; for, perhaps, more than anything he has written, the satirist here paints in the boldest style, and with the most durable as well as brilliant colors, the abuses, as he conceives, of literature, of learning, of science. We may pass over the mere temporary and personal satire of the three first books, then also worked up into their present form, with Theobald deposed from the throne of dulness, and King Cibber installed in his place. Those portions will always be read by the few, in spite of their capricious injustice, and, what is worse, of their miserable grossness. The fourth book, with a little of the same personality, and of the same indelicacy of which it may be readily cleared, may be read by all, as the most magnificent satire in our language.

The heroic games of the goddess Dulness are over. The rival booksellers, Curll, Lintot, and Tonson, have run their race. The authors have dived

> "Where Fleet-ditch, with disemboguing streams,
> Rolls the large tribute of dead dogs to Thames."

Hoadly and Blackmore have read the assembly to sleep. King Cibber has been carried to the Elysian shades. The future reign of universal ignorance is foretold:

> "Proceed, great days, till learning fly the shore."

The prophecy is about to be accomplished. The goddess is "coming in her majesty, to destroy order and science, and to substitute the kingdom of the dull upon earth."

> "Beneath her footstool Science groans in chains,
> And Wit dreads exile, penalties and pains."

"In tenfold bonds the muses lie." The act for subjecting plays to a licenser, which Walpole had managed to pass, had thus made "Thalia nerveless, cold, and dead." Walpole perhaps had saved Thalia from her own degradation. Opera comes to supplant comedy.

> "When lo! a harlot form soft sliding by
> With mincing step, small voice, and languid eye:
> Foreign her air, her robe's discordant pride
> In patchwork fluttering, and her head aside;
> By singing peers upheld on either hand
> She tripp'd and laugh'd, too pretty much to stand."

Opera "cast on the prostrate Nine a scornful look," and she drove Handel, with her rival oratorio, "to the Hibernian shore." Fame blows her trumpet, and a "vast involuntary throng" crowd round the throne of the goddess. There come the

> "Patrons, who sneak from living worth to dead."

The commentators come. Dulness, smiling, exclaims,

> "Let standard authors, thus, like trophies borne,
> Appear more glorious, as more hack'd and torn;
> And you my critics in the chequer'd shade
> Admire new light through holes yourself have made."

Alderman Benson is there, noted for the monuments he put up to departed genius, with his own name and titles pompously recorded in the inscription upon one tomb:

> "On two unequal crutches propp'd he came;
> Milton's on this, on that one Jonson's name."

The vanity of the age of Anne is less offensive than the cold neglect of the age of Victoria, in which it was fruitlessly tried to raise a monument to Caxton. The spectre of the Public Schools appears, with his "beaver'd brow" and his "birchen garland." He would speak in humbler tones now, but the time is not long passed since he thus might have spoken:

> "Since man from beast by words is known,
> Words are man's province, words we teach alone.
> When Reason doubtful, like the Samian letter,
> Points him two ways, the narrower is the better.
> Plac'd at the door of Learning, youth to guide,
> We never suffer it to stand too wide.
> To ask, to guess, to know, as they commence,
> As fancy opens the quick springs of sense,
> We ply the memory, we load the brain,
> Bind rebel Wit, and double chain on chain,
> Confine the thought, to exercise the breath;
> And keep them in the pale of words till death.
> Whate'er the talents, or howe'er design'd,
> We hang one jingling padlock on the mind;
> A poet the first day, he dips his quill;
> And what the last? a very poet still.
> Pity! the charm works only in our wall,
> Lost, lost too soon in yonder house or hall."

Aristarchus comes to represent the universities. Aristarchus, the Bentley of the "Battle of the Books." For a century the ruling powers of Oxford and Cambridge stood up against the terrible satire which their representative thus enunciates:

> "Ah, think not, mistress! more true Dulness lies
> In Folly's cap than Wisdom's grave disguise.
> Like buoys, that never sink into the flood,
> On Learning's surface we but lie and nod.

* "Anecdotes," p. 150.
† Quoted in Mr. Carruthers' "Life of Pope," p. 198.
‡ Boswell, one-volume edition, p. 442. § Ibid., p. 203.

* * * * * *

For thee we dim the eyes and stuff the head
With all such reading as was never read :
For thee explain a thing till all men doubt it,
And write about it, goddess, and about it :
So spins the silkworm small its slender store,
And labors, till it clouds itself all o'er.
What though we let some better sort of fool,
Thread ev'ry science, run through every school !
Never by tumbler through the hoops was shown
Such skill in passing all, and touching none.
He may indeed (if sober all this time)
Plague with dispute, or persecute with rhyme.
We only furnish what he cannot use,
Or wed to what he must divorce, a muse :
Full in the midst of Euclid dip at once,
And petrify a genius to a dunce :
Or set on metaphysic ground to prance,
Show all his paces, not a step advance.
With the same cement, ever sure to bind,
We bring to one dead level every mind :
Then take him to develop if you can,
And hew the block off, and get out the man."

The "man" formed in the seats of learning then comes with his "laced governor from France," who thus addresses the goddess :

"Through school and college, thy kind cloud o'ercast,
Safe and unseen the young Æneas past :
Thus bursting glorious, all at once let down,
Stunn'd with his giddy larum half the town.
Intrepid then, o'er seas and lands he flew :
Europe he saw, and Europe saw him too.
There all thy gifts and graces we display,
Thou, only thou, directing all our way :
To where the Seine, obsequious as she runs,
Pours at great Bourbon's feet her silken sons ;
Or Tiber, now no longer Roman, rolls,
Vain of Italian arts, Italian souls :
To happy convents, bosom'd deep in vines,
Where slumber abbots, purple as their wines :
To isles of fragrance, lily-silvered vales,
Diffusing languor in the panting gales :
To lands of singing or of dancing slaves,
Love-whispering woods, and lute-resounding waves.
But chief her shrine where naked Venus keeps,
And Cupids ride the lion of the deeps,
Where eas'd of fleets, the Adriatic main
Wafts the smooth eunuch and enamor'd swain.
Led by my hand he saunter'd Europe round,
And gather'd every vice on Christian ground."

Never was nobler poetry. With slight difference of times and manners, never was more enduring satire.

The pedants make room for the collectors of coins and curiosities ; and these are succeeded by entomologists and florists :

"A tribe, with weeds and shells fantastic crown'd,
Each with some wondrous gift approach'd the power,
A nest, a toad, a fungus, or a flower."

The goddess expresses her anxiety that such studies should be pursued in the manner in which they have been, and possibly still are, worse than useless :

"Oh ! would the sons of men once think their eyes
And reason given them but to study flies !
See Nature in some partial narrow shape,
And let the author of the whole escape ;
Learn, but to trifle ; or, who most observe,
To wonder at their Maker, not to serve."

It was the "partial narrow shape" which in the infancy of scientific investigation led men to be mere collectors and classifiers. The broad views of great general laws, which connect together the whole natural world, have slowly been formed upon those employments which the poet derides as frivolous. It is not only the dull that "may waken to a humming-bird," find "congenial matter in the cockle-kind," or "wander in a wilderness of moss," but the acutest intellect may be led to the highest generalizations by the study of a mollusk. In the same way it is simply the abuse of learning when the pedant says,

"On words is still our whole debate,
Dispute of *me* or *te*, of *aut* or *ut*."

But in such debate were laid the foundations of accurate scholarship ; and even in "the pale of words" of the public schools did boys learn to do some one thing well, and thereby to discipline the mind to a comprehension of many things. Perhaps in our day some satirist may arise to proclaim the evils of a totally opposite system, with reference to the general enlightenment of much larger masses of society. He may deride a system of competitive examination which embraces the whole circle of knowledge, and thus may produce in all, and not only in the "better sort of fool," the skill of the tumbler jumping through the hoops—passing every science and touching none. It is this sciolism, he may say, which will tend to the same results as the poet has described in him

"Whose pious hope aspires to see the day
When moral evidence shall quite decay."

The solitary freethinker addresses the goddess in words which may be echoed by a conceited multitude :

"Let others creep by timid steps and slow,
On plain experience lay foundations low ;
By common-sense to common knowledge bred,
And, last to Nature's cause through Nature led :
All-seeing in thy mists, we want no guide,
Mother of arrogance, and source of pride."

There is nothing more characteristic of the eminent writers of the earlier part of the eighteenth century than the persistent way in which they addressed themselves to the popular understanding. Even the prevailing mental philosophy had little in it that was abstruse or recondite. In rejecting the doctrine of innate ideas, and making the senses the origin of knowledge, Locke had to derive his illustrations and proofs from the commonest facts. His language is perfectly simple and familiar. He assumes that there is no mystery in the complex operations of the human mind ; and resting our ideas upon experience, he develops a system upon which all men may follow him to his conclusions. Metaphysics have assumed a very different aspect ; and far more subtle views have made the study of metaphysics at once more difficult and more interesting. The same tendency to take the obvious and popular arguments for the evidences of the truths of natural and revealed religion, and to rest the exhortations of the Christian preacher upon that foundation of reason upon which the lay moralist relies, is to be traced in the theological writings of the same period. The theology and the philosophy were equally cold and passionless, equally narrow and incomplete. But they were adapted to their age ; and they were not without their beneficial influence in preparing the way for something higher and nobler—something more expansive than the belief that there is nothing mysterious in the mind of man, in the laws which govern the universe, or in the doctrines upon which faith must take its hold. These are matters which are beyond our province to dilate upon. The same principle, which really consisted in presenting only one portion of a subject in the most palpable form, influenced the lighter writings of that age. It equally pervades the poetry of Pope and the prose satire of Swift. The principle was founded upon an accurate estimate of what the robust English understanding would accept at this period of its development. It assumed that a great deal had been forgotten and that a great deal was unnecessary to be learned, in theology, in philosophy, in poetry. There was a crowd pressing forward to be instructed, to be pleased, to be amused. A broad and smooth road was to be made for their progress ; the old ascents were to be levelled, the dangerous fords were to be bridged over.

The genius of Swift was calculated, more than the genius of any of his great contemporaries, to make the half-truths which he presented to the popular mind have the semblance of containing the whole truth. His wondrous logical power, his lucid manner of dealing with a few details as if they comprehended the entire subject, his sarcasm which looks like candor—these qualities concealed the unscrupulous partisanship which is at the bottom of all his political writings. "To lie like truth" was the art by which he made Marlborough hated, and destroyed the fruits of Marlborough's victories in the peace of Utrecht. By the same power he made the Irish believe that they were ruined by a beneficial project to give the nation a copper currency, instead of the tallies with which the smaller exchanges were often conducted. The masterpieces of literature upon which Swift's fame must ever rest, go with the same directness to the popular comprehension. The humor, so profound, is also so obvious. The irony, so subtle, is also so unmistakable. Every one of common education who reads the "Tale of a Tub" can understand it without a key. The whole scheme of the book is to reduce the gravest questions which have agitated the world to something like burlesque. But it is not burlesque. Underlying the mockery there are stern realities which set men thinking. His wit, it is said, lost Swift a

bishopric; but he had his consolations. In his latter years he looked some time upon his first great work, and then, shutting the book, exclaimed, "Good God! what a genius I had when I wrote that!" A genius indeed; but how fatal a possession! What miseries of disappointed ambition, and then what horrors of crushing misanthropy it brought with it!

The circumstantiality with which Swift always invests his ludicrous inventions, is preserved, without the least slip, throughout the "Tale of a Tub." The history of the three brothers, Peter, Martin, and Jack—the representatives of popery, the Anglican Church, and Calvinism—is introduced with a grave anachronism, which mystifies the reader, and takes him from the days of Leo X., Luther, and Calvin, into the town life of the days when Jonathan Swift awed and delighted the club at Button's. We give the passage, with slight omissions, not only as an illustration of the author's peculiar talent, but as an addition to the pictures of social life which the more gentle humorists have sketched.

"Being now arrived at the proper age for producing themselves, they came up to town, and fell in love with the ladies, but especially three, who about that time were in chief reputation; the Duchess d'Argent, Madame de Grands Titres, and the Countess d'Orgueil. On their first appearance our three adventurers met with a very bad reception; and soon with great sagacity guessing out the reason, they quickly began to improve in the good qualities of the town. They wrote, and rallied, and rhymed, and sung, and said, and said nothing; they drank, and fought, and slept, and swore, and took snuff; they went to new plays on the first night, haunted the chocolate-houses, beat the watch, and lay on bulks; they bilked hackney-coachmen and ran in debt with shopkeepers; they killed bailiffs, kicked fiddlers down stairs, eat at Locket's, loitered at Will's; they talked of the drawing-room, and never came there; dined with lords they never saw; whispered a duchess, and spoke never a word; exposed the scrawls of their laundress for billets-doux of quality; came over just from court, and were never seen in it; attended the levee *sub dio*; got a list of peers by heart in one company, and with great familiarity retailed them in another. Above all, they constantly attended those committees of senators who are silent in the house and loud in the coffee-house; where they nightly adjourn to chew the cud of politics, and are encompassed with a ring of disciples, who lie in wait to catch up their droppings. The three brothers had acquired forty other qualifications of the like stamp, too tedious to recount, and by consequence were justly reckoned the most accomplished persons in the town."

The power which Swift possessed of sustaining, whether in narrative or in argument, the most complete personation of the character he assumes, is one of his remarkable qualities. We all know that Mr. Samuel Gulliver, after his wonderful adventures, "growing weary of the concourse of curious people coming to him at his house at Redriff, made a small purchase of land, with a convenient house, near Newark;" and that he there composed his "Travels into several remote nations of the world," which were published in 1727. Arbuthnot wrote to Swift after this publication, "Lord Scarborough, who is no inventor of stories, told us that he fell in company with a master of a ship, who told him that he was very well acquainted with Gulliver, but that the printer had mistaken; that he lived in Wapping, and not in Rotherhithe." The "Drapier," who stirred the Irish to madness, is throughout his letters "a poor, ignorant shopkeeper," one who has "a pretty good shop of Irish stuffs and silks," and, instead of taking Mr. Wood's bad copper, intends to truck with his neighbors, butchers and bakers, goods for goods. Gulliver is never betrayed into any forgetfulness of his condition of life, and always has some minute circumstance at hand, to bring his marvellous relations within the range of probability. Arbuthnot also wrote to Swift, "I lent the book to an old gentleman, who went immediately to his map, to search for Lilliput." It is in this way that children read Gulliver's adventures with undoubting trust—happy if the melancholy exhibition of Swift's hate to his species be not comprehended by them. The time comes when the man understands the satire, and admires or loathes the satirist. But what vitality in some of the touches; what art, without the slightest exhibition of the artist! Take one example from the court of Lilliput:

"There is likewise another diversion, which is only shown before the emperor and empress and first minister, upon particular occasions. The emperor lays on the table three fine silken threads of six inches long; one is blue, the other red, and the other green. These threads are proposed as prizes for those persons whom the emperor has a mind to distinguish by a peculiar mark of his favor. The ceremony is performed in his majesty's great chamber of state, where the candidates are to undergo a trial of dexterity, very different from the former, and such as I have not observed the least resemblance of in any other country of the new or old world. The emperor holds a stick in his hands, both ends parallel to the horizon, while the candidates, advancing one by one, sometimes leap over the stick, sometimes creep under it, backward and forward, several times, according as the stick is advanced or depressed. Sometimes the emperor holds one end of the stick, and his first minister the other; sometimes the minister has it entirely to himself. Whoever performs his part with most agility, and holds out the longest in leaping and creeping, is rewarded with the blue-colored silk; the red is given to the next, and the green to the third, which they all wear girt twice round about the middle; and you see few great persons about this court who are not adorned with one of these girdles."

It is no derogation from the merit of Swift that he might have learned the secret of personation from one who had gone before him. In 1719 a book was published which thus commences: "I was born in the year 1632, in the city of York, of a good family, though not of that county, my father being a foreigner of Bremen, who settled first at Hull. He got a good estate by merchandise, and leaving off his trade, lived afterward at York, from whence he had married my mother, whose relatives were named Robinson, a very good family in that county, and from whom I was called Robinson Kreutznaer; but, by the usual corruption of words in England, we are now called, nay we call ourselves, and write our name, Crusoe." World-famous name! The author of that book had, in as high a degree as Swift, the power which Mr. Hallam ascribes to Bunyan—the power of representation. "He saw and makes us see what he describes."

In his private conversation Pope indirectly confessed to the gross injustice he had committed in "The Dunciad," in speaking contemptuously of one whose fame will endure as long as his own: "The first part of Robinson Crusoe is very good. Defoe wrote a vast many things, and none bad, though none excellent, except this. There is something good in all he has written." * Of the "vast many things," all of which contain "something good," there are works of fiction which are as striking as Robinson Crusoe, although in their reality—in their naked delineations of actual life, but always with the view to make vice hideous—they can scarcely be recommended for general perusal. Defoe's ruling principle in his broad pictures of the manners of the highest and the lowest ranks is thus stated by him in the preface to his "Life of Colonel Jack:" "The various turns of his fortune, in different scenes of life, make a delightful field for the reader to wander in; a garden where he may gather wholesome and medicinal fruits, none noxious or poisonous; where he will see virtue and the ways of wisdom everywhere applauded, honored, encouraged, and rewarded; vice and extravagance attended with sorrow and every kind of infelicity; and at last, sin and shame going together, the offender meeting with reproach and contempt, and the crimes with detestation and punishment." This was the principle upon which Hogarth also worked. But as Hogarth's prints cannot all be hung up in a modern drawing-room, so Defoe's novels of familiar life are not for universal reading—however journalism may now expatiate o'er scenes where fiction dare not tread.

CHAPTER CXLVI.

View of the state of the arts from the Revolution of 1688 to the accession of the house of Brunswick—Architecture—Wren—Rebuilding of London—St. Paul's—Wren's parish churches—Wren's miscellaneous buildings—Vanbrugh—Character as an architect—Hawksmoor and Gibbs—Burlington—Sculpture—Gibbons—Cibber—Roubiliac—Painting—Portrait Painting in England—Kneller—Jervas—Verrio and Laguerre—Thornhill—Other painters—Hogarth.

During the period which has passed under review in the preceding chapters of this volume, the arts were, with one exception, in a very depressed condition. For a brief space it had seemed as though art would have taken firm root in this country: it was now a sickly exotic. Charles I., although his taste and influence in art matters may perhaps have been overrated, did undoubtedly labor strenuously during his troubled reign to add to the splendor of his court by the liberal patronage of art and artists. Partly it may have been done in

* Spence's "Anecdotes," p. 196.

rivalry, partly in imitation of the monarch who then sat on the throne of France. But whatever was the cause the effect was the same. He attracted to his court either as visitors or residents some of the most famous painters of the day; he obtained at a cost his necessities could ill afford * a collection of paintings far surpassing anything of the kind which this country had hitherto seen; and, though the evil times on which he had fallen prevented him from carrying his purpose into execution, we know that he sought to unite in one splendid metropolitan palace the utmost attainable magnificence of the combined arts of the architect and the painter. His example found eager imitators among his courtiers. Nobles and wealthy commoners were no longer content as of old, with portraits of themselves, their wives, and their elder sons, but began to compare the merits of Titian and Velasquez, of Raffaelle and Honthorst, of Rubens and Snyders and Vandyck; and to seek for a work by some cunning hand of Italy, Spain, or the Netherlands to decorate their town house or country mansion. The Duke of Buckingham and the Earl of Arundel were at the head of the courtly connoisseurs. They dispatched agents to Italy and the East to seek for works of merit; and, urged on by the rival ministers, our envoys at Madrid, Venice, Constantinople, and the Hague were almost as much occupied in negotiating for pictures and statues as in affairs of state.

The passion for art penetrated probably but little downward. Among the higher classes it was a mere fashion. By the Puritans the taste of the king for religious paintings was regarded as idolatrous: his classic pictures offended their notions of propriety. The civil war broke up the royal and many private collections. Cromwell indeed saved the royal pictures from being utterly dispersed, and the stately galleries of several of the older nobility yet contain many works purchased for them in the reign of Charles. But the influence was not abiding. Cromwell had little leisure, probably little inclination, to attend to pictures and statues. The period of the commonwealth was not one in which private individuals would venture to indulge the taste if they possessed it, still less to simulate a taste they did not feel. With the restoration came a season of lax morals and thoughtless self-indulgent habits, inimical to everything pure and elevating in art, but favorable to the voluptuous and meretricious artist. Verrio and Laguerre grew rich, as their sensual deities and profane virtues sprawled over the ceilings and staircases of the palaces of the king and the nobility; and Lely found ample employment for his pencil in depicting the sleepy-eyed "beauties" of the royal court and harem.

Painting and sculpture were at a low ebb when William and Mary ascended the throne of England. Kneller had succeeded to Lely as the fashionable portrait painter, and he reigned without a rival. Cibber and Gibbons practised as sculptors; but their chisels were almost confined to carving in wood the internal, in stone the external, decorations of buildings. Walpole says of William, "This prince like most of those in our annals contributed nothing to the advancement of the arts." And he adds that "Mary seems to have had little more propensity to the arts than the king." † William was not a man to waste time on what he would consider trifling pursuits, when serious affairs both at home and abroad called for the utmost exercise of his time, thought, and energy. But if he cared little for the other arts, he did not neglect architecture; and so long as William lived Wren had not to complain of ingratitude or neglect. William and Mary did, however, in a certain careless way, patronize painters. They gave employment, as their immediate predecessors had done, to painters of portraiture and of allegory; the one probably because they could understand and enjoy it, the other because it was the mode. The king, we need not doubt, took more genuine delight in superintending the laying out of the grounds of Hampton Court in the Dutch taste than in examining pictures, but he caused a gallery to be erected in his favorite palace for the reception of the marvellous cartoons of Raffaelle, while he decorated the walls of the other apartments of that pleasant residence with Dutch fruit and flower-pieces and scenes of Dutch life. But if William contributed little to the advancement of the arts, his immediate successors contributed even less: and art such as it was in England in the period under notice may be said to have been kept alive rather in defiance than by favor of that royal countenance which on the continent was regarded as the very breath of its nostrils.

Science in its objective development had at this time reached a higher point than it had ever before attained in England; and the one branch of art in which England excelled was, as might have been anticipated, that which is dependent upon science for its very existence. But it was the genius of one extraordinary man, called out by the greatness of the occasion, which re-created English architecture, and made it the sublime thing it became in his hands. Between Inigo Jones and Wren there was no architect worthy to be so called in England. And indeed Wren was the first Englishman who for centuries could put in a claim that could not be gainsayed to the title of architect, as, later, Hogarth was the first to prove that an Englishman might become a great painter. These two men are in fact the connecting links of the art of this period, with that of the preceding and of the following periods: and they mainly save this period of English art-history from being strictly a history of art in England, and not also of English art.

Wren was already a man of mature age, ripe intellect, and of scientific acquirements, unusual in extent and variety even in that age of remarkable scientific men, when he turned to the study of architecture: and it may be that it was owing to this, that in his hands architecture became a living reality and not a thing of rule and system. The son of Dean Wren, and the nephew of the well-known bishop of that name, he received every advantage of education, and every opportunity which social position and family influence could afford. Yet it is little short of marvellous to read of him when a mere boy, as not only skilled in mathematics, but the inventor of various astronomical, gnomonic, and pneumatic instruments; as being looked upon as a prodigy at Oxford, where he had entered as a commoner when only fourteen; as having secured a European celebrity at two-and-twenty; as being the next year appointed Gresham professor, and two or three years later called to the Savilian chair in his own university. At what time he commenced the study of architecture is not known.* From his having been appointed assistant-surveyor-general in 1661, it has been conjectured that his architectural talents must have been recognized then. But this is by no means certain. The surveyor-general was Sir John Denham, the poet, and a knowledge of architecture was certainly no part of his qualification for the office. Wren was made his assistant with a view to becoming his successor. The situation may have been obtained as a motive and a means for retaining in London the brilliant young man of science who was found to be equally ready at drawing up, for the royal signature, the preamble of the newly founded Royal Society, organizing the new institution, and preparing papers and projects, constructing machines, and devising experiments which would give *éclat* to its meetings; and if such a thing were suggested to the king, who took very unusual interest in the prosperity of the infant society, there can be little doubt that he would willingly give Wren the place without inquiring very strictly into his special fitness for it. Be that as it may, the place was in his hands no sinecure. His first important undertaking in connection with it was the restoration of the old church of St. Paul's, which had been left in a ruinous condition since its desecration by Cromwell's soldiers. It had already lost its Gothic character by the erection of Inigo Jones's great Corinthian portico at the west end; and Wren would have entirely remodelled it by constructing a grand central cupola which he thought would

* Some curious particulars illustrating the difficulties experienced by Charles in raising money for the full payment of his commissions and purchases will be found in Mr. Sainsbury's admirably edited "Original Papers relating to Rubens" (8vo. 1859). It was more than two years after Rubens had finished his paintings for the ceiling of Whitehall before Charles was able to pay the last 500*l.* of the 3000*l.* which Rubens was to receive for them—though Gerbier, the king's agent at Brussels, writes urgent letters to the king himself, as well as to his ministers, stating how "Spaniards, French, and other nations talk" of the royal pictures lying there "as if for want of money." But the royal jewels were also at this time lying "at pawn there," and the parties who had advanced their money on them were threatening the envoy "by public notary" that if they were not redeemed by a certain day "they would put the jewels up to real and public sale for their satisfaction." (Sainsbury, p. 185, and note.) Even more trouble was experienced and caused by the king's inability to provide the purchase money for the famous Mantuan collection. (Ibid., Appendix H.)

† "Anecdotes of Painting," vol. ii. p. 585, Wornum's ed.

* See Stephen Wren's "Parentalia;" and the "Life of Wren," by Elmes.

be "of present use for auditory, make all the external repairs perfect, become an ornament to his majesty's most excellent reign, to the Church, and to this great city." But he was not to construct his grand central dome *yet*. At the outset, as at every future step of his architectural career, he had to encounter stubborn prejudice and stupidity. "You will not forget," said the excellent Evelyn many years later, "the struggle we had with some who were for patching it up anyhow, so the steeple might stand instead of new building; when, to put an end to the contest, five days after, that dreadful conflagration happened, out of whose ashes this phœnix is, and was by providence designed for you." *

Before the conflagration Wren had happily prepared himself for the mighty labor of repairing its ravages. He had satisfied himself as to the principles of architecture, and familiarized himself as far as possible with the practice. One of the most valuable glimpses we have into his mode of study is in a letter written by him in 1665 from Paris, whither he had gone to examine the vast works at the Louvre, then in course of erection. "The Louvre," he says, "for a while was my daily object, where no less than a thousand hands are constantly employed in the works; some laying mighty foundations; some in raising the stones, columns, entablements with vast stones, by great and useful engines; others in carving, inlaying of marbles, plastering, painting, gilding; which altogether make it a school of architecture the best probably in Europe."† And he, we may say, was certainly the best scholar in it. He would have given his skin, he writes, for Bernini's plan of the Louvre, "but the old reserved Italian gave me but a few minutes' view of it. . . . I had only time to copy it in in my fancy and memory." But other plans and buildings he is able to copy as well as to survey, so that he says, "I shall bring you almost all France upon paper." He might perhaps have done better, as Walpole said, and as has often been said after him, if he had gone on to Italy instead of remaining in France. French "filgrand works and little knacks," as he calls them, did somewhat pertinaciously cleave to his memory and corrupt the purity of his taste; but he left France with a conviction which he emphatically expressed, and which he never after suffered to escape from him, that architecture ought not be swayed like language and dresses by new fashions, but that "building certainly ought to have the attribute of eternal"—an attribute which his buildings certainly possess.

The fire of London was what gave him his grand opportunity, and imparted the strongest and most permanent impulse to his genius. How he was prepared to grapple with the mighty task of reconstructing a great city and how his purpose was foiled, has already been sufficiently told. That he was fully alive to the necessity for great lines of thoroughfare, the value of large central openings, and ready access by broad cross-streets between every part of the city, and of spacious quays along the Thames; and that he could contrive a comprehensive scheme, which, while it would meet the actual requirements of the city, was sufficiently flexible to adapt itself to an ever-increasing commerce, his plan is abundant proof.‡ He would have concentrated the great commercial buildings, such as the Royal Exchange, the Post Office, Excise Office, etc., together in the heart of the city, with the main streets radiating from them; have placed St. Paul's at the division of two main-trunk streets, and nearly where it now stands, so that its lofty dome might form the crown of the capital from whatever side it was approached; but then he would have left a large vacant space before its western front, that its grand proportions might have made themselves fully seen on entering the city from the court end of town, and have built Doctors' Commons behind it, so as to prevent its being encroached on by mean houses; the churches he proposed to erect in conspicuous spots and at nearly equal distances; his main streets were to have been ninety feet wide, and none of the inferior streets less than thirty, while three spacious piazzas would have imparted an air of dignity and finish to their general aspect. That the importance of giving to the city a nobler architectural character had long before impressed itself on his mind, was shown in his report on the state of old St. Paul's, where he speaks of "this great city" as the "most unadorned of her bigness in the world."

The first stone of his master-work, St. Paul's, was not laid till nine years after the fire. At first the authorities were anxious to make the old church last a little longer, but that was decided by its falling about their ears. Then the design he prepared for the new edifice was not approved—the great opponent to it being, as is understood, the Duke of York, afterward James II. Wren had designed a Protestant cathedral. The duke was bent on having one in which the ceremonies of the Romish Church might be performed with unstinted splendor.* Wren was obliged to give way; but his first design was that which he always regarded as the best. The large model which he prepared of it may be seen in the South Kensington Museum. The building would have been surmounted like the present one with a lofty dome. But in the earlier design the architect proposed to assemble the congregation on ordinary occasions in the grand central area under the dome, as has in the present pile been only done in the recent exceptional evening services. There can be little doubt that the first design would have given a simpler, grander, and more original interior. It may be doubted whether the exterior would have been so impressive. The dome, noble as it would have been, was less majestic, and there were no features corresponding to the beautiful western campanile towers, or that would have compensated for their absence. Wren would have preferred his original design, but he did his best to make that on the plan he was forced to adopt the worthiest he possibly could. And, despite all the objections that minute criticism has urged against it, he succeeded in erecting one of the very noblest piles which man has raised for the glory of his Maker.

The work which he commenced in 1675 he steadily prosecuted in the face of opposition and contumely for five-and-thirty years, when, in 1710, he had the happiness to see the last stone laid by his eldest son Christopher: a rare happiness for the architect of so great a work, and one that has secured to London the almost unparalleled fortune of having a cathedral of the grandest class, in which perfect unity of design is maintained throughout, as it only could have been by the architect superintending the work from its commencement to its completion, and as is not always secured even then.

By common consent St. Paul's is placed in the very first rank of the architectural works of modern times. Classic purists and mediæval ecclesiologists alike take exception to its style and details. We may at once admit that its ornamentation is not unexceptionable; that objections may fairly be taken to its style. But making the largest admissions, we cannot but feel that it remains, in grandeur of mass and picturesqueness of outline, alone almost among works of its class: a stately, imposing, seen under some circumstances of position and season, even a sublime temple. Many of the faults which are pointed out in the design there can be no doubt Wren was as cognizant of as his critics; many others that are commonly felt there can be little doubt were forced on him against his earnest protests. Of the plan we have spoken. One of the objections most commonly urged against the design is the coupling of the columns in the west front, and the raising of one order over another. But, as is shown in the Parentalia, Wren had at least well considered the matter. He thought a lofty front necessary to give dignity to the building; but stones of a size equal to those of the ancient porticos being unattainable, he considered that a single order of some ninety feet would have presented an appearance of instability, and that the necessary appearance of strength for a double order could only be obtained by coupling columns of a less diameter; while this would have the advantage, by giving wider openings, of rendering obvious the entrances, a thing not required in an ancient temple. He may have been wrong, but he has at least the merit of erring as the consequence of carefully thinking out his problem—which is better than being correct by the simple rule of copying. So, on the other hand, the balustrade and the vases at the sides, which more than anything else serve to take off from the true magnitude of the pile, were only adopted by him on compulsion; his letter to the commissioners being extant† in which he denounces their resolution to set up a balustrade in the strongest terms, as one that could only have been made by per-

* "Architects and Architecture," Dedication to Wren. Evelyn was a joint commissioner with Wren in the survey of old St. Paul's.
† "Parentalia," p. 262.
‡ See his statement of his intentions, *ante*, vol. iv. p. 547.

* "Spence's Anecdotes," p. 256, ed. Singer.
† Elmes' "Life of Wren."

sons ignorant of the principles of architecture. "Statues erected on the four pediments only, will," he says, "be a most proper, noble, and sufficient ornament to the whole fabric;" though he knows that "ladies think nothing well without an edging." This letter, it is noteworthy, was written in 1717, after the building was virtually finished. The "ladies," however, had their way, and the edging was tacked on. The cold naked look of the interior is an objection raised by every visitor; but it ought to be remembered that Wren designed the interior to be adorned with mosaics, and was in treaty with professors of the art in Italy for their execution. The authorities, however, disallowed them, and had in their place the inside of the dome covered with paintings by Sir James Thornhill—worthless in themselves, and the painted imitations of columns, vases, and other architectural features between which, have the further effect of seriously interfering with the curves of the noble vault, and marring its simple majesty.

Next in artistic importance to St. Paul's rank the churches with which Wren adorned the city. These, instead of placing in the most prominent positions, he was compelled to put often in the most out-of-the-way streets and lanes, where the buildings themselves were in many instances concealed by shops and warehouses. Hence he directed his chief attention to the interiors and the spires. And here he showed himself to be a great original artist. Italian ecclesiastical architects had to a great extent adhered to the Roman basilica form. The wonderful Gothic builders of Northern Europe had almost invariably adopted that of the Latin cross. In our own country, with a few exceptions, such as the round churches of the Templars, churches of any size or importance were cruciform. Inigo Jones had, however, in the church of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, for the first time imitated a Grecian temple. Wren as far as he was allowed cast aside precedent, and constructed his churches with the primary purpose of enabling the congregation to see and hear the clergyman. "The Romanists," he said, "built large churches; it was enough if they heard the murmur of the mass, and saw the elevation of the host; but ours are to be fitted for auditories." He has not wholly succeeded perhaps even in this respect, but he succeeded better than most later architects. The interiors of his churches are indeed generally admired by those who are not wedded to particular precedents, and think originality in ecclesiastical architecture a cardinal sin. Of his church interiors, that of St. Stephen's, Walbrook, with its happy arrangement of columns, is the most general favorite, and if it were not that there is something more of solemnity wanting it would be most admirable. The auditory of this church he has covered with a cupola, so he has that of some others. Some he has made oval in plan, and covered with an elliptic cupola (as in St. Benetfink); others, like St. Mary's Abchurch, are square, and covered with a circular dome; several are modelled on the Basilica; none have the form of the Latin cross.*

If the interiors of his churches were designed for service, the towers were as certainly designed for effect. Mr. Cockerell, in his admirable "Tribute to Sir Christopher Wren," has with the greatest care and judgment brought these remarkable examples of our great architect's genius together so that they may be readily compared with each other. But properly to appreciate them they must be studied in their actual positions; and then it will be seen not only how picturesque in form they almost without exception are, but how happily they are adapted to their respective places; while every one who looks over the city so as to see several of them grouped together will acknowledge the charm which their variety affords. Although whenever he directly imitated Gothic architecture he failed utterly—as in the towers he added to Westminster Abbey—these city steeples are a sufficient proof that Wren worked in the true Gothic spirit.

We have dwelt thus long on Wren, and especially on his churches, because he is not only our first great English architect, but because he lived through the entire period of which we have to speak, and his churches are what are most characteristic of him and of his age. They are works not unimpeachable in an artistic point of view, but they are the works of a man of original thought, works of great constructional excellence, works illustrating an age of immense scientific knowledge and independent thought: in their way Wren and his cathedral are as characteristic of the age as are Newton and his Principia.

Had Wren not built either St. Paul's or his parish churches he would yet have been a great architect, though they throw all his other works into the shade. Some of his other works are indeed of no great mark. The monument is not the commonplace thing it has been represented to be, but it has not much of the originality of the monument he originally designed. Marlborough House and his additions to Hampton Court say little for his skill as a builder of palaces; he was more successful in his additions to the palace at Greenwich—now Greenwich Hospital—and in Chelsea Hospital, a work well adapted to its purpose and site. His other more important buildings were: in London, the Royal Exchange, Custom House, both long since destroyed, Temple Bar, and the College of Physicians, now a meat-market; the Sheldonian Theatre, Ashmolean Museum, Queen's College Chapel, and Gateway at Christ's Church College, Oxford; the library and other buildings at Trinity College, and the Chapel of Emanuel College, Cambridge; the Observatory, Greenwich; and the unfinished palace of Charles II. at Winchester. Wren held the office of surveyor-general from the reign of Charles II. to that of George I., when he was displaced to make way for a wretched creature named Benson, only remembered by his discreditable association with the name of Wren, the still more discreditable cause of his early ejection from the office into which he had been so unworthily inducted, and the place Pope has assigned him in the Dunciad. Wren, now in his eighty-sixth year, retired from public life and spent the brief remainder of his days, says his son, "in contemplation and study, and principally in the consolation of the Holy Scriptures: cheerful in solitude and as well pleased to die in the shade as in the light." He had held the office of surveyor for five-and-forty years: his pay as architect of St. Paul's was £200 a year; as architect of all the city churches, £100. He died at the ripe age of ninety; and his countrymen gave him a fitting burial-place, under the choir (it ought to have been under the glorious dome) of his own St. Paul's, and an epitaph worthy of the man and the place.

What Wren did for ecclesiastical, Vanbrugh did, though in a lesser measure, for English palatial architecture. Like Wren, Vanbrugh did not adopt the profession of an architect till long after he had gained celebrity in a very different line. But while a profound acquaintance with mathematics and mechanics might seem a solid basis for constructional architecture, there was little promise that a writer of licentious comedies could at the age of five or six and thirty turn with success to the practice of a profession usually considered to require a laborious course of preparatory study. Vanbrugh's first, and in some respects his finest work, was the extensive palace of the Earl of Carlisle, Castle Howard, a work that at once stamped him as a man of originality of conception, and unquestionable constructive ability. From this time he found no lack of employment, but all his commissions were for works of a similar character: he is not known to have erected a single public building, with the exception (if that can be called an exception) of a theatre in the Haymarket, which he built as a speculation of his own, and in which Congreve was his partner and Betterton his stage-manager. His chief work is Blenheim, of which he was appointed architect by the government, but in the execution of which he met with a long succession of vexations—first from the difficulty of obtaining supplies of money with sufficient regularity to carry on the work, and then, after the death of Marlborough, from the impetuous duchess, who took the building out of his hands, and though she continued it according to his designs, would not pay him his salary, or permit him (or even his wife) to enter the grounds to see the outside of the structure he had designed. Among other of his last works may be named King's Weston, near Bristol; Grimsthorpe, Yorkshire, a very striking structure; Eastbury, Dorsetshire, now pulled down; Oulton Hall, Cheshire, and Seaton Delaval, Northumberland. Vanbrugh had to endure not only the censures of pompous dulness, but the keen shafts of the wits of his day, and perhaps even now his name is most commonly associated with one or other of their pungent epigrams. It cannot be denied that his works abound in incongruities, that the massiveness is often excessive, that the parts are too much broken up, that in aiming at picturesque variety he has produced a fritter of

* See "Plans, Elevations, and Sections of the Parochial Churches of Sir Christopher Wren, erected in the cities of London and Westminster," by John Clayton, fol. 1848.

ill-connected parts: yet about them all there is richness, imagination, originality, and power. Condemned by Swift, Pope, and Walpole, it became fashionable to sneer at Vanbrugh, till Reynolds, with the cordial fellow-feeling of genius, saw that Vanbrugh had struck into a new path, and produced what may be called a pictorial style of architecture, and feeling so at once turned the current of popular opinion by boldly expressing his own. And after all that has been said of Vanbrugh, Reynolds' is the truest appreciation of the external character of his buildings: of their interiors we fear so much could scarcely be said with justice, unless it be of the halls, which are always with him a magnificent feature. Reynolds says: "To speak of Vanbrugh in the language of a painter, he had originality of invention, he understood light and shadow, and had great skill in composition. To support his principal object he produced his second and third groups or masses: he perfectly understood in his art what is the most difficult in ours, the conduct of the background, by which the design and invention is set off to the greatest advantage. What the background is in painting, in architecture is the real ground on which the building is erected; and no architect took greater care than he that his work should not appear crude and hard: that is, it did not abruptly start out of the ground without expectation or preparation. This is a tribute which a painter owes to an architect who composed like a painter, and was defrauded of the due reward of his merit by the wits of his time, who did not understand the principles of composition in poetry better than he, and who knew little or nothing, of what he understood perfectly, the general ruling principles of architecture and painting." *

In church architecture Wren was succeeded by his pupil Hawksmoor, and by Gibbs, for the exercise of whose talents a favorable opportunity was afforded by the act of Anne, which provided for the erection of fifty new churches in London, though not nearly so many were built. Hawksmoor was a man of considerable original talent, but having been engaged to assist Vanbrugh in the erection of Castle Howard and some of his other works, he engrafted some of his new master's fancies upon the more masculine style of his original instructor. His best work is generally considered to be St. Mary's Woolnoth, Lombard Street, which has great merit both in the interior and exterior; but to our thinking Limehouse Church deserves at least to divide the crown with it. St. George's, Bloomsbury, also by him, has a portico of fine proportions; but though it has found defenders in our own day, the pyramidal steeple with its crowning statue is a huge absurdity. The chief work of Gibbs is the church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, the portico of which has acquired much fame. But Gibbs, like Hawksmoor, failed to learn from Wren how to design, or where to place a tower and spire. Every one of Wren's towers rises directly from the ground, and has the lower part of a massive character. In this church of St. Martin's the spire rises behind the portico, and seemingly out of the roof. Lower in the scale of merit are the churches of St. George's, Hanover Square, St. Luke's, Old Street, with an obelisk for a spire, and Greenwich, the works of John James, a man of some reputation in his day; that "chef d'œuvre of absurdity," as Walpole well designates it, St. John the Evangelist, Westminster, looking, as has often been said, with its four turrets at the angles, like a table with its legs in the air—of which Thomas Archer was the architect, and St. Giles's-in-the-Fields, and St. Olave's, Southwark, by Flitcroft. The accession of the house of Brunswick inaugurated an epoch of ecclesiastical architecture as dreary as that of William had been glorious. And in secular architecture there was not much greater promise. The best works were Chatsworth, by Talman—a very different place to the Chatsworth of our own day, but still a work of considerable merit; Woburn Abbey, by Flitcroft; and Montague House (the old British Museum), for the erection of which M. Pouget was expressly imported from France.

An evidence of the interest taken in architecture was the existence of amateur architects who erected buildings little inferior to those of their professional contemporaries. At the head of these was Dean Aldrich—the author of the famous Oxford Logic—who not only wrote a work on the "Elements of Civil Architecture," but carried his own precepts into practice by erecting from his own designs the church of All Saints, Oxford, and the building at Christ Church, known as Peckwater. The well-known library of Christ Church was the work of another amateur, Dr. Clarke, who represented Oxford in parliament in the reign of Queen Anne. But the most celebrated of these amateur architects was Lord Burlington, the great patron, if not the founder, of that new school which ripened under the Georges, and which looked up to Palladio as its head. Burlington was an ardent admirer of Inigo Jones, but acquired his knowledge of architecture and formed his taste in Italy—Palladio being the master whom he took for his model. On his return to England he devoted himself to the task of making Palladio known to his countrymen, whose taste he fancied had been corrupted by the splendid irregularities of Wren and Vanbrugh, the latter of whom he joined the wits in ridiculing. Burlington not only published the designs of Palladio, but, as illustrations of his manner, constructed the villa at Chiswick, in our own day the favorite residence of the Duke of Devonshire, and Burlington House in Piccadilly, now in the occupation of the Royal Society. The villa at Chiswick was a copy on a reduced scale of the Villa Capsa, while Burlington House was modelled on the Vitricarti Palace, both at Vicenza, and both by Palladio. Lord Burlington also erected a house for Lord Harrington at Petersham, one for the Duke of Richmond at Whitehall, another for General Wade in Cork Street, and the Assembly Rooms at York. All were greatly admired in their day, and all have a certain air of elegance; but they are wanting in the picturesqueness and vigor of those of Vanbrugh, and as it would seem wanting also in their convenience. What is good about them is borrowed. Burlington had no originality, and, despite the praises of Pope, no genius; and his influence and example did much to introduce that systematic imitativeness which for so long pressed heavily on English architecture. Burlington's assistant and disciple was Kent, "painter, sculptor, architect," as he delighted to style himself, and who in painting, sculpture, and architecture, displayed equal want of taste. Kent, however, will be remembered as a landscape gardener, in which art he, with Pope, set the example of a return to a simpler and more natural style.

Sculpture in the reign of William was the handmaid of architecture. In the decorations of St. Paul's, Wren was able to avail himself of the best talent in the country. The wook carvings of the interior were executed by Grinling Gibbons, the phœnix over the south door was by Cibber, and the conversion of St. Paul in the tympanum of the western portico, by Francis Bird.

Gibbons is believed to have been an Englishman by birth, though of Dutch parentage. He was first brought into notice by Evelyn, who, having discovered him by accident in a mean lodging, introduced him to Charles II., and to other lowlier but more liberal patrons. He executed a few statues, among others that of James II. behind the Banqueting House, Whitehall; but his great skill lay in carving birds, flowers, plants, etc., in wood, in which he still remains unequalled. The chief works of this kind executed by him are those in the choir of St. Paul's; those at Chatsworth, in which, however, he was largely assisted by others, and especially by a Derbyshire man named Watson, who possessed rare dexterity as a carver, but of whose power in designing we have no evidence; and those at Petworth, where the marvellous skill of Gibbons in this line of art is seen to most advantage. But, after all, Gibbons was rather a mechanic of matchless ability than an artist—a copyist of what he saw, and in no sense a creator.

Cibber was a native of Holstein. Having studied at Rome he came to England to seek his fortune. For a while he was employed as an assistant by John Stone, a carver of architectural work. On the death of his master Cibber set up on his own account. Although undoubtedly a man of original power, he does not seem to have ventured much beyond the line of business of his predecessor Stone. For some years he was engaged in fabricating gods, goddesses, and Roman emperors, for the house and grounds at Chatsworth. One of the two large vases at Hampton Court, and the bas-reliefs on the London Monument, are also from his chisel. So also were several of the statues in the Royal Exchange. But the work on which his fame rests are the statues of Melancholy and Raving Madness, which stood over the gateway of Old Bedlam, and which may now be seen in the South Kensington Museum; but which have suffered too much by recarving and painting to admit of their original character being fairly estimated.

* Thirteenth Discourse.

Wren's other chief assistant in the sculptures of St. Paul's, Francis Bird, was an Englishman, but studied at Brussels under Cozins. His principal work is the rilievo of the conversion of St. Paul—not one of the worst sculptural ornaments in the tympanum of a London portico; his also are the well-known statues of Queen Anne in St. Paul's churchyard, Henry VI. at Eton, and Wolsey at Christ Church. A better work than either of these, perhaps, is the monument to Dr. Busby in Westminster Abbey: the huge mass of marble erected in the same place to the memory of the Duke of Newcastle is a joint production of Bird and Gibbs. The statues on Temple Bar are the work of John Bushnell. There were other sculptors, both British and foreign, practising in England at this time, but they are now mere names, and were never anything better than carvers in stone.

A truer artist, but later in date, was Scheemakers, a Dutchman, to whom we are indebted for the admirable bust of Dryden in Westminster Abbey, and some other good busts in private collections, as well as for many worthless monuments. With his name may be associated that of another foreign sculptor, John Michael Rysbrack, who for some time was the most fashionable sculptor in this country. Like Scheemakers he was a skilful hand at a portrait-bust, and consequently found ample patronage. But he had also much skill in carving the monuments then in vogue—as may be seen in that prodigious work by him in the chapel at Blenheim, in memory of the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough. He also executed several very respectable portrait-statues.

Rysback and Scheemakers were supplanted in the popular favor by Louis François Roubiliac, a Frenchman, who for many years enjoyed unquestioned supremacy as a sculptor in this country, and whose influence was traceable in English sculpture long after Englishmen had risen to eminence in the profession. The work which brought Roubiliac into celebrity was the monument of John, Duke of Argyle, in Westminster Abbey, of its kind one of the finest monuments in that building. Westminster Abbey contains many other monuments by him, that in memory of Admiral Warren being perhaps the best, but that to Mr. and Mrs. Nightingale the most celebrated. In this, Death in the form of a skeleton is casting a dart at the lady whose husband is endeavoring to shield her from the blow. A less poetic conception it would be hard to find, but similar prosaic conceits disfigure almost all Roubiliac's more ambitious works, and destroy the pleasure which the design of many of the figures and the execution of all would otherwise produce. Roubiliac's real power is most shown, however, in his portrait statues, where he had little opportunity for the exhibition of extravagances like these, but which he too often placed in affected attitudes, and enveloped in drapery which is deficient in everything resembling sculpturesque simplicity and repose. The statues by which he is best known are those of Newton in Trinity College, Cambridge—a work of a very high order, by far the finest he ever produced, and surpassed by few of later date—Handel in Westminster Abbey, and Shakespeare in the Hall of the British Museum. Roubiliac was an imitator of Bernini, and a constructor of allegories in marble, and to his example and authority it is that we are indebted for no small portion of the monumental absurdities which disfigure our two great metropolitan and most of our provincial cathedrals.

We turn now to painting. Whatever might be the state of the arts in other respects, England had not for several generations been without portrait painters of distinguished ability. Henry VIII. employed Holbein; Mary patronized Antony More; Elizabeth, Zucchero and De Heere. Under James flourished Mytens and Vansomer; and about this time Mirevelt, Hilliard, and the elder Oliver found employment for their pencils. Vandyck was the court painter to Charles I., but he found in an Englishman, Dobson, no unworthy rival. The features of Cromwell and the commonwealth chiefs were preserved to us by the manly pencil of our countryman Walker. Under the restoration, as we have seen, Lely was the royal favorite; and his successor, Sir Godfrey Kneller, had risen into distinction when William ascended the throne.

Kneller, a German by birth, was fortunate in the country he chose for his abode, and fortunate in the time of choosing it. He learned painting under Rembrandt and Ferdinand Bol, but he had afterward studied in Rome and practised in Venice. He came to England while Lely was at the height of his celebrity, but he was patronized by the Duke of Monmouth, and granted a sitting by Charles II., and he soon found that England was a profitable field of labor. He lived till far in the reign of George I., but no change of sovereign or of dynasty produced any change in his fortune. Walpole thinks that "had he lived in a country where his merit had been rewarded according to the worth of his productions, instead of the number, he might have shone in the roll of the greatest masters."* This may well be doubted. There was something beyond his cupidity which would have prevented that; and we certainly need not regret that of all the sovereigns who sat to him,† "not one of them discovered that he was fit for more than preserving their likeness." For most painters it would have been abundant honor to have had such sitters. Kneller was not only fortunate as the painter of so many sovereigns, but even more fortunate as reckoning among his sitters an array of names illustrious in the annals of England, such as perhaps no other painter can boast, and such as would have caused the canvases of a far less worthy painter to be carefully cherished: Marlborough, Godolphin, Somers, Bentinck, Russell, Stanhope, Harley, among statesmen and soldiers; Newton, Wren, Locke, Dryden, Evelyn, Gibbons, Vanbrugh, Congreve, Pope, Atterbury, Steele, Addison, among men of science, art, and letters, are but a few of the more famous for whose likenesses we are chiefly indebted to him. Yet Kneller was far from being a good painter. The beauties of the court of William and Mary, which he painted by Mary's desire, in rivalry with Lely's Beauties of Charles II., show that when doing his best Kneller was but an indifferent painter of female loveliness. But another series of pictures produced in his later years, and when his hand was growing feeble, the "Kit-Cat" portraits,‡ evince equally with his famous head of Dryden, and several others named above, that he could paint a fine manly representation of a really intellectual countenance. In truth, Kneller was a shrewd man and a great lover of money. He saw that his fashionable customers cared little for the higher qualities of art so that he gave them smooth features and bright drapery. Portraits of this kind were easily painted, yet, even with the help of a staff of drapery painters, he found difficulty in meeting the demand for his productions. But he was a man of keen intellect, and fond of the society of intellectual men, and when he had to paint the head of one of that order, he set about it with a heartiness which insured a favorable result. His state portraits, therefore, are for the most part smooth, unmeaning, meretricious things; his portraits of eminent men have some of them great merit as works of art, while nearly all bear the stamp of unmistakable intellect.

Contemporary with Kneller during the early part of his career was an Englishman, John Riley, who was a portrait painter of very considerable ability, but he died young in 1691. The portrait painters who shared largest in the popular favor after Kneller at this time were, however, nearly all foreigners. Michael Dahl and John Closterman were, perhaps, the most conspicuous in England; Sir John Baptist Medina having been persuaded to settle in Scotland, where he painted nearly all the nobility of that country.

The rival during his later years, and the successor of Kneller as the fashionable portrait painter, was Charles Jervas, whose manner was founded on that of Kneller, but who possessed little of Kneller's knowledge of art or native ability. Pope has embalmed his memory in verses which must either be regarded as a remarkable illustration of the complacency of his muse in administering to the vanity of his friend, or of his want of judgment in painting. Along with Jervas flourished Jonathan Richardson, an amiable man, and a pleasing writer on art, but a very poor painter; his skill may be judged of by the portrait of Lord Chancellor Talbot in the National Portrait Gallery. Portrait painting has been steadily declining in England from the days of Vandyck, Dobson, and Walker. The corruption of the art was commenced by Lely, continued by Kneller, and carried on

* "Anecdotes of Painting," ii. p. 586.

† Walpole gives the list—Charles II., James II., and his Queen, William and Mary, Anne, George I., Louis XIV., Peter the Great, and the Emperor Charles VI.

‡ These portraits, forty in number, were painted for Jacob Tonson, the bookseller, who was secretary of the Kit-Cat Club. They now belong to Tonson's representative, Mr. W. R. Baker, of Bayfordbury, Herts.

with constantly accelerating force by Jervas, Richardson, and their compeers, till it was consummated by Hudson; by whose pupil, Reynolds, however, it was once more restored to all its ancient honor.

Turning to other branches of painting we have only to record the same process of decline. Charles I. invited Rubens to adorn the ceilings of the palaces of Whitehall and Greenwich with gorgeous allegories. Charles II. employed Verrio to cover those of Windsor with similar productions. But the Neapolitan had none of the genius which enabled the brilliant Fleming to fascinate the observer in spite of the coarseness of his forms and the extravagance of his inventions. The paintings of Rubens remain the delight of the connoisseur and the artist. The cold voluptuous allegories of Verrio have become a by-word and a laughing-stock. Yet his pencil was sought after for similar works as long as he could wield it, and through the reign of William he continued to cover the saloons of the nobility with his prodigious compositions. Laguerre exceeded him in folly, and rivalled him in coarseness. Thornhill, who followed in the same line, and in whom it came to an end, was of a colder temperament; but if his works are more decent, they are also more dull. The best of Laguerre's productions are at Blenheim; the best of Thornhill's on the dome of St. Paul's and the hall of Greenwich Hospital. Henry Cooke, who painted the choir of New College Chapel, deserves a word of praise in passing for not having quite ruined the cartoons of Raffaelle, which he was directed by William to repaint and restore. Other of these ceiling-painters were Antonio Pellegrini; Sebastian Ricci, a Venetian of real ability, who seemed inclined to make England his home, but left in dudgeon on Thornhill being appointed to paint St. Paul's; and his nephew, Marco Ricci.

In other branches of painting we might mention as practising with success in this country, the names of the Vandeveldes, the famous sea-painters—the founders of a school which has never wanted followers; Hemskerk, patronized by William for his Dutch drinking pieces; Dirk Maas, the Dutch battle-painter; Godfrey Schalken, whose candle-light subjects are still eagerly purchased; Boit, the enamel painter; Monnoyer, the flower painter; Louis Cradock, who painted birds and animals; and many more of unquestionable ability. But it would be idle to dwell on them. The story would be merely a repetition of what has already been related. There was throughout a certain encouragement of painters, with little knowledge of painting. England possessed neither a school of painting, nor galleries of pictures, nor writers on art. There were no means of instruction for patrons or for students. The demand for pictures was supplied almost wholly by foreign painters of second-rate ability, who found here an amount of patronage they could not hope for in their native places. Art was almost necessarily therefore at the mercy of fashion. The leading connoisseur or the court painter set the mode, and all of inferior rank hastened to conform to it.

The true regenerator of painting in England was William Hogarth, the sturdy asserter of truth and matter of fact in painting. His merit as a satirist, a painter of manners, and a moralist have to be spoken of in another chapter. Even his contemporaries admitted his ability in these respects, though they hardly perhaps took the full measure of his genius. But Walpole only gave utterance to the common belief when he said that Hogarth was no painter. When Hogarth lived and Walpole wrote, the worship of the "Old Masters" of painting had seized hold of those whose talk was of pictures. Walpole meant that Hogarth did not imitate the composition, and copy the chiaroscuro, and borrow the colors, of the painters of the Netherlands or Italy. But though Hogarth looked out on nature for himself, and painted what he saw in the manner it appeared to his own eyes, he always placed his figures so that they would tell the story in the clearest way; drew them with skill; gave to them a truth and force of characteristic expression such as few painters of any other school ever equalled; arranged the light and shadow so as that every object should have just that measure of each which belonged to it, yet every figure and every part of the composition should hold its true place in respect of all the rest, and of the picture as a whole; colored truly and forcibly, and in harmony with the serious purpose of his pictures, although not in accordance with the traditions of painting-rooms and picture galleries; and finally in the manipulation showed an amount of dexterity in the handling of his tools such as many a painter, who is known only as a painter, might well have envied.

With the mention of Hogarth we close this sketch. He forms the link which unites this period with that in which the English school sprang into a sturdy existence, and therefore claimed notice here; but his proper place as a painter undoubtedly is at the head of the school of which he was the founder.

CHAPTER CXLVII.

Hogarth as the historian of manners in the transition-time between Anne and George III.—His art essentially dramatic—Society, in Hogarth's pictures, appears a sort of chaos—The life of the streets—The anarchy out-doors a type of the disorder in houses of public resort—Genteel debauchery—Low profligacy and crime—the cock-pit—The gaming-house—The prison—Bedlam—The rake's levee—The lady's public toilette—Marriage à-la-mode—The election prints—The sleeping congregation—Fanaticism.

When Defoe, in 1724, had given to the world three novels in which the incidents in the various fortunes of a low abandoned woman, of a more refined courtesan, and of a young thief, are related with a circumstantiality that is "like reading evidence in a court of justice," * there was an artist engraving shop-bills and silver plate for a livelihood, who was also looking with a curious eye upon the world around him. As he walked about London, all its strange exhibitions of pomp and misery—its habitual contrasts of velvet and rags—its eccentric characters, its grotesque faces—were to him materials for artistical study and for moral reflection. Did the genius of Hogarth take any direction from the genius of Defoe? Had he read "Moll Flanders," when he painted his first great fiction of the "Harlot's Progress"? Had he read "Colonel Jack" when he painted that never-to-be-forgotten figure in "Industry and Idleness" of the young blackguard who is gambling on a gravestone with Tom Idle—some such as Defoe described as "brutish, bloody, and cruel in his disposition; sharp as a street-bred boy must be, but ignorant and unteachable from a child." Charles Lamb said that Defoe's novels are "capital kitchen-reading, while they are worthy, from their interest, to find a shelf in the libraries of the wealthiest and the most learned." † Hogarth's first set of prints, in which he might originally have had the adornment of the kitchen-wall chiefly in view, became the subjects of fan-mounts, which ladies of quality displayed at the opera. The graphic representations of Hogarth have been truly termed "books." We look upon them as presenting the best materials for the history of manners in the transition time from Anne to George III. We regard Hogarth as the legitimate successor of Steele and Addison, as presenting a mirror of some portion of the higher and middle classes, and of Defoe in exploring the depths of ignorance and vice.

The works of Hogarth range over a period of nearly thirty years; from the days of Walpole and the Excise Law to the days of Wilkes and Liberty. He was the engraver as well as the painter of these representations, "which have the teeming, fruitful, suggestive meaning of words." He got small prices for his pictures. He made a fortune by his prints. Every one could read his prints; and his art went direct to the popular comprehension. His was essentially a dramatic art. But he was bound by no pedantic rules about the unities of time and place, in opposing which law of the critics Dr. Johnson was "almost frighted at his own temerity." On the other hand, he had an absolute reverence for that "poetical justice," the occasional absence of which in Shakespeare Johnson thinks a great demerit. With Hogarth, it is always vice punished, virtue rewarded. The limitations of his art might have something to do with this great object of Hogarth as a moralist. Defoe very considerably departed from such an overstrained view of the results of human conduct. Defoe does not, as a matter of course, hang the thief, and make the respectable apprentice lord mayor of London. His notion is that "the best and only good end of an impious, misspent life is repentance:" and so Colonel Jack, the pickpocket, becomes a decent member of society, and Moll Flanders ends as a respectable

* Charles Lamb, in a contribution to Wilson's "Life of Defoe."
† Essay on Hogarth, in "Reflector."

wife and mother after she is transported. Hogarth could not very well *paint* repentance, so as not to be mistaken for hypocrisy. In his pictorial stories we are taken through all the transitions of guilt and extravagance—to Bridewell, to the jail, to the madhouse, to the gallows. Society, in Hogarth's pictures, is a sort of chaos, in which filth jostles finery; grossness makes decorum blush; and drunken frenzy is well-nigh involving all things in a general conflagration, typified by the revellers at the "Rose" setting fire to the map of the world.

Many of the indications of this chaotic state of life in England may be worth a transient notice. Let us glance first at the out-door life—the life of the London streets. By day, as by night, disorder seems to reign. By day there is not the slightest appearance of authority to repress outrage or robbery, to enforce decency, or to save from accident. The brewer's carman falls asleep upon his shaft, and the child driving his hoop across the road is crushed under the wheels of the dray.* St. James's Street is crowded with sedan chairs bearing lords and ladies to Queen Caroline's drawing-room, while a group of shoeblacks, chimney-sweepers, and half-naked vagabonds are playing at cups and balls, dice, cards, and prick-in-the-garter, on the pavement.† In the city, close by the monument, the great thoroughfare to London Bridge is choked by a mob of butchers with marrow-bones and cleavers, of drummers and fiddlers, of beggars relieved with broken meat—all assembled to greet with their din the marriage of Mr. Francis Goodchild.‡ Before the window of the Enraged Musician in St. Martin's Lane, the blind hautboy player, the ballad-singer, the boy with the drum, and other gentry that the policeman now deem street nuisances, are undisturbed, while the irritable professor stops his ears and shrieks in vain. Before Covent Garden Church, on a snowy morning, market-women are warming themselves at a fire of sticks, and the quack doctor is holding forth to the crowd.§ When magistracy, even, puts on its grandest pomp and splendor in the lord mayor's show, the lumbering gilt coach is surrounded by a mob of whooping and fighting blackguards. By night, confusion is worse confounded. Bonfires blaze in the narrowest streets on occasions of public rejoicing. The Salisbury flying coach is overturned at Charing Cross, amid the crackling of tar-barrels and the hissing of squibs. Traitors' heads upon Temple Bar are lighted up by the fire beneath that burns Guy Faux. In their usual state the streets are dark. The cutpurse and the burglar roam about unmolested. The rake beats the watchman, and carries his staff and his lanthorn in triumph to the hideous revels at the night-house.‖ The "fiery fop," the "frolic drunkard,"

> "Lords of the street, and terrors of the way,"

insult every passenger; and no judicious magistrate fines the rich ruffian five pounds, as in our more decorous days.

The anarchy of the streets is but a type of the absence of all legal supervision and control in houses of public resort, and in places of amusement for high and low. One of Hogarth's early prints is "A Midnight Conversation." Twenty years after Steele and Addison had exhibited, under many forms, the club-life of London, Hogarth brings together a far less decorous set in tipsy jollity. They are not the drunkards of the pot-house. They are the noble Britons who, up to the end of the eighteenth century, thought it no disgrace to a gentleman to be led reeling home by the watchman, or to fall under the table, while roaring out the Bacchanalian songs which were the most precious gifts of the English muse. The president, who is concocting a fresh bowl of punch, is a rubicund divine, whose calling, according to the theory of that age, is as much denoted by the corkscrew hanging from his finger as by the band and cassock which he wears. The solemn listener next to him, with his band and his full-bottomed wig, is a barrister. Another distinguished personage of the company, judging by his laced cravat and his sword, is an undoubted gentleman, although he is so far gone in enjoyment that he sets fire to his ruffles instead of his pipe. The officer with the cockade breaks his head as he falls from his chair; and the apothecary, holding on to the table, pours brandy upon the bald pate. The justice has hung up his cocked hat and wig, and has made himself comfortable in his nightcap, sitting apart in resolute drinking. Maudlin drunkenness, ranting drunkenness, sleepy drunkenness, sprawling drunkenness, are given with inimitable minuteness of character and incident. This is genteel revelry. In the night cellar in Chick Lane, Smithfield, some of the low profligates are fighting in the background with chairs and pokers, while others are quietly smoking on. The thieves in the foreground are dividing their booty; their murdered man is thrust into a hole; the constable comes, not to disperse the whole gang of the Blood-bowl house, but to carry off Tom Idle to Newgate. He began his career by gambling in the churchyard; the beadle stands over him with a stick. He is sent to sea, and runs away from the round dozen. He comes home and becomes a thief; and the end is the last ride in a cart to Tyburn. Tyburnia is now otherwise occupied than in looking upon a procession of javelin men followed by a ragged and scrambling mob, while Tiddy-Doll sells his cakes, and but for the coffin in the cart the gathering has as merry an aspect as a country fair. This is the last step in the mad dance of low profligacy; and the great master of the ceremonies is the hangman, who sits astride upon the gallows, smoking his pipe.

What the bear-garden was in the time of Steele is the cockpit in the time of Hogarth. It is free for all men. The gambler by profession here sits by the side of the amateur in the blue ribbon, as welcome as in the ring at Epsom. The blind peer is betting with the blackguards around him, while the thief at his elbow is purloining the bank-note which my lord is prepared to stake. Another illustrious one, with a star on his breast, is jammed among the crowd; the carpenter, in his shirt-sleeves, presses on the noble shoulder, and thus disturbs the earnestness with which his lordship contemplates the two cocks at the crisis of the game.* In the fashionable gaming-house there is the same equality and happy fraternity. The rake, who has run through his inheritance, but is again master of riches by marriage with an ancient lady whom he will hate and ruin, is the central figure of the gaming-house. He has lost his money, in the frenzy of despair has torn his periwig from his head, and is invoking Heaven with curses. By the fire sits the highwayman, regardless even of the liquor he has ordered. He has no business in such company, for, according to the wise Mr. Peachum, "the man who proposes to get money by play should have the education of a fine gentleman, and be trained up to it from his youth." The company at the gaming-house are gentlemen for the most part in laced coats and ruffles. There is no want of money or credit. The usurer is lending his gold to one, and drawing his bill. Another fortunate gamester is sweeping off his stakes. All are absorbed in their joy or their rage, their hope or their despair; and the watchman who rushes in to bawl that the house is on fire can scarcely obtain a notice. The retribution must come, according to the Hogarthian doctrine, which cannot be impugned, though the moral is not always so palpable as the great painter makes it. The highwayman will be hanged, for he has lost the means of propitiating the thief-taker. The rake will go to the debtor's prison. The economy of the prison is regulated by those approved principles which subsisted for a century after Hogarth. The misery of the common-room leads to the madhouse. The terrible scenes of melancholy and laughing madness which Cibber personified in his statues are minutely displayed by Hogarth. Bedlam was an image of the external life which the painter has represented in so many aspects—the ludicrous side by side with the terrible—and the attempts to make the mad world sane were founded upon the same ignorance of moral health and disease as in the treatment of the lunatic by a general system of coercion.

Horace Walpole has remarked of Hogarth, "the very furniture of his rooms describe the characters to whom they belong. . . . The rake's levee-room, the nobleman's dining-room, the apartments of the husband and wife in marriage à-la-mode, the alderman's parlor, the poet's bedchamber, and many others, are the history of the manners of the age." This is true, as far as it goes. "It was reserved to Hogarth to write a scene of furniture." In the same way Hogarth is the great authority for costume. But dress and furniture are only a small part of the "history of the manners of the age." Let us look at the domestic life associated with these externals. The rake's levee-room is peopled with a group of figures that again remind us of the chaotic state of society even in gilded saloons. Charles

* "Stages of Cruelty."
† "Rake's Progress."
‡ "Industry and Idleness," 6.
§ "Morning."
‖ "Rake's Progress," 3.

* "The Cockpit."

Lamb has described this remarkable exhibition as "almost a transcript" of the opening scene of Shakespeare's "Timon;" "we find a dedicating poet, and other similar characters in both." But the difference is as manifest as the similarity. In Timon's levee we have the poet, the painter, the jeweller, and the merchant. The rake, in his morning-gown, attends to the bully who grasps his sword, and places his hand on his breast, to intimate the secrecy with which he will stab in the dark. The jockey exhibits the bowl which his master's racers have won. The prize-fighter comes to teach him the science of quarter-staff. The French fencer and the attitudinizing dancing-master are ready to give their lessons. Handel is touching the harpsichord. Bridgman has his designs for a landscape garden when the villa is built:

"Heaven visits with a taste the wealthy fool."

The poet is in the antechamber spouting his verses among tailors and wigmakers. It is exaggeration, we may say, to group together such opposite professors of fashionable accomplishments. But ostentation makes no nice distinctions. The patron sees no difference between the poet and the dancing-master.

If the rake's levee may seem to some an overstrained representation, the genius of Hogarth has been vindicated by Scott seizing upon similar characteristics of the levee of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham—"a gathering of eagles to the slaughter." Amid projectors, and gamesters, and others of "the sordid train"—who "stimulate the wild wishes of lavish and wasteful extravagance," are the poet, the architect, the musician—"all genuine descendants of the daughter of the horse-leech, whose cry is, Give, give."* Turn to the fourth plate of "Marriage à-la-mode." The Lady Squander is at her public toilette. As her hair is dressed—the most important labor of the day—Farinelli is singing to a flute accompaniment. A fashionable lady is in ecstasy; a country gentleman is asleep. The coxcomb sips his coffee with the vacant indifference that belongs to an exquisite with his hair in papers. The mistress of the mansion, whose plebeian wealth has been wedded to titled poverty, is receiving from a gentleman who is lolling upon a sofa a ticket for the masquerade. The barrister who drew the settlement for the marriage of the lady is thus making arrangements for a very prompt dissolution of the tie. The citizen's daughter is the victim of the lawyer's profligacy. The lawyer passes his sword through the noble husband, and is hanged. The lady takes poison. There are various scenes of this drama before we reach the catastrophe. One scene has been painted with matchless skill. The lady has passed the night in her splendid mansion, amid a crowd of visitors. She has snatched an hour or two of broken and feverish sleep, and has risen unrefreshed to a late breakfast. The servants have been unable to repair the disorder of the previous night. It is noon, but the candles are still burning, the furniture is disarranged, the floor is strewed with music, and books of games, and overturned chairs. The husband has spent his night from home. The jaded debauchee—his dress disordered, his features pale and fallen, his whole attitude expressive of that withering satiety which has drunk the dregs of what is called pleasure, and found nothing but poison in the cup—tells a tale of the ruin which has overwhelmed thousands. Neither the besotted husband nor the careless wife can listen to the silent remonstrances of the old steward, who comes to them with a bundle of unpaid bills, and a file with only one receipt upon it. The uplifted hand and careworn face of the old servant distinctly paint the ruin which he sees approaching in debt and dishonor. The catastrophe, indeed, is more sudden than he expects.

If this be the life of fashionable England, we can scarcely be surprised at its "Gin Lane," where the drunken wife lets her infant fall from her arms down an area, and the tumble-down house reveals the spectral sight of a wretch hanging to a beam. The moral is here written in capital letters, which those who run may read. The moral is not quite so legible, when we look upon that print in which Francis Goodchild, esquire, sheriff of London, is represented as feasting the liverymen of his company. The eager clamor for fresh supplies; the gloating satisfaction of the healthful feeder; the exhausted appetite of the apoplectic gorger—these triumphs of civilization may yet attest that Hogarth was "not for an age, but for all time" in some of these note-books. The satire of his "election" is of course only local and temporary. There is now no treating allowed. The odious attempt to seduce the incorruptible British patriot by a vulgar feast is proscribed by statute and by custom. No candidate at the head of the table, with "Liberty and Loyalty" for his banner, submits to be whispered to by a fat old hag, while a facetious elector knocks their heads together. No haberdasher brings an assortment of ribbons and gloves, and is paid by a promissory note. The wife threatening her husband with vengeance if he refuses the proffered bribe, is necessarily extinct. The attorney knocked off his chair by a brickbat that comes through the window, can no longer apply to the gentle people that some libellers in our day call "roughs." The banner of "No Jews" has gone, with every other proclamation of intolerance. Ignorance is banished and no longer shouts "Give us our eleven days." The print of the canvas, again, must be quite obsolete in its allusions. The yeoman no longer stands between two rival agents, with his palm open to each. This sturdy Englishman is not Garrick between tragedy and comedy. He is not Hercules between virtue and pleasure. He is an honest elector, who then did what he thought best for his family. He was tempted, and he yielded. All such temptations are at an end. No man takes guineas in the open street; and we may therefore presume that bribery has ceased to exist. Then, again, no such scenes can take place as in Hogarth's Election Booth, for a registration has been established, and all is fairness and tranquillity. No dying freeholder is brought from his bed to the poll; no idiotic cripple has the name of the Blue candidate shouted in his one ear, and of the Yellow in the other. No counsel are now vociferating for or against the legality of the voter who has lost his hands, taking hold of the Testament with his iron hook. No group of voters now chuckle over a squib which, in addition to its subtle wit, has the picture of one of the candidates on a gallows. Lastly, the solemnity of Chairing has gone out, and perhaps the accompanying generosity of setting free and enlightened non-electors to scramble for sixpences. Hogarth has painted a scene of riot, broken heads, blind fiddlers and dancing bears, which have no exact parallel in our age; and the evils of an election may therefore be supposed, by some believers in social perfectibility, to have died out, with many other political evils, in our more decent times.

Hogarth lived at a period when some very signal changes in morals and manners were slowly developing themselves, under influences which were either ridiculed or regarded as unworthy of notice. The chaotic state of society which he has so truthfully set forth in its most striking examples must not be received as the whole truth. The essayists, the dramatists, the novelists, the painters, have furnished almost the only materials we possess for estimating the peculiar characteristics of a modern age. But we must not attempt to believe that many of their representations of vice and folly were any other than exceptions to the average amount of decorum and good sense which regulated the intercourse of the higher and middle classes, and of respect for the laws and for public order which, taken as a whole, the laboring class manifested. When we look at the defective state of the municipal administration of the country—the total absence of means for the prevention of crime, except the terror of the barbarous code for its punishment—we may almost be surprised that there were not more Gin Lanes and more Blood-bowl houses. When we regard the comparatively small influence which the Church then exercised upon social evils, we may wonder how the upper classes passed from the corrupt atmosphere of Hogarth's saloons into the more healthful air of the court-life of eighty years ago. A great change had then come over all classes. Hogarth has two prints which he produced out of his keen observation of passing things—manifestations which he could scarcely be expected to regard with a prophetic or philosophic spirit. "The Sleeping Congregation" of 1736 speaks of the time when the bewigged preacher droned through his tedious hour, without the slightest attempt to touch the vicious or to rouse the indifferent. The "Credulity, Superstition, and Fanaticism, a Medley," of 1762, tells that a new power had arisen. The chief object is the ridicule of Methodism. Whitefield's Journal and Wesley's Sermons figure by name among the accessories of the piece, where the ranting preacher is holding forth to the howling congregation. Pope had described the "harmonic twang" of the donkey's bray—

* "Peveril of the Peak."

"There, Webster, pealed thy voice, and Whitefield thine." *

Bishop Lavington had written "The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists compared." Hogarth followed the precedent, in all ages, of despising reformers. The followers of George Whitefield and of John Wesley might be ignorant, superstitious, fanatical. They themselves might have indirectly encouraged the delusions of a few of their disciples. But they eventually changed the face of English society.

CHAPTER CXLVIII.

Proceedings on the death of Queen Anne—George I. proclaimed king—His arrival in England—Sophia, Princess of Zell—Ministerial arrangements—Parliament—Impeachments of Queen Anne's late ministers—Riots in England—Insurrection in Scotland—Insurrection in England—The march to Preston—Surrender of the rebels at Preston—Battle of Sheriffmuir—The pretender in Scotland—His flight to France—Impeachments of the rebel lords—Executions and escapes of leaders—Fate of the humbler insurgents.

At seven o'clock of the morning of the first of August, 1714, Queen Anne died. The course of proceeding under this event had been determined by statute in 1705. The council was immediately to meet, and then to open three sealed packets, which contained the names of persons nominated by the Protestant successor to the throne, to act with seven great officers of state named in the statute, as lord justices. No contest, therefore, could arise about the temporary possession of authority. When the dying queen appointed Shrewsbury lord high treasurer, the hopes of the Jacobite party received a fatal blow. When the sealed packets were opened, and eighteen peers, the greater number of whom were Whigs, were nominated by the Elector of Hanover, the schemes for the restoration of the exiled family, which had been gradually maturing in the last four years of the reign of Anne, were more effectually crushed. The French agent wrote to Louis XIV. that Bolingbroke was grievously disappointed; for he had said that in six weeks, if the queen's death had not occurred, matters would have been in such a state that there would have been nothing to fear for the future. "What a world is this, and how does fortune banter us," writes Bolingbroke to Swift. There was a bold accomplice in Bolingbroke's plots who was not inclined at first to grieve over the caprices of fortune. It is related upon the authority of Dr. Lockier, Dean of Peterborough, that, upon the death of the queen, Atterbury urged the immediate proclamation of the pretender, to which Ormond demurring, the bishop replied with an oath, "we have not a moment to lose." Lockier, who was a personal friend of George I., says, "Such a bold step would have made people believe that they [the Jacobites] were stronger than they really were, and might have taken strangely. The late king, I am persuaded, would not have stirred a foot, if there had been a strong opposition; indeed the family did not expect this crown; at least nobody in it but the old Princess Sophia." † Opposition there was none. The lords justices issued a proclamation, declaring that the high and mighty Prince George, Elector of Brunswick Lüneburg, had, by the death of Queen Anne, become our rightful and liege lord, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland. Multitudes crowded round the heralds as they proclaimed the stranger king. Not a voice of dissent was raised. The same afternoon the parliament met, according to the provision of the Act of Regency. The lords justices entered upon their administrative functions. The Peers and the Commons sent congratulations to the new sovereign upon his happy and peaceable accession to the throne, and besought his majesty to give the kingdom the advantage of his royal presence as soon as possible. The civil list was settled upon the same scale as had been granted to Queen Anne. Throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland no popular discontent was manifested. The title of King George was recognized by France and the other European powers, whether Protestant or Catholic. There was partial dissatisfaction, no doubt, among some of that class of politicians whose loyalty was determined by the extent to which their personal interests were expected to be gratified. The name of Marlborough was not found in the list of those nominated to the Regency, and he retired to the country, after having made a sort of triumphal entry into London. Many a solicitation for place and preferment went over to Hanover. But the new king exhibited no eagerness to quit the quiet country where he was respected, and where he had no contests of Whig and Tory to disturb his peace. It was the 18th of September when George, accompanied by his eldest son, landed at Greenwich.

That the new king should have been received with acclamations when he set his foot on English soil was a matter of course. But his personal appearance and demeanor were not calculated to excite any fervid enthusiasm. He was fifty-four years of age. He was below the middle stature. He was shy and awkward. He could not speak English. His public virtues were probably little known to his new subjects. Possessing despotic power, he had governed his Hanoverians wisely and beneficently; and the people shed tears of real grief when he left them. He had no showy qualities. He was unfortunate in his marriage, and did not win popular respect by the exercise of the domestic virtues. Every one knew that twenty years before the Elector George Louis was called to the throne of England—that is, in 1694, when he was electoral heir-apparent—some terrible tragedy had occurred in the palace of Hanover. Count Philip Königsmark suddenly disappeared. Princess Sophia Dorothea, the wife of the electoral prince, was divorced in a somewhat irregular way by a court held at Hanover, and was now pining away her life in the castle of Aldhen, with no glimpse of the outer world but the dreary Heath of Lüneburg. "Old peasants, late in the next century, will remember that they used to see her sometimes driving on the heath—beautiful lady, long black hair, and the glitter of diamonds in it; sometimes the reins in her own hand, but always with a party of cavalry around her, and their swords drawn." * Sophia, born Princess of Zell, was the mother of George II., who constantly asserted her innocence. Of her imprudence there could be no doubt. Her sad story has furnished abundant matter of controversy. After the death of George I., under the floor of the princess's dressing-room a body was discovered which was considered to be that of Count Königsmark. Horace Walpole, who derived his information from his father Sir Robert, assumes that the unfortunate victim of jealousy was there secretly strangled. Later accounts allege that there was a scene of violence and loss of life, in which Königsmark had openly to encounter many persons. "It has at length," says the historian of Frederick the Great, "become a certainty, a clear fact, to those who are curious about it. . . . Crime enough is in it, sin and folly on both sides; there is killing too, but not assassination (as it turns out); on the whole there is nothing of atrocity, and nothing that was not accidental, unavoidable; and there is a certain greatness of decorum on the part of those Hanover princes and official gentlemen, a depth of silence, of polite stoicism, which deserves more praise than it will get in our times." †

The unostentatious sovereign, "all dressed in brown, even his stockings," ‡ was not fitted by nature to form for himself a court-party, by which he might in some degree have neutralized the two great parliamentary parties. He had been accustomed to govern a small country through ministers to whom his will was law; and he did not understand the complications which made the King of England in many respects the possessor of a nominal power, while the real power was with those called his servants. The novelty of his position is well illustrated by his majesty's account of one of his earliest impressions. He said, "This is a strange country. The first morning after my arrival at St. James's I looked out of the window, and saw a park, with canals, etc., which they told me were mine. The next day Lord Chetwynd, the ranger of *my* park, sent me a fine brace of carp out of *my* canal; and I was told I must give five guineas to Lord Chetywnd's servant for bringing me *my own* carp out of *my own* canal in *my own* park." § King George was inevitably and completely thrown into the hands of the great Whig party, to whose firmness and decision he was indebted for his quiet accession to the throne. It was not a question, as in the early days of King William, whether the government could be best conducted by the union of party leaders or by one dominant party. George had not the ability or the ambition to be in many respects his own minister, as William

* "Dunciad," book ii. † Spence's "Anecdotes," p. 55.

* Carlyle, "Friedrich II. of Prussia," vol. i. p. 34.
† Ibid., p. 35.
‡ H. Walpole. "Reminiscences of the Court of George I. and II."
§ "Walpoliana."

was. He had to rely upon the chiefs of the party who upheld his parliamentary title to the crown, in opposition to the party who would have clung to the hereditary title. The Chevalier St. George had issued from Lorraine, on the 29th of August, a manifesto, in which he asserted his right to the throne. He had been inactive, he said, "until the death of the princess, our sister, of whose good intention toward us we could not for some time past well doubt; and this was the reason we then sat still, expecting the good effects thereof, which were unfortunately prevented by her deplorable death." Bolingbroke, the chief encourager of those good intentions, was removed from his office of secretary of state, and the seals were taken from him with some impolitic want of respect. Lord Townshend was appointed in his place, and the other great offices were filled up by leading Whigs. The doubts of Marlborough's fidelity to the Hanoverian succession had been manifested by the omission of his name in the Council of Regency. He was, nevertheless, nominated to his former offices of captain general and master of the ordnance. Trusted, however, he was not; and he justified the suspicions which attached to his proverbial faithlessness by sending, as a loan, a sum of money to the pretender, just before the unsuccessful issue of the rising of 1715 furnished evidence that the Stuart cause had become in a great degree hopeless.

The coronation of the king took place on the 20th of October. The peers of both parties attended the ceremony. In January the parliament was dissolved, and the writs for a new election were sent out. When the two houses met on the 17th of March, the preponderance of the Whigs was decidedly manifested. The king opened the parliament in person, but his speech was read by the lord chancellor. Its tone was moderate and conciliatory. "Let no unhappy divisions of parties here at home divert you from pursuing the common interest of your country." The address of the peers contained a passage which excited an animated debate, in which Bolingbroke spoke for the last time. "To recover the reputation of this kingdom in foreign parts" was held to be injurious to the memory of the late queen. The offensive sentence was carried by a large majority. The address of the Commons was still more pointed against the latter advisers of Queen Anne.

The pretender's hopes, it was said, "were built upon the measures that had been taken for some time past in Great Britain. It shall be our business to trace out those measures whereon he placed his hopes, and to bring the authors of them to condign punishment." It was clear that the new possessors of power would not attempt to win over their enemies by conciliation. Oxford, who was probably not so deeply committed as some of his colleagues, patiently awaited the approaching storm. Ormond braved its utmost fury, and openly associated with the most suspected Jacobites. Bolingbroke appeared at Drury Lane Theatre, bespoke a play for the ensuing night's performance, and then fled to France. He soon after became secretary of state to the prince who asserted his right to the crown of England as James III., and to the crown of Scotland as James VIII. On the 9th of April the secretary of state, Stanhope, laid a mass of papers on the table of the Commons, which had reference to the peace of Utrecht and the cessation of arms which preceded it. These were referred to a secret committee. On the 9th of June their report was presented, and then Walpole rose, and impeached Bolingbroke of high treason. The resolution of impeachment was passed without a division. Lord Coningsby then impeached Robert, Earl of Oxford, of high treason and other crimes and misdemeanors. This resolution was also carried without a division. On the 21st of June a similar impeachment of Ormond was decided by a majority of forty-seven. Ormond followed Bolingbroke in his flight to France. Acts of attainder were immediately passed against both these fugitives. Oxford was impeached at the bar of the lords, and was committed to the Tower.

During the autumn of 1714 it became manifest that the old high-church spirit was again stirring up the bitterest party strife. There were riots at Bristol on the night of the king's coronation, when the cry was, "Down with the Roundheads! God bless Doctor Sacheverel!" At Birmingham, Norwich, Reading, and other towns, there were similar disturbances. The elections of the spring of 1715 were conducted with more violent excitement than at any previous period. Mob intimidation was held to be more effective even than bribery. The impeachments of Bolingbroke, Oxford, and Ormond were followed by riots of a really serious character. At Manchester, in June, the meeting-houses of dissenters were destroyed by a triumphant mob; the prisons were thrown open; the health of King James was openly drunk. In July tumults of an alarming nature occurred in the midland counties, especially in Staffordshire, where the dissenters were the universal objects of outrage. The powers of the justice of peace and the constable were quite unequal to cope with these manifestations of the blind fury of the populace. These disturbances gave occasion to the Riot Act, which, with some modifications, continues to be the law of the land.

On the 21st of September the parliament was adjourned. The royal speech alluded to an event of momentous importance, "the open and declared rebellion which is now actually begun in Scotland." Since the abortive attempt of Prince James Edward to invade Scotland with a French army in 1708, there had been outward tranquillity; but there was considerable dissatisfaction among the Scottish adherents to the national independence, which they held was imperilled by the union. There had been serious differences, also, between the Presbyterians and the tolerated Episcopalians. The Hanoverian king had been proclaimed at Edinburgh without any manifestations opposed to the triumphant attitude of the Whigs. The Jacobites "were so confounded at this surprising turn of Providence that they durst not move a tongue against it in public." * Yet the numerical strength of the scattered supporters of the old dynasty in Scotland was probably greater than that of the sober and industrious inhabitants of towns, who had a natural horror of political convulsions. The Lowland Lairds, a jovial and thoughtless race, having little acquaintance with the real business of life, and very slight participation in the conduct of public affairs, were ready enough to hiccup out sedition as they drained their punch-bowls to the health of King James. They could enforce military service upon the theory of feudal obedience; but they had lost the power of practically organizing those tenants who were once content to be accounted vassals. On the contrary, in the Highlands there was still in vigor the old clannish spirit, which could readily convert the mountaineers into a formidable army. If the chiefs of clans could again agree to take part in a general insurrection, they might co-operate with the discontented Lowlanders; and with the aid of the Roman Catholic gentry of the English border counties, the Hanoverian succession might be overthrown by one vigorous blow. Such was the belief that produced the rebellion of 1715.

Among the Scottish nobles who had advocated the union none had been more zealous than John Erskine, Earl of Mar, who came to Edinburgh as secretary of state in 1706, under the Whigs, and continued to be secretary under the Tories. His happy art of accommodating himself to circumstances procured him the name of "Bobbing John." In the interval between the death of Queen Anne and the arrival of King George in England the Earl of Mar addressed a letter to his new sovereign, in which, as one of his secretaries of state, he congratulated him upon his happy accession; set forth that his own sincerity and faithfulness were out of dispute, seeing the part he acted "in the bringing about and making of the union, when the succession to the crown of Scotland was settled in your majesty's family;" and protested that "your majesty shall ever find me as faithful and dutiful a subject and servant as ever any of my family have been to the crown, or as I have been to my late mistress the queen."

The advisers of George had small confidence in these protestations; and upon the changes which ensued after the arrival of the king, the Earl of Mar was removed from his important office, and the Duke of Montrose was appointed in his stead. He came to London, married a daughter of the Duke of Kingston, one of the great Whig party, attended the royal levee on the 1st of August, and on the 2d was on his way to Scotland to organize an insurrection. In one of the most curious memoirs of that period, the Master of Sinclair, who took an important part in the great rising of 1715, directs against Mar the extremest force of "the peculiar tone of asperity" which caused his narrative to be so long withheld from the public eye.† In his view the mind of Mar was as deformed as his body.

---

* Rae, quoted in Burton, vol. ii., p. 87.

† Preface to "Memoirs of the Insurrection in Scotland in 1715. By John Master of Sinclair. From the original manuscript in the

The motives of Mar in raising the standard of revolt are thus described by this bitter censor: "Having no other game to play, knowing that the mobs and broils in England had roused the Scots Tories, who were very attentive to all that passed there, which, according to their laudable custom, they magnified to cheat themselves, he did not know how far, with his management, and making use of so favorable a conjuncture, he might work them up before things turned stale, and while their spirits were in a ferment. If, by the force of lying, and making them believe he was trusted by the English Jacobites and the King [James], he should succeed in raising them, no matter what came of it, he could lose nothing, not even a reputation." * Even Sir Walter Scott gives Mar credit for no higher principles of action than "disappointed ambition and mortified pride." † Disguised as a working-man, the earl, with two friends and two servants, sailed from London to Newcastle in a collier; and there hiring a vessel, went up the Frith of Forth, and landed at Elie, a village in Fifeshire. In his way to his castle of Kildrummie he issued invitations for a great hunting-party in the forest of Mar. On the 26th of August several noblemen and gentlemen of "interest in the Highlands" were assembled round Mar's castle, with a following of about eight hundred men. On the 3d of September a meeting of a more select number was held at Aboyne, a castle of the Gordon family; when Mar, "telling them of his design, he showed them the king's picture, which was all the credentials he had." ‡ This portrait he repeatedly kissed.

He subsequently issued a manifesto announcing his appointment to command the forces, which appointment the Master of Sinclair holds to have been forged. On the 6th of September the Earl of Mar, in his capacity of general, raised the royal standard in Braemar, and proclaimed James VIII. King of Scotland, and James III. King of England. The Highlanders beheld with dismay the fearful omen of the gilt ball on the top of the flagstaff being carried away by a gust of wind. The chiefs separated, to send the fiery cross through their districts, at whose sight their vassals were expected to prepare to appear in arms at a general rendezvous. Mar accompanied the signal by a gentle enforcement of his commands, addressed to his baillie of the lordship of Kildrummie: "Let my own tenants in Kildrummie know, that if they come not forth with their best arms, I will send a party immediately to burn what they shall miss taking from them. And they may believe this only a threat—but by all that's sacred, I'll put it in execution, let my loss be what it will, that it may be an example to others. You are to tell the gentlemen that I expect them in their best accoutrements on horseback, and no excuse to be accepted of. Go about this with all diligence, and come yourself and let me know your having done so. All this is not only as ye will be answerable to me, but to your king and country." §

The tenants upon whom Mar desired to enforce this obedience to his arbitrary will were not under the absolute command of a chief as were the Highland clans. They are described as people of a Lowland origin, who spoke the English language with the northern accent. ‖ A more unlimited authority was exercised over their Highlanders by the Marquis of Tullibardine, the eldest son of the Duke of Athol, by the Marquis of Huntly, the eldest son of the Duke of Gordon, by the Earl of Panmure, by the Earl of Southesk, and by many lesser chieftains, under whose command the white cockade was speedily worn by their devoted vassals. The great soldier and statesman, John, Duke of Argyle—the Mac Callum Mhor, under whose command thousands of Celtic followers would fight either for King James or King George—was the stanch supporter of the Hanoverian succession, and to him was confided the command of the government forces in Scotland. The general body of Presbyterians soon saw that, although they might clamor against the union and the Whig ministers, there was no alliance for them with the Roman Catholic and the Episcopalian supporters of King James. There was many a discontented laird like the Master of Sinclair, who "had an innate zeal and affection for all the remains of the old royal family of Scotland," and had a great contempt for the "wretches of a mushroom growth," who had been thriving upon the improving industry of the country, "and thereby put themselves upon a level with those whose vassals they were not long before." * The people, properly so called, had no participation in the rising of 1715. Wherever there was wealth, the fruit of industrious labor—as in the country south of the Forth and the Clyde—Jacobitism had no strong hold. From the Highlands, with the exception of a few districts, the discontented chieftains could carry a large following to the field. In the northern counties of England there were many Jacobites and Papists; but the rebel leaders of Scotland were wofully deceived in the expectation from them of any important aid. According to Sir Walter Scott "the handful of Northumberland fox-hunters seem never to have had any serious thoughts of fighting, and soon sickened of it." †

At the moment when Mar raised the standard of revolt in Scotland the news arrived of the death of Louis XIV. The great monarch died on the 1st of September. Bolingbroke, who as long as the king lived was sanguine of engaging the aid of France in the restoration of the Stuart family, wrote to his friend Sir William Wyndham, "my hopes sunk as he declined, and died when he expired." The Scottish Jacobites affected to make light of the loss of this consistent supporter of their cause. One of them said to the Master of Sinclair, "A young prince, such as the regent, would push our affair with more vigor than the old king, who was half-doated." The regent Duke of Orleans was more politic than to quarrel with the English government, and he not only rendered no assistance, but intercepted the military stores provided for the insurgents at the expense of the Chevalier St. George. The "honest men," as the Jacobites named their party, were left to their own resources. Some of their first movements were successful. Others as signally failed. They were defeated in a bold attempt to seize the castle of Edinburgh on the 9th of September. Lord Drummond had concerted this enterprise with ninety gentlemen, according to one authority; ‡ with fifty young apprentices, advocates' servants, writers, and some servants of the government, according to the Master of Sinclair. They had corrupted a sergeant, a corporal, and two sentinels of the garrison. The sentinel on duty was to draw up a scaling-ladder; and the operation was being performed when the ladder was found too short. In this dilemma they lingered and hesitated till the patrol approached to relieve the sentinel; when he drew down the grappling-iron, fired his piece, and shouted "Enemy." The conspirators escaped as well as they could, but four or five were secured by the civil authorities as they leaped down from the lower shelf of the rock. The Master of Sinclair, who had joined the insurgents in spite of his doubts of their prudence and his contempt of their leader, set out from the camp at Perth at the head of four hundred horsemen, each with a trooper behind him; and having marched through Fife with great expedition, succeeding in boarding a government vessel laden with arms that was at anchor near Burntisland. They thus obtained the means of arming four hundred rebels, and returned unmolested to the headquarters at Perth, where Mar had now about twelve thousand men under his command. As usual with the Highland chieftains, some were quarrelling about the post of honor, and all were waiting the opportunity for some lucky undertaking, and neglecting the means of their own safety. The Master of Sinclair says, "Mar, after coming into Perth, did nothing all this while but write; and, as if all had depended on his writing, nobody moved in any one thing. There was not a word spoke of fortifying the town, nor the least care taken of sending for powder to any place. We did not want gunsmiths; and yet none of them were employed in mending our old arms. Whoever spoke of these things, which I did often, was giving himself airs; for we lived very well, and as long as meat, drink, and money was not wanting, what was the need of any more?" § The leaders in this strange insurrection seemed to believe that the mere announcement of their intentions to place James on the throne, coupled with their implicit reliance on Mar's assurance that their king was coming with irresistible aid from France, would suffice for their triumph in Scotland, while the advance of some of their forces into England would at once drive the Elector of Hanover from his usurped power.

At the beginning of October the Duke of Argyle was at Stirling,

possession of the Earl of Rosslyn. With notes by Sir Walter Scott, Bart." Printed for the Abbotsford Club, 1858.

* Memoirs, p. 67. † Introductory Notice, p. xv.
‡ Memoirs, p. 20. § Scott's "Tales of a Grandfather."
‖ Burton, "History of Scotland," vol. ii. p. 108.

* Memoirs, p. 2.
† Introductory Notice to the Memoirs of the Master of Sinclair, p. xvi. ‡ Patten. § Memoirs, p. 92.

with about fifteen hundred regular troops. Small as this army was, the position of Argyle was such that Mar could not venture an attempt to force a passage, if he desired to move southward to assist a rising on the English border. Nor could he venture with his main body to cross the Frith of Forth, for a large naval force was cruising on that coast. Moreover, Mar, if these impediments could have been overcome, could not safely move his whole army, for he had received letters from Bolingbroke stating "that in all probability the king would land very quickly in the north of Scotland." It was therefore determined to send a large detachment of the rebel force to the aid of the southern insurgents, while the main army remained at Perth to await their expected royal leader. This determination was executed with skill and boldness. Two thousand five hundred men marched under the command of Brigadier Mac Intosh, an experienced soldier, toward the coast of Fife, where a number of boats had been collected in various small harbors. To divert the English cruisers, an appearance of bustle in preparing craft was made in the neighborhood of Burntisland; while an embarkation of troops took place at Craile, Anstruther, and other small places, where the estuary was broadest, and a passage in open boats would be considered hazardous. On the night of the 2d of October sixteen hundred men were thus carried across to landing-places on the southern coast of the Forth, near North Berwick. Another detachment, which sailed later, was not so successful; for the government vessels were then on the alert, and a portion of the troops had to return to the Fife coast, while three hundred landed on the Isle of May, having been chased thither by ships of war. These men, under the leadership of Lord William Murray, sustained great privations, having been blockaded on the island by the government vessels. The Master of Sinclair, who seldom indulges in panegyric, pays a tribute to the heroism of this fourth son of the Duke of Athol—"the school-boy" who kept his men together, and refused himself to leave the island till he had brought them all safely off. Mac Intosh and his little army were tempted to depart from the instructions of Mar to go "on south, to meet our friends who are in arms there," so as to be out of Argyle's reach before he could come up with them. They resolved, on the contrary, to attack Edinburgh before Argyle could be there to defend it. But the delay of a day in their western march afforded time to the civic authorities to summon the duke from Stirling; and he was at Edinburgh with five hundred horse, as the foot soldiers of Mac Intosh arrived. They found no supporters waiting for them in arms, and they marched to Leith, which town they entered without resistance, and then posted themselves in the remains of the citadel, built by Cromwell, but demolished at the restoration. Here, having seized some cannon and ammunition from vessels in the harbor, they were enabled to show so firm an attitude that Argyle, having no artillery, thought it imprudent to attack them. After having held Leith for two days the insurgents, on the night of the 15th, marched at the lowest ebb of the tide along the sands beyond Musselburgh; and they reached Seton House, the castellated mansion of the Earl of Winton, early in the morning of the 16th. Here they remained safely till the 19th; for Argyle had hurried back to Stirling on receiving intelligence that Mar's army was moving southward. The movement of Mar was a judicious feint to avert the attack that would probably have been fatal to the band of Mac Intosh.

The march of these Highlanders to the south of Scotland, and onward to Preston, has been minutely described by one who deserted their cause and gave testimony against his confederates, but whose narrative is full of those curious details which personal observation can alone supply.* On the first day of their march they reached Longformachus. On the second day, at Dunse, they proclaimed King James, the Highlanders being drawn up in order of battle. On arriving at Kelso, on the 22d, they were met, according to appointment, by a body of horsemen from the south of Scotland, and of Northumbrians. The Scots were under the command of Lord Kenmure; the English under that of Mr. Forster. These leaders were chosen as being Protestants, to counteract the prevailing opinion that this was a Roman Catholic insurrection. The number of the English did not exceed three hundred. Having crossed the deep and rapid Tweed, they entered the town, and the Highlanders soon joined them from the Scottish side, "with their bagpipes playing, led by old Mac Intosh; but they made a very indifferent figure; for the rain and their long marches had extremely fatigued them, though their old brigadier, who marched at the head of them, appeared very well." * Among the English was Lord Derwentwater, who, with many friends and all his servants, "mounted, some upon his coach-horses, and others upon very good useful horses, and all very well armed," had united his fortunes, and given the countenance of his excellent character to this feeble attempt to overthrow a strong government. On Sunday, the 23d, the Reverend Mr. Patten was directed to preach "at the great kirk of Kelso," the grand old Norman abbey church. Protestants and Papists both attended the service, and the chaplain pays his tribute of admiration to the decency and reverence with which the common Highlanders behaved. A Presbyterian clergyman preached in the afternoon. On the Monday, King James was proclaimed, "with colors flying, drums beating, and bagpipes playing;" and a long document was read, entitled "Manifesto by the noblemen, gentlemen, and others, who dutifully appear at this time in asserting the undoubted right of their lawful sovereign, James VIII., by the grace of God King of Scotland, England, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, etc., and for relieving this, his ancient kingdom, from the oppressions and grievances it lies under." The evils of the union were dwelled upon in this manifesto. It talked about the preservation of laws, liberties, and property, with freedom from foreign domination; and it inferred that the restoration of the Stuarts would be the best security for the Protestant religion. Never were words more unmeaningly used, to cover the one design which was clearly enough expressed in the text which Mr. Patten chose for his sermon: "The right of the first-born is his." And so the borderers who stood armed in the market-place at Kelso shouted, "No union! No malt-tax! No salt-tax!" and the poor Highlanders probably wondered how nobly the English gentlemen, who were assembled with their fiery racers and hunters, and were surrounded by their liveried servants, would be able to reward them for having left their native hills to engage in a cause of which nothing was said that they could comprehend. The insurgents lingered at Kelso for five days, and then the little army of about fourteen hundred men moved forward. They at last moved, after much debate whether they should march to the west of Scotland and attack Dumfries and Glasgow, or return northward and give battle to General Carpenter, who was following them, as they knew, or go boldly into England, where they were assured twenty thousand men of Lancashire would join them. This plan was at last resolved upon, and the march was commenced to Jedburgh, and thence to Hawick. Here the Highlanders resisted the decision to cross the border. They separated themselves, and went to the top of a rising ground; there resting their arms, and declaring that "they would fight if they would lead them on to the enemy, but they would not go to England." Lord Winton had told them that if they went to England they would be all cut in pieces or sold for slaves. They, however, agreed to keep together as long as they stayed in Scotland. As the little army advanced in a westerly direction along the border, their discontent became more manifest. They were threatened by their southern allies, whom they appeared more ready to fight than to obey. They were tempted by the offer of sixpence a day—a promise to them of fabulous wealth. But five hundred of the obstinate mountaineers went off, and dispersed themselves in the hills and moors, in the hope to reach, sooner or later, their distant homes. On the 31st of October the diminished forces had reached Longtown. When they were on English ground the command of the whole band was assumed by Mr. Forster, who held his commission from the Earl of Mar.

The insurgent force, although under imperfect discipline and irregularly armed, was so formidable in its appearance that fifteen thousand of the *posse comitatus*, called out to oppose them, fled in terror at their approach to Penrith. Of this valiant body Lord Lonsdale and the Bishop of Carlisle were the chief leaders. Patten, with a covert sarcasm, says that many blamed Lord Lonsdale for his retreat; but those who knew how unprepared with arms and stores the multitude was, justly commended his wise conduct. At Penrith King James was proclaimed, and the Highlanders had the comfort of finding abundant good cheer which had been prepared for the English

* "The History of the late Rebellion, etc. By the Rev. Mr. Robert Patten, formerly chaplain to Mr. Forster," 2d edit., 1717.

* Patten, p. 39.

whom they had scared away. They conducted themselves with civility toward the inhabitants, who gazed with wonder, not unmixed with fear, upon the brigadier, who "looked with a grim countenance" as he rode at the head of his strangely accoutred men. Reaching Lancaster on the 7th of November, they were welcomed by Roman Catholic families; and it is recorded that "the gentlemen soldiers dressed and trimmed themselves up in their best clothes, for to drink a dish of tea with the ladies of this town."* Lancaster, with its castle, offered a strong position for defence; but, says Patten, "our infatuations were not yet over." Having halted for two days, they marched on to Preston, through roads which long after were described as the worst in England. This town obtained its name of "proud Preston," as being a favorite residence of the rich Catholic families. Two troops of dragoons quartered here moved off on the approach of the rebels. It seemed to them as if England could offer no resistance to their march. At Preston they were joined by many of the Catholic gentry, with their tenants and servants. Although this accession of strength fell far short of their expectation of a general rising in the northern counties, the insurgents were full of confidence. They abandoned themselves to the pleasures of the hour as if no danger were at hand. "The ladies in this town," writes one Peter Clark, "are so very beautiful, and so richly attired, that the gentlemen soldiers, from Wednesday to Saturday, minded nothing but courting and feasting." Mr. Forster, the commander of the rebel forces, seems to have been wholly unequal to the duty he had assumed. He relied upon the sanguine assurances of the Lancashire Jacobites that no force could approach Preston on the English side. He was contented to have intelligence of General Carpenter's movements in his advance from Scotland. On the night of Friday, the 11th of November, the news came that a force under General Wills was marching from Wigan upon Preston. A council of war was immediately held, but without the chief in command, who, it was alleged, had received "some damage at a convivial entertainment," so that it became necessary he should retire to bed. The orders given by this council were countermanded by Forster the next morning. He went forth to look upon the enemy when he could no longer doubt of their approach. At the bridge over the Ribble, about half a mile from the town, Forster had stationed a small detachment; but it was soon withdrawn by him, and the road to Preston from the south was left open instead of being resolutely defended. Patten says that General Wills expected that the rebels would have made a stand at the bridge, which they might have barricaded, and he therefore advanced cautiously through the deep and narrow lane which led from the bridge. This lane was the place where Oliver Cromwell was resisted in an uncommon manner, according to Patten's narrative, by the king's forces in 1648, "who, from the height, rolled down upon him and his men, when they had entered the lane, huge large millstones." Cromwell makes no mention of this incident in his dispatch of the 20th of August, but he describes the place as "a lane, very deep and ill, up to the enemy's army, and leading to the town." In this lane, and on either side, Cromwell was fighting for four hours, in what he calls "a hedge dispute," before he "charged the enemy in the town and cleared the streets."† Along this famous lane Wills advanced cautiously. He began to think that the rebels had quitted the town; but when he entered the street he found that barricades had been thrown up, which presented a formidable defence. Two of his dragoons having been shot, no summons to surrender was required; and an attack was immediately made on the barrier of the street near the church, which led to the Wigan road. Mac Intosh here commanded. A hundred and twenty of the king's troops fell in a few minutes from the deadly aim of the Highland marksmen. But other entrances to the town by by-lanes were soon occupied by the besiegers, and they possessed themselves of two houses which became strong positions. Three other barriers were the scenes of sharp conflicts. Houses set on fire burned on through the night, while the unceasing sound of musketry proclaimed how deadly was the struggle. The insurgents who had marched from Scotland held their ground bravely, but many of the new recruits took the opportunity of making their escape from such perilous strifes, over an unguarded ford of the Ribble.

The morning of Sunday, the 13th, brought to the rebel army the sad conviction that the game was nearly played out. General Carpenter had reached Preston with two thousand five hundred cavalry; and the town was effectually surrounded on every side. Carpenter, though of superior rank, did not supersede Wills in his command. The Highlanders wished to make a daring attempt to cut their way through the king's forces. Forster and the English made an effort to obtain favorable terms of surrender. In the subsequent trials of some of the unfortunate leaders of this insurrection, General Wills deposed, and his deposition was fully confirmed by other officers, that Colonel Oxburgh, an Irishman, having been deputed by Mr. Forster, offered that the besieged should lay down their arms, on condition of being received as prisoners of war, and recommended to the royal mercy. Wills replied that he would not treat with rebels. All that he would do for them was, that if they laid down their arms, and submitted prisoners at discretion, he would prevent the soldiers cutting them in pieces, till he had further orders. Other negotiators came to the general, and the surrender was finally postponed to the next morning. But no promise of applying for the royal mercy could be obtained from Wills. Oxburgh, who forfeited his own life, declared upon the scaffold that the general said, "You cannot better entitle yourselves to that clemency than by surrendering yourselves prisoners at discretion." There were, of course, two modes of interpreting such a loose declaration. About fifteen hundred of the rebels surrendered, two thirds of whom were Scotch. Among the prisoners were eight noblemen. The number of the insurgent forces who escaped from Preston must have been considerable. The English troops marched into the town. The Highlanders were drawn up in the market-place, and were finally put into the church, "where," says Patten, "they continued about a month, the townspeople being obliged to find them water and bread, while they took what care of themselves they could, unripping all the linings from the seats or pews, and making thereof breeches and hose to defend themselves from the extremity of the weather." Some of the common men were subsequently tried, and, being found guilty, were executed or transported. Officers who had held commissions in the royal forces were summarily convicted by courts-martial, and were shot. The noblemen and other leaders were marched under strong guard to London. Patten relates that, "setting forward from Highgate, we were met by such numbers of people that it is scarce conceivable to express, who with 'Long live King George,' and 'Down with the Pretender,' ushered us throughout to our several apartments."

While the English insurrection thus came to an end at Preston, important events were taking place in Scotland. The government, partly through the politic adhesion of Simon Fraser, who claimed to be Lord Lovat, obtained possession of Inverness. At the same time the Earl of Mar marched southward from his camp at Perth, and Argyle led his forces northward. The Master of Sinclair represents the movements of Mar as indecisive, and deficient in military organization—that he incumbered his army with cannon without having powder or ball; and being prevented by the presence of the enemy from passing the Forth at Stirling, was wholly ignorant where the river was fordable at this winter season. "I never heard," he says, "of any man in our army who knew anything of these fords except Rob Roy; who, they themselves said, they could not trust."* On the 12th of November the Master of Sinclair, with three squadrons of cavalry and the greater number of the Highland clans, were in advance of Mar, whose quarters were at Ardoch. They were marching upon Dunblane, when the wife of a Jacobite laird sent a lame boy as messenger to say that Argyle was already there. The van ceased their advance, the rear formed a junction with them, and the whole army passed the night in a very narrow hollow of the hill near the Sheriffmuir—so called as being the old place of meeting for the militia of the sheriffdom of Monteith. "All the night did our army lie in that small circumference; and I believe eight thousand men, for we were about that number, were never packed up so close together since the invention of gunpowder."† Early in the morning of the 13th the insurgents drew out of their confined quarters, and formed, in two lines, above the hollow where they had passed the night. From the elevated ground Mar saw some officers at a short distance examining his position. Argyle, who was now at the head

* "Lancashire Memorials," quoted in Burton.
† Dispatch, in Carlyle's "Cromwell," vol. i. p. 290.

* "Memoirs," p. 201. † Ibid., p. 208

of four thousand seasoned troops, was looking upon the irregular forces, twice in number, that he was preparing to encounter. He had prearranged that he would endeavor to bring the rebels to battle upon the Sheriffmuir. It was a very peculiar battle-ground—"a broad eminence, which is formed by a spur of the Ochils, but swells so gently that at a distance it seems an elevated plain. . . . It has the peculiarity of being a regular curve, presenting in all parts a segment of a sphere, or rather an oblate spheroid. There are no rapid declivities and no plains. Hence in every part of the hill there is a close sky-line, caused by the immediate curve; and where there is so much of the curve as will reach a perpendicular of some eight feet between two bodies of men, they cannot see each other." * When Argyle's army was known to be at hand there was little question how to act. When there was a doubt with some about venturing to attack, the Highland chiefs cried out "Fight! Fight." The clans shouted, tossing up their caps and bonnets. Mar headed the Highlanders who were to oppose the left wing of the king's troops. He was superior in numbers. The English, under General Witham, were terrified and scattered under the rush of the Highlanders, and in a few minutes were in full retreat toward Stirling. The attack of the insurgents on the right wing, commanded by Argyle, had a totally different result. The night of frost had made a morass hard enough to bear a charge of cavalry; and while a squadron passing over the icy ground took the enemy in flank, Argyle with his remaining horse attacked their front. The rout was here complete, though many times in a distance of three miles did the Highlanders attempt to rally. It was a doubtful battle. Argyle had broken the left wing of the rebels, and had driven them over the river Allan. Mar had scattered the left wing of the royal army, and had chased them to Corntoun, a village near Stirling. Mar had been the first to return to the battle-field. He saw Argyle toiling along the road at the foot of the hill with his exhausted forces. "If they had but thrown down stones," writes Sir Walter Scott, in a note to Sinclair's "Memoirs," "they might have disordered Argyle's troops." Mar determined to leave the battle-field to Argyle, and then, while the wail of the bagpipes was heard in the retreat, was uttered, by Gordon of Glenbucket, the well-known apostrophe, "Oh, for an hour of Dundee!" But the ineffectual battle had for Argyle all the advantages of a great victory. The insurgents returned to Perth in numbers greatly reduced by desertion. "We were not long in our old quarters," writes the Master of Sinclair, "when the bad news of our friends' misfortune at Preston was brought us." Mar felt that the time was come when he might, through a friend, ask if Argyle was empowered to grant terms. Argyle replied that he would apply for such powers. Mar in his Diary says that no answer was returned to Argyle's application to the government in London.

It might have been wise in the government of George I. to have made some demonstration of a conciliatory policy. But the fear of a successful insurrection in England was overpassed. The affair of Preston had destroyed all the hopes of the northern Jacobites. Six thousand Dutch troops had landed, and were on their march to Scotland. Other reinforcements for Argyle's army were constantly arriving at Stirling. In this condition of strength no overtures toward oblivion were likely to be favorably regarded. An event now occurred which, if it had been well timed, might have rendered the struggle between the house of Brunswick and the house of Stuart more equal. James Edward had sailed from Dunkirk in a small armed vessel and had landed at Peterhead. He had only six followers, and proceeding through Aberdeen he reached the camp at Perth on the 16th of January, 1716. The advent of the prince was not so propitious to his cause as his adherents might have expected. The Highlanders gazed on a man of somewhat feeble frame and of listless action. In an account of the "proceedings at Perth" it is said, "We saw nothing in him that looked like spirit. Our men began to despise him. Some asked if he could speak. His countenance looked extremely heavy. He cared not to come abroad among us soldiers, or to see us handle our arms or do our exercise." The prince whose appearance was thus so disappointing took up his residence at Scone, and surrounded himself with all the etiquette of royalty. He issued proclamations, one of which commanded all able-bodied male persons to repair to his standard; another fixed the day of his coronation for the 23d of January. Alarm seems to have been felt at the court in London. Lord Townshend, who may be considered prime minister, was apprehensive that the chevalier would receive assistance from France. On the 26th of January Townshend wrote thus to Horace Walpole, the English minister at the Hague: "The pretender is now at Perth, and to be crowned King of Scotland. This step his friends here would not have suffered him to take in the present situation of affairs, unless the regent [of France] had given strong assurances of assistance. They send over in single ships, arms and ammunition, and officers; and those who are in the secret of their affairs seem confident they shall be further and more openly assisted as soon as the season will permit. For my part I cannot think anything can divert the regent from taking vigorously part with the pretender, but a strict union among our old friends and allies, by which he will see that he cannot meddle with our affairs here without involving France in a new war with all Europe; and by the best intelligence we have, the passion of the French is so strong in favor of the pretender that nothing but the fear of a new and general war can prevent their assisting our rebels here." *

To have relied upon that union of strength with merciful conciliation which the ministers of George had in their own power, without regard to continental alliances, might have been the best course for defeating the hopes of the pretender. The regent of France was not disposed to give the aid to the pretender which Townshend dreaded. The open assistance did not arrive. Argyle, with his reinforced army, was moving northward. Between him and Perth were villages in which shelter and provision might be obtained; and a decree went forth from the royal palace of Scone, by which the military commanders of Mar's forces were ordered to burn and destroy each village—houses, cows, and forage. Six happy abodes of a peaceful population were thus devastated, and the inhabitants were turned out in the snow to perish. Mar in a private letter wrote, "We shall be forced to burn and destroy a good deal of the country to prevent the enemy marching, which goes very much against the king's mind, as it does mine and more of us; but there's an absolute necessity for it." The prince himself wrote to Argyle respecting this act, "It was indeed forced on me by the violence with which my rebellious subjects acted against me, and what they as the authors of it must be answerable for—not I." Mar's belief was that Argyle's troops could not march when there was no cover left; for "how they can endure the cold for one night in the fields I cannot conceive; and then the roads are so that but one can go abreast." But Argyle did march, although, it is alleged, with some reluctance. On the 21st of January a party of dragoons went forth to report how far it was practicable to advance through a country buried in snow. On the 29th the main body moved, the peasantry having been pressed to clear the roads. On the 30th Argyle was at Auchterarder, one of the desolated villages. Terror began now to prevail among the courtiers in Perth. James Edward attended a council of war, and manifested extreme reluctance to compromise his personal safety. The Highlanders desired to place the king in the midst of them, and fight to the death—a desire by no means agreeable to an unenterprising man who now saw before him little else than a prospect of more signal misfortune than had yet awaited him. On the 30th of January, a day of evil omen, the army was informed that it was determined to retreat from Perth. They crossed the Tay upon the ice, and passing through Dundee reached Montrose on the 4th of February. Many of the Highlanders had previously dispersed, and had sought the shelter of their valleys. In the offing were several French vessels. Murmurs went through the camp that they were about to be deserted by the prince who had come to lead them to victory. Appearances were kept up by a guard of honor patrolling round the royal quarters. But the plan of escape had been effectually arranged. James Edward and the Earl of Mar passed at night by a lane to the harbor, got into a boat which was in waiting, were soon on board a French ship, and were safely landed near Gravelines. General Gordon, who was left chief in command, went on to Aberdeen with an army reduced to a thousand men. When Argyle entered Aberdeen on the 8th of February the whole insurgent army had melted away. The unhappy prince, whose attempt to regain the throne of his ancestors had thus so signally failed, wished to do a

* Burton, vol. ii. p. 191–3.

* Coxe, "Walpole," vol. i. p. 50.

slight act of justice to the poor people who had been ruined by what he deemed a military necessity among rebellious subjects. With the letter to Argyle which we have mentioned, he sent a sum of money, desiring it to be given as a relief to those whose homes he had commanded to be destroyed.

The parliament met on the 9th of January, 1716. The rebellion was necessarily the most prominent subject of the king's speech. The past successes were matter of congratulation; but the danger was not yet overpassed. "Our enemies," said the king, "animated by some secret hopes of assistance, are still endeavoring to support this desperate undertaking; and the pretender, as I have reason to believe, is landed in Scotland." Among the ill consequences of this rebellion was the extraordinary burden which it must create. "I take," added his majesty, "this first opportunity of declaring that I will freely give up all the estates that shall become forfeited to the crown by this rebellion, to be applied toward defraying the extraordinary expense incurred on this occasion." This incentive to a sweeping measure of attainder was scarcely wanted to stimulate the zeal of the majority in the Commons. Not an hour was lost in the proceedings which were expected to consign many victims to the executioner. Before the house adjourned, Mr. Lechmere, in a speech which is reported at length, impeached James Earl of Derwentwater of high treason. This speech of the Whig member is remarkable for its emphatic assertion that the punishment of the leaders of the rebellion was a national question, involving the great principle of the Act of Settlement as opposed to the bare claim of hereditary right. In justice to the king, as well as the people, they ought to take this prosecution into their own hands. The power of impeachment, Mr. Lechmere said, was the most valuable and useful privilege that belonged to the body of the Commons, and he maintained that no pardon under the great seal could discharge a judgment obtained under such an impeachment. Six other members severally impeached William Lord Widdrington, William Earl of Nithisdale, George Earl of Winton, Robert Earl of Carnwath, William Viscount Kenmure, and William Lord Nairn. The Commons agreed to the impeachments without any opposition; and on the same day the seven members carried their impeachments to the bar of the House of Lords. In a few days the articles against the seven noblemen were presented to the Peers; and on the 19th of January they knelt at the bar, and each delivered his answer to the charges. The answers of all, with the exception of that of Lord Winton, amounted to a plea of guilty. When Lord Derwentwater was asked by the chancellor if he meant by his answer to plead guilty, the reply was, "He does; and submits to the king's mercy, and humbly desires their lordships' intercession to his majesty." The same supplication for mercy, founded upon extenuating circumstances set forth in their answers, was urged by the five Scottish noblemen whose pleas of guilty were recorded. On the 9th of February Lord Derwentwater and his companions in misfortune were again brought to the bar of the House of Lords, and the ancient sentence in cases of high treason was pronounced by Lord Chancellor Cowper, who had been appointed by the king to act as lord high steward.

That unavoidable struggle between the advocates of an exemplary punishment for the highest legal offence, and the advocates for mercy toward mistaken but conscientious political offenders, now went on under circumstances of intense interest. The ordinary feelings of compassion and the national dislike of blood-shedding were more than commonly excited when it was known that the young Countess of Derwentwater, surrounded by the highest ladies of the court, had obtained an audience of the king, and implored pardon for her lord. It was known too that the wives of the Lords Nithisdale and Nairn had suddenly appeared in an antechamber through which King George passed, and throwing themselves at his feet had disturbed the phlegmatic monarch by attempts to present their petitions. Lady Nithisdale has described this scene: "I caught hold of the skirt of his coat, that he might stop and hear me. He endeavored to escape out of my hands, but I kept such strong hold that he dragged me upon my knees from the middle of the room to the very door of the drawing-room. At last one of the blue ribbons who attended his majesty took me round the waist, while another wrested the coat out of my hands. The petition, which I had endeavored to thrust into his pocket, fell down in the scuffle, and I almost fainted away through grief and disappointment." Walpole, whose nature was wholly opposed to severity, took the statesman's view that condign punishment in the cases of these lords was essential to the public security. The lobbies of parliament on the 21st of February were filled with high-born ladies who came in a body to petition the Lords and Commons. Many even of the Whig members of the lower house, among whom was the kind-hearted Richard Steele, were advocates for mercy. Walpole, to prevent these appeals, moved the adjournment of the house to the 1st of March, during which interval the executions were to take place. Walpole only carried his motion by a majority of seven. In the House of Peers, upon a debate whether the king could pardon those condemned under impeachment, Nottingham, a member of the cabinet, opposed the opinion of his colleagues. The power of the king to pardon was affirmed; and an address to his majesty, to reprieve such of the condemned lords as should deserve his mercy, was voted by a small majority. The ministers could not wholly resist such manifestations. They met in council; resolved to reprieve the Lords Nairn, Carnwath, and Widdrington; but issued an order for the execution of the Lords Derwentwater, Kenmure, and Nithisdale on the following morning. On the 24th of February Derwentwater and Kenmure suffered death on a scaffold erected on Tower Hill. They each professed their remorse for having pleaded guilty, and avowed their conviction that James III. was their rightful sovereign. The chamber in the Tower in which Lord Nithisdale was confined was found vacant. His escape had been effected by the courageous agency of his devoted wife. The relation of this heroic adventure is contained in a letter from Lady Nithisdale to her sister, after she had resided many years happily with her husband in France.* Having vainly striven to move the king to receive her petition, she formed the resolution to attempt her lord's escape. Seeing no prospect of his pardon, on the night before the morning appointed for his execution she went in a coach to the Tower, accompanied by a tall and slender lady of the name of Morgan, who, in addition to her own clothes, carried under her riding-hood a complete dress, fitted for a tall and stout lady named Mills, about the same size as the noble prisoner. Lady Nithisdale took in the slight Mrs. Morgan to her husband, and disrobed her of the clothes intended for the portly Mrs. Mills. Mrs. Morgan was then dismissed, and sliding out unnoticed, sent up stairs the other lady, who was weeping, and covering her face with her handkerchief. The exchange of dress was soon effected by Mrs. Mills, who left her own clothes for the prisoner; and she took her departure with loud injunctions from Lady Nithisdale to "dear Mrs. Catherine," who was no longer weeping, to send her ladyship's maid with a dress fitted for her to present a petition that night. The excellent manager then returned to her lord, whitened and rouged his face, concealed his beard, put on an artificial head-dress, and led him out with his handkerchief to his eyes, the very Mrs. Mills who had come in weeping and covering her face. At the outer door was the tardy maid, who in reality was an affectionate friend of Lady Nithisdale, and by her care was the fortunate prisoner conducted to a place of security. The anxious wife now returned to her husband's chamber, talked, as to her lord, somewhat loudly, imitated his voice, finally bade him good-night, so that all might hear, and then went quietly away. It is difficult to understand this without being apprised that Lady Nithisdale had previously moved the compassion of the guards, had given them little presents, and was accustomed to pass to her husband without much notice. Having shared her husband's place of concealment in an obscure lodging for a day or two, the brave wife had the satisfaction of knowing that he got to Dover in the disguise of a footman to the Venetian ambassador, whose coach and six was going to meet his brother. Such details as these of the ingenuity which love may prompt in the hour of distress are a welcome relief to the consideration of the severe course of penal infliction which we should be scarcely justified in describing as political vengeance. The escapes of many of the prisoners—among whom was Lord Winton immediately after his trial, Mr. Forster, and the old brigadier Mac Intosh—would lead to the belief that the government was not sorry that the stern necessity for the punishment of rebels taken in arms should be avoided by less direct modes than that

* Published in "Transactions of the Society of Antiquaries in Scotland," vol. i. The chief passages are extracted in Lord Mahon's History, vol. ii. Appendix.

of the royal clemency. In this case, as in many others, a government has much to contend with in the passions and prejudices of individuals. It might have been thought that after the lapse of ten years the hatreds of clanship and the thirst for the fall of political enemies might have been laid aside. The following record is not creditable to the character of the Duke of Argyle. In the Diary of Lord King, who was lord chancellor in 1725, is the following entry: "June 15th, 1725. A regency, where, among other things, was read a petition of George Lord Murray, setting forth that he was but eighteen years old when he went into the rebellion; that he stands indicted, but was never convicted nor attainted; praying the king's mercy: which being referred by the king to the regency for their opinions, we were all of opinion that there was nothing in law to stand in the way of the king's pardon, and that if he pleased he might do it. But it was desired that there might be a more explicit opinion, and what we should advise the king to do. I said I wished him pardoned, but I was unacquainted with the facts, and therefore could only say that if the king thought fit to pardon him, there was nothing in law to obstruct it; but to advise either one way or other I could not, because I was not sufficiently master of the facts. The archbishop would not advise anything in the case of blood. The Duke of Argyle strongly against it, because this man's treason was attended with perfidy, in deserting the king's troops and running away to the rebels; and if this man were pardoned, others would immediately make the same application. Roxburgh, Walpole, a majority were for it; so a letter ordered to advise the king to pardon him." *

The escapes, to which we have alluded, of some of the leaders in this rebellion, were very remarkable instances of boldness and perseverance. Mac Intosh, though advanced in years, on the day before his trial was to take place knocked down the keeper and turnkey of Newgate, fled into the London crowds, and reached a place of safety abroad. Forster, by the agency of his servant, got out of Newgate with the aid of a false key, and the master and the man had time to get off, having locked up the keeper in his own prison. Winton, whose adventurous life had given him some profitable experiences, having lived with a blacksmith in France, "was very curious," says Patten, "in working in several handicraft matters." He cut one of the iron bars of his window in the Tower with some small tool which he had concealed from his keepers. Some humbler instruments of the insurrection were less fortunate. Many were tried at Liverpool who had been taken at Preston. Some were executed, and more banished to the plantations. A large number of Scotch prisoners had been sent for trial to Carlisle, but Scots of all parties contended that this proceeding was a breach of the judicial independence of Scotland. An act had been passed by which the rebels might be tried in other English counties than those in which they were apprehended. The Scottish lawyers maintained that this act did not apply to prisoners taken in Scotland. The trials at Carlisle went on. Some were condemned, others were released, but no capital punishment was inflicted. The English judges did not choose to incur the responsibility of the possible misconstruction of a statute.

CHAPTER CXLIX.

The pretender in Paris—He discards Bolingbroke—The Septennial Act—The king leaves for Germany—His foreign predilections—Negotiations at Hanover for a French alliance—The king's jealousy of the Prince of Wales—Lord Townshend dismissed from his office of secretary of state—Arrest of the Swedish ambassador—Schism in the ministry—Stanhope prime minister—Trial of the Earl of Oxford—The Quadruple Alliance—Open quarrel between the king and the Prince of Wales—Byng's destruction of the Spanish fleet—Measures of toleration proposed by Stanhope—Spanish expedition to Scotland—Successes of France and England in Spain—Alberoni disgraced—Spain accedes to the quadruple alliance—The Peerage Bill.

Within a fortnight after the fugitive prince, who had slunk away at night from the brave mountaineers who would have fought for him to the last, had landed on the continent, King George announced the fact to parliament. Both houses addressed the king, desiring that the most effectual means should be taken "toward preventing the pretender from finding refuge or protection in any country in amity with your majesty." The pretender himself took the most effectual means to quiet the alarm of the Whig politicians. On his arrival at St. Germains, *incognito*, he was met by Bolingbroke; received from his secretary the sound advice to hasten to his old residence at Bar-le-duc; promised Bolingbroke that he would immediately set out, embracing him at their parting; and, instead of taking a journey to find a safe asylum, before it was too late, lingered in Paris, and sent to Bolingbroke, by the hands of the Duke of Ormond, a dismissal from his service. James at once fell into the hands of weak politicians and intriguing priests. He was politely refused admission to the territory of Lorraine, and he finally settled in the papal states—a locality precisely calculated to render the Protestant feeling of Great Britain more acute. Bolingbroke never forgot the indignity he had received. He vowed that never more should his sword or his pen be employed for a Stuart, and he kept his word. The character which he drew of James is marked by the intensity of his dislike: "He is naturally inclined to believe the worst, which I take to be a certain mark of a mean spirit and a wicked soul. . . . Prone to judge ill of all mankind, he will rarely be seduced by his credulity; but I never knew a man so capable of being the bubble of his distrust and jealousy." *

The vindictive and intolerant spirit of the English legislature against Roman Catholics was again called into action by the rebellion of 1715. A few days after the execution of Lord Derwentwater, whose adherence to the old religion and the old dynasty cost him his life, and bereft his family of their fair possessions, a bill was brought in by Mr. Lechmere, "to strengthen the Protestant interest in Great Britain by enforcing the laws now in being against papists." One of its provisions was to punish papists for enlisting in the king's service. All such securities for the Protestant interest have happily yielded to the influence of time. One important act of parliament, which was mainly intended to avert the dangers which threatened the peaceful continuance of the Hanoverian succession, remains in force, after nearly a century and a half, when all such apprehensions have long since passed away. Amid the vital changes in parliamentary representation which we have seen in our time, the Septennial Act of George I. has endured, and will probably continue to endure, without reference to the temporary objects of its original enactment. The bill which provided that no parliament should in future sit more than three years, upon which William III. exercised his veto in 1693, was passed in the year following. Before the passing of this triennial act of the 6th of William and Mary, the duration of parliament was only limited at the will of the reigning sovereign, or was determined by his death. The second parliament of Charles II. sat for seventeen years. The preamble to the Septennial Act, after reciting the portion of the statute of William and Mary regarding the duration of parliament, says, "Whereas, it hath been found by experience, that the said clause hath proved very grievous and burdensome, by occasioning much greater and more continued expenses, in order to elections of members to serve in parliament, and more violent and lasting heats and animosities among the subjects of this realm, than were ever known before the said clause was enacted, and the said provision, if it should continue, may probably, at this juncture, when a restless and popish faction are designing and endeavoring to renew the rebellion within this kingdom, and an invasion from abroad, be destructive to the peace and security of the government." The Septennial Act was called by Dr. Priestley, "a direct usurpation of the rights of the people; for by the same authority that one parliament prolonged their own power to seven years they might have continued it to twice seven." Had the parliament of George I. simply repealed the Triennial Act, they might have sat to the end of his reign without interruption except from the pleasure of the crown. The preamble to the Septennial Act looks to its temporary expediency; to the evils that might have been produced in the agitated state of parties (when the greater number of Tories had become Jacobites, as Bolingbroke asserts), if a general election were to take place in 1717. The debates on this question had principally relation to the Septennial Bill as a permanent measure. It was intro-

* Lord King's "Notes on Domestic and Foreign Affairs," appended to "Life of Locke," vol. ii.

* Letter to Sir W. Wyndham.

duced in the House of Lords, where it passed by no very preponderating majority. In the Commons the proportionate majority was much greater. Among the people generally the measure appears to have excited very little interest, and scarcely any opposition; there being only petitions against it from ten boroughs, half of these being places of small population,* and open to that corruption which made frequent elections occasions for dishonest traffic. During the passing of the bill Lord Somers was in his last fatal illness. His intellect was sufficiently clear for a short time to give an opinion upon the measure to Lord Townshend: "I think," he said, "it will be the greatest support possible to the liberty of the country." The great constitutional lawyer died on the day the bill was read a third time in the House of Commons. Speaker Onslow often declared that the passing of the Septennial Bill formed the era of the emancipation of the British House of Commons from its former dependence on the crown and the House of Lords.† The period would arrive when this greater power of the House of Commons produced by the Septennial Act would be looked upon with jealousy by large portions of the middle classes, and of those beneath them in station; and when a principle even more democratic than that of triennial elections should be ardently desired, as one of the modes of converting the member of parliament into a delegate instead of a representative. Practically, very few parliaments of recent times have had a septennial existence; and many thinking persons have been disposed to agree with Mr. Hallam, that under the existing custom of considering six years as the natural life of a House of Commons, "the usual term of duration should be permitted to take its course, except in cases where some great change of national policy may perhaps justify its abridgment." Our constitutional historian holds that "the crown would often obtain a very serious advantage over the House of Commons, if it should become an ordinary thing to dissolve parliament for some petty ministerial interest, or to divert some unpatible resolution."‡ While the Septennial Bill was passing through committee in the Commons, Mr. Lechmere desired to introduce a clause to disable the holders of pensions during pleasure from becoming members of *either house* of parliament. This was opposed as interfering with the privileges of the Peers. But Stanhope, one of the secretaries of state, brought in a bill which provided that no person having a pension from the crown during pleasure, or for a term of years, either in his own name or in the name of any person for his benefit, should sit or vote in the House of Commons, under a penalty of twenty pounds for every day in which he should so sit or vote.§

By the Act of Settlement the descendant of the Princess Sophia of Hanover who should be called to the throne of Great Britain was restricted from going out of the kingdom without the consent of parliament. A bill was brought in to repeal that clause of the act; and becoming law without opposition, the king prepared to set forth to his German dominions. Previous to his majesty's departure there was a creation of eight peers. The king's anxiety to visit Hanover at this juncture was extremely objectionable to his responsible advisers. But their remonstrances were useless. When Addison eulogized what he described as the "uniformity and firmness of mind" of George I.,‖ he, of course, did not recognize that family characteristic which carried firmness, too often, into obstinacy. "His majesty was bred up from his infancy with a love to this our nation," continues Addison. He did not speak of the greater love which the king, not unnaturally, bore to his own hereditary dominions. "By his succeeding to the dukedom of Zell," writes the political essayist, "he became one of the greatest princes of Germany, and one of the most powerful persons that ever stood next heir to the throne of Great Britain. The duchy of Bremen and the bishopric of Osnaburg have considerably strengthened his interests in the empire, and given a great additional weight to the Protestant cause." Happier might it have been if this great prince of Germany, and his successor, could have mitigated their excessive "predilection for their native country, which alone could endanger their English throne."¶ There was a constant suspicion, during their reigns, that continental alliances and wars were in the interest of Hanover rather than in that of Great Britain; and although this belief was in some instances unjust, every minister had to contend against the unpopularity which it threw upon the government. Every minister, from Walpole to Chatham, was, in his turn, obliged to yield, however unwillingly, to the "uniformity and firmness of mind" which governed the continental policy of these princes. Their repeated absences from England were no light interruption to the tranquil progress of English affairs. These absences became a positive danger when each of these kings was known to stand upon the worst terms with his eldest son. Speaking a foreign language, surrounded by foreign mistresses and favorites, and constantly called away to his foreign states, George I. never ceased to be regarded by the English people as a foreigner. He was imperfectly acquainted with the character of the people he had been called upon to govern; and he took no pains to understand their reasonable wishes, or to conciliate their unreasonable prejudices. The government of the kingdom naturally fell into the hands of the ministers who represented the stronger party. It was fortunate that eventually a minister obtained almost exclusive power, who for many years kept the nation quiet, and allowed its growing industry to become the source of great material prosperity. The system of Sir Robert Walpole was little fitted to call forth any high political aspirations, to originate any great reforms, to widen and deepen the foundations of freedom and toleration. But it preserved the country from convulsions, if it failed to destroy the bitterness of parties. Walpole was neither tyrannous nor unjust. He governed by corruption, in our present improved view of what is corruption, when a bribe is no longer termed "a consideration;" but having obtained his parliamentary supremacy by unworthy methods, he did not employ his venal instruments to trample upon the liberties of his country. He laughed at the noisy patriots whom he did not care to buy, or was unable to buy; but during the twenty years of his unassailable possession of power, amid the constant sense of danger from the tendency of Toryism to identify itself with Jacobitism, he proscribed no political enemy. It has been truly said, "Sir Robert Walpole was the minister who gave to our government that character of lenity which it has since generally preserved."* Before Walpole became the supreme director of affairs, there was much complication of foreign policy, which we will endeavor to relate as succinctly as the necessary details will permit.

In the spring of 1716 defensive alliances had been concluded by the British government with the States-General and with the emperor, to operate in case of aggression on either by France or other powers. The issue, however, of the rebellion of 1715 had entirely indisposed the government of the Regent of France to any rupture with England. The Duke of Orleans was moreover anxious to procure the support of England to his succession to the crown of France, in the event of the death of Louis XV., a sickly boy. The claim to that crown had been renounced by the Bourbon King of Spain; but Philip V. might interpret that renunciation according to the power which he might possess of setting his agreement at nought. While George I. was at Hanover this summer, negotiations were going forward between Stanhope, his secretary of state, and the Abbé Dubois, the profligate but most able servant of the regent. The English government desired the expulsion of the pretender from France and its dependencies, and was anxious to stipulate that a new harbor should be abandoned which Louis XIV. had begun to construct at Mardyke, to serve the same warlike purposes as Dunkirk, which had been demolished according to the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht. The agent of the regent was ready to yield these points, to secure the friendship of the government of King George. Thus the policy of England and France tended toward peace and a more intimate alliance. On the other hand, the continental objects of George I. threatened to involve his island subjects in a war, in which they would certainly not have engaged had their king not also been Elector of Hanover. When Charles XII. of Sweden, in 1714, after those five years of seclusion at Bender which followed the disastrous day of Pultowa, burst upon Europe again, he found a large part of his territories divided among many rapacious neighbors, with whom he would have to fight if Sweden were to regain any semblance of her old power. Frederick IV. of Denmark, in 1712, had conquered Schleswig and Holstein, Bremen and

* Lord Mahon, "History," vol. i. p. 307.
‡ "Constitutional History," chap. xvi.
‖ "Freeholder," No. 2.
† Coxe's "Walpole."
§ 1 Geo. I. stat. 2, c. 56.
¶ Hallam.

* Macaulay, "Essay on Horace Walpole."

Verden. To strengthen himself against Charles, "the Swedish-iron hero," as Mr. Carlyle calls him, Frederick bartered away Bremen and Verden to the Elector of Hanover, in 1715, for a hundred and fifty thousand pounds, on condition that George should join a coalition against Sweden. George's son-in-law, Frederick William of Prussia, had gone to war that same year, with his giant grenadiers, to compel Charles to resign his pretensions to Stettin, which Prussia had obtained in pawn for a payment of sixty thousand pounds. The northern war blazed furiously. The Elector of Hanover sent a British fleet into the Baltic to coerce Sweden, and with six thousand Hanoverians joined the Prussians, Danes, and Russians, against "the Lion-king." At Stralsund Charles made his last effort. He was overpowered, and getting away to Sweden, meditated schemes of vast import, but thoroughly impracticable. Charles endeavored to gratify his revenge against England in stirring up another Jacobite insurrection. Northern Europe was now still more agitated; for the Czar Peter had marched with his Muscovites into Mecklenburg, and was threatening Denmark. George was for violent measures against Russia, which his minister Stanhope very wisely discountenanced. This smoke did not burst into flame. In the conduct of the negotiation with France there was a difference of opinion between Stanhope at Hanover and Townshend at home; and this, with other less dignified causes, produced a partial breaking-up of King George's first Whig ministry.

The history of the schism which drove Townshend from the helm is given with great minuteness by the excellent descendant of Stanhope; and with a laudable anxiety to acquit his ancestor of any paltry attempt to abuse the confidence of George I., to the prejudice of his honest and able minister at home.* It is scarcely necessary for us to enter generally upon these details. One point, however, connected with this ministerial change is of importance, as a characteristic of the domestic politics of the first, second and third princes of the house of Brunswick who were kings of England. From the second year of George I. may be dated the manifestation of that national calamity which our country had to endure during three successive reigns—the hateful exhibition of a party in opposition to the government of the actual sovereign gathering round the heir-apparent. When King George set out for Hanover in the summer of 1716, he was extremely jealous of intrusting, during his absence, any special power and authority to the Prince of Wales. The king wished to join others in commission with the prince. Townshend opposed this. The king so far yielded as to appoint his son guardian of the realm and lieutenant; but he withheld the title of regent from him, and imposed several restrictions upon his administrative power. The popularity which the prince acquired during the king's absence was looked upon with fear and suspicion at Hanover. He was affable, appeared fond of English customs, spoke our language tolerably well, and went among the people in a free and unreserved manner. Party-writers began to contrast the son with the father. The prince was not discreet in a position where discretion was so essential. He manifested an eagerness to open the parliament in person during the king's absence; while the king desired that the prorogation might be extended, to enable him to remain longer at Hanover. Townshend, in his communications with Stanhope, had pressed that the king should speedily decide as to his return, intimated the prince's wish to open parliament, and suggested that in certain emergencies a larger discretionary power should be given to the "Guardian of the Realm." The king was enraged, and avowed his determination to dismiss his chief minister from his office of secretary of state. To soften this dismissal Townshend was offered the office of lord lieutenant of Ireland. The secretary at first stoutly refused. His colleagues were indignant. Stanhope, from Hanover, tried to persuade them to acquiesce in the king's determination. The Whigs, he wrote to Mr. Methuen, one of the commissioners of the treasury, "may possibly unking their master, or (which I do before God think very possible) make him abdicate England; but they will certainly not force him to make my Lord Townshend secretary."† When Townshend was removed from the administration, the public indignation was loudly expressed. He was considered to be sacrificed to the cabal which looked upon Hanover as more important than England. He was known to be hated by the rapacious Mademoiselle de Schulenberg, the king's mistress, who was afterward created Duchess of Kendal. George hastened his return to England, and having probably been made aware of the danger he incurred in breaking with the most important members of the great Whig party, expressed his regret to Townshend for having acted with precipitation. The fallen minister was at last induced to accept the lord lieutenancy of Ireland, and Methuen was appointed secretary of state as the colleague of Stanhope. The apparent renewal of the friendly relations of the sovereign and his ministers was not of long duration.

The king opened the session of parliament on the 20th of February, 1717. He announced that a treaty of alliance had been concluded between Great Britain, France, and the States-General. There were to be no longer apprehensions about Dunkirk and Mardyke; the pretender was to be removed beyond the Alps. This treaty, concluded on the 4th of January, 1717, is known as the "Triple Alliance." The king further notified that he had directed papers to be laid before parliament, "which contain a certain account of a projected invasion." These papers were "Copies of letters which passed between Count Gyllenburg, the Baron Gortz, Spaar, and others, relating to the design of raising a rebellion in his majesty's dominions, to be supported by a force from Sweden." The discovery of this scheme had delayed the opening of the session. In October some letters between Baron Gortz, the bold and intriguing minister of Charles XII., and Count Gyllenburg, the Swedish envoy in London, had been intercepted and deciphered by the English government. On the 29th of January Stanhope, as secretary of state, laid the information thus obtained before the council; and it was determined to resort to the extraordinary measure of arresting the Swedish envoy, and of seizing his papers. Gyllenburg, of course, stoutly resisted, and pleaded the protection to which the representatives of foreign governments are entitled by the law of nations. That law, however, does not sanction an ambassador in being the active instrument of plots against the government to which he is accredited. General Wade carried off the contents of the Swede's escritoire, and put a guard over his prisoner. The contents of the papers fully justified the act of the government. Gortz had organized a scheme for an insurrection in England, and a simultaneous invasion of Scotland by the King of Sweden. Spain had entered into the confederacy. Its prime minister, Alberoni, had remitted a million of French livres to Spaar, the Swedish envoy in Paris, to set the forces of Charles XII. in motion. The pretender had offered sixty thousand pounds for the same object. The whole affair exploded upon the arrest of Gyllenburg. The King of Sweden did not disown the acts of his ministers, neither did he own them; but he ordered the British resident at his court to be put under arrest. Apprehensions of danger from Sweden were still professed by the English ministry, and on the 3d of April Stanhope delivered to the Commons a royal message, asking for an additional supply, "not only to secure his majesty's kingdoms against the present dangers with which they are threatened from Sweden, but likewise to prevent as far as possible the like apprehensions for the future." In the debate which ensued strong objections were made to the proposition. "It must needs be very surprising to the whole world," said one member, "that a nation, not long ago the terror of France and Spain, should now seem to fear so inconsiderable an enemy as Sweden." The motion for a supply was only carried by a majority of four votes. It was opposed by many of the Whigs, and coldly supported by others. Walpole, to whom the house looked up on all financial questions, spoke indeed in favor of the motion, but with a reserve that was more significant than censure. It was clear that the most important of the Whig leaders were jealous of the influence of Sunderland, who was now held to be the king's chief adviser. The result of this debate was that the same evening Townshend was dismissed from his office of lord lieutenant of Ireland, and that the next morning Robert Walpole resigned—firm in his resistance to the entreaties of the king to keep the seals of chancellor of the exchequer. Other resignations followed, including that of Methuen. Stanhope now became the head of the government, Sunderland and Addison were appointed secretaries of state, and James Craggs secretary at war.

Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, having been two years a prisoner

* Lord Mahon, "History," vol. i. ch. vii.
† Coxe, "Life of Walpole."

in the Tower, presented a petition to the House of Lords praying that his confinement might not be prolonged. The day of his trial was therefore fixed for the 24th of June. The Peers were assembled in Westminster Hall; the Commons were in attendance as prosecutors; the prisoner stood at the bar with the axe by his side; one of the managers opened the first article of impeachment regarding the Treaty of Utrecht. Lord Harcourt, the ex-chancellor, then moved that the Peers should retire to their own house, and he there proposed a resolution, which was carried by a majority of thirty-two, "that no evidence should be received on the charges for misdemeanor till the charges for high treason were disposed of." It was known that the evidence was insufficient to convict Oxford of the crime that would have affected his life and estate. The Commons were indignant at this proceeding of the Peers, which it is affirmed was suggested by Walpole; and they refused to comply with it, regarding it as an infringement of their privileges. The Lords persevered, and named the 1st of July as the day when the trial should proceed according to the principle they had laid down. The Commons resolved that, justice being denied to the nation, they would abandon the prosecution. The defeat of the government was no doubt fortunate. Oxford was acquitted, as no prosecutor had appeared. The multitude cheered, and the nation generally, as well as the Tories, was not displeased that there should be some oblivion of political offences. The session of parliament was concluded by an Act of Grace, from which Oxford and Prior were excluded, but which released from prison the Lords Carnwath, Widdrington, and Nairn, and others who were under sentence of death or in confinement for their participation in the rebellion of 1715.

The period during which Stanhope had the chief administration of affairs, from 1717 to his death in 1721, was a period of extraordinary excitement in the complicated policy of various European states, and of momentous embarrassment in the financial operations of the English people and the English government. It is difficult to describe our foreign relations in a brief narrative, and it would not be very interesting to relate the events connected with them in any lengthened detail. The whole course of these events is calculated to show how, in many cases, those territorial arrangements which appear to have been finally settled by treaties are suddenly broken up by unforeseen combinations; how the restless ambition of princes and ministers, the pretensions of rival dynasties, the dissatisfaction of peoples shifted from master to master, render what is called the balance of power a condition of things in which those who fancy they may preserve an equilibrium, fall under the necessity of perpetually throwing a weight into one scale, or taking a weight out of another. Such attempts being generally failures, the blindfolded phantom of justice terminates the abortive labor by throwing away the scales and drawing the sword.

The chief instigator of the disputes which in 1717 threatened to involve Europe again in a general war was Cardinal Alberoni, the prime minister of Spain. Philip V. had never displayed any vigor of mind, and he was now governed by his queen, over whom Alberoni had an absolute control. This remarkable Italian, the son of a laborer, had been in Spain with the Duke de Vendôme during the War of the Succession. His agreeable qualities had gained him the favor of Vendôme, and he had gradually worked his way to the highest trust and dignity. When General Stanhope was a prisoner in Saragossa he became acquainted with Alberoni, and when the same general became King George's secretary of state, their correspondence on the subject of a commercial treaty was marked by a more than usual manifestation of a desire on the part of the Spanish minister to be on good terms with the British government. But the emperor had never recognized Philip as king of Spain. Under the peace of Utrecht he held the dominions in Italy which had formerly belonged to Spain. In the defensive treaty between Great Britain and the emperor the territorial guarantee was thus offensive to the court of Philip V. The alliance with France was still more offensive. The tone of Alberoni toward the British government became wholly changed. He had great projects in view, which he thought would raise Spain in the scale of nations. He prepared an armament at Barcelona, whose destination was wholly unknown. In August, 1717, a Spanish fleet anchored in the bay of Cagliari, and eight or nine thousand troops made a descent on the island of Sardinia, of which they took possession after a stout resistance from Spaniards of the Austrian party. The expedition was not merely intended to seize this barren territory. Spain had an eye to Sicily, which had been ceded at the peace to Victor Amadeus. England interposed, in the endeavor to preserve the peace of Europe. Negotiations went forward, without much effect; Stanhope having sent his cousin, afterward Earl of Harrington, as ambassador to Spain. The Regent of France also sent his ambassador. But the bold and crafty Alberoni wanted only to gain time, and he made the most extensive preparations for war upon a great scale. Spain, directed by the energy of this adventurer, threw off her accustomed lethargy. In a year or two he had set in motion every instrument of intrigue against France and England. The Turks had been totally defeated by Prince Eugene at the great battle of Peterwaradin. Alberoni urged the Sultan to persevere in the war with the emperor. He had encouraged Baron Gortz in his schemes for the invasion of England by Sweden. He entered into correspondence with the pretender, and proposed a Spanish expedition to land in Britain, to be commanded by James, or by the Duke of Ormond. He fomented insurrections and conspiracies in France. In 1718 it became evident that the British government must prepare for warlike operations, and give up its attempts at mediation. Alberoni, whose vanity made him presumptuous, but whose acuteness gave him signal advantages over ordinary politicians, must have offered many a rude shock to the complacency of diplomatic routine. The English negotiators had to attempt the difficult task of reconciling the conflicting interests of the emperor and the Bourbon King of Spain. The Treaty of Utrecht had failed in placing the peace of Europe on a durable foundation. There must be other territorial arrangements, which it was the object of the Quadruple Alliance of England, Holland, France, and the emperor to effect. Exchanges of dominion were to be made between the rivals; something gained and something yielded on either side; doubtful successions guaranteed; compensations; all interests consulted but that trifling one, the welfare of those handed about from potentate to potentate. It is impossible not to feel a sort of respect for the vain and insolent Alberoni, when he encountered with words such as these the solemn bargain-makers whom the English cabinet employed to arrange articles of accommodation between the Austrian and Bourbon rivals: "You made war to establish the balance of power, and you concluded a peace without any balance whatever. . . . There are certain men who would cut and pare states and kingdoms as though they were so many Dutch cheeses." Thus treating their projects of pacification with contempt, he went his own way to redress the wrongs of which he complained, describing the peace of Utrecht as "a treaty made by the devil," and the scheme of another balance as a monster which he termed "a goat-stag." He resolved for war, exclaiming, "The Lord's hand is not shortened."

With this threatened interruption to the peace of Europe, the administration of Stanhope, who was now raised to the peerage, had to meet the parliament which was summoned for the 21st of November. Just at this time a scene took place within the walls of St. James's Palace which threatened as much embarrassment to the tranquil progress of government as any complication of foreign affairs. The king and the Prince of Wales openly quarrelled. The rupture was deemed of sufficient importance to warrant the secretary of state in writing an explanation of the circumstances to the foreign ministers. This official account does not differ in any material point from the more lively narrative of Horace Walpole: "The Princess of Wales had been delivered of a second son. The prince had intended his uncle, the Duke of York, Bishop of Osnaburg, should with his majesty be godfather. Nothing could equal the indignation of his royal highness when the king named the Duke of Newcastle for second sponsor, and would hear of no other. The christening took place as usual in the princess's bedchamber. Lady Suffolk, then in waiting as lady of the bedchamber, and of most accurate memory, painted the scene to me exactly. On one side of the bed stood the godfathers and godmothers; on the other the prince and the princess's ladies. No sooner had the bishop closed the ceremony than the prince, crossing the feet of the bed in a rage, stepped up to the Duke of Newcastle, and, holding up his hand and forefinger in a menacing attitude, said, 'You are a rascal, but I shall find you;' meaning, in broken English, 'I shall find a time to be revenged.' 'What was my astonishment,' continued Lady Suffolk,

'when going to the princess's apartment next morning, the yeomen in the guard-chamber pointed their halberds at my breast, and told me I must not pass! I urged that it was my duty to attend the princess. They said, 'No matter; I must not pass that way.'" * The Prince of Wales had been put under arrest in his own apartment, into which Lady Suffolk was forbidden to pass, and was finally commanded to leave the palace, which he did with the Princess Caroline of Anspach, his sensible wife. Then was exhibited the unbecoming spectacle of the heir-apparent in opposition to the government of his father; of the court of Leicester House in rivalry to the court of St. James. The discarded members of the Whig cabinet could at Leicester House lament, in common with Tories and Jacobites, over their exclusion from power. Walpole and Shippen could make common cause as assailants of the existing government, however irreconcilable themselves upon the principles upon which the government should be conducted. The king, on the other hand, was surrounded by some indiscreet and unscrupulous adherents. After his majesty's death, Queen Caroline found among his private papers a proposal from the Earl of Berkeley, first lord of the admiralty in 1718—which proposal was in the handwriting of Charles Stanhope—to seize the Prince of Wales and carry him off to America. George I. had too much sense to adopt the kidnapping project; but he formed a crude plan to obtain an act of parliament that the prince should be compelled to relinquish his German possessions upon coming to the throne of Great Britain. The friends of a constitutional monarchy were alarmed at these proceedings, and it was fortunate that the power which the great abilities of Walpole eventually secured under George I., enabled him to use, for the purpose of outward reconciliation, the influence which he had obtained over the Prince of Wales during his term of opposition politics.

Into fightings arising out of the squabbles of the empire and of Spain—or rather, out of the squabbles of "Kaiser Karl VI. and Elizabeth Farnese, termagant queen of Spain" †—was England precipitated. When the number of troops to be maintained came to be discussed in parliament, "downright Shippen" said that some expressions of the king's speech "seem rather calculated for the meridian of Germany than of Great Britain." He added, "It is the only infelicity of his majesty's reign that he is unacquainted with our language and constitution, and it is therefore the more incumbent on his British ministers to inform him that our government does not stand on the same foundation with his German dominions, which, by reason of their situation and the nature of their constitution, are obliged to keep up armies in time of peace." ‡ For these expressions Mr. Shippen was sent to the Tower, and there remained till the prorogation of parliament in March. There were interesting debates in both houses on the evident tendency to engage in war indicated by the number of troops to be employed; but the parliament was prorogued with the royal expression of a hope that such treaties might be concluded, "as will settle peace and tranquillity among our neighbors." The hope was illusive; and indeed was contrary to a message from the crown, just at the close of the session, pointing out the necessity of an increase of the navy. No specific object was named; but Walpole observed that the message and the address which was voted had the air of a declaration of war against Spain. On the 4th of June Admiral Byng sailed for the Mediterranean, having twenty ships of the line under his command; for intelligence had been received that an armament of twenty-nine ships of war, with transports for thirty-five thousand soldiers, had sailed from Barcelona with sealed orders. The English prime minister, Lord Stanhope, in the desire to avert war, had proceeded to Madrid, and he was even prepared to give up Gibraltar, which it appears he thought "of no consequence." Alberoni, amid pacific professions, had manifested no disposition to abate his pretensions. While Stanhope was talking of peace, the Spanish fleet had sailed into the Bay of Solento, and having landed a large force upon Sicilian ground under the Marquis di Lede, the troops in a few days had become masters of Palermo. The chief military operation was the siege of Messina. On the 31st of July the citadel was invested. On the 1st of August Sir George Byng's fleet was anchored in the Bay of Naples, where he took on board two thousand German troops to reinforce the Piedmontese garrison of Messina. The Spanish fleet would have been in comparative safety if they had remained at anchor in the road of Messina, in line of battle, with the batteries behind them that Di Lede had constructed. The admirals chose to put to sea, and Byng hurried after the Spaniards, through the Straits of Faro. On the 11th of August the English squadron was carried by a breeze into the heart of the Spanish fleet, off Cape Passero. Six of their men-of-war had been separated from their main body, and a division, commanded by Captain Walton, was dispatched by the English admiral to intercept them. The battle, it is held, was commenced by the Spaniards. Byng was superior in force, and the Spanish admirals acted without a settled plan. But they fought bravely, till the main fleet was all taken or destroyed. The report of Captain Walton to his admiral is the very model of a business-like dispatch: "Sir, we have taken and destroyed all the Spanish ships which were upon the coast: the number as per margin." The Spanish fleet was thus swept away; but Byng, in a letter to Di Lede, affected to consider this catastrophe as not necessarily involving a war between the two nations. Messina fell before the Spanish troops, at the end of September, and Byng again anchored in the Bay of Naples. Alberoni did not quietly endure the pacific mode in which his fleet had been annihilated. He seized all British vessels and goods in Spanish ports.

The war smouldered on during two years, for an object which has been truly said, "could not be excelled in insignificance." * King George, in opening parliament on the 11th of November, announced that he had concluded terms and conditions of peace and alliance between the greatest princes of Europe, but that Spain "having rejected all our amicable proposals, it became necessary for our naval forces to check their progress." Walpole headed in the Commons the opposition to an address of thanks, contending that by their giving sanction to the late measures they "would screen ministers, who, having begun a war against Spain, would now make it the parliament's war." The motion for an address of thanks was carried by a majority of sixty-one.

A domestic measure of real interest to the nation, and honorable to the ministry to have proposed, was carried during this session, with some curtailments of its original design. It was a bill for the relief of Protestant dissenters, entitled "a bill for strengthening the Protestant interest in these kingdoms." Stanhope took a liberal view of the religious differences which had so long agitated the nation, and he desired to repeal, not only the Act against Occasional Conformity, the Schism Act, and the Test Act, but to mitigate the penal laws against Roman Catholics. It was contended, and perhaps prudently, by some of his colleagues, that by aiming at too much nothing would be accomplished. The debates were warm in both houses; and finally, by a majority of only forty-one, the measure was passed, without the repeal of the Test Act, and without any attempt to put the Roman Catholics upon a juster footing of equality, however limited, with their fellow-subjects.

The hostility of Alberoni toward the government which had proved the most formidable enemy to his designs for the extension of the power of the Spanish monarchy, now assumed the somewhat dangerous form of an alliance with the pretender, and a direct assistance to him in another attempt at the invasion of Great Britain. There was no longer to be hope for the house of Stuart in the rash designs of Charles of Sweden. He had fallen by a stray bullet—probably by the hand of an assassin—in the trenches of Frederickshall. He no more will terrify the world with his volcanic outbreaks. Alberoni was to accomplish, by weaving his web of intrigue around the persevering adherents of James, what his brother intriguer Gortz had failed to accomplish. Upon the sister of Charles XII. succeeding to the crown of Sweden; there had been a political revolution, and the restless minister of the late king had perished on a scaffold. Alberoni had failed in the issue of a conspiracy which he had stirred up against the regent Orleans. It was effectually crushed; and, whatever were the private views of the regent, his lenity in this affair was a proof that he possessed one of the best attributes of power, "the quality of mercy." The plot of the Duke and Duchess of Maine being clearly traced to the schemes of the Spanish minister,

* "Reminiscences of the Courts of George I. & II."
† Carlyle, "Friedrich II.," vol. i. p. 499.
‡ "Parliamentary History," vol. vii. col. 508.

* Carlyle.

war was declared by France against Spain. There was one great card more to play. The pretender was invited to Madrid. He safely reached that capital from Italy, and was received with signal honors. The Duke of Ormond and the Earl Marischal and his brother had also passed from France into Spain. An expedition had been prepared by Alberoni, which it was originally intended that James should lead. But it was at length arranged that Ormond should land in England, that Lord Marischal should sail with some forces to Scotland, and that Keith, his brother, should go through France to gather together the Jacobites who had taken refuge there. The armament which sailed from Cadiz, consisting of five men-of-war, with twenty transports, carrying five thousand men, was scattered by a great storm in the Bay of Biscay. The crews threw overboard the stands of arms, the munitions of war, and the horses, to lighten their vessels, and the greater part of the armada returned to Spanish ports in a dismantled condition. The Earl Marischal, with two frigates, carrying about three hundred troops, proceeded to Scotland; and his brother, with Tullibardine, Seaforth, and a few other noble refugees, joined him in a small vessel. The whole proceeding was known to the British government through information furnished by the Regent of France. The adventurers, with the Spanish soldiers, landed on the banks of Loch Alsh, in the month of May, 1719. The vessels returned to Spain, and the Scottish leaders were left to face their desperate enterprise. They established themselves in an old castle in the inner reach of the loch; but their attempts to fortify it afforded them no safety. Three English vessels of war entered these solitary waters and battered the rude tower to the ground. Scattered parties of Highlanders joined the Spaniards, and the whole body, about fifteen hundred—some accounts say two thousand—encamped at Glenshiel. In this valley, surrounded by mountains whose pathways were known only to the natives, they remained inactive, expecting to be joined by large bodies of insurgents. No general rising took place in the Highlands. No great chiefs again ventured to appear in arms against a strong government. In June General Wightman, with sixteen hundred troops, marched from Inverness. He hesitated to attack desperate men in their formidable pass; but a sharp struggle took place with detached bodies on the mountain sides, which lasted three hours. The next day the Spaniards surrendered as prisoners of war, but the Highlanders had disappeared. Wightman had twenty-one men killed, and a hundred and twenty-one wounded. He brought into Edinburgh two hundred and seventy-four Spanish prisoners. The Scottish leaders took shelter in the Western Isles, and finally escaped to Spain.

Whatever opposition might be raised to the origin and objects of the war in which England was engaged against France, no one could complain that the naval power of the country was inefficiently employed. No British admiral could have manifested more energy and promptitude than Admiral Byng displayed, in exploits that required the utmost courage and decision of character. He rendered the most efficient aid to the forces of the emperor in the contest with the Spaniards for the possession of Sicily. By his sagacious counsels he gave a successful direction to the languid efforts of the imperial commanders, who were jealous of each other, and divided in their plans. Their troops were destitute of provisions, and he supplied them by sea with stores, to prevent them starving in the interior of the island. They were insufficiently supplied with ammunition, and he furnished them with the means of attack and defence. With such aid the Austrians, after a serious defeat at Franca Villa, in June, 1719, were enabled to besiege the Spaniards in Messina, of whose citadel they obtained possession in October. There were military operations of less importance before the Spaniards finally evacuated Sicily and Sardinia. Meanwhile the French had sent an army against Spain, under the command of the Duke of Berwick, the natural son of James II.—the general who had won the victory of Almanza for the Bourbon King of Spain. Berwick was now to lead an army against the same king; and he was to be assisted by English sailors belonging to the government of the sovereign who was regarded as an usurper by the head of his own family. The French made themselves masters of Fuenterabia and St. Sebastian; and Lord Cobham, with an English squadron, captured Vigo. These disasters might have convinced Alberoni that the conflict with these great powers, in which Spain had engaged, was an undertaking in which his own abilities could not supply the want of material resources. But he probably was not prepared to be deserted by the court which he had so ably served in the endeavor to increase its power and importance. Before the reverses in Sicily Alberoni had made overtures for peace. Stanhope proposed to Dubois to demand from King Philip the dismissal of his minister. His ambition, said Stanhope, had been the sole cause of the war; and "it is not to be imagined that he will ever lose sight of his vast designs, or lay aside the intention of again bringing them forward, whenever the recovery of his strength and the remissness of the allied powers may flatter him with the hopes of better success." King Philip submitted to this dictation. In December, 1719, Alberoni, by a royal decree, was dismissed from all his employments, and was commanded to leave the Spanish territory within twenty-one days. Incapable grandees rejoiced that the son of an Italian gardener no longer ruffled their solemn pride; some loftier spirits testified their respect to fallen greatness. The cardinal went back to Italy a poor man. After vain attempts to resist or evade the demands of the allies that Spain should accede to the Quadruple Alliance, that accession was proclaimed in January, 1720, Philip declaring that he gave peace to Europe at the sacrifice of his rights. He renewed his renunciation of the French crown. Europe was again at peace. Even the Czar of Muscovy had been warned by the presence of an English fleet in the Baltic that he would not be permitted utterly to destroy Sweden. By England's protection of the female successor of Charles XII. the Elector of Hanover secured Bremen and Verden. The policy of foreign affairs did not exclusively contemplate the safety of King George's island subjects, but there was no advocacy of merely German policy of which the nation had a right to complain. The reputation of Great Britain was not damaged by the mode in which the war had been carried on. Her naval strength had been successfully exerted. A peace of twelve years, with a very trivial interruption, was the result of the Quadruple Alliance.

The two parliamentary sessions of 1719 were remarkable for ministerial attempts to carry a measure which would have produced a vital change in the composition of the House of Lords. It was proposed to limit the royal power of creating peers; and the king was persuaded to send a message to the Lords that his majesty has so much at heart the settling the peerage of the whole kingdom upon such a foundation as may secure the freedom and constitution of parliament in all future ages, that he is willing his prerogative stand not in the way of so great and necessary a work. In February resolutions were proposed in the upper house that the English peers should not be increased beyond six of their present number, with the exception of princes of the blood, and that instead of there being sixteen elective peers for Scotland, the king should name twenty-five as hereditary peers. In the House of Lords the resolutions were carried by a large majority. The proposition produced an excessive ferment. The Whig members and the Whig writers took different sides. Addison supported the bill; Steele opposed it. The measure was abandoned on account of the strong feeling which it produced on its first introduction; but it was again brought forward in the session which commenced on the 23d of November. It passed the Lords with very slight opposition. In the Commons the bill was rejected by a very large majority, 269 to 167. On this occasion Walpole, generally the plainest and most business-like of speakers, opposed the bill with a rhetorical force which, according to the testimony of Speaker Onslow, "bore down everything before him." The exordium of his speech is remarkable: "Among the Romans, the wisest people upon earth, the temple of fame was placed behind the temple of virtue, to denote that there was no coming to the temple of fame but through that of virtue. But if this bill is passed into a law, one of the most powerful incentives to virtue would be taken away, since there would be no arriving at honor but through the winding-sheet of an old decrepit lord, or the grave of an extinct noble family; a policy very different from that glorious and enlightened nation who made it their pride to hold out to the world illustrious examples of merited elevation:

"Patere honoris scirent ut cuncti viam."

The opponents of the Peerage Bill did not fail to use the obvious argument, that although the prerogative of the crown might be abused by the creation of peers, as in the late reign, to secure a majority for the court, there was a greater danger in so limiting the peerage as to make the existing body what Walpole called "a compact impenetrable phalanx."

CHAPTER CL.

The South Sea scheme—Public infatuation—The bubble bursts—Parliamentary measures—Session of 1722—Plot for invasion and insurrection—Trial of Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester—His banishment—Wood's patent for a copper coinage in Ireland—The Drapier's letters—The ale-duty in Scotland—Riot at Glasgow—Impeachment of Lord Chancellor Macclesfield—Foreign affairs—Treaty of Hanover—Siege of Gibraltar—Peace—Death of George I.

THE great event of the sixth year of the reign of George I. was the exciting affair of the South Sea Scheme—an event upon which, after the lapse of a hundred and forty years, we may still look with greater interest than upon the treaties and the wars of which it is said, with some truth, that they are to us as the "mere bubblings up of the general putrid fermentation of the then political world."* Few people of that time clearly understood what this famous South Sea project meant; and it is somewhat difficult to make it intelligible now.

In the infant days of the national debt the great terror of statesmen was its increase and duration. At the accession of Queen Anne the debt amounted to sixteen millions; at her death it had reached fifty-two millions. In 1711 there was a floating debt of about ten millions. Harley, then lord treasurer, proposed to create a fund for that sum, and to secure the payment of interest, by making certain duties of customs permanent. Capitalists who held debentures were to become shareholders in a company incorporated for the purpose of carrying on a monopoly of trade to the Spanish coasts of South America, making the new fund a part of their capital stock. Thus was established the South Sea Company. When the peace of Utrecht was completed, Spain refused to permit any approach to the free trade which would have made such a commercial company of value. One ship only was allowed to be sent annually. A few factories were established, and the one ship sailed in 1717. Alberoni broke the treaty and seized the British goods. But the company had other means for the employment of capital, and many opulent persons were among its shareholders and directors.

At the opening of the session of parliament in November, 1719, the king said to the Commons, "I must desire you to turn your thoughts to all proper means for lessening the debts of the nation." In January, 1720, a proposal was read to the House of Commons from the South Sea Company, in which it was set forth that if certain public debts and annuities were made part of the capital stock of the company, it would greatly contribute to that most desirable end adverted to in his majesty's speech. Before that speech was delivered, Sir John Blunt, a South Sea director, had been in communication with the ministers, who gave a favorable ear to his projects. There was an annual charge upon the revenue of eight hundred thousand pounds, for irredeemable annuities granted in the reigns of William and Anne. To buy up these annuities was the advantageous point in the proposal of the company. The House of Commons agreed in the necessity of reducing the public debts. "Till this was done," said Mr. Brodrick, who moved that other companies should be allowed to compete, "we could not, properly speaking, call ourselves a nation." The Bank of England accordingly sent in a rival proposal; and the two companies went on outbidding each other till the South Sea Company's large offer to provide seven millions and a half to buy up the annuities was accepted. The annuitants were not compelled to exchange their government security for the company's stock; and the chief doubt seemed to be whether the greater number would consent to this transfer. Although the terms offered by the company to the annuitants were not encouraging, there was a rush to accept them. To hold stock in a company whose exclusive trading privileges might realize that "potentiality of wealth" which is never "beyond the dreams of avarice," was a far grander thing than to receive seven, eight, or even nine per cent upon annuities. Within six days of the announcement of the company's terms, two thirds of the annuitants had exchanged their certain income for the boundless imaginary riches of South America.

Upon this foundation was built the most enormous fabric of national delusion that was ever raised among an industrious, thrifty, and prudent people. It had been long manifest that there was a great amount of superfluous capital, especially of the hoardings of the middle classes, which wanted opportunities for employment. To obtain interest for small sums was scarcely practicable for the mass of those who were enabled to keep their expenditure below their incomes. Before the beginning of the century, companies, more or less safe, had been formed to meet this desire for investments. In spite of the long wars of the reigns of William and Anne, and the Jacobite plots and rebellions which threatened the Protestant succession, the country was going steadily forward in a course of prosperity. Wherever there is superfluous wealth, beyond the ordinary demands of industry for capital, there will be always projectors ready to suggest modes for its co-operative uses. The machinery of directors and managers—an organization with which our countrymen are now as familiar as that of a parish vestry—was as ready, though not quite as efficient, at the beginning of the eighteenth century as in the middle of the nineteenth. There was then to be seen many a type of the subtle attorney and the impudent secretary, who have spread such consternation in our own times. There was then to be seen the magnificent list of noble names, such as continue to attract the unwary to have confidence in some board where very few know the secret transactions. Even the Prince of Wales was then the governor of a Welsh copper company. But it seems to us that the belief of all the schemes of that scheming time being fraudulent and delusive is a mistake. Many of these schemes might be premature; and having chiefly in view the profit to be made by the rise of shares, might be called "bubbles." But it is scarcely reasonable to class the following projects among the ridiculous schemes of that gambling time: For improving alum works; for paving the streets of London; for supplying various towns with water; for improving the art of making soap; for improving the paper manufacture; for making iron with pit-coal; for extracting silver from lead. It had been justly said by a writer who decried, in 1695, "many pernicious projects now on foot," that "some were very useful and successful while they continued in a few hands, till they fell into stock-jobbing, now much introduced, when they dwindled to nothing: others of them were mere whims, of little or no service to the world."* Such, no doubt, was the general character of the manifold projects of 1720. In the summer of that year, the South Sea year, "the dog-star rages" over Exchange Alley with a fury that has never been equalled; because no capitalist, even to the possessor of a single shilling, was then too humble not to believe that the road to riches was open before him. Subscribers to projects recommended by "one or more persons of known credit," were only required to advance ten shillings per cent. A shilling, and even sixpence per cent was enough to secure the receipt for a share in the more doubtful undertakings. Shares of every sort were at a premium, unless in cases where the office that was opened at noon on one day was found closed on the next, and the shillings and sixpences had vanished with the subscription books. But the great impulse to the frantic stock-jobbing of that summer was the sudden and enormous rise in the value of South Sea stock. In July Secretary Craggs wrote to Earl Stanhope, who was abroad with the king, "It is impossible to tell you what a rage prevails here for South Sea subscriptions at any price. The crowds of those that possess the redeemable annuities is so great that the bank, who are obliged to take them in, has been forced to set tables with clerks in the streets."† The hundred-pound shares of the South Sea Company went up to a thousand pounds in August. The shares of the Bank of England and of the East India Company were transferred at an enormous advance. Smaller companies of every character—water companies, fishery companies, companies for various manufactures, companies for settlements and foreign trade—infinite varieties, down to companies for fatting hogs and importing jackasses from Spain—rushed into the market amid the universal cry for shares and more shares. The directors of the South Sea Company opened a second, a third, and a fourth subscription. They boldly proclaimed that after Christmas their annual dividend should not fall short of fifty per cent upon their £100 shares. The rivalry of the legion of projects of that season was odious to these great lords of the money-market. The government itself began to think that some fearful end would come to the popular delusion; and a royal proclamation was issued against "mischievous and dangerous undertakings, especially the

* Carlyle, "Friedrich," vol. i. p. 559.

* "Angliæ Tutamen," quoted in Anderson's "Commerce."

† Coxe's "Walpole," vol. ii. p. 189.

presuming to act as a corporate body, or raising stocks or shares without legal authority." It was calculated that the value of the stock of all the companies, with corporate authority or no authority, amounted at the current prices to five hundred millions sterling, being five times as much as the circulating medium of Europe, and twice as much as the fee simple of all the land of the kingdom. The attempt of the South Sea Company to lessen the number of their competitors was the prelude to their own fall. At their instance, writs of *scire facias* were issued, on the 18th of August, against four companies; and the subscribers to these, and to all other projects not legalized, were ordered to be prosecuted by the officers of the crown. A panic ensued. In a day or two the stocks of all the companies not incorporated rapidly fell; and with the downward rush went down every description of stock. Before August knowing and cautious holders of South Sea stock began to sell out. Walpole, who had originally opposed the scheme, did not carry his opposition to the extreme of neglecting his opportunity of largely adding to his fortune by investing at the proper time and selling out at the proper time. The Earl of Pembroke applied to Walpole for his advice as to the great question of selling when the shares were at their culminating point. The adroit financier coolly answered, "I will only tell you what I have done myself. I have just sold out at £1000 per cent, and I am fully satisfied."* By the middle of September holders of South Sea stock were crowding the Exchange, not as eager buyers but as more eager sellers. The stock was at 850 on the 18th of August; in a month it had fallen to 410. Mr. Brodrick, on the 13th of September, writes that the most considerable men of the company, "with their fast friends, the Tories, Jacobites, and Papists," had drawn out, "securing themselves by the losses of the deluded thoughtless numbers whose understandings were overruled by avarice, and hopes of making mountains of molehills. Thousands of families will be reduced to beggary. . . . The consternation is inexpressible; the rage beyond expression; and the case is so desperate that I do not see any plan or scheme for averting the blow."† On the 29th of September South Sea stock had fallen to 175. This greatest of bubbles had burst. Many persons of rank and station were not so prudent as Walpole and the Earl of Pembroke had been. The Duke of Portland, Lord Lonsdale, and Lord Irwin were provided with colonial governments to enable them to live—a species of consideration for ruined nobility which is rather in bad odor in our days. Merchants, lawyers, clergy, physicians, passed from their dream of fabulous wealth and from their wonted comforts into poverty; some "died of broken hearts; others withdrew to remote parts of the world, and never returned."‡ It has been observed that "the calamitous effects of the madness were rather individual and immediate than permanent or general. There was little, if any, absolute destruction of capital. The whole mischief consisted in a most quick and violent shifting of property from one hand to another."§ But the derangement of the ordinary course of industry was to be added to this shifting of property. Serious as was this temporary evil, furious as it made the sufferers in their reproaches against every one but themselves, eager as it rendered the legislature for confiscation of the property of the South Sea directors, the national credit was not permanently impaired by the infatuation which produced so much private misery. In this respect the issue of the South Sea scheme was essentially different from the Mississippi scheme of John Law in France, which also exploded in that fatal year for projectors; producing there what was equivalent to a national bankruptcy. When the South Sea crash came there was alarm for its public consequences. But Walpole, who had again joined the government, though in a subordinate office, applied his great financial abilities to avert the difficulties which this convulsion might occasion to the state; and instead of joining the first cry for vengeance upon the South Sea directors, he calmly said in parliament, that if London were on fire, wise men would endeavor to extinguish the flames before they sought for the incendiaries. When the king opened the session on the 8th of December the royal speech recommended measures "to restore the national credit." Walpole was regarded by all parties as the man to effect this.

To endeavor to equalize, to the most inconsiderable extent, the losses and gains of individuals by the extravagant rise and sudden depression of South Sea stock would have been a task far beyond the province of any minister of state. The financial abilities of Walpole were necessarily directed to the very difficult labor of disentangling the government from the embarrassments of the South Sea Company. The English ministry had never attempted to sustain the value of the company's shares by arbitrary edicts, or to interfere with their fall by regulations that were based upon other principles than the great natural laws by which the money market, like every other market, must be governed. The French ministry, when the scheme of Law for relieving its exhausted finances by a paper currency, based on the imaginary riches of Louisiana, was in the course of breaking down, gave its orders that individuals should not retain in their possession any sum beyond a small amount of gold and silver, and should be compelled to carry on their transactions in Law's substitute for money. The shares were not to fall according to the rate at which their owners were willing to sell them, but to sink in nominal value, by a monthly reduction, till they had reached half their original price, at which rate they were to be fixed. All this, of course, was the merest convulsion of despotism. The regent had shifted a large amount of the debts of the state to the deluded people, and no attempt was made to retrieve the national credit. Walpole had to pursue a policy which was the only possible one under a limited monarchy, and which indeed was not beset with the difficulties that the government of the regent would have had to encounter in any struggle to be honest. The French finances were hopelessly embarrassed by a long course of extravagance, before Law thought he could perform the part of the magician in the Arabian story, making a scrap of paper pass as a piece of silver. The English finances were healthy, though the national debt amounted to fifty or sixty millions. The French government adopted the schemes of Law to furnish the means of new extravagances. The English government went into the scheme of the South Sea Company with the view of redeeming a portion of the national debt, and thus of lessening the amount of taxation. Voltaire records that he had seen Law come to court with dukes, marshals, and bishops following humbly in his train. The English court was not free from shame in the South Sea project. Half a million of fictitious stock had been created by the directors previous to the passing of the bill. The Duchess of Kendal, as well as other favorites of the king, had large douceurs out of the profits which the directors made by the transfer of these shares; and it is lamentable to add that Craggs, the secretary of state, his father the postmaster-general, and Aislabie, the chancellor of the exchequer, were among the recipients of this bribery. It was the business of parliament to trace the extent of the corruption, and to punish in some degree those directors for vengeance upon whom the nation was frightfully clamoring. Although in the petitions to parliament "for justice on the authors of the present calamities," we may see how individuals come to consider the losses produced by their own insensate desire for sudden riches as national misfortunes, we may yet observe how general is the calamity when a people think to grow rich by gambling instead of by work. The petition of the county of Kent avers that it was lately one of the most flourishing in the kingdom, "and is now reduced to a most unhappy condition by the execrable fraud of the late wicked South Sea directors." The petition of the borough of Leicester states that "no sooner had the South Sea directors, and the vile emissaries they dispatched over the kingdom to propagate lies and forgeries, so imposed upon the honest credulous people as to draw all their ready money and treasure into their infamous hands, but we saw trade instantly struck dead, our manufactures disregarded, our combed wool (once the staple and glory of our industrious corporation) lie neglected in our workhouses, our poor increasing for want of employment." Maidstone cannot pay the duty on hops, for there is no money in circulation. Somerset represents that the clothier's trade is gone to decay. Warwick says that the South Sea parricides have reduced a plundered people, in the space of one year only, "to as deplorable a state of calamity and distress as they ever yet suffered by any civil tumult or foreign war." Birmingham complains that its trade is wonderfully reduced, and that there is no money to pay the poor workmen. Want of money is the universal cry. No branch of industry has been exempted, according to these petitions, from suffering.* There may be

* Coxe, vol. i. p. 730. † Ibid., vol. ii. p. 190. ‡ Anderson.
§ G. L. Craik, "History of British Commerce," vol. ii. p. 194.

* See the petitions in "Parliamentary History," vol. vii. col. 761 to col. 797.

exaggeration in these complaints. But it is nevertheless easy to understand how difficult it would be, in a condition of society where commercial credit was not upheld by large banking operations, to escape very serious evils, when the many streams and rills in which capital ordinarily flowed were diverted into one vast flood, and thus for a while the channels were left dry from which industry derived its regular nourishment.

The Commons, through the entire session, were occupied with investigations and discussions connected with the financial convulsion. Walpole brought forward his plan for sustaining the national credit, and had induced the house to agree that the public contracts with the South Sea Company should be undisturbed. His first proposal, to engraft a portion of the stock of that company into the Bank of England, and another portion into the East India Company, was carried after much debate; but this plan was ultimately merged into another measure. The private estates of the directors were to be regarded as a fund to provide some remedy for the public embarrassment. A bill was passed to compel them to deliver on oath an estimate of the value of their property, and to prevent them going out of the kingdom. A secret committee of inquiry was appointed. After they had examined Mr. Robert Knight, the cashier of the company, he fled to Brabant. A reward of £2000 was offered for his apprehension; but it was believed that there were influences at work powerful enough effectually to screen him. Knight was arrested at Antwerp; but the States of Brabant refused to give him up. "Screen" became a byword. Caricatures—which it is said were become common at this period for political objects—had for their point the Duchess of Kendal and the flight of the cashier. "The Brabant Screen" exhibited the king's mistress sending Knight upon his travels, giving him his dispatches from behind a screen.* The prudent cashier took care to obliterate, as far as possible, the evidence that great ladies and ministers of state had been corrupted by the South Sea directors. The committee of the Commons reported that "in some of the books produced before them false and fictitious entries were made; in others entries with blanks; in others entries with erasures and alterations; and in others leaves were torn out." They found, further, that some books had been destroyed, and others taken away or secreted. Out of the mouths of the directors the committee extracted evidence to show that there had been extensive appropriation of stock to "certain ladies," at the instance of Mr. Secretary Craggs; and the proof was clear that persons high in office had received and held stock during the time that the company's bill was depending in parliament, "without any valuable consideration paid, or sufficient security given for the acceptance of, or payment for, such stock." Nevertheless Charles Stanhope, one of the accused, was cleared by a majority of three. The Earl of Sunderland was exonerated by a larger majority; but he could not stand up against the popular odium, and resigned his post of first commissioner of the treasury. Aislabie, the chancellor of the exchequer, was expelled the house, and was sent to the Tower. James Craggs died of small pox during the heat of this inquiry. His father, the postmaster-general, destroyed himself by poison.

The charges against the directors were founded upon their practice of "selling their own stock at high prices, at the same time that they gave orders for buying stock upon account of the company;" and upon their various contrivances "to give his majesty's subjects false notions of the value" of the South Sea stock. Their punishment, under the bill that was passed, was severe. Their estates, amounting to two millions sterling, were confiscated for the relief of the sufferers by their schemes. A small allowance was made to each; but they were disabled from ever holding any place, or for sitting in parliament. Such visitations for their offences were thought far too lenient by the greater number of their contemporaries. They may now be considered excessive. Edward Gibbon has recorded his opinion of what he held to be the oppression endured by his grandfather, one of the directors. "Of the use or abuse of the South Sea scheme, of the guilt or innocence of my grandfather and his brother directors, I am neither a competent nor a disinterested judge. Yet the equity of modern times must condemn the violent and arbitrary proceedings which would have disgraced the cause of justice, and would render injustice still more odious. No sooner had the nation awakened from its golden dream than a popular and even a parliamentary clamor demanded their victims; but it was acknowledged on all sides that the South Sea directors, however guilty, could not be touched by any known laws of the land. The speech of Lord Molesworth, the author of 'The State of Denmark,' may show the temper, or rather the intemperance, of the House of Commons. 'Extraordinary crimes (exclaimed that ardent Whig) call aloud for extraordinary remedies. The Roman lawgivers had not foreseen the possible existence of a parricide; but as soon as the first monster appeared he was sewn in a sack and cast headlong into the river; and I shall be content to inflict the same treatment on the authors of our present ruin.' His motion was not literally adopted; but a bill of pains and penalties was introduced, a retroactive statute, to punish the offences which did not exist at the time they were committed. Such a pernicious violation of liberty and law can be excused only by the most imperious necessity; nor could it be defended on this occasion by the plea of impending danger or useful example."*

During a debate in the Lords upon the conduct of the South Sea directors, the Duke of Wharton, as profligate as he was able, made a furious attack upon Stanhope, comparing him to Sejanus. The anger to which the earl was moved produced a rush of blood to his head. A temporary relief by cupping was obtained; but the next day the skilful and honest secretary of state suddenly expired. No suspicion of improper connection with the South Sea scheme had affected his honor. Lord Townshend again became secretary of state. With Walpole chancellor of the exchequer, salutary measures were pursued to restore confidence. The South Sea Company were relieved from certain engagements to make advances to the government, and the credit of their bonds was sustained at its just value.

The session of 1722 was a busy session. Questions more important than those connected with party interests were discussed. An act had been passed in the last session—under the apprehension of the plague which was raging in France—for the building of pest-houses, to which infected persons, and even the healthy of an infected family, were to be removed; and lines were to be drawn round any infected town or city. Earl Cowper, the ex-chancellor, a man of liberal and enlightened views, moved for the repeal of these powers, as unknown to our constitution, and inconsistent with the lenity of our free government. But his motion was rejected. "The people called Quakers" had presented a petition, complaining that, under their present form of affirmation, they were unable to answer in courts of equity, take probates of wills, prove debts on commissions of bankruptcy, take up their freedoms, and be admitted to poll at elections for their freeholds. Upon a debate in the Lords, Atterbury, the Bishop of Rochester, spoke against indulgences "to be allowed to a set of people who were hardly Christians." The London clergy petitioned against a bill for their relief, contending that, however the Quakers might be injured in their private affairs, "an oath was instituted by God himself as the surest bond of fidelity among men," and that any relaxation of that principle would only tend to multiply a sect "who renounce the divine institution of Christ, particularly that by which the faithful are initiated into his religion." The bill for the relief of the Quakers was passed in spite of the hard terms in which they had been assailed. The session was prorogued to the 15th of March; and it was previously dissolved, under the provisions of the Septennial Act. During the prorogation the Earl of Sunderland died; and his father-in-law, the great Duke of Marlborough, terminated his checkered career of political time-serving and of military glory. When he was borne to Westminster Abbey, with funeral pomp proportioned to his great achievements, we may believe that there were few who did not feel that his wonderful services to his country ought in some degree to obliterate the memory of the infirmities of an ambitious and selfish nature—the failings which have prevented him taking his place in history as one of the grandest of England's sons.

In 1720 the wife of James Edward carried forward the aspirations of the house of Stuart into another generation, by giving birth to a son. Atterbury, the most uncompromising of partisans, considered this "the most acceptable news which can reach the ears of a good Englishman." Charles Edward Louis Casimir, whose royal descent

* Wright, "England under the House of Hanover," vol. i. p. 79.

* "Memoirs of Edward Gibbon."

was put beyond suspicion by the presence of seven cardinals in the chamber of the princess, was destined even in his cradle to give the signal for conspiracies and possible insurrections. The Duke of Ormond was again to lead foreign forces to the invasion of Britain. The Jacobites in England, among whom there were five earls and the undaunted Bishop of Rochester, were to get possession of the Tower, seize all the deposits of public treasure, and to proclaim James III. The delusions of these men are to be pitied. They were enthusiasts. They looked upon the fallen house of Stuart through a haze of sentiment, and saw in Charles I. and James II. only the images of legitimate kings, murdered and deposed by their wicked and rebellious subjects, and in the exiled descendants of these kings only princes who had an absolute right to eject the unlawful possessors of their crowns. The nation—the people—were, in their view, but men born to obey, in whose obedience there could be no discretion. They saw, moreover, in a dominant church, that supreme authority over the consciences of Christian believers which would admit of no scruples as to doctrine or ceremonials. Dissent was simply heresy and schism. A judicious, and in many respects impartial, historian, ascribes, what he calls "the second growth of Jacobitism" to the publication in the reign of Anne of Clarendon's "History of the Rebellion." Atterbury was one of its editors. The "gray discrowned head" of Charles; the exile and the restoration of his son—these were the stirring recollections that made the remnant of the old cavaliers, now bearing the somewhat less glorious name of Tories, turn to the first Charles' grandson "pining in a distant land, under circumstances not far unlike to those of Charles Stuart in France."* We may reasonably doubt whether so clever a man as Atterbury had not read other histories besides those of Clarendon; whether he could only see the popular gladness of the restoration, and not direct one thought to the degradation of the monarchy, to the struggles to make his countrymen slaves and papists, which followed the restoration. Yet some men do read history in the way which is held to have produced "the second birth of Jacobitism," and Atterbury might have been of the number.

The departure of the king, in the summer of 1722, upon his usual visit to his German dominions, was to be the signal for an invasion of England by the pretender and his faithful Ormond. Disbanded troops of various countries were being collected together for this enterprise. The managers of the plot had the supreme folly to apply to the Regent of France for the aid of five thousand men; and the regent, having more respect for treaties than Louis XIV., informed the British minister at Paris of the application. The vigilant Walpole was soon acquainted with the plan of action and the names of the actors. The king was advised not to go to Hanover; a camp was formed in Hyde Park; and some of the conspirators—two nonjuring clergymen, two Irish priests, a young barrister, and two lords—were apprehended. After a delay of three months the Bishop of Rochester was arrested, and, after examination before the council, was sent to the Tower. For nearly thirty years had Francis Atterbury been known as the keenest of controversialists as well as the most impressive of preachers. From the beginning of the century he had been considered as the leader of the high-church party: the great asserter of the independence of convocation. Gradually he had become identified with the most extreme principles of passive obedience; was the promptor of Sacheverel in his defence in 1710; was recognized as having earned a bishopric when Harley came into power; and had, upon the death of Queen Anne, taken a very decided part in his hostility to the Hanoverian succession. His arrest in August, 1722, produced the most violent ferment among his church party. The Episcopal order, it was proclaimed, was outraged. Atterbury was prayed for in the London churches. Atterbury was represented, in a print intended to move the popular sympathy, as standing behind his prison-bars, gazing upon a portrait of Laud. The plot, it was maintained, was a base fiction. The new parliament met in October; and the king, in his speech on the 11th, announced the discovery of a dangerous conspiracy, and the arrest of some of the conspirators. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended for a whole year; and the consent of the House of Peers was desired to sanction the detention in the Tower of the Bishop of Rochester, Lord North and Grey, and the Earl of Orrery. A foolish declaration, signed "James Rex," had been issued on the 22d of September, in which James III., King of England, Scotland, and Ireland, proposed that George should quietly deliver to him the throne of those kingdoms; when he, King James, would bestow upon George the title of king in his native dominions, and invite all other states to confirm it. Moreover, the British crown should be confirmed to the penitent usurper, if ever he should attain it in the due course of legitimate succession. This wonderful production was ordered by parliament to be burned by the common hangman, as "a false, insolent and traitorous libel." On the 1st of March, 1723, a committee of the Commons made a report of their examinations into the evidence of the conspiracy. It is a document of great length. It involved other eminent persons besides those who had been arrested. Christopher Layer, the barrister, had been previously tried and condemned in the King's Bench. He was the only person who suffered capital punishment. Bills of pains and penalties were passed against the two Irish priests. The most important person among the accused, the Bishop of Rochester, was also proceeded against by bill, enacting his punishment and deprivation. This bill passed the Commons without a division. Atterbury declined making a defence before the lower house; but on the 6th of May he stood at the bar of the House of Lords, and after the evidence against him had been gone through he defended himself with great ingenuity and eloquence.

The debate among the Peers on the question that the bill do pass was remarkable for the constitutional opposition of Lord Cowper, the ex-chancellor. He said, "My lords, this bill carries in the frame of it an invincible objection to it; for the preamble and the enacting part, the crime and the punishment, bear no proportion to each other. The preamble contains a charge of high treason against the bishop; and pray, my lords, why should he not be punished accordingly? . . . What reason can be given why the bishop should not be punished, at least equal with others, in case of high treason? Why truly, the want of legal evidence is the only reason pretended. . . . To palliate the matter a little, a distinction is endeavored to be made between legal evidence and real evidence, or between such evidence as our law requires and such as in natural justice and equity ought to be admitted. But, my lords, this is a distinction entirely without a difference; for what is evidence of a fact before any judicature whatsoever but such testimony as the nature of the case requires, to induce a moral certainty of the truth of the thing testified? . . . The wisdom and goodness of our law appear in nothing more remarkably, than in the perspicuity, certainty, and clearness of the evidence it requires to fix a crime upon any man, whereby his life, his liberty, or his property may be concerned: hereon we glory and pride ourselves, and are justly the envy of all our neighbor nations. Our law, in such cases, requires evidence so clear and convincing that every bystander, the instant he hears it, must be fully satisfied of the truth of it. It admits of no surmises, innuendoes, forced consequences, or harsh constructions, nor anything else to be offered as evidence but what is real and substantial, according to the rules of natural justice and equity." These arguments of a great legal authority have a lasting importance far beyond the immediate question of Atterbury's guilt or innocence. The bill of pains and penalties was a mischievous precedent, "open to the same objection as the attainder of Sir John Fenwick—the danger of setting aside those precious securities against a wicked government which the law of treason has furnished."* The possible guilt of the offender does not justify an irregular and arbitrary mode of dealing with his offence. It might be merciful in the government thus to proceed against the bishop in a mode which did not affect his life; but that mode was more probably the only way in which they could secure a conviction at all. The connection of Atterbury with the exiled family before his banishment has been abundantly proved by other evidence than that within the reach of his accusers and judges. The bill against him was passed by a majority of forty peers, most of the bishops voting against him—possibly with some higher motive than that imputed to them in the sarcasm of Lord Bathurst, of believing, as the wild Indians believed, that they would inherit the abilities as well as the spoils of any great enemy whom they slew. The estate of Atterbury was not forfeited by his attainder. He embarked for France in June, 1723, and died at Paris in 1732.

* Lord Mahon, "History," vol. ii. p. 51.

* Hallam, "Constitutional History," chap. xvi.

In 1724, through the ordinary course of ministerial rivalries and jealousies, the accomplished Lord Carteret was removed from the office of secretary of state, which he held in conjunction with Lord Townshend, and the same course was pursued toward him as toward Townshend himself in 1716. Carteret was appointed lord lieutenant of Ireland—a post considered of far less anxious responsibility than that of secretary of state. During his lord-lieutenancy Ireland became no bed of roses. Among the many real wrongs which Ireland has borne, and the not less numerous imaginary grievances of which she has complained, in her connection with England, there is probably no example of a national ferment so wholly disproportionate to the extent of the injury as that of Wood's patent for a coinage of copper farthings and halfpence. No one can doubt that when a nation is in almost utter want of money of the lowest denomination, the extortions practised upon the humblest classes must be considerable. Ireland was so completely without a currency to conduct the smaller operations of trade that laborers were paid by cards bearing the seals and signatures of their employers. In all such cases of a questionable or a depreciated currency, it is the poor man who has to bear the largest amount of trouble or loss. In 1722 a patent was granted to William Wood, a proprietor and renter of iron and copper mines in England, to enable him to coin farthings and halfpence for Ireland to the value of £108,000. There is no doubt that the patentee was to make a profit, for the Duchess of Kendal had been bribed to promote the grant of the patent. But Walpole and his subordinates took every reasonable measure of precaution that the coinage should not become an opportunity for fraud or excessive gain. Sir Isaac Newton, as master of the mint, approved the terms of the contract; and when the coins were in circulation, and it was seen that discontent was assiduously stirred up, an assay was made by the officers of the mint, and it was declared that in weight and fineness of metal the pieces were satisfactory. The difference of exchange between England and Ireland had been thought a satisfactory reason for a slight diminution in weight of the copper currency for Ireland.

The Irish parliament, moved in some degree by the apparent neglect of this exercise of the royal prerogative, without consulting the Irish privy council, voted an address to the king, that the terms of the patent would occasion a loss to the nation of 150 per cent. Walpole was astonished, as he well might be, at this impudent declaration of a legislative body. He examined the matter carefully, and perceived that the assertion was founded upon a computation that the rough Irish copper was worth twelvepence a pound, and that a pound of halfpence and farthings coined out of fine copper were to pass for thirty pence. He found that the mint of London paid eighteen pence per pound for prepared copper; that the charge of coinage was fourpence per pound; and that the duties and allowances upon copper imported into Ireland amounted to 20 per cent. A committee of the English privy council went into a searching examination of the whole affair, and fully justified the patentee from any charge of having abused the fair terms of his patent. It was, however, conceded that the amount of farthings and halfpence issued should not exceed £40,000 in value; and that this money should not be a legal tender for a larger sum than fivepence halfpenny in one payment.

Under these circumstances, in 1724 a letter was published by M. B. Drapier, addressed "to the tradesmen, shopkeepers, and country people in general, of the kingdom of Ireland, concerning the brass halfpence coined by one William Wood, hardwareman," which letter thus solemnly opens: "What I intend now to say to you is, next to your duty to God and the care of your salvation, of the greatest concern to yourselves and your children: your bread and clothing, and every common necessary of life, entirely depend upon it." The writer, as every one guessed, was the famous Dean of St. Patrick's; and certainly no pen was so able as that wielded by Jonathan Swift, to raise a popular clamor by the most skilful treatment of his subject; and, what was perhaps as much to the purpose, by the most unscrupulous assertions. In England the Drapier said, halfpence and farthings pass for little more than they are worth; if you were to beat them to pieces and sell them to the brazier, you would not lose much more than a penny in a shilling. But Mr. Wood made his halfpence of such base metal and so much smaller than the English ones, that the brazier would hardly give you above a penny of good money for a shilling of his; so that the sum of £108,000 in good gold and silver must be given for trash that will not be worth eight or nine thousand pounds real value." The Irish parliament falsely asserted that the depreciation amounted to 150 per cent. The more mendacious demagogue asserted that the depreciation amounted to 1100 per cent. "For example, if a hatter sells a dozen of hats for 5*s.* apiece, which amounts to £3, and receives the payment in Wood's coin, he really receives only the value of 5*s.*" Throughout the whole of the Drapier's letters, Swift's argument rests upon the most solid basis of political economy; but his premises are utterly false. He knew well what England and Ireland had suffered by the depreciation of the coin. This bold opponent of the government which had delivered his country from despotism, says, "I intend to truck with my neighbors, the butchers and bakers and the rest, goods for goods; and the little gold and silver I have I will keep by me, like my heart's blood, till better times, or until I am just ready to starve; and then I will buy Mr. Wood's money, as my father did the brass money in King James' time, who could buy £10 of it for a guinea." Against such logic as this what could simple truth avail? The Irish went mad about Wood's halfpence. The mischievous dean not only stirred the nation up with Drapier's letters, but with songs that were sung in every street. Wood was to be scalded in his own melted copper. He was to be hanged:

"The halfpence are coming, the nation's undoing;
There's an end of your ploughing, and baking, and brewing;
In short, you must all go to rack and ruin."

When Carteret came over he found the Irish people in a state of frenzy. He tried what are called strong measures. He offered a reward of £300 for discovering the author of the "Drapier's Letters." He prosecuted their printer. The grand jury threw out the bill; and another grand jury made a presentment, setting forth that "several quantities of base metal coined, commonly called Wood's halfpence, have been brought into the port of Dublin, and lodged in several houses in this city, with an intention to make them pass clandestinely;" and that "having entirely his majesty's interest and the welfare of our country, and being thoroughly sensible of the great discouragements which trade hath suffered by the apprehensions of the said coin, whereof we have already felt the dismal effects, and that the currency thereof will inevitably tend to the great diminution of his majesty's revenue, and the ruin of us and our posterity, do present all such persons as have attempted or shall endeavor by fraud or otherwise, to impose the said halfpence upon us, contrary to his majesty's most gracious intention, as enemies to his majesty's government, and to the safety, peace, and welfare of all his majesty's subjects of this kingdom." It was in vain that the government attempted to stand up against this storm. The grand jury said, "We do, with all great gratitude, acknowledge the services of all such patriots as have been eminently zealous for the interest of his majesty and this country, in detecting the fraudulent imposition of the said Wood, and preventing the passing of his base coin." Swift wrote this eulogy upon his own patriotism. He had beaten the government of King George. The patent was withdrawn. It was believed by the few who knew how baseless were the exaggerated complaints of Wood's halfpence, that the Drapier had asserted the independence of Ireland. The multitude believed whatever he had predicted of national ruin. This victory was in some respects the triumph of genius; but it must not be forgotten that if the genius manifested in the "Drapier's Letters" could lead one admirer of Swift to regard them as the most perfect examples of oratory since the days of Demosthenes,* a calmer view of the limits to which genius ought to be confined by honesty would lead us to say that out of the four names which the great partisan chose to bear,

"Dean, Drapier, Bickerstaff, or Gulliver,"

that of Drapier ought to be as odious to those who justly estimate the duty of a public writer, as that filth in which Swift delighted to wallow—more his own filth than the filth of his age.

Walpole restored Ireland to quietness by cancelling Wood's patent. He had the rare wisdom of yielding even to popular prejudice, when perseverance was clearly more perilous than concession. With Walpole such a course may be regarded as prudence. With a less skilful and powerful administrator it would have been weakness. In 1725

* Isaac Hawkins Browne.

Scotland was also firing-up upon a domestic question. The House of Commons, in opposition to the opinion of Walpole, had determined that the malt duty, which had been constantly evaded in Scotland, should be merged in a duty of threepence on every barrel of ale. The duty was to come into operation on the 23d of June. On that day there was considerable restlessness among the population of Glasgow. Daniel Campbell, the member of parliament for Glasgow—one of the class which had been raised to opulence by the commercial freedom which the union opened—was considered by the populace to have supported the government in devising the ale duty. Campbell's house was attacked at midnight and destroyed. Military force was called in; and the next day the soldiers, being beset by the mob in their guard-house, the people were fired upon and several were killed and wounded. General Wade, whose troops had been employed in the most useful service of constructing the great military roads of the Highlands, marched into Glasgow and effectually quelled the riot. At Edinburgh the resistance to the tax took another form. The brewers refused to brew. The Scotch lawyers talked of prosecution and imprisonment. The wiser secretary for Scotland indeed threatened; but he saw that such a combination would break down of itself. The brewers had a meeting and resolved to put the question, "Brew or not?" One man said he would not be bound by a majority, and voted "Brew." The assembly broke up, and all the brew-houses of Edinburgh were at work that night. Walpole wrote to Lord Townshend in September, "I think we have once more got Ireland and Scotland quiet if we take care to keep them so."

In 1725 England presented the miserable spectacle which she had witnessed in the reign of James I.—a lord chancellor impeached for malversation in his great office. Thomas Parker was a very different man from Francis Bacon; and the offences of which the Earl of Macclesfield was accused were of another character than those which were the ruin of the Viscount St. Alban's. The chancellor of King James was disgraced upon the charge of having received bribes from suitors. The chancellor of King George was impeached, found guilty, excluded forever from office, and fined thirty thousand pounds, upon the charges of selling masterships in the Court of Chancery and of conniving at the frauds of the masters in trafficking with the trust-money of the suitors and the estates of widows and orphans. Lord Campbell, in controverting a disposition in some writers of recent times to consider that Lord Macclesfield was unjustly condemned, holds that "his conviction was lawful and his punishment was mild." *

The foreign policy of George I. under the able administration of Walpole had become decidedly pacific. The nation was manifestly prospering under the relief which peace had brought. The fear of the pretender and of Spanish or Swedish invasions had passed away. The house of Brunswick after ten years of struggle was firmly fixed on its constitutional throne. Yet there were still threatenings of war. The Congress of Cambrai, to which the difficulties that had not been finally settled by the peace of 1720 had been referred, had been wearily discussing certain royal claims and disputes—"bailing out water with sieves"—for four or five years. The regent Orleans had died during these tedious protocollings in 1723. Louis XV., declared of age, had taken the government of France into his own hands, with the Duke de Bourbon as his minister. The alliance of France with England continued uninterrupted. But the Emperor Charles and the King of Spain, Philip, were coming to a closer understanding about territorial arrangements than England, France, and Russia thought safe. Philip of Spain was a mere shadow in the management of these affairs. His queen was the restless agitator; and Elizabeth had found a most active successor to Alberoni in the Duke de Ripperda, a Dutch adventurer, who found it as easy to change from Protestantism to Catholicism, as he afterward did to change from Catholicism to Mahometanism. Ripperda was sent upon a secret mission to Vienna, to accomplish, by a direct treaty between the two great rival powers, what the Congress of Cambrai had been vainly hammering at for a time not to be borne by royal patience. The courts of France and Spain had, moreover, got into a very pretty quarrel in 1725. When Philip acceded to the Quadruple Alliance, his reluctance had been smoothed over by a plan for marrying the infanta of Spain to the youthful King of France, and also of marrying his son, Don Luis, to a daughter of the regent Orleans. The children were betrothed, after the then usual fashion of sovereigns. When Louis XV., though only fifteen years old, was held of age to govern, the infanta was only eight years old. The Duke de Bourbon, and probably the young king also, had no disposition to complete a marriage which so long postponed the prospect of succession. The infanta was returned to Spain with little ceremony, and another Queen of France was looked out for. The court of Madrid was of course in a fever of indignation. The national pride was wounded as well as the royal honor. All Frenchmen were ordered to leave Spain. The Congress of Cambrai was at an end. Ripperda was to make any bargain with the emperor. As King George hesitated about taking part in the quarrel, the alliance of the courts of Madrid and Vienna was to be one of hostility to the courts of Versailles and St. James's. The Treaty of Vienna, in 1725, was ominous to the peace of Europe.

Looking back upon these affairs, they excite very small interest in our day; they pass over as the summer cloud "without our special wonder." It was fortunate that England and France had no desire for war. Cardinal Fleury had succeeded the Duke de Bourbon as prime minister of Louis XV., and he and Walpole were not going to rush into hostilities. But they would take measures of precaution. The Treaty of Hanover bound England, France, and Prussia—the date September 3d, 1725—in an engagement to hold by each other if either were attacked. The tables were turned since the War of the Succession. The old foes were fast friends, and the old friends bitter foes; and all these changes took place, as in private friendship, for "some trick not worth an egg." War seemed imminent, however pacifically disposed were Fleury and George. When the English parliament met on the 20th of January, 1726, the king announced the conclusion of his defensive treaties with the Most Christian king and the King of Prussia, to which several of the powers had been invited to accede. There was some opposition to the address approving the treaty; but the government majority was very large. Some change might have been expected in the policy of Spain, by the fall of Ripperda, who was dismissed from his employments, and, apprehensive of royal or popular resentments, had taken refuge in the house of the English minister. He was accused of having exaggerated the desire of Austria for so intimate an alliance with Spain as would have warranted an offensive league between them. Ripperda was dragged from Mr. Stanhope's apartments and sent to prison. The rights of ambassadors were considered to have been violated, and the remonstrances of the English government embittered the disputes between the two countries. They were more embittered by the revelations that Ripperda made to Stanhope, in revenge for his disgrace, and in gratitude for the asylum that had been afforded him. He disclosed the secret articles of the Treaty of Vienna, and declared that its chief object was the extirpation of the Protestant religion.

Warlike movements were very soon organized in England. The Czar Peter was dead. The Czarina Catherine I., had prepared a fleet for co-operation with Austria and Spain. Admiral Wager sailed to the Baltic with an English fleet; and the politics of Russia became more pacific. A squadron under Admiral Hosier blockaded Porto Bello—an unfortunate enterprise, for the brave admiral and a large number of his fleet's crews perished of yellow fever in the Spanish Main. If this activity was not war, it was very like war. In the parliament which met in January, 1727, the king announced that he had received information upon which he could wholly depend, that one of the secret articles of the Treaty of Vienna was an agreement to place the pretender upon the throne of Britain. The parliament instantly voted a large increase of the army and navy. The emperor was advised by Palm, his minister at London, to disavow such a secret agreement. The indiscreet resident addressed a memorial to the king, a translation of which was printed and published, in which the secret articles were disavowed, and the royal word was spoken of with disrespect. The two houses were indignant at "the insolence" of the imperial minister in dispersing his memorial through the kingdom; declaring "their utmost abhorrence of this audacious manner of appealing to the people against his majesty." Palm was commanded immediately to leave England. Spain was assembling an army for the siege of Gibraltar, under the command of the Conde de Las Torres, who boasted that in six weeks he

* "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. iv. p. 555.

would drive the heretics into the sea. On the 11th of February the siege was commenced. English men-of-war in the harbor secured a constant supply of provisions for the garrison from the coast of Africa. Lord Portmore—one of the men whose energy age appears unable to cripple—hastened from England, in his eightieth year, to defend the fortress of which he was the governor. For four months the Spaniards ineffectually fired upon the rock, and then they raised the siege.

On the 15th of May, 1727, King George closed the session of parliament preparatory to his departure for Hanover. He adverted to the attack upon Gibraltar. He had suspended, he said, his resentments under such provocation; and instead of having immediate recourse to arms, and demanding that assistance of his allies which they had engaged, and were ready to give, he had concurred with France and the States-General in making overtures of accommodation. Sweden had acceded to the Treaty of Hanover, and a convention had been signed by Denmark. The overtures of accommodation, thus mentioned, had been successful. The Austrian ambassador signed, on the 31st of May, preliminaries of peace with England, France, and Holland. Spain remained alone; neither prepared for war nor acceding to the conditions of peace. At this juncture the power of Walpole seemed to be somewhat endangered. Bolingbroke—who had been allowed by the intervention of Walpole to return to England; who was about to embark at Calais at the close of his exile, when Atterbury landed there a banished man; who had been restored to his estates by act of parliament in 1725—was intriguing to reach once more the possession of power under George which he had obtained under Anne. He had secured, by bribes and protestations, the favor of the Duchess of Kendal, the mistress, or, according to some, the left-handed wife of the Hanoverian king. The duchess presented to her royal admirer a memorial from Bolingbroke, in which he denounced Walpole as the author of every public evil. The king put this paper into the hands of Walpole, with his usual straightforward mode of action. The ambitious statesman therein requested an interview with his sovereign. George was indisposed to grant this meeting. Walpole earnestly pressed it, with his never-failing sagacity; for, as he himself said, "if this was not done, the clamor would be that I kept his majesty to myself, and would allow none to come near him to tell the truth." George told his minister that Bolingbroke's complaints and representations were "bagatelles." The king set out for Hanover on the 3d of June, accompanied by the Duchess of Kendal and Lord Townshend. The unhappy wife of George had died on the 13th of November, 1726, after many schemes of escape. The king landed on the 7th at Vaert, in Holland. On the 8th he proceeded on his journey, leaving the Duchess of Kendal on the Dutch frontier. On the 9th he slept at Delden, and was again in his coach at four o'clock in the morning of the 10th, accompanied by two official persons of the court of Hanover. In the forenoon of that day he was struck by apoplexy. He refused to stop at Ippenburen, as his attendants wished. His hands fell; his eyes were heavy; but his will was strong. "Osnabruck! Osnabruck!" he exclaimed. His one surviving brother, the prince bishop, had his palace at Osnabruck. The king's voice grew fainter. He murmured in his death-sleep, "C'est fait de moi" (All is over with me). All was over. When the bishop was roused by the gallop of horses in his courtyard at midnight, George, King of Great Britain and Elector of Hanover, was dead. He was buried at Hanover.

CHAPTER CLI.

Accession of George II.—Walpole confirmed in power—Frederick, the heir-apparent—Course of foreign policy—The Stuarts—Arrival in England of Prince Frederick—Townshend leaves office—What is history?—The Dissenters—Inquiry into the state of the jails—Law proceedings in English—Party quarrels and libels—Parliamentary opposition—The salt-tax—The excise scheme—Wars in Europe—Neutrality of Great Britain—Motion for the repeal of the Septennial Act—Wyndham's character of Walpole—Walpole's character of Bolingbroke—Bolingbroke quits England.

Sir Robert Walpole is seated at dinner in his villa at Chelsea on the 14th of June, 1727. An express arrives from Lord Townshend, who has accompanied George I. to the continent as secretary of state. The king is dead. The first commissioner of the treasury is instantly in the saddle on his road to Richmond, where the Prince of Wales is staying. The Prince of Wales has dined and is asleep in his bedchamber, the princess sitting by his side. Sir Robert Walpole must see the prince immediately. At that moment the great minister probably regarded his tenure of power as more uncertain than when the Duchess of Kendal was intriguing with Bolingbroke against him. The prince looked upon his father's chief adviser with suspicion and resentment. "I am come to acquaint your majesty with the death of your father," was Walpole's hasty communication. He then asked certain questions about the king's pleasure as to the council being summoned, and as to other necessary formalities. "Go to Chiswick, and take your directions from Sir Spencer Compton," was the uncourteous reply.* Sir Spencer Compton was treasurer to the Prince of Wales. He was speaker of the House of Commons and paymaster to the army—"a plodding, heavy fellow, with great application but no talents," says Lord Hervey. Walpole told Compton it was clear that the king meant him for his minister. Walpole professed that he had no desire of power for himself—a small office in the household would be sufficient to show that he was not disgraced. The minister expectant, who was "always more concerned for the manner and form in which a thing was to be done than about the propriety or expediency of the thing itself," was charmed with the moderation of the man who had been the ruler of England. He asked Walpole to make for him a draught of a speech to be delivered by the king to the council, while he went to the king at Leicester House. When he returned, the speech was ready. Sir Spencer made a copy of it, and went back to Leicester House. One passage in the speech was objected to by the king; and Sir Spencer, not seeing his way to alter it, requested Sir Robert to see his majesty and implore him to leave it as originally drawn. The shrewd Caroline of Anspach, who was the firm friend of Walpole—"a better judge than her husband of the capacities of the two men, and who had silently watched for a proper moment for overturning the new designations—did not lose a moment in observing to the king how prejudicial it would be to his affairs to prefer a man in whose own judgment his predecessor was the fittest person to execute the office." † The next day, when the son-in-law of Walpole was displaced from his office of master of the robes, all thought the fall of the ministry was certain. The king had been known, in his father's time, to speak of Walpole as a rogue; of his brother Horace as a dirty buffoon; of Newcastle as an impertinent fool; of Townshend as a choleric blockhead. But the king made no decided movement toward a new administration. The courtiers flocked around Sir Spencer; they got out of the way of Sir Robert. The Civil List was to be settled by parliament in a fortnight. The court moved to Kensington, "where the king," says Hervey, "by the audiences that were asked, and the offers that were made to him by the great men of all denominations, found himself set up at auction, and every one bidding for his favor at the expense of the public." Walpole outbid his rivals. He proposed in parliament that the entire revenue of the Civil List should be settled on the king, being an increase of about 130,000*l.*, and that Queen Caroline should receive a jointure of 100,000*l.* Not a voice was raised against the proposal but that of Shippen. Walpole and his party continued in power. Compton was consoled with the presidency of the council and a peerage. Horace Walpole, as well as Lord Hervey, attributing the triumph of Walpole to the strong influence which the queen possessed over her husband, intimate that Walpole's political opponents, and even some of those who acted with him, thought that the prince's favorite mistress, Mrs. Howard (afterward Lady Suffolk) would be the dispenser of court favors in the new reign. "Sir Robert's sagacity discerned that the power would be lodged with the wife, not with the mistress; and he not only devoted himself to the princess, but totally abstained from even visiting Mrs. Howard." ‡

Queen Caroline's jointure, and an addition of a hundred and thirty thousand pounds to the royal income, provoked only the

* "The Memoirs of John, Lord Hervey, from the Accession of George II. to the Death of Queen Caroline," edited by Mr. Croker, and first published in 1848, have drawn aside the veil from many a courtly scene, although the mutilation of the MS. has left some enigmas yet unsolved.

† Horace Walpole, "Reminiscences." ‡ Ibid.

remonstrance of Shippen. He did not even find a seconder to his amendment. The time was not yet ripe for agitating the question of a distinct provision for the eldest son of the king, independent of any allowance the crown might bestow upon him. Frederick was about twenty years of age, was not a resident in England, and was not yet created Prince of Wales. The case of his father was different when he was Prince of Wales. He was thirty-two years of age, he came to England at the accession of George I., and he lived here with his wife and daughters. Unhappily, both on the part of the father and the mother of Frederick, there was a deep-rooted antipathy toward this eldest son—an unhappy circumstance which probably interfered with such an arrangement as would not have left him wholly dependent upon what Lord Hervey terms "the discretion and generosity of his father." George II. was not very discreet, and he was very far from generous. The unkingly passion of avarice was predominant in his most trivial disbursements. But this precise little man had one supreme royal virtue, that of an inflexible love of justice. Personal courage he signally possessed—it is an attribute of his race. He fought under Marlborough at Oudenarde in 1708. He headed the charge of his infantry at Dettingen in 1743. In Queen Caroline, George, for ten years of his reign, had such an adviser and friend as few sovereigns have ever been blessed with. She possessed the rare wisdom—difficult even in private life, but far more difficult in the relations of a king and his consort—of governing her husband without appearing to govern. She never offered an opinion when any matter of state was discussed between the king and his ministers in her presence; but her opinion was ever certain to prevail. Queen Caroline and Robert Walpole perfectly understood the system under which the succession of the house of Brunswick became less and less assailable. Expediency was their great principle—let well enough alone—*quieta non movere*. Keep the nation as much as possible at peace with its neighbors. Abstain from asserting any prerogative that might appear to interfere with parliamentary government. Secure a majority in parliament, even at the cost of pandering to the cupidity of the dishonest and time-serving. Surrender even what you know to be right, if the danger of popular clamor against a measure be greater than the good which it proposes to accomplish. These are not noble maxims of government; but they were not without their beneficial results upon a nation that had been disturbed by conflicting principles for nearly a century. The consequence of this policy was that there are fewer stirring events in the first fourteen years of the reign of George II. than in any period of like duration in our history. Happy is the family which is reared without any adventures to record beyond the "migrations from the blue bed to the brown." Happy the nation which has little to offer to the notice of the historian, during the period of half a generation, but its steady progress in the arts of industry; its growth of capital; its abundant provision of the funds for sustaining labor; its general contentment, which some silly outbreak of popular prejudice only renders more remarkable; its leisure to examine into social evils, which chiefly affect those masses of the people that politicians have been too apt to neglect till they have become dangerous in their impatience of intolerable abuses.

The foreign policy of England had ceased to be perplexed with apprehensions of insurrection and invasion for restoring the Stuart family. At the accession of George II. there was a momentary hope among the Jacobites that something might be done. Atterbury, who had thrown off all disguise, described to James the spirit of caution and fear which possessed his friends "at home"—how nothing could be expected of them without foreign assistance. The British and French governments were in entire accord. Spain, although still grumbling about Gibraltar, had consented to a peace. All unsettled questions with the emperor and others were to be referred to a congress at Soissons. Eighteen months were the peputies at this congress, pretending to debate about the Pragmatic Sanction,* and other nice points of diplomatic subtlety. "The cooks of the plenipotentiaries," says Lord Hervey, "had much more business there than their secretaries." The ministry of George became tired of a state of things which was neither peace nor war, and, when their patience was worn out by the never-ending discussions of Soissons, they, in conjunction with France and Holland, concluded the Peace of Seville with Spain, leaving the emperor to fight his own battle. Some sixteen months later, by the Treaty of Vienna with Great Britain and Holland, there was obtained a guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction, by which Charles, the emperor, who had no sons, had provided that the succession to the hereditary estates of Austria should rest in the female line. Spain, shortly after, acceded to the treaty. The disputes as to the Spanish Succession came to an end—"the problem with which creation had groaned for some twenty years past, finally accomplished better or worse."* During the twelve years in which England was at peace with all nations the pretender fell into a state of humiliation which compelled his supporters long to remain in hopeless apathy. There were always scheming priests and unprincipled adventurers about him, to tell him of some party quarrel or some popular discontent in England and Scotland as being propitious to his return. But no man of any mark or influence could now be induced to engage in a dangerous adventure for the cause of a man who was faithless and ungrateful—who had quarrelled with Bolingbroke and Atterbury, and had chosen his advisers from among the weakest and most bigoted of his adherents. James Edward's character was such as to alienate his warmest friends. The cause of the Stuarts they thought was utterly lost unless the grandson of James II. should burst out in a more propitious day, to witch the world with a revival of the heroic attributes claimed for some of Scotland's ancient line of kings.

The year 1728 is chiefly noticeable for the arrival in England of Frederick, now styled Duke of Edinburgh, but afterward Prince of Wales. In the session of parliament which commenced in January, 1729, the Commons congratulated the king upon this arrival—a congratulation which the king could have well dispensed with. At the debate upon the address the prince was present, "to satisfy a laudable curiosity with the manner of proceeding in the House of Commons."† The young heir to the crown was in a somewhat unhappy position—stinted of pecuniary means by his parsimonious father; brought up from his childhood to believe that he was to marry Wilhelmina, the pretty, clever, and accomplished Princess of Prussia, as Friedrich, Crown Prince of Prussia, was to marry the English Princess Royal. This double-marriage project was always liable to wreck upon some political rock ahead, some petty quarrel or jealousy between the royal cousins—the fidgety George, Elector of Hanover, and the fiery Friedrich Wilhelm, King of Prussia; a leaning to French and Spanish alliances on the English part, a clinging to German interests, represented by the emperor, on the Prussian part. The Prince of Wales, who had never seen his destined bride, professed to be madly enamored of her. The princess rather affected indifference, although her mother was set upon the match, and her ladies saluted her as Princess of Wales. An envoy is sent from England in 1730 to settle these nuptial projects at Berlin. Sir Charles Hotham is to insist upon the double marriage; the passionate Friedrich Wilhelm will hear only of one at the present time. The Prince of Wales writes to the envoy to get the affair finished—for he is desperately in love. Though there is much feasting and immoderate libations, the affair will not get finished. Hotham goes back to England to report his ill success. In four years Frederick, Prince of Wales, has another wife provided for him, the clever Wilhelmina having in 1731 been compelled to marry the Prince of Baireuth—a happier fate, probably, than that of keeping a petty court as Princess of Wales, the central point of opposition to the government of her husband's father.‡

In 1730 Lord Townshend and Sir Robert Walpole quarrelled; and the quarrel ending in Townsend's resignation of office, Walpole became supreme in the administration. It is related by Coxe, under the date of 1729, that a personal scuffle took place between the two ministers. The famous quarrel scene of Peachem and Lockit in the "Beggar's Opera" has been held to have been derived from this unseemly exhibition, which Lord Mahon considers to have occurred in 1730, just before Townshend's resignation. Mr. Croker has pointed out that, "as the 'Beggar's Opera' was played on the 29th of January, 1728, it is certain either that the date of the historians is an anachronism, or that Gay alluded to some earlier dispute, or that the story

* See Table of Treaties, *ante*, p. 733.

* Carlyle, "Friedrich II." vol. ii. p. 68.
† "Historical Register."
‡ See Carlyle, vol. ii. pp. 31, 147, 151.

was made from the scene."* Lord Townshend did not conduct himself ungenerously toward his old friend and brother-in-law. He did not join the violent faction by which Walpole was assailed. He retired to the country; and by the encouragement which he gave to the turnip-husbandry he led the way to that system of cultivation which enabled the agricultural production of England to keep pace with her growing population.

The same keen critic who notices the anachronism of the quarrel scene as caricatured by Gay points out that "it is remarkable that Coxe [Life of Walpole] passes, in two lines, the period from May 1730, to January, 1733, as wholly unmarked by any public event;" and that "Lord Hervey's Memoirs make exactly the same leap."† We do not assume that history has nothing to record during this period. It is our duty to notice some matters as public events which those who chiefly deal with the grand affairs called history—rivalries of ministers, intrigues for places and honors, wonderful adjustments of the balance of power—very frequently pass over. If we dilate somewhat upon topics that have more especial reference to the progress of "the people" in material prosperity and in good government, than we have found in the complexities of the Congress of Soissons, of the Peace of Seville, and of the Treaty of Vienna—topics perhaps more useful than a minute inquiry into the equivocal relations of George II. with Lady Suffolk—we must be content to bear the reproach of a school that defines "the people" as "the lower orders." The "eminent hands" of the last century invariably denominated "the people" as "the mob;" and they have successors who divide society into "upper classes" created to govern, and "lower orders" sent into the world to obey.

The alleged leap of two years and a half in the "Memoirs" of Lord Hervey is not strictly correct. He notices, at considerable length, as occurring in the latter end of the summer of 1730, a design "projected among all the dissenters of England to petition the parliament in the next session for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts."‡ From Lord Hervey's official position of vice-chamberlain to the king—which he attained in May, 1730, when he left the opposition party of Pulteney, around which he had been hovering, to become the adherent of the minister whose power was now firmly established—he acquired an intimate acquaintance with the inner workings of the court life. The dissenters represented their steady support of the government on revolution principles—their unwavering adherence to the Protestant succession. Walpole could not deny their claims; but he knew the storm that would be raised if he gave them encouragement. The queen was persuaded to send for Hoadley, then Bishop of Salisbury, to persuade him that "all times were not proper to do proper things"—that the bringing forward such a measure as the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts would still further divide the already divided Whig party—that "as the clergy had hitherto been kept quiet by a promise of everything in their province remaining as it was, so consequently, when that promise was broken, it would set all the turbulent spirits and ill-humors of that body again afloat." Hoadley declared that as he had so often given his opinion as to "the unreasonableness of these laws in a social light, and the profaneness of them theologically considered," he must always support the repeal of them; but that he would nevertheless employ his interest among the dissenters to divert "the immediate trying of this point." A report soon got abroad that the bishop had told the queen that the request of the dissenters was so unreasonable that he could not give them his support. The bishop was indignant, and urged Walpole to allow him to hold out some promise of future relief to the dissenters. Sir Robert was firm, and would give no such assurance. The adroit minister, whose power of management was ready to grapple with every difficulty, got the body of London dissenters to choose a committee. "As the honest gentlemen who composed that committee were all moneyed men of the city, and scriveners, who were absolutely dependent upon Sir Robert, and chosen by his contrivance, they spoke only as he prompted, and acted only as he guided." They were induced to meet the lord chancellor, the speaker of the House of Commons, the two secretaries of state, and Sir Robert; and these great men convinced them that, as there was no prospect of success, the present was an improper time for any application to parliament for their relief. The committee reported their negotiations to a general assembly of the London dissenters especially convened; and that assembly adopted their convictions, and communicated them to all their brethren in England. "In this manner this storm that threatened the administration from the Presbyterian party blew over." Looking at the manœuvre of Walpole, and the subserviency of his committee of dissenters, we must not altogether forget that in 1727 and 1728 acts of indemnity had been passed in favor of those who had not duly qualified for office. In 1729 such an act was intermitted; in 1730 it was renewed; in 1731 it was again intermitted. During the remainder of Walpole's administration this relief was regularly granted. With four other exceptions, in the reign of George II., the indemnity was passed every year, till the repeal of the obnoxious laws in 1828.

The parliamentary records of 1729 and 1730 present us with three reports of the select committee of the House of Commons "on the state of the gaols of this kingdom." These reports contain a minute exposure of as horrible a system of oppression and cruelty as probably ever existed in any civilized country. The inquiry was confined to the three London prisons for debtors—the Fleet, the Marshalsea, and the King's Bench. This exposure was one of the most important steps in the slow march of a just administration of the law—that step which at last arrives at the capacity to discriminate between the criminal and the unfortunate. It was the preparation for that onward progress which counts it wisdom as well as mercy not to drive the criminal out of the pale of humanity. To one man it was principally owing that these terrible abuses were dragged to light. Mr. Oglethorpe, afterward General Oglethorpe—the philanthropist whose "strong benevolence of soul" is eulogized by Pope—the accomplished veteran whose life Johnson desired to write, and for whose earnest commendation of his "London," when he was friendless and unknown, Johnson was ever grateful—was chairman of the committee that penetrated into the dismal recesses of the Fleet prison, personally to examine into the condition of the prisoners. The Fleet was an ancient prison, in which the illegal punishments of the Star Chamber had been administered without control. When that jurisdiction was abolished in the reign of Charles I. it became a prison for debtors, and for those committed for contempts by the Courts of Chancery, Exchequer, and Common Pleas. Although the statutes of the 22d and 23d of Charles II. vested the government of all prisons in the judges of the higher courts, and in justices of the peace, the warden of the Fleet enjoyed a patent office, to be purchased by a large payment to some minister of the crown. John Huggins gave 5000*l.* to Lord Clarendon for his patent; and John Huggins sold his patent for a like sum to Thomas Bambridge and Dougal Cuthbert, esquires. The committee of the House of Commons imputed the evil practices of this prison chiefly "to the venality of the warden's office." The worthy patentees had a tolerably profitable investment. By the payments of the prisoners for lodging, they made 811*l.* 4*s.* per annum; by the commitment and dismission fees, 766*l.* 18*s.* 8*d.*; by liberty of rules, 1500*l.*; by chaplain's fees, which they farmed upon a small payment to the chaplain, 813*l.* 16*s.*; by rents of various premises, 740*l.*; making a total of 4632*l.* 18*s.* 8*d.* per annum. A system of fraud and extortion was laid bare by the inquiries of the committee, which showed how impossible it was for any but the affluent prisoner to obtain the humblest lodging and the coarsest food. Those without money were handed over to "the common side," too happy if disease, engendered by filth and starvation, soon released them from their miseries. Those prisoners who refused to bear their oppressions without remonstrance were put in irons—were confined in damp and loathsome dungeons. The case of Captain John Macpheadris, who had been a flourishing merchant till the South Sea year, when, being surety to the crown for a friend, he failed, is narrated in the report of the committee with a pathos rarely excelled by writers of fiction. Macpheadris furnished a room, but refusing to pay an extravagant price for it, and offering what was legally due, "Bambridge locked the prisoner out of his room, and forced him to lie in the open yard, called the Bare. He sat quietly under his wrongs, and, getting some poor materials, built a little hut, to protect himself, as well as he could, from the injuries of the weather." Bambridge was disgusted at his "unconcernedness." He ordered his officers to pull down the little hut; he would

* Note in Lord Hervey's "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 117.
† Ibid.
‡ "Memoirs," chap. vii. pp. 144 to 158.

put the culprit who dared to be "easy" into the Strong Room to-morrow. Through a rainy night the wretched man lay on the ground. But this was comfort compared to the Strong Room. Loaded with irons he continued for three weeks, without a bed, in that dungeon. The irons were so closely riveted that his torture nearly brought him to the point of death, and he became lame for life. The report of this case thus concludes: "The prisoner, upon this usage, petitioned the judges; and after several meetings, and a full hearing, the judges reprimanded Mr. Huggins and Bambridge, and declared that a gaoler could not answer the ironing of a man before he was found guilty of a crime; but it being out of term, they could not give the prisoner any relief or satisfaction." Instance upon instance of similar cruelties came before the committee. Huggins and Bambridge, with four of their agents and accomplices, were ordered by the House of Commons to be committed to Newgate, and to be prosecuted by the attorney-general. A bill was subsequently brought in to deprive Bambridge of his office. The inquiry into the prison of the Marshalsea disclosed similar enormities on the part of the keeper, who "hath arbitrarily and unlawfully loaded with irons, tortured, and destroyed, in the most cruel and barbarous manner, prisoners for debt under his care." Thumbscrews and iron skull caps were here the received instruments of torture. But the horrors of "the common side" of the Marshalsea far exceeded those of the Fleet. Three hundred and thirty prisoners were crowded into a few narrow wards; forty or fifty being locked up, through the night, in a room not sixteen feet square. If they escaped the jail distemper, famine destroyed them; for the prison allowance was insufficient to support life, and the donations of the charitable were intercepted by the scoundrels in authority. The committee saw in the women's sick ward many miserable objects lying, perishing with extreme want; and "in the men's sick ward yet much worse." The prison of the King's Bench was found exempt from the most revolting of these abuses. The Lord Chief Justice Raymond did not accept fees or presents from the marshal, and he did hear and redress the complaints of the prisoners.

In the session of parliament which commenced in January, 1731, petitions were presented to the Commons from the magistracy of the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire, complaining "That the obliging grand-jurymen at the sessions of the peace, to make their presentments in a language which few of them understood; and the suffering in any of the proceedings of the courts of justice, or in any of the transactions of the law, whereby the person or property of the subject may be affected, the use of a language not intelligible, and of a character not legible, but by the learned in the law, were great occasions of the delay of justice, and gave room to most dangerous frauds." The ancient practice of using a corrupt Latin for written pleadings had been abolished, with many other legal abuses, in the time of the commonwealth. When the restoration gave back the monarchy, with much of its inherent good and a considerable portion of its trappings of evil, it was held wise and reverential to restore the old law language. During five reigns the people had borne this mischievous absurdity. Lord Chancellor King, the son of an Exeter grocer—one of "the people"—saw the necessity of attending to the prayer of the Yorkshire petitions. He directed a bill to be introduced in the House of Commons to enact "That all proceedings in courts of justice shall be in the English language." The bill was passed, after some opposition, such as is always at hand to resist what is dreaded as "innovation." In the House of Lords the judges, speaking through the lord chief-justice, were decidedly against the change—difficulties would arise in translating the law out of Latin into English; lawsuits would be multiplied, in regard to the interpretation of English words. The Duke of Argyle contended that our prayers were in our native tongue that they might be intelligible, and why should not the laws, wherein our lives and properties are concerned. The complaint came from "the people"—from magistrates, from jurymen. There never was a period in our history, even in the darkest times, in which the remonstrances of the middle classes against prescriptive abuses were not faithfully seconded by some of an aristocracy that did not stand, as a caste, apart from "the people." The bill passed; and the Lords added a clause to provide that records and other documents should be written in a plain legible hand, such as that in which acts of parliament are engrossed. The tenacity with which some minds, even of a high order, cling to custom and precedent, is shown in the lament of Blackstone that the old Law Latin was disused. Lord Campbell adds, "I have heard the late Lord Ellenborough, from the bench, regret the change, on the ground that it has had the tendency to make attorneys illiterate." There were two other complaints in the Yorkshire petitions which required the labor of a century to redress: "That special pleadings, by their intricacy and dilatoriness, rendered the prosecution of the rights of the subject difficult and expensive; that the recovery of small debts, as the law then stood, was impracticable."

The king, in opening the fifth session of parliament in 1732, adverted to the foreign policy by which peace had been secured, and the consequent ease which his subjects enjoyed. "This happy situation of affairs, I promise myself, will inspire you all with such temper and unanimity, and such a seasonable zeal for the public good, as becomes a parliament sensible of the great blessings they enjoy." It was not probable that the royal recommendation of temper and unanimity would have much influence upon the violent spirit of party. There was a strong opposition to the address, in which Pulteney took the lead. The great opponent of Walpole was not likely to be in a placid mood. In the summer of 1731 his name had been struck out of the list of privy councillors by the king's own hand, and he was removed from all commissions of the peace. At that period the war of pamphlets and periodical works was conducted as fiercely by Bolingbroke and Pulteney as in the day when Swift headed the great battle against the Whigs. The organ of Walpole's bitter assailants was "The Craftsman." Pulteney had been visited with the anger of the court, for publishing a private conversation between Walpole and himself, in which the king's minister had spoken very freely of his present master when Prince of Wales. Neither of these rivals hesitated to violate the confidence of familiar intercourse in their party quarrels. In the attacks upon Walpole the license used was such as gentlemen of a later period would disdain to employ. The great minister was nicknamed "Sir Blue String," "Sir Robert Brass," "Iago." Caricatures, issuing from the "Craftsman's" publisher, set forth "Robin's Reign." He was "the harlequin of state"—Satan's minister. Franklin, the printer of the "Craftsman," was convicted of a libel. The mob huzzaed Pulteney, who had attended the trial. Never was such a season of quarrel and scandal. Lord Hervey and Pulteney fought a duel about an article in the "Craftsman," which is gone to the region of all worthless effusions of party spite. Pope libelled Lord Hervey in a character which, for its brutal virulence, must ever be execrated, but which for its concentration of all the powers of satire will never be forgotten. As the supporter of Walpole in the House of Commons—as the confidential intimate of Queen Caroline—Hervey is thus delineated:

> "Whether in florid impotence he speaks,
> And, as the prompter breathes, the puppet squeaks;
> Or, at the ear of Eve, familiar toad,
> Half froth, half venom, spits himself abroad,
> In puns, or politics, or tales, or lies,
> Or spite, or smut, or rhymes, or blasphemies." *

A pleasant world to live in, for statesmen and authors!

The parliamentary history of 1732, imperfectly as the debates are reported, give us some notion not altogether inadequate of the vigor which characterized a British House of Commons, at a period of a strong government encountered by a powerful opposition. To us, who have escaped some of the dangers to the constitution which were then predicted by those whom Walpole contemptuously termed "patriots and boys," denunciations such as those of Pulteney against standing armies may appear trite and juvenile. Nevertheless, we cannot but admire the spirit which called them forth, when we look around, even at this day, upon other states. "The nations around us," said Pulteney, "are already enslaved, and have been enslaved by those very means. By means of their standing armies they have every one lost their liberties." That is true now, as it was true then. But when he goes on to say that "it is impossible that the liberties of the people can be preserved in any country where a numerous standing army is kept up," we ask, How has England preserved its liberties with a standing army? The answer is at hand. England never lost the safeguard of a free expression of public opinion. Vain were the attempts to prevent the publication of proceedings in parlia-

* "Prologue to the Satires."

ment. In 1729 Mr. Raikes, of Gloucester, was ordered to attend at the bar of the Commons, upon a complaint that he had printed speeches purporting to have been delivered in that house; and it was unanimously resolved, "that it is an indignity to, and a breach of the privileges of, this house, for any person to presume to give, in written or printed newspapers, any account or minutes of the debates, or other proceedings of this house, or of any committee thereof; and that upon the discovery of the authors, printers, or publishers, this house will proceed against the offenders with the utmost severity." In 1738 William Pulteney, whose memory is of small historical value if disconnected with what we have learned of his speeches in parliament, was eager to join in that most solemn resolution against any publication of the debates, which compelled the use of fictitious names in "Debates in the Senate of Great Lilliput"—a device which Johnson made so famous in the "Gentleman's Magazine." The jealousy with which parliamentary privilege was guarded made even "patriots" insensible to the value of a power of influencing public opinion legitimately through the press, instead of by the publication of virulent personal attacks upon the party opposed to them. Pulteney dreaded that the publication of speeches in parliament, even if they were not misrepresented, would look very like making members "accountable without doors for what they say within." The boldness of Sir William Wyndham might have contributed to the eagerness of all parties to debate without publicity. "I don't know but what the people have a right to know what their representatives are doing," said the stanch old Tory.

The financial measures of Walpole—although the sober judgment of later times does not condemn them in the unmeasured manner in which they were denounced by his contemporaries as arbitrary and unjust—had in some cases more regard to the strengthening of his government than to the statesman's obligation to raise supplies in the manner least oppressive to the national industry. His great object was to propitiate the country party. In 1732 he revived the salt duty, which, only two years before, had been held to be injurious, and was abolished by statute. In proposing the revival of a tax, which he contended was the most just because the most general, he made it perfectly understood that the tax to which the poorest laborer would contribute what was deemed a trifle, was to relieve the proprietors of estates from the necessity of paying a land-tax of two shillings in the pound instead of one shilling. He calculated that if the population consisted of eight millions, and the sum of 230,250*l.* were raised by a salt tax, it would not amount to sevenpence a head. There were men in the House of Commons who saw the fallacy of this argument—who told the minister that he was about to injure the agriculture and manufactures of the country by imposing a duty upon an article of essential importance in the operations of industry. Pulteney truly said, "If any of our neighbors can sell but one tenth part of a farthing in a yard cheaper than we can do, they will at last turn us entirely out of the business. This holds as to all our manufactures in general, but as to some particular manufactures, such as glass, leather, earthenware, it is still more grievous. I find it is granted by all, that the making use of salt is an improvement to land." We cannot be surprised that these arguments were of no avail in the days of George II. when we look back upon their fruitless repetition for nearly a century, during which period the importance of salt in the arts had increased a hundredfold. In what condition would be our manufacturing industry if salt were now taxed as it was taxed in the reign of George IV.?

Walpole carried his revived salt duty by a majority of only thirty-eight. The most popular argument against the government was that this measure was a step toward a general excise. "Every excise," said Pulteney, "is a general excise, if the whole body of the people, the poor, the needy, the most wretched, are obliged to contribute thereto. . . . If this be granted, and tamely submitted to by the people, it may be an encouragement to ambitious and wicked ministers in future times to proceed a step farther, and lay another excise upon some other commodity used by the generality of the people; that again will give encouragement to a third attempt, and so on; till at last the people of this country be subjected, as well as some of our neighbors, to a general excise in the most extensive sense; that is, an excise upon every person, and almost every thing that can be converted to the use of man." Walpole certainly could not have calculated what would be the effect of such a cry as this, sent through the country, however imperfect the means of publicity. In the session of parliament which commenced in January, 1733, such a storm was raised by the very name of excise as went nigh to shake the monarchy to its foundations.

The first imposition of a tax known as excise was by the parliament after the commencement of the civil war. Beer, ale, cider, and perry were so taxed in 1645. The Royalists raised money by a similar tax. These duties were continued at the restoration, with additional imposts on the new luxuries of tea and coffee. In the reign of James II. there was a temporary excise upon wine, vinegar, tobacco, and sugar. In the reign of William, salt, malt, and distilled liquors were thus taxed. The customs duties on tobacco, tea, brandy, and wine, although very productive to the revenue, were diminished by frauds of enormous magnitude. A committee of the House of Commons reported, in 1732, that in the article of tobacco alone the government was defrauded of one third of the import duties, by perjury, forgery, and collusion. The smuggling of tea and brandy was conducted with such systematic violence by gangs of armed men that from 1723 to 1732 two hundred and fifty custom-house officers had been beaten and abused, and six had been murdered. The prosecutions of persons concerned in the illicit trade had amounted to two thousand. The plan of Walpole had chiefly in view the prevention of these frauds and outrages. The warehousing system upon goods imported was not then in existence. The merchant had to pay his duties at once at the custom-house upon the arrival of the cargo. Walpole proposed that the duties upon wine and tobacco should be inland duties; that the imports should be warehoused, and removed from time to time by permit, upon due payment; that the retail dealers in the articles so taxed should come under the same excise laws. Before Walpole proposed his scheme an outcry was raised, in parliament and out of parliament, an outcry of which Johnson's celebrated definition of "excise" is a faint echo: "A hateful tax levied upon commodities, and adjudged, not by common judges of property, but by wretches hired by those to whom excise is paid." On the 14th of March Sir Robert brought forward his plan. He denied that he had ever intended a general excise. The shameful frauds upon the revenue with reference to the duties on wine and tobacco had induced him to propose that these duties should come under the laws of excise. The gross produce of the customs upon tobacco was 750,000*l.* The complicated frauds, such as arose out of drawbacks, reduced the net receipts to 160,000*l.* By changing the mode of collection the revenue would be so increased that he should be able wholly to abolish the land-tax. Such a proposal does not appear so tyrannical as to drive a people to madness. The actual duties were not to be increased by their collection as inland duties. Warehouses and shops were to be entered at the Inland Office, and were liable to be searched by the officers of revenue; but the officers of customs possessed a like power of search. Yet Wyndham declared that "in all countries excises of every kind are looked upon as badges of slavery;" and he suggested the warning example of the "two noted ways-and-means men," Empson and Dudley, who administered to the insatiable desire for money of their master, Henry VII., but who met their reward when their master's son took off both their heads when he came to the throne. The allusion was palpable; for the Prince of Wales sat under the gallery. Pulteney exclaimed that the inscription on Sir Robert Walpole's tomb should be, "This is the man who would have enslaved his country by an excise." Round the door of the House of Commons an extraordinary concourse of people was assembled. Walpole intimated that such a multitude had been assembled by the influence of magnates of the city: "Gentlemen may give them what name they think fit; it may be said that they came hither as humble supplicants, but I know whom the law calls sturdy beggars." The imprudent phrase was never forgotten. It was bandied about that night in the lobby; and when Sir Robert was leaving the house, after having carried his motion by a majority of sixty-one, he was roughly assailed, and was saved from injury by the interposition of Mr. Pelham.

For three weeks the Excise Bill was debated fiercely at every stage. The ministerial majority gradually dwindled. The ferment throughout the country, stimulated by pamphlets and ballads, alarmingly increased. Tindal, a looker-on, says, "The public was so heated with papers and pamphlets that matters rose next to a rebellion." There were greater dangers to the government than ordinary riots,

which appeared imminent. Lord Scarborough told the queen that he would answer for his regiment against the pretender, but not against the opposers of the excise. The same nobleman said to Walpole, two days before the day appointed for the second reading of the bill, that "the soldiers had got a notion that it would raise the price of tobacco, and upon this notion were so universally set against the scheme that they cursed the administration and the parliament, murmured treason even under the walls of the palace, and were almost as ripe for mutiny as the nation for rebellion." * Lord Hervey relates that Sir Robert, when the clamor was at its height, told the king and queen that there was only one of two courses to be pursued—either that the bill should be dropped or that the author of it should resign. The king and queen both assured their minister that they would never forsake him, and that they would stand or fall together. On the 10th of April the petition of the city was presented to the House of Commons, attended by the citizens in a train of coaches that reached from Temple Bar to Westminster. The petitioners prayed to be heard by counsel against the bill. Such a concession in the matter of a tax before the house was contrary to its rules and orders; yet the demand was rejected only by a majority of seventeen. Walpole felt that this was a defeat. "He stood some time after the house was up, leaning against the table, with his hat pulled over his eyes, some few friends with melancholy countenances round him; while his enemies, with the gayety of so many bridegrooms, seemed as just entering upon the enjoyment of what they had been so long pursuing." † After the debate Sir Robert assembled about a dozen of his friends at supper. He told them gayly, "This dance it will no farther go; and to-morrow I intend to sound a retreat." On the 11th Walpole proposed in the Commons that the second reading of the bill should be deferred for two months. This was carried without a division. As Sir Robert passed through the lobby this night there was a serious scuffle between the multitude and the civil power; and the portly minister had a narrow escape from being trampled to death amid friends and foes. Universal was the rejoicing at the defeat of the government measure. Bonfires and illuminations lighted up every town. Cockades were worn, inscribed "Liberty, property, and no excise." The court and the ministry were revenged upon some of the great household officers, whose connections had voted against the measure, by dismissing the lukewarm friends from their employments. Colonels were deprived of their regiments for their obnoxious votes—a practice unjustifiable, but which was not laid aside even in the reign of George III. In the next session, when the dealers in tea petitioned against the excise regulations of an act of George I., and Pulteney suggested that "the wicked scheme of an honorable gentleman" might not yet be laid aside, Walpole thus replied: "As to the wicked scheme, as the gentleman is pleased to call it, which he would persuade gentlemen is not yet laid aside, I, for my own part, can assure this house, I am not so mad as ever again to engage in anything that looks like an excise, though in my own private opinion I still think it was a scheme that would have tended very much to the interest of the nation."

The last session of the parliament chosen in 1727 was opened by the king on the 17th of January, 1734. The policy of a government anxious to maintain neutrality while other nations were at war, and at the same time to make it understood that a strong desire for peace was no symptom of national weakness, was never more emphatically expressed than in the words which Walpole put into the mouth of George II. A new quarrel had broken out in Europe upon the death, in 1733, of Augustus II., King of Poland. Austria and Russia advocated the succession of his son. France supported the election of Stanislaus, who had been king before Augustus. The war assumed a more general character, and revived some of the old disputes between France, Spain, and Austria. An army of French, Spaniards, and Sardinians overran Austria. Lombardy, Naples, and Sicily were invaded by Don Carlos, Duke of Parma, the son of the Queen of Spain; and the Austrians being unable to resist, he was crowned King of Naples and Sicily as Charles III. On the Rhine the war was conducted by Prince Eugene, still vigorous, against Marshal Berwick. The son of James II. was killed at the siege of Philipsburg. The companion-in-arms of Marlborough held his ground in this campaign, and died two years after. Under the circumstances, which we can only thus briefly indicate, the King of England wisely spoke to his parliament: "The war, which is now begun, and carried on against the emperor, with so much vigor, by the united powers of France, Spain, and Sardinia, is become the object of the care and attention of all Europe; and though I am no ways engaged in it, and have had no part, except by my good offices, in those transactions, which have been declared to be the principal causes and motives of it, I cannot sit regardless of the present events, or be unconcerned for the future consequences, of a war undertaken and supported by so powerful an alliance. . . . The resolutions of the British parliament, in so nice a juncture, are of too great moment not to be carefully attended to, and impatiently expected, by all, and not the least by those who will hope to take advantage from your determinations, whatever they shall be, and to turn them to the prejudice of this kingdom. It must therefore be thought most safe and prudent thoroughly to weigh and consider all circumstances before we come to a final determination. As I shall have, in all my considerations upon this great and important affair, the strictest regard to the honor of my crown and to the good of my people, and be governed by no other views, I can make no doubt but that I may entirely depend on the support and assistance of my parliament, without exposing myself, by any precipitate declarations, to such inconveniences as ought, as far as possible, to be avoided. In the mean time I am persuaded you will make such provisions as shall secure my kingdoms, rights, and possessions, from all dangers and insults, and maintain the respect due to the British nation. Whatever part it may in the end be most reasonable for us to act, it will, in all views, be necessary, when all Europe is preparing for arms, to put ourselves in a proper posture of defence."

The great merit of Sir Robert Walpole, in resolutely maintaining the policy of neutrality, may be better appreciated from the circumstance that the king and queen were opposed to his pacific views. George used daily to tell his minister "that it was with the sword alone he desired to keep the balance of Europe. He could not bear the thought of growing old in peace, and rusting in the cabinet, while other princes were busied in war, and shining in the field." * The observant vice-chamberlain says that the queen, with all her good sense, was as unmanageable as the king. "Wherever the interest of Germany and the honor of the empire were concerned, her thoughts and reasonings were often as German and Imperial as if England had been out of the question." † The perseverance of Walpole had its reward. He was odious at Vienna; but before the end of the summer of 1734 George said to his minister, "I have followed your advice, Walpole, in keeping quiet, contrary often to my own opinion, and sometimes I have thought contrary even to my honor, but I am convinced you advised me well." ‡ The king had discovered that overtures of friendship from all parties had been the result of the pacific policy of his minister; that as a possible mediator he was of more importance than as a rash belligerent. Walpole continuing firm in maintaining the neutrality of England, in conjunction with the States-General, the emperor sent an emissary to London, to intrigue with some members of the opposition against the prime minister. Sir Robert detected the Austrian agent, and the Abbé Strickland, Bishop of Namur, was obliged to depart, although he had been graciously received at court. The pacific minister had an argument for the king and queen, which sounds like insular selfishness, but which insular common-sense will always applaud: "There are fifty thousand men slain this year in Europe, and not one Englishman." Under the mediation of England and Holland, peace was concluded in 1735. By this pacification France added Lorraine to her territory. This acquisition, it has been argued even of late years, "disturbed the balance of Europe to a degree that Europe never has recovered." We are told that "as a general question, it cannot be doubted that Austria is a natural ally of England, because France has been, and always must be, the most formidable enemy to both." §

The repeal of the Septennial Act was the great domestic question of this session. The party that advocated a return to triennial parliaments would possess the superior popularity in the coming elec-

* Lord Hervey's "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 187. † Ibid., p. 195.

* Lord Hervey's "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 3.
† Ibid., p. 373. ‡ Ibid., p. 381.
§ Mr. Croker, Note on Lord Hervey, vol. i. p. 375.

tions. No doubt many who now opposed the government upon this measure would be open to the charge of inconsistency; for "Whig patriots," especially Pulteney, had supported the Septennial Act of 1716. Bolingbroke, the arch-enemy of Walpole, was at hand to combat every scruple of conscience, and induce the listeners to his sophistries to believe that political tergiversation was a virtue. The prime minister must be struck down, and for that purpose any weapon was lawful. In the debate upon this constitutional question Sir William Wyndham, the great Tory chief, made an attack upon Walpole, which Walpole treated as the inspiration of Bolingbroke. Over the parliamentary bitterness of adverse factions oblivion mercifully spreads her veil in most cases. But in this case, the portrait of Walpole drawn by Wyndham, and the portrait of Bolingbroke drawn by Walpole, are masterpieces of invective, which take us into the very heart of those days when the right honorable member in the blue ribbon had to endure the taunts of his adversaries with rare equanimity, or to turn upon them like a noble animal at bay, as he did upon this memorable occasion.

There has been a call of the house. The debate has been proceeding during several hours. Sir William Barnard, the Whig member for London, has spoken for the repeal with that strong sense which Walpole always acknowledged as more difficult for him to answer than the declamation of Pulteney, Lyttelton, or Pitt. Sir William Wyndham rises in reply to Sir William Yonge. He goes through all the arguments against the Septennial Act with the adroitness of a ready debater. At the close of his speech he rises to a height of eloquence which scarcely belongs to his parliamentary character: "We have been told, sir, in this house, that no faith is to be given to prophecies, therefore I shall not pretend to prophesy; but I may *suppose* a case, which, though it has not yet happened, may possibly happen. Let us then suppose, sir, a man abandoned to all notions of virtue or honor, of no great family, and of but a mean fortune, raised to be chief minister of state by the concurrence of many whimsical events; afraid or unwilling to trust any but creatures of his own making, and most of them equally abandoned to all notions of virtue or honor; ignorant of the true history of his country, and consulting nothing but that of enriching and aggrandizing himself and his favorites; in foreign affairs, trusting none but those whose education makes it impossible for them to have such knowledge or such qualifications as can either be of service to their country, or give any weight or credit to their negotiations. Let us suppose the true interest of the nation, by such means, neglected or misunderstood; her honor and credit lost; her trade insulted; her merchants plundered; and her sailors murdered; and all these things overlooked, only for fear his administration should be endangered. Suppose him, next, possessed of great wealth, the plunder of the nation, with a parliament of his own choosing, most of their seats purchased, and their votes bought at the expense of the public treasure. In such a parliament, let us suppose attempts made to inquire into his conduct, or to relieve the nation from the distress he has brought upon it; and when lights proper for attaining those ends are called for, not perhaps for the information of the particular gentlemen who call for them, but because nothing can be done in a parliamentary way, till these things be in a proper way laid before parliament; suppose these lights refused, these reasonable requests rejected, by a corrupt majority of his creatures, whom he retains in daily pay, or engages in his particular interest, by granting them those posts and places which ought never to be given to any but for the good of the public. Upon this scandalous victory, let us suppose this chief minister pluming himself in defiances, because he finds he has got a parliament, like a packed jury, ready to acquit him at all adventures. Let us further suppose him arrived to that degree of insolence and arrogance as to domineer over all the men of ancient families, all the men of sense, figure, or fortune in the nation, and, as he has no virtue of his own, ridiculing it in others, and endeavoring to destroy or corrupt it in all. I am still not prophesying, sir, I am only supposing; and the case I am going to suppose I hope never will happen. But with such a minister and such a parliament, let us suppose a prince upon the throne, either for want of true information or for some other reason, ignorant and unacquainted with the inclinations and the interest of his people; weak, and hurried away by unbounded ambition and insatiable avarice. This case, sir, has never yet happened in this nation. I hope, I say, it will never exist. But as it is possible it may, could there any greater curse happen to a nation than such a prince on the throne, advised, and solely advised, by such a minister, and that minister supported by such a parliament."

Pelham has spoken against the motion, and Pulteney has argued briefly and feebly for it. The speaker, Onslow, calls upon Sir Robert Walpole. All eyes turn eagerly to look upon the man who calmly rises to say that he did not intend to trouble the house in this debate, but as pictures of imaginary persons had been drawn, he hoped he might be allowed to draw a picture in his turn: "Now, sir, let me too *suppose*, and the house being cleared, I am sure that no one that hears me can come within the description of the person I am to suppose. Let us suppose in this, or in some other unfortunate country, an anti-minister, who thinks himself a person of so great and extensive parts, and of so many eminent qualifications, that he looks upon himself as the only person in the kingdom capable to conduct the public affairs of the nation; and therefore christening every other gentleman who has the honor to be employed in the administration by the name of Blunderer. Suppose this fine gentleman, lucky enough to have gained over to his party some persons really of fine parts, of ancient families, and of great fortunes, and others of desperate views, arising from disappointed and malicious hearts; all these gentlemen, with respect to their political behavior, moved by him, and by him solely; all they say, either in private or public, being only a repetition of the words he has put into their mouths, and a spitting out of that venom which he has infused into them; and yet we may suppose this leader not really liked by any, even of those who so blindly follow him, and hated by all the rest of mankind. We will suppose this anti-minister to be in a country where he really ought not to be, and where he could not have been but by an effect of too much goodness and mercy; yet endeavoring, with all his might and with all his art, to destroy the fountain from whence that mercy flowed. In that country suppose him continually contracting friendships and familiarities with the ambassadors of those princes who at the time happen to be most at enmity with his own; and if at any time it should happen to be for the interest of any of those foreign ministers to have a secret divulged to them, which might be highly prejudicial to his native country, as well as to all its friends; suppose this foreign minister applying to him, and he answering, 'I will get it you; tell me but what you want, I will endeavor to procure it for you.' Upon this he puts a speech or two in the mouths of some of his creatures, or some of his new converts. What he wants is moved for in parliament, and when so very *reasonable* a request as this is refused, suppose him and his creatures and tools, by his advice, spreading the alarm over the whole nation, and crying out, 'Gentlemen, our country is at present involved in many dangerous difficulties, all of which we would have extricated you from, but a wicked minister and a corrupt majority refused us the proper materials.' And upon this 'scandalous victory,' this minister became so insolent as 'to plume himself in defiances!' Let us further suppose this anti-minister to have travelled, and at every court where he was, thinking himself the greatest minister, and making it his trade to betray the secrets of every court where he had before been; void of all faith or honor, and betraying every master he ever served. I could carry my suppositions a great deal farther, and I may say I mean no person now in being; but if we can suppose such a one, can there be imagined a greater disgrace to human nature than such a wretch as this?"

The session was closed on the 16th of April, and on the 18th the parliament was dissolved. The boldness with which Walpole had stood up against attack had produced a sensible effect upon his adversaries. To Walpole's philippic against Bolingbroke has been attributed the resolution of that most able but dangerous man to leave England and English politics. This view is perhaps overstrained. But he was a disappointed intriguer. He retired to France. "My part is over," he said, "and he who remains on the stage after his part is over deserves to be hissed off."

CHAPTER CLII.

New parliament of 1735—Peace of Vienna—The Gin Act—The Porteous riots—Parliamentary proceedings on these riots—Unpopularity of the king—Marriage of the Prince of Wales—Royal animosi-

ties—Birth of a princess—Illness of Queen Caroline—Death of Queen Caroline.

THE first session of the new parliament, which met in January, 1735, was prolonged only till May. The king announced his determination to visit his dominions in Germany, and the queen was appointed regent. George was sorely tempted to engage in the war by an offer of the command of the imperial army on the Rhine. Walpole had foreseen such a possible flattery of the king's military ambition, and had prepared him to say that he could not appear at the head of an army as King of England, and not have an Englishman to fight under him.* The summer passed without any important military operations. On the 22d of October the king returned from Hanover—according to Lord Hervey in very bad temper, and dissatisfied with everything English. His majesty had left a lady in Hanover, Madame Walmoden, to whom he wrote by every post. Soon after his return the preliminaries of a general peace were signed at Vienna. Europe would be at rest again for four years. "The happy turn which the affairs of Europe had taken" was announced at the opening of parliament in January, 1736. The tranquillity of England and Scotland was seriously disturbed in this season of foreign pacification.

On the 20th of February a petition against the excessive use of spirituous liquors was presented to the House of Commons from the justices of peace for Middlesex. The drinking of geneva, it was alleged, had excessively increased, among the people of inferior rank; the constant and excessive use of distilled spirituous liquors had already destroyed thousands, and rendered great numbers of others unfit for labor, debauching their morals, and driving them into every vice. Upon the motion of Sir Joseph Jekyll it was proposed to lay a tax of twenty shillings a gallon upon gin, and to require that every retailer should take out an annual license costing £50. Walpole gave no distinct support to this measure, nor did he oppose it. He saw that a greatly reduced consumption of spirituous liquors would affect the revenue; that a high duty would produce less than a low duty; and he therefore proposed that £70,000 which had been appropriated to the civil list from the smaller duties on spirits should be guaranteed, if the prohibitory rate were adopted. Pulteney opposed the bill altogether, upon the principle that he had heard of sumptuary laws by which certain sorts of apparel had been forbidden to persons of inferior rank, but that he had never before heard of a sumptuary law by which any sort of victuals or drink were forbidden to be made use of by persons of a low degree. Yet the magnitude of the evil certainly warranted some strong legislative measure. It was stated that within the bills of mortality there were twenty thousand houses for retailing spirituous liquors. Sudden deaths from excessive gin-drinking were continually reported in the newspapers. The extent of this vice was too obvious to allow the arguments against the impossibility of preventing evasion of the duties to have much weight. Compliance with the statute was to be enforced by the machinery of the common informer. So the bill was passed, and was to come into operation after the 29th of September. On that day the signs of the liquor-shops were put in mourning. Hooting mobs assembled round the dens where they could no longer get "drunk for a penny and dead-drunk for twopence." The last rag was pawned to carry off a cheap quart or gallon of the beloved liquor. As was foreseen, the act was evaded. Hawkers sold a colored mixture in the streets, and pretended chemists opened shops for the sale of "Cholick-water." Fond, playful names, such as "Tom Row," "Make Shift," "The Ladies' Delight," "The Baulk," attracted customers to the old haunts. Informers were rolled in the mud, or pumped upon, or thrown into the Thames. Gin riots were constantly taking place for several years. "The Fall of Bob" was the theme of ballad and broadside, which connected the minister with "Desolation, or the Fall of Gin."† The impossibility of preventing by prohibitory duties the sale of a commodity in large request was strikingly exemplified in this gin-struggle. It became necessary in 1743, when the consumption of gin had positively increased, to reduce the excessive duty. A ludicrous example of one of the abortive attempts at minute legislation is exhibited in a rejected clause of the act of 1736. In the wish to protect the sugar-colonies by encouraging the consumption of rum, it was proposed to exempt punch-houses from the operation of the Gin Act, provided the agreeable liquor so retailed was made of one third spirit and two thirds water, at the least, so mixed in the presence of the buyer. If the liquor were stronger than what sailors call "two-water grog," the tippler might pay for his bowl by laying an information.

The Porteous tragedy of Edinburgh in 1736 has become the property of romance. One writer appears to think that the function of the historian has been superseded by that of the novelist. "The tale of the Porteous riot scarcely needs telling, for it has been told by Sir Walter Scott in one of the best and most read of the exquisite Waverley novels."* The judicious historian of "England from the Peace of Utrecht" approaches the subject apologetically. "Some years back the real events might have excited interest; but the wand of an enchanter is now waved over us. . . . How dull and lifeless will not the true facts appear when no longer embellished by the touching sorrows of Effie or the heroic virtue of Jeanie Deans!"† Possibly. But "the real events," "the true facts," have a significance which the writer of fiction does not always care to dwell upon. They strikingly illustrate the condition of society. They are essentially connected with the history of public events which preceded them, and of public events which came after. They illustrate the policy of the government and the temper of the governed. We cannot pass them over or deal with them slightingly. They form the subject of very important parliamentary proceedings in 1737, which are necessary to the proper understanding of the relations between England and Scotland. An impartial review in this, as in most other cases, is as much to be aimed at as a picturesque narrative.

Smuggling in England, as we have seen, had been long carried on to an enormous extent. The seafaring population were accustomed to look upon many gainful adventures as lawful and innocent which we now regard as criminal. The slave-trade, with all its odious cruelties, was a regular mercantile undertaking. Buccaneering in the South Seas was a just assertion of the rights of the British flag. The contraband trade in brandy, tea, and tobacco, was a laudable endeavor to sell their countrymen goods at a cheap rate bought in a fair market. But the principle of smuggling was not recognized as a national benefit. The merchant was opposed to it. The wealthy consumer had conscientious scruples against encouraging it. In Scotland the nation, with the exception of a few flourishing trading communities, abetted smuggling, and regarded smugglers as useful members of society. In a report attributed to Duncan Forbes, it is said, "The smuggler was the favorite. His prohibited or high-duty goods were run ashore by the boats of whatever part of the coast he came near. When ashore, they were guarded by the country from the custom-house officer. If seized, they were rescued; and if any seizure was returned, and tried, the juries seldom failed to find for the defendant."‡ Mr. Burton points out the difference in the circumstances of England and Scotland which made the principle of equality of taxation odious; and emphatically says, "For more than half a century after the union, English fiscal burdens were as unbearable to the Scots as they would be to the Norwegians at the present day." Mr. Patrick Lyndsay, the member for Edinburgh, in a remarkable speech in the House of Commons on the subject of the Porteous riot, said, "I must beg leave to explain the source of these late disorders that have given so much trouble to the legislature. The pernicious practice of smuggling, prejudicial to the fair trader, and so hurtful to the common and general good of the nation, has prevailed but too much in that country, as well as in this. Whoever may be the importers and proprietors of run goods, it is most certain that the lowest class of men, the dregs of the people, those persons who compose mobs, are the persons employed in the running of these goods; and they get so much more by their illicit trade than they can by honest labor, that they neglect their labor for the sake of this vile and destructive trade."§ Mr. Lyndsay did not hesitate to say—for which boldness he was called to account by a portion of his

* Lord Hervey, vol. ii. p. 7.
† See Wright's "England under the House of Hanover," vol. i. p. 159 to p. 163.

* "Cabinet History of England," vol. xvi. p. 32.
† Lord Mahon, vol. ii. p. 285.
‡ Quoted in Burton's "History of Scotland," vol. ii. p. 267.
§ "Parliamentary History," vol. x. col. 253.

constituents—that some high-church Presbyterians, "who assert and maintain an absolute independency on the civil power," and taught that any statute "is iniquity established by law," indirectly encouraged the outrages of "men of weak understanding and strong passions."

The small seaports on the coast of Fife were more remarkable than any other districts of the wide and ill-defended seaboard of Scotland, as the haunts of the most daring bands of systematic smugglers. Two such persons, named Wilson and Robertson, having had some goods seized by the officers of revenue, entered with two associates the custom-house of Pittenween, and when the collector fled, carried off a large sum of money. Wilson and Robertson were apprehended, were tried, and were sentenced to death. Mr. Lyndsay related that Wilson maintained, to the last moment, that he was unjustly condemned. "He admitted," to one of the reverend ministers of Edinburgh, "that he had taken money from a collector of the revenue by violence; that he did it because he knew no other way of coming at it; that the officers of the revenue had by their practice taught him this was lawful, for they had often seized and carried off his goods by violence; and so long as they had goods of greater value in their hands than all the money he took from them, they were still in his debt, and he had done no wrong." * There can be no doubt that the mob of Edinburgh, and many above the mob, took the same view of Wilson's offence, and held the same opinion about revenue laws.

The attempt of Wilson and Robertson to escape from the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, when Wilson, a bulky man, stuck fast in the iron bars of his cell, is as well known as any of the adventures of Jack Sheppard. His generous effort to save his comrade after the condemned sermon in the Tolbooth church has redeemed his memory from the ignominy of the common malefactor. Surrounded by four keepers, Wilson held two with his hands and a third with his teeth, while Robertson knocked down the fourth and escaped. This heroism made Wilson's own fate certain. He was executed on the 14th of April, while the populace looked on with stern compassion. No attempt at rescue was made, for the place of execution was not only surrounded by the city guard but by a detachment of the Welsh fusiliers. After the body was taken down a rush was made to seize it from the hangman. The populace then attacked the city guard, who were under the command of John Porteous, their captain. Porteous was a man of strong passions, very often brought into conflict with the blackguards of the city, and now in peculiarly ill-temper from his dignity being interfered with by the unusual presence of a military force called to assist in keeping the peace. He is said to have fired himself; he certainly ordered his gendarmerie to fire upon the people. Several persons were killed or wounded. The fusiliers also fired; but in firing above the heads of the mob they hit several who were lookers-on from the adjacent windows. Porteous was brought to trial in July, before the High Court of Justiciary, on a charge of murder, for having caused the death of citizens without authority from the civil magistrate. He was convicted, and sentenced to capital punishment; but his conduct being considered by the council of regency in London as an act of self-defence, he was reprieved by the English secretary of state. His execution had been fixed by the authorities of Edinburgh for the 8th of September. The news of the reprieve produced a sensation that foreboded mischief.

The 8th of September fell on a Wednesday. A report had gone forth that some tumult would take place on that day, when the populace, being disappointed of a legal sacrifice to their revenge, would attempt some daring act against Porteous. This was deemed a foolish story; but the Lord Provost of Edinburgh took some precautions to resist any outrage on that Wednesday.† Porteous himself had no fears. A Scottish clergyman, Mr. Yates, had preached in the Tolbooth church, Porteous being present, on Sunday, the 5th; and he afterward saw Porteous, and told him of the report, and advised him to be cautious about admitting persons to his room. Porteous slighted his information, and said, "were he once at liberty, he was so little apprehensive of the people that he would not fear to walk at the cross of Edinburgh with only his cane in his hand as usual." ‡

The Tolbooth of the Scottish capital, like most other places of confinement, had its feasts for those who could pay, and its starvation for those who were destitute. On the evening of Tuesday, the 7th of September, Porteous was surrounded by a jolly party, draining the punch-bowl in toasting the speedy liberation of their friend. There was another remarkable festal assembly in Edinburgh that night. Mr. Lind, captain of the city guard, deposed that, "being informed that the mob was gathering, he went to Clark's tavern, where the provost was drinking with Mr. Bur and other officers of his majesty's ship the Dreadnought, then stationed in the road of Leith; and upon acquainting him with the danger, the provost desired him to go immediately back, and draw out his men, and that he would instantly follow him, and put himself at the head of the guard to face the mob." * The mob was quicker than the provost or his captain. They had disarmed the guard, had taken possession of the guard-house, and were arming themselves with muskets, halberds, and Lochaber axes, which they there found. Edinburgh had suddenly fallen into the complete possession of a lawless multitude. The city walls on the east and south sides had gates, which, after sunset, were shut and guarded. The mob had secured the Westport, the Cowgate, and the Netherbow-port, nailing them up, and barricading them, to prevent military aid coming from the suburbs. A loch closed the city on the north. On the west was the castle, from which the garrison might have descended upon the high street. In the Canongate was a regiment under the command of Major-General Moyle. It was given in evidence that the provost, when he sallied forth from his tavern, requested Mr. Lyndsay to carry a verbal order to Major-General Moyle to send a force to his aid. The member for Edinburgh executed his commission, but the general, seeing how a jury of Edinburgh had convicted a military officer of murder, when he acted without explicit orders from the civil magistrate, refused to move upon receiving only a verbal message. The governor of the castle did not choose to act on his own responsibility. Thus secure, the multitude went about their work with a calm resolution which was long attributed to an organization proceeding from leaders much above the ordinary directors of mobs. No point was neglected. Magistrates rushed out to ring the alarm bell; the tower in which the bell hung was in the possession of the insurgents. Onward they marched, in numbers rapidly increasing, to the Tolbooth. Here they make a solemn demand that Captain John Porteous should be delivered up to them. Being refused, as they expected, they proceeded to batter the outer gate. Crowbars and sledge-hammers were employed in vain. Fire accomplished what bodily strength could not effect. The rioters rushed to the apartment of the unhappy man. He was concealed in the chimney; but they dragged him down, and bade him prepare for death. Struggling ineffectually, he was carried to the Grass-market, the usual place of execution. He was carried on men's hands, as two boys carry a third, by grasping each other's wrists. This stern multitude went on in silence, the glare of torches lighting up their lowering brows and the pallid features of their victim. Near the spot where the gallows had stood on which Wilson was hanged, a pole projected from a dyer's shop. A rope was fastened round the neck of Porteous; and then the subordination of the rioters to some recognized authority was manifest. "Walker, the town-officer, whom the mob had so pelted that he was obliged to throw off his livery coat, declared he was by when they murdered Porteous; and that one more forward than the rest was checked by the others, and desired to wait for orders; that he thereupon quitted the end of the rope, which by this time being about Porteous's neck, he was ready to have hoisted him up, and went about to another, who very composedly gave him orders; and that he returned and drew the rope up and hanged Porteous." † He was not hanged quickly. There was a terrible scene of butchery. Mr. Lyndsay gave in evidence that he returned [from Major-General Moyle's house] about five in the morning; and, with several who had been with the provost all night, went to the Grass-market, where the body of Porteous yet hung, and a number of people standing about it. But he further declared that, as he returned from his fruitless mission, "the mob was pouring in vast shoals out of the town into the country; and that he did not remember any one

* "Parliamentary History," vol. x. col. 254.
† Evidence before Parliament—"Parliamentary History," vol. x. col. 267. ‡ Ibid., col. 268.

* Evidence before Parliament—"Parliamentary History," vol. x. col. 269. † "Parliamentary History," vol. x. col. 271.

face of the many hundreds he met with, though he had lived and borne the highest offices in the city for many years." * The organizers of this daring act were never discovered, after the most rigid investigation. Duncan Forbes, who had conducted an inquiry, as lord advocate, into the circumstances of the case, could fix upon no leader of the rioters, and he ascribed the deed to the impulse of one of "the headstrong mobs" with which Scotland was formerly too well acquainted. General Wade, who had been sent down to assist Forbes in the inquiry, stated in his place in parliament that the servant of an artisan in Edinburgh had been told, three or four days before the murder, that Tuesday night was appointed for revenging innocent blood, and he was to attend when he heard "the ruff of a drum." General Wade maintained that there was nothing in the whole proceeding that looked like the precipitate measures of a giddy mob; and that he never saw, or ever heard of, any military disposition better laid down, or more resolutely executed, than the murderous plan of these rioters. It would appear that the Porteous mob were not without precedents for their guidance. Major-General Moyle, in relating the circumstances to the Duke of Newcastle, thus wrote: "I cannot but mention to your grace that this is the third prisoner, within the memory of man, that has been taken out of a tolbooth here, and barbarously murdered by the mob." Mr. Patrick Lyndsay combated the notion that any above the lowest class of the people were concerned in the Porteous murder, or looked with approbation upon it. He drew a distinction between an English and a Scotch mob. The English did not "do mischief with their eyes open." The lowest class of people in Scotland, he said, "have generally speaking a turn to enthusiasm; and so strong is the influence, such is the force of delusion, that they can work themselves up to a firm persuasion and thorough belief that any mischief they are to do is not only lawful but laudable; that it is their duty to do it; and, from a religious principle, to do it at any risk, even at the risk of their lives." † The Earl of Isla reported to Walpole that "all the lower ranks of the people who had distinguished themselves by pretences to a superior sanctity, talk of the murder as the hand of God doing justice."

The Porteous outrage took place while Queen Caroline was regent in the absence of the king. She felt it as an insult to her authority, and the ministry were inclined to visit the apparent neglect of the magistracy of Edinburgh with serious humiliation. A bill was brought in for disabling the lord provost from ever holding office, and for imprisoning him; for abolishing the town-guard of Edinburgh; for taking away the gates of the Netherbow-port. The Scottish peers and the Scottish members of the Commons fired up at this supposed assault upon the national honor. In the course of the parliamentary inquiry the Scottish judges were summoned to give evidence upon some legal points. It was contended by the Duke of Argyle and other peers that these judges ought to sit on the woolsack as do the English judges, when their presence is wanted in the House of Peers. There was no precedence for such a course, and the Scottish judges were required to stand at the bar. Scotland was outraged by this distinction. The debate in both houses upon the proposed measure of pains and penalties assumed the character of a national controversy. "Unequal dealing," "partial procedure," "oppression to be resisted," and an independent nation "forced back into a state of enmity," were expressions which showed the danger to which this affair was tending. Walpole hinted that when the bill was committed he should not object to amendments founded on reason and equity. When it finally went to the Lords it merely disqualified the lord provost from holding office, and imposed a fine upon the city of Edinburgh of £2000, for the benefit of the widow of Porteous. The impartial author of the modern "History of Scotland" has remarked that "no one can read these debates without seeing reasons why the conduct of Scotland was so different from that of England in the insurrection which broke out eight years afterward." ‡ Although the modified statute upon the Porteous riot could scarcely be a reasonable cause for national irritation, a supplementary measure produced a violent opposition from the Presbyterian clergy. It was enacted that they should read from their pulpits, once a month, a proclamation for discovering the murderers of Captain Porteous. This was held to be an Erastian measure, interfering with the spiritual authority of the Kirk. That proclamation also contained the offensive words, "The Lords spiritual in parliament assembled." This was held to be a recognition of that church government which Scotland had rejected. At this period there was a schism among the Scottish clergy, and this measure had not a healing tendency. Some read the proclamation; some refused to do so. Compliance with the order of the government was held to be faithlessness to the Church.

The state of popular feeling in regard to the highest personages in the realm was, in 1736, seriously alarming. The king during the whole summer and autumn had remained in Germany. The queen was little seen as the winter advanced, for she lived a retired life at Kensington; and, strange as it may seem, we find in a letter from Lord Hervey to his mother, written in November, that the road between London and Kensington "is grown so infamously bad that we live here in the same solitude as we should do if cast on a rock in the middle of the ocean." * The roads to Kensington through the park were equally impassable. People of all ranks were indignant at the king's long stay in Germany. The national ill-humor was expressed in pasquinades. On the gate of St. James's Palace this notice was stuck up: "Lost or strayed out of this house, a man who has left a wife and six children on the parish. Whoever will give any tidings of him to the churchwardens of St. James's parish, so as he may be got again, shall receive four shillings and sixpence reward. N.B. This reward will not be increased, nobody judging him to deserve a crown." † The Prince of Wales was a favorite of the people. It was well known that he was disliked by the king and queen, and that was enough to make him popular. He had been disappointed in the Prussian match, and at the beginning of 1736, being impatient to marry, he had been told that a bride would be found for him in the person of the Princess of Saxe Gotha. The lady arrived in England on the 25th of April, and was married two days after. She was only seventeen years of age, could speak no English, and little French; but she had good sense, and in the difficult circumstances of her subsequent life had to exercise much prudence and sagacity. On the prince's marriage the houses of parliament addressed the king. On this occasion an orator, who is mentioned by Lord Hervey as "Cornet Pitt," contrived, in his first speech, to throw so much covert sarcasm into his praise of the king for consenting to the prince's demand that a wife should be found for him, that "Cornet Pitt" was broke at the end of the session. The prince became "parliamentary fireship to his majesty's opposition." ‡ He was beloved in the city and hated at St. James's. His good deeds won no favor from his family. There was a fire in the Temple, and he worked all night in helping to put it out. The court said he was of no use there, and that he only pretended to have been struck on the head by a falling beam. He was liberal to public charities. This, it was held, was not benevolence but popularity-hunting. He was certainly a weak young man; he had been notoriously dissolute. But he advantageously contrasted with his father, whose irregularities of life were not controlled by his advancing years. In December the king came home, after the public hopes rather than fears had been excited by the belief that he was at sea during a terrible storm in which many ships were wrecked. The differences between the Prince of Wales and his father soon became notorious. The allowance which the king made to the prince was £50,000 per annum. Private advisers of the prince called this allowance mean, and recommended him to apply boldly to parliament for an annual grant of £100,000 out of the king's civil list, and be no longer dependent on his father. Some wiser persons earnestly counselled forbearance. But the prince was obstinate, and he had the indelicacy to make promises to peers and commoners of what he would do for them when he came to the throne, if they would support him now. One of the most intriguing of politicians has left a minute account of his own share in this affair. § He took great credit for having labored to dissuade the prince from persevering in his rash course, and really seems to have honestly set forth the danger of a

* "Parliamentary History," vol. x. col. 272.
† Ibid., col. 252. ‡ Burton, vol. ii. p. 278.

* Hervey, vol. ii. p. 190. † Ibid., p. 191.
‡ Carlyle, Friedrich, vol. ii. p. 577.
§ Appendix to Diary of George Bubb Doddington, afterward Lord Melcombe.

family quarrel, and the alternative to which Frederick was driving both houses of parliament—that of supporting the prince who wore the crown, or of siding with the heir-apparent. The Prince of Wales was obstinate. Contrary to expectation, the ministry had a majority of thirty in the Commons. The question was subsequently tried in the Lords, and there also the prince failed.

Such a rupture between a passionate father and a flighty son could not pass off without some lasting effects. The king wanted to turn the prince and his household out of St. James's, but Walpole dissuaded his majesty from that step. At last, one of the most extraordinary events in the private annals of royal houses separated the king and his son for years. The Prince and Princess of Wales were residing with the king and queen at Hampton Court, the princess being far advanced in pregnancy. The royal family had dined together in public on Sunday, the 31st of July. In the evening the princess was taken ill. The prince, against all remonstrance, insisted that his wife should not be confined at Hampton Court. She was forced into a coach, with the prince and three ladies; was driven at full gallop to St. James's; and there gave birth to a girl within an hour of her arrival. Only two of the great officers of state were present. The king and queen at Hampton Court went to bed, in entire ignorance of the piece of insanity which their son had perpetrated. They were awakened by a messenger from London about two o'clock; and by four the queen was at St. James's. No apology was then made by the prince—no explanation given. Horace Walpole very sensibly asks, "Had he no way of affronting his parents but by venturing to kill his wife and the heir to the crown?" A correspondence ensued between George II. and his rash son; of which the issue was, that although the prince confessed that he had been in the wrong, the harsh father issued this peremptory command to him: "It is my pleasure that you leave St. James's, with all your family." Frederick quitted the palace, and took up his residence at Norfolk House, in St. James's Square. The people rejoiced in the birth of a princess; for they said, "If ever she came to the crown, what had been so much wished ever since the Hanover family came to the throne, by every one who understood and wished the interest of England must happen—which was the disjoining the Electorate of Hanover from the crown of England." *

In his quarrel with the king and queen, the Prince of Wales managed to add to his own popularity. The general dislike toward the father made the son who opposed him a public favorite. The prince, however, contrived to make it appear that not to the sovereign, but to the chief minister, what he considered as injustice was to be imputed. When the lord mayor and aldermen of London addressed their congratulations to him on the birth of a princess, Frederick said he knew the value of their friendship, and should never look upon them as "beggars." The "sturdy beggars" of Walpole's rash speech in the excise year was never to be forgotten. The prince went to the performance of "Cato." At the lines

> "When vice prevails, and impious men bear sway,
> The post of honor is a private station,"

the audience huzzaed, and the prince joined in the applause in a very marked manner. In the midst of these unseemly exhibitions Queen Caroline was taken dangerously ill, on the 9th of November. She had long been afflicted with a serious complaint, which she bore with heroic fortitude, concealing from every one, even from her physicians, the real nature of her malady. The Prince of Wales expressed great anxiety to see his mother. He was forbidden by the king to come to St. James's. The queen herself said to the king, according to Lord Hervey, "I am so far from desiring to see him, that nothing but your absolute commands should ever make me consent to it." This was on the second day of her serious illness. On the third day the king, who for fourteen years had been aware of her dangerous affliction, but who had promised never to mention it, thought it his duty to send for a surgeon and disclose what was so repugnant to the queen's false delicacy. It was soon found that the disease had gone too far to allow of hope. On the 14th Sir Robert Walpole arrived from Houghton. He was conducted by the king to her majesty's bedside. "The interview was short, but what the queen said was material, for these were her words: 'My good Sir Robert, you see me in a very indifferent situation. I have nothing to say to you, but to recommend the king, my children, and the kingdom, to your care.'" * Horace Walpole says, "As the king and Sir Robert were alone, standing by her bedside, she pathetically recommended, not the minister to the sovereign, but the master to the servant. Sir Robert was alarmed, and feared the recommendation must have left a fatal impression; but, a short time after, the king, reading with Sir Robert some intercepted letters from Germany, which said, that now the queen was gone Sir Robert would have no protection—'On the contrary,' said the king, 'you know she recommended me to you.'" † Lord Hervey relates a curious conversation between the great minister and himself, one night as they were hovering round this death-bed: "Oh, my lord," said Sir Robert, "if this woman should die, what a scene of confusion will here be! Who can tell into what hands the king will fall? or who will have the management of him? I defy the ablest person in this kingdom to foresee what will be the consequence of this great event." "For my own part," replied Lord Hervey, "I have not the least doubt how it will be. He will cry for her for a fortnight, forget her in a month, have two or three women that he will pass his time with; but while they have most of his time, a little of his money, less of his confidence, and no power, you will have all the credit, more power than ever you had, and govern him more absolutely than ever you did. Your credit before was through the medium of the queen, and all power through a medium must be weaker than when it operates directly. Besides, sir, all princes must now and then be deceived by their ministers, and as the king is much easier deceived than the queen, so your task, whenever that task is deceiving, will be much less difficult than it was before. In the first place, because the king is naturally much less suspicious than the queen; in the next, because he is less penetrating; and lastly, because he cares much less to converse with different people, and will hear nobody talk to him of business but yourself." "Oh, my lord," interrupted Sir Robert, "though he will hear nobody but me, you do not know how often he refuses to hear me when it is on a subject he does not like; but by the queen I can with time fetch him round to those subjects again; she can make him do the same thing in another shape, and when I give her her lesson, can make him propose the very thing as his own opinion which a week before he had rejected as mine." ‡

On Sunday night, the 20th of November, Caroline lay expecting a speedy relief to her sufferings. The king was asleep at the bed-foot; the Princess Emily also sleeping on a couch. Suddenly an attendant exclaimed that the queen was dying. All started up. "Open the window!" the queen exclaimed, and then said, "Pray." The Princess Emily began to read a prayer, but before she repeated ten words all was over. The king, with all his silliness about mistresses—a silliness which he avowed even to his dying wife in well-known words, indicative of the loose morality of the period—loved and respected Caroline. "The grief he felt for the queen, as it was universally known, and showed a tenderness of which the world thought him before utterly incapable, made him for some time more popular and better spoken of than he had ever been before this incident." § Truly does Mr. Carlyle say, "There is something stoically tragic in the history of Caroline, with her flighty vaporing little king: seldom had foolish husband so wise a wife." The one dark shade upon her character was her persevering dislike of her eldest son—a dislike almost approaching to hatred, and so opposed to the calm sense which was the usual guide of her actions. Her contemporaries saw this blot. The irony of Pope expressed it:

> "Hang the sad verse on Carolina's urn,
> And hail her passage to the realms of rest,
> All parts performed, and all her children blest."

In this aversion of the queen, as well as of the king, there was possibly some stronger motive than posterity will now ever know. The Memoirs of Lord Hervey would probably have revealed, as was hinted in 1778, the origin of the antipathy of his parents to Prince Frederick. But under the will of Lord Hervey's son, the Earl of Bristol, those Memoirs were not to be published till after the death of George III. The mystery was not solved when the Memoirs were published in

* Lord Hervey's "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 412.

* Lord Hervey, vol. ii. p. 516. † "Reminiscences."
‡ "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 523. § Lord Hervey, vol. ii. p. 540.

1848; for the nephew of the Earl of Bristol caused many mutilations to be made in the manuscript which came into his possession. "It is evident," says a reviewer of these Memoirs, "that the alienation between Prince Frederick and, not only his father but his mother, was strong and decided while he was yet in his early youth—years before he ever saw England."*

CHAPTER CLIII.

Act for Licensing Plays—Birth of a prince, afterward George III.—Commercial disputes with Spain—Popular war-cry—Jenkins' ear—A convention with Spain denounced in parliament—Walpole is driven into war—His struggles to retain power—Capture of Porto Bello—Attack upon Carthagena—Anson and Byron—Extension of the field of war—Motion to remove Walpole from the king's councils—Walpole resigns—He is created Earl of Orford—Parliamentary inquiry into his administration.

THERE never, probably, was a minister who was the object of so much personal satire as Walpole. As his master hated "boets and bainters," Walpole despised journalists and pamphleteers. He was no patron of letters. He did not look out for young men who had written university prize-poems, to make them envoys and secretaries. He left authors to rise or fall by their profession; to grow rich like Pope, or to starve like Savage. What the minister did in the way of purchasing literary aid was worse than nothing. Smollett says, "He either wanted judgment to distinguish men of genius, or could find none that would engage in his service; he therefore employed a set of wretched authors, void of understanding and ingenuity." Tindal, a more impartial chronicler, has a similar testimony to this common mistake of statesmen. "No man ever set the press to work with so little judgment as he did. He looked upon writing to be a mechanical kind of business; and he took up with the first pen that he could find in public offices, or whom he could oblige by private liberality." When Bolingbroke and Pulteney had worked "The Craftsman" as far as such machinery would go, a new set of assailants appeared in the most popular of all forms of attack. The Stage became political. Gay, in his "Polly," going far beyond the personal allusions of "The Beggar's Opera," the lord chamberlain revived his obnoxious power, and the representation of "Polly" was forbidden. In 1735, when Sir John Bernard brought in a bill "to restrain the number of houses for playing interludes, and for the better regulating of common players of interludes," Walpole proposed to introduce a clause to confirm and enlarge the power of the lord chamberlain in reference to plays. Sir John Bernard objected to the clause, and withdrew his bill. In 1737 Henry Fielding produced "Pasquin" at the theatre in the Haymarket. Colley Cibber ascribes to this piece the enactment for licensing plays which Walpole brought forward in that year: "Religion, laws, government, priests, judges, and ministers, were laid flat at the feet of the Herculean satirist, this Drawcansir in wit, who spared neither friend nor foe; who, to make his fame immortal, like another Erostratus, set fire to his stage by writing up to an act of parliament to demolish it." Walpole made no direct attack upon "Pasquin;" but having obtained, from the manager of Goodman's Fields Theatre, the manuscript of a farce called "The Golden Rump," which, says Smollett, "was fraught with treason and abuse upon the government," the adroit minister read the most obnoxious passages to the House of Commons, and then moved an amendment to the Vagrant Act, as far as related "to the common players of interludes." Two clauses were introduced, by which the customary privilege of the lord chamberlain to interfere with theatrical representations was made a legal power. Under this bill the lord chamberlain might prohibit the representation of plays; and copies of all new plays, additions to old plays, prologues and epilogues, were to be submitted to that officer for the purpose of being licensed. Smollett implies that there was a "vigorous opposition" to this measure. One speech only remains to us, that of Lord Chesterfield, to indicate that there was any opposition at all. This was considered one of the most brilliant efforts of the great wit and accomplished orator. His prediction that this bill was a step for introducing arbitrary power, "for removing or hoodwinking, one after another, those sentries who are posted by the constitution of a free country for warning the people of their danger," may be regarded as the exaggeration of party. The Bill for Licensing Plays was not to be a precedent "to lay the press under a general license." From that period the freedom of the press has been surrounded by multiplied safeguards, which the declaimers for its liberty in that day would have regarded with horror. The Act for Licensing Plays still subsists among us. There have been many abuses of the power of the licenser—in most cases silly abuses. But no friend to the liberty of thought, of speech, and of writing, can wish these restraints upon the theatre wholly removed. There is a manifest distinction between the profaneness and indecency that is written and the profaneness and indecency that is spoken. The moral corruption of an audience is like the spread of a contagious disease. The reader who gloats over a dangerous book indulges in a secret vice which shuns companionship. The improved education of all classes, and the general elevation of the condition and character of writers for the stage, as well as of all other writers, have made the office of the licenser almost unnecessary. But the lofty tone of patronage in which Lord Chesterfield speaks of "the poor author" is a sufficient intimation of the existence at that time of a wretched and perhaps unscrupulous class of caterers for public amusement: "Wit, my lords, is a sort of property; it is the property of those who have it, and too often the only property they have to depend on. It is, indeed, but a precarious dependence. Thank God, we, my lords, have a dependence of another kind. . . . I must own I cannot easily agree to the laying of any tax upon wit; but by this bill it is to be heavily taxed; it is to be excised; for if this bill passes it cannot be retailed in a proper way without a permit; and the lord chamberlain is to have the honor of being chief gauger, supervisor, commissioner, judge, and jury: but what is still more hard, though the poor author, the proprietor, I should say, cannot perhaps dine till he has found out and agreed with a purchaser, yet before he can prepare to seek for a purchaser he must patiently submit to have his goods rummaged at this new excise-office." Thanks to the example of the "poor author" who threw the tardy patronage of Lord Chesterfield in his face, the class with the "precarious dependence" of "one property only" have learned to struggle bravely till they have tested its value; certainly they have learned not to waste life in lamentations that they have not "a dependence of another kind."

The year 1738 was marked by an event which to many of the present day, still in life's "middle chamber," appears to be the link connecting them with generations long passed away. On the 24th of May, old style—June 4th, new style—was born George Augustus, son of the Prince of Wales—the George the Third who came to the throne in 1760; who lived to 1820. When we arrive at such an historical epoch we feel how intimately the past and the present become interlaced, and how every retrospect of public affairs involves something prospective. The birth of a grandson of George II. was an occasion of national rejoicing. It probably increased the reigning king's jealousy of his son. A notice from the lord chamberlain was inserted in the London "Gazette," that no visitor of the prince should be admitted to the Court of St. James's. The opposition gathered more and more round the prince. The "terrible Cornet of Horse," as William Pitt was named, became one of the gentlemen of his bedchamber. The rival establishments—St. James's at one end of Pall Mall, and Carlton House at the other end—kept the town well amused.

In 1739 the foreign policy of Great Britain was driven by parliamentary faction, seconded by popular ignorance, upon a lamentable change from peace to war. For twelve years Sir Robert Walpole had kept the country at peace. He had effected this great good without any compromise of the country's honor; with an accumulation of the country's resources, which made other powers respect her strength. The ambition of kings, the lust of conquest, the intrigues of ministers, the blunders of diplomatists—these are the causes ordinarily assigned when a nation is precipitated into a war, in which vast interests are endangered, and the beginners of the fray are not "thrice armed" in having their "quarrel just." Walpole was driven into a war with Spain, which quickly became a general war by mercantile cupidity and mock patriotism. Walpole ought to have resigned his power rather than have thrown aside his principles. But he valued office more than consistency; and he consented to im-

* "Quarterly Review," vol. lxxxii. p. 502.

peril his country, with the perfect conviction that her safety and prosperity depended upon a totally opposite policy than that which was forced upon him. He did the worst thing which a minister can do. He suffered others to conduct the war inefficiently, because he himself disliked the war. In yielding to the clamor of his political enemies he did not propitiate them; and when he falls, "never to rise again," we lose somewhat of our respect for the hero of many a well-foughten field of party, who ought to have stood to his own convictions, even though his adversaries had moved to a triumph over him with the "two-handed engine" ready to strike.

For a century and a half England and Spain had been more than commercial rivals—they had been commercial enemies. The trade of Spain with her vast possessions in South America was essentially a monopoly. Every English sailor, from the days of Drake, had been eager to break up the monopoly in the most effectual way, by a dash at the Spanish treasure-ships and richly freighted merchantmen. A regular participation in the trade with her colonies was jealously guarded against in every treaty of Spain with England. The right of searching merchant-vessels sailing near Spanish colonial ports was always insisted upon; and the right was rarely suffered to be evaded, for guard-ships (guarda costas) were always maintained in full activity. By the Treaty of Utrecht, as we have seen, the expectation of a free trade with the Spanish coasts of South America was only realized in the permission to send one ship annually. The Treaty of Seville, in 1729, did not provide for any relaxation of this restriction, or of any of the earlier prohibitions. The rapidly increasing importance of the British colonies of North America rendered it impossible that the commerce of the settlements of the new world with Europe, or with each other, the North with the South, could remain upon the exclusive footing established by the treaties of 1667 and 1670. If the Spanish government would not relax its narrow policy, English adventurers would not scruple to evade it. When the annual South Sea ship sailed with its cargo, other vessels followed in its wake; and the cargo of the one ship became almost inexhaustible. Ships driven by stress of weather into Spanish ports might refit and refresh their crews. The inconstant wind was very favorable to a little honest trading. When a population wants to buy, and ships are at hand to sell, prohibitory decrees are weapons "hung by the wall." Smuggling was carried on without much concealment, by pleasant trips of shore-boats to English vessels, and to North American vessels, lying off the harbors which they could not enter. The English merchants grew bolder with success, and the Spanish government more angry and violent. The right of search on the high seas was asserted by the Spanish guarda costas. Ships were often illegally detained, and their crews sometimes treated with severity. The British people, generally, heard only of the cruel tyranny of the Don, and knew little of the systematic offences against the Don's commercial jealousy which so moved his wrath. Walpole had been denounced of old by Atterbury as "the cur-dog of Britain and spaniel of Spain;" and when Walpole, in 1738, was successful in asserting his pacific policy by a parliamentary majority, the opposition appeared more and more determined to drive him into a war with Spain. The minister admitted that English merchants and seamen were unjustly and inhumanly treated by the Spanish guarda costas, and that the honor and interest of the country required that there should be reparation for the past and security for the future. He was negotiating to obtain redress in a peaceable manner, and he therefore resisted the motion for the production of papers which would embarrass this endeavor. In the House of Lords an address to the crown of a very warlike tendency was carried. Petitions from merchants of various ports, complaining of Spanish outrages, were daily presented to the Commons. Captains and seamen were examined at the bar of the house, and related grievous stories of cruelties and oppressions exercised upon British crews. One narrator of a grievance, which dated back seven years, stirred the parliament and the people into a rage which Pulteney could not increase, and which Walpole could not control. On the 16th of March it is ordered by the Commons that "Captain Robert Jenkins do attend this house immediately;" and by a second order "that Captain Robert Jenkins do attend on Tuesday morning."

The English newspapers of June, 1731, had related that Captain Jenkins, with his owners, had been to Hampton Court, to lay before the Duke of Newcastle a statement of the wrongs which he had received from the Spaniards. He was homeward bound with a cargo from Jamaica, and on the 20th of April, not far from the Havana, was boarded by a guarda costa and rigorously searched. No contraband goods could be found. He was threatened with death if he did not confess where his gold and his unlawful merchandise were hidden. He had no contraband goods, he again and again averred. The Spaniards slashed him with their cutlasses; they hung him up to the yard-arm. Before he was quite exhausted they let him down, and again bade him confess. He spoke of his Britannic Majesty's flag—of the high seas—in a mild assertion of the injustice he was receiving. His ear had been half cut off when the ship was boarded; and now the miscreants tore the ear out of his head, exclaiming, "Carry that to your king." Poor Jenkins got no redress from the Duke of Newcastle in 1731. On Tuesday, the 21st of March, 1738, when the captain stood at the bar of the House of Commons, he produced his ear out of a box in which he always carried it about him, wrapped up in cotton. "Ridiculous story," cries the biographer of Walpole. "The fable of Jenkins' ear," says the author of "A Regicide Peace." "He lost his ear in the pillory," exclaim official sceptics. "The ear of Jenkins is a singular thing. Might have mounted to be a constellation, like Berenice's hair," observes Mr. Carlyle, "had the English people been of poetic turn." Pope has given a couplet to the famous ear:

> "The Spaniards own they did a waggish thing,
> Who crop't our ears and sent them to the king."

Whether a truth or a myth, the ear of Jenkins drove England to war.

In opening the session of parliament in February, 1739, the king announced that, supported by the resolutions of parliament, he had made such representations to Spain of the hardships and injuries sustained by his trading subjects in America, and had so strongly demanded reparation and security, that he had been enabled to conclude a convention, under which a payment would be made to compensate his subjects for losses, and all matters in dispute would be settled by plenipotentiaries as regarded the future. Violent were the debates in both houses. All the papers connected with these negotiations were demanded to be laid upon the table; and the demand was of course resisted. Smollett, who rarely admits any merit in the administration of Walpole, very justly says that "no government could act, either in external or domestic affairs, with proper influence, dignity, and dispatch, if every letter and instruction relative to an unfinished negotiation should be exposed to the view of such a numerous assembly, composed of individuals actuated by motives in themselves diametrically opposite." All historical experience—the experience even of the passing hour—shows how embarrassing is the task of the ministers of a mixed monarchy to conduct delicate negotiations with absolute governments. The freedom of speech in a British parliament is embarrassing enough; but perfect unreserve on the part of an administration is absolutely impossible. It is come to be understood by all practical and judicious representatives of the people that a large confidence must be placed in ministerial responsibility. Walpole had a majority in refusing to produce the papers moved for. But when the convention was laid before parliament, and was published to the nation, an outcry burst forth—against the amount of indemnity to be paid to Spain—against the omission of any mention of the right of search, referring that and other questions to subsequent negotiation—against the non-punishment of the captains and crews of the guarda costas—which must have overthrown the ministry in the storm, had the ministry been typified by the oak instead of by the willow. Lyttleton and Pitt put forth all their oratorical strength against the convention. The surpassing fame of Pitt may be dated from his effort on that 8th of March. He concluded his speech by describing the convention as a stipulation for national ignominy; an illusory expedient to baffle the resentment of the nation; a truce, without a suspension of hostilities on the part of Spain; a surrender of the rights and trade of England to the mercy of plenipotentiaries. "The complaints of your despairing merchants, the voice of England, have condemned it. Be the guilt of it upon the head of the adviser." But the eloquence of Pitt produced no effect upon the nation comparable with the war-cry of Sir Thomas Sanderson. "The court of Spain, being resolved to grant nothing that might any way contribute to our future security, resolved not to allow the word satisfaction to be so much as once mentioned in this treaty; even the Spanish pirate who cut off Cap-

tain Jenkins' ear making use at the same time of the most insulting expression toward the person of our king—an expression which no British subject can decently repeat, an expression which no man who has a regard for his sovereign can ever forgive; even this fellow, I say, is to live to enjoy the fruits of his rapine, and remain a living testimony of the cowardly tameness and mean submission of Great Britain, and of the triumphant pride and stubborn haughtiness of Spain." The ministerial majority was only twenty-eight—260 against 232. Walpole stood up for some time against the parliamentary opposition and the popular outcry. The great philosophical politician of the generation which succeeded Walpole says, "I have seen, and with some care examined, the original documents concerning certain important transactions of those times. They perfectly satisfied me of the extreme injustice of that war, and of the falsehood of the colors which Walpole, to his ruin, and guided by a mistaken policy, suffered to be daubed over that measure. Some years after it was my fortune to converse with many of the principal actors against that minister, and with those who principally excited that clamor. None of them—no, not one—did in the least defend the measure, or attempt to justify their conduct. They condemned it as freely as they would have done in commenting upon any proceeding in history in which they were totally unconcerned." *

The majority of the government, small as it was, induced a change of tactics in some of the leading members of the opposition. On bringing up the report upon the resolution which the ministers had carried, there was another division, which was also in favor of the ministerial measures, the majority being twenty-eight. Sir William Wyndham then announced the determination of himself and his friends to secede in a body from the House of Commons. "I here, sir, bid a final adieu to this parliament. Perhaps when another parliament shall succeed, I may again be at liberty to serve my country in this capacity. . . . Meantime I conclude with doing that duty to my country which I am still at liberty to perform, to pray for its preservation: may, therefore, that Power, which has so often and so visibly interfered in behalf of the rights and liberties of this nation, continue its care over us at this worst and most dangerous juncture, while the insolence of enemies without and the influence of corruption within threaten the ruin of her constitution." Wyndham, as the consistent adherent of the Jacobite party, was not an adequate representative of the opinions of those who were honestly opposed to Walpole's system of government, but were not desirous to replace it by bringing back the Stuart dynasty. He exposed himself to the bitter reproof of the minister, that, as the mouthpiece of a faction that never sat in the house but to distress the government and serve a popish interest, "he was looked upon as the head of those traitors who, twenty-five years ago, conspired the destruction of their country, and of the royal family, to set a popish pretender on the throne." Walpole added, "I am only afraid that they will not be as good as their word." Sixty members seceded with Wyndham; and the secession left the minister at his ease for the rest of the session. Walpole was thus enabled to carry a very questionable measure—that of subsidizing Denmark for a Hanoverian object instead of for the interest of Great Britain. The parliament was prorogued on the 14th of June.

The plenipotentiaries under the convention had met; but the Spaniards had been moved by the threatening denunciations of the English parliament to make a stand upon what they thought *their* national honor. There was a dispute about a trumpery money payment of ninety thousand pounds. Cardinal Fleury offered to guarantee the payment, provided an English squadron was withdrawn from the Mediterranean. The public temper was for war. The king was for war. Walpole was urged to demand an express renunciation of the right of search, and an acknowledgment of the British claims to disputed territory in North America. Spain unceremoniously rejected the demands, and on the 19th of October a declaration of war against Spain was proclaimed in London. When the heralds rode into the city to declare the war, the Prince of Wales and a numerous body of opposition leaders accompanied them; and while every steeple sent forth a joyous peal, the prince stopped at a tavern at Temple Bar, and set the multitude huzzaing by calling for a tankard and drinking "success to the war." Walpole heard the peal of the bells, and exclaimed, "They may *ring* the bells now; they will soon be *wringing* their hands."

When the parliament met on the 15th of November, 1739, the king said, "I have, in all my proceedings with the court of Spain, acted agreeably to the sense of both houses of parliament, and therefore I can make no doubt but I shall meet with a ready and vigorous support to this just and necessary war." "Just and necessary" are the epithets which every government applies to every war into which it rushes. The seceders from parliament had returned. The altered policy of Walpole had failed to secure him popularity with the people or adequate support from their representatives. He was regarded, truly enough, as the secret friend of peace. He had now to bear all the odium of the increased taxation which is the inevitable result of war. When he wished to conduct war with the necessary vigor, he was opposed. The royal navy was short of seamen. Walpole proposed that there should be a general registry of seamen serving on board merchant-vessels, that they might be called upon in a case of emergency. This was held to be despotism, and he abandoned his measure. That real power which he derived from being firm to his own principles was gone. Old friends and enemies, new friends and enemies, saw that the commanding superiority of the man who had carried the vessel of the state through many a troubled sea was dwindling away. The Duke of Argyle deserted him. The great Scottish chief was dismissed from his employments. Walpole had been dared by Pulteney to strip of his posts "one military person great in his character, great in his capacity, great in the important offices he has discharged;" but he did dare. "Mr. Keith, a Jacobite, was with the duke when this dismission came. 'Mr. Keith,' the duke said, 'fall flat, fall edge, we must get rid of these people,' which Mr. Keith interpreted might imply both master and man."* Wyndham ceased to trouble Walpole. He died in 1740. But Pulteney was still ready to do battle against him; and "the terrible Cornet of Horse" was prepared for any onslaught. There were divisions in the cabinet. The Duke of Newcastle, whose name Walpole afterward declared was synonymous with "perfidy," was growing jealous of the man who had so long treated him as a subordinate. Newcastle complained that measures were agreed upon before others were allowed to give an opinion. "What do you mean?" cried Walpole; "the war is yours. You have had the conduct of it. I wish you joy of it." They differed about ships being sent to America. Walpole objected to leaving our own coasts defenceless. Newcastle maintained his own view, and Walpole exclaimed, "I oppose nothing; I give in to everything; am said to do everything; and to answer for everything; and yet, God knows, I dare not do what I think right. I am of opinion for having more ships of the squadron left behind; but I dare not, I will not, make any alteration. Let them go! Let them go!" †

* Burke, "Thoughts on a Regicide Peace."

* Extract from the "Stuart Papers," given by Lord Mahon, vol. iii. p. 10.

† Letter of Newcastle to Hardwicke, quoted by Lord Mahon, vol. iii. p. 31.

KNIGHT'S POPULAR HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

A HISTORY OF SOCIETY AND GOVERNMENT FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO OUR OWN TIMES.

By CHARLES KNIGHT.

VOLUME VI.

CHAPTER CLIII. (*Continued*).

On the 17th of March, 1740, both houses went up with an address of congratulation to the king, "on the glorious success of your majesty's arms in the West Indies, under the command of Vice-Admiral Vernon, by entering the port and taking the town of Porto Bello, and demolishing and levelling all the ports and castles belonging thereto, with six men-of-war only." Vernon, a member of parliament, was strongly opposed to the administration of Walpole; but the principle of concession procured his appointment to the command of the expedition, whose success was popularly reckoned as a wonderful triumph. The "six men-of-war only" was a phrase carried by the opposition in the Commons, to mark what could be done by a resolute commander. Admiral Hosier had hesitated to attack the same place with twenty ships in 1726. The famous ballad of "Admiral Hosier's Ghost" was written by Glover to point this contrast, and to insinuate that Vernon, as he had informed his friends, was not properly seconded at home. The forced inactivity of Hosier enabled the government to avert a war. Yet the patriotic ballad of the author of "Leonidas," true to the politics of its time, sees no honor and safety but in fighting. The shade of Hosier thus apostrophizes Vernon:

"I, by twenty sail attended,
Did this Spanish town affright.
Nothing then its wealth defended
But my orders not to fight.
Oh! that in this rolling ocean
I had cast them with disdain,
And obey'd my heart's warm motion,
To have quell'd the pride of Spain."

The ministry determined to let Vernon, the popular hero, have a fair opportunity to obey his "heart's warm motion." In the course of the summer and autumn they sent out an armament to join the popular admiral at Jamaica. Some great attack was to be made upon the Spanish possessions; but the precise destination of the expedition was to be determined by a council of war. The whole force consisted of 115 ships, 15,000 sailors, and 12,000 soldiers. It was resolved, upon the advice of Vernon, to attack Carthagena, the strongest fortified place in Spanish America. The command of the land forces had devolved upon General Wentworth; for Lord Cathcart, an experienced officer, had died on the passage. Smollett, the historian, has related the assault upon Carthagena with the vague generality which was once considered to be the only proper historical style. Smollett, the novelist, who at the age of twenty was serving in one of Admiral Vernon's ships as a surgeon's mate, has brought the scene before our eyes in far more vivid colors. After various delays, the fleet was before Carthagena. The one narrow entrance to the harbor, called the Boca Chica, was defended by several forts and batteries, one principal fort being known as the castle. The troops had been landed, and had erected batteries to fire upon this castle on one side, while the large ships should attack it on the other side. The signal, says the surgeon's mate, was given for his ship to engage. "Our ship, with others destined for this service, immediately weighed, and in less than half an hour came to an anchor before the castle of Boca Chica, with a spring upon our cable; and the cannonading (which, indeed, was terrible) began. The surgeon, after having crossed himself, fell flat on the deck; and the chaplain and purser, who were stationed with us in quality of assistants, followed his example, while the Welshman and I sat upon a chest looking at one another with great discomposure, scarce able to refrain from the like prostration. And, that the reader may know it was not a common occasion that alarmed us thus, I must inform him of the particulars of this dreadful din that astounded us. The fire of the Spaniards proceeded from eighty-four great guns, besides a mortar and small arms, in Boca Chica, thirty-six in Fort St. Joseph, twenty in two fascine batteries, and four men-of-war mounting sixty-four guns each. This was answered by our land battery, mounted with twenty-one cannon, two mortars, and twenty-four cohorns, and five great ships of seventy or eighty guns, that fired without intermission." A sailor whose hand was shattered by a grapeshot is brought down to the cockpit: "While I was employed in dressing the stump, I asked Jack's opinion of the battle, who, shaking his head, frankly told me he believed we should do no good. 'For why? because instead of dropping anchor close under shore, where we should have had to deal with one corner of Boca Chica, we had opened the harbor, and exposed ourselves to the whole fire of the enemy from their shipping and Fort St. Joseph, as well as from the castle we intended to cannonade; that, besides, we lay at too great a distance to damage the walls, and three parts in four of our shot did not take place; for there was scarce anybody on board who understood the pointing of a gun.'" The Boca Chica is at length abandoned by the Spaniards, and the men-of-war enter the outward harbor. Vernon wrote home to announce his "wonderful success." Carthagena was held to have fallen; and, as Voltaire states, a medal was struck in honor of "the avenger of his country"—of the gallant Vernon—who had made himself master of the rich city hitherto deemed impregnable. The fleet tardily overcame the obstacle of sunk ships, and penetrated to the inner harbor. The author of "Roderick Random" again throws interest into the usual dry narrative: "After having put garrisons into the forts we had taken, and re-embarked our soldiers and artillery, a piece of service that detained us more than a week, we ventured up to the mouth of the inner harbor, guarded by a large fortification on one side and a small redoubt on the other, both of which were deserted before our approach, and the entrance of the harbor blocked up by several old galleons and two men-of-war that the enemy had sunk in the channel. We made shift, however, to open a passage for some ships that favored a second landing of our troops, at a place called La Quinta, not far from the town, where, after a faint resistance from a body of Spaniards who opposed their disembarkation, they encamped with a design of besieging the castle of St. Lazar, which overlooked and commanded the city. Whether our renowned general had nobody in his army who knew how to approach it in form, or that he trusted entirely to the fame of his arms, I shall not determine; but, certain it is, a resolution was taken in a council of war to attack the place with musketry only. This was put in execution, and succeeded accordingly, the enemy giving them such a hearty reception that the greatest part of the detachment took up their everlasting residence on the spot. Our chief, not relishing this kind of complaisance in the Spaniards, was wise enough to retreat on board with the remains of his army, which from eight thousand able men landed on the beach near Boca Chica, was now reduced to fifteen hundred fit for service." In all these operations there was no cordial union between the admiral and the general. They had

separate commands. Vernon, a vain man, was indifferent to any success in which he should not have the chief honor. He sent no assistance to Wentworth in the attack upon Fort San Lazaro until the failure was irretrievable. The wet season had begun; the fleet and army were ill-provisioned; an epidemic fever raged. On the 24th of April it was determined to abandon the assault of Carthagena. The one success was paraded by Vernon in a dispatch: "I believe even the Spaniards will give us a certificate that we have effectually destroyed all their castles." The fortifications were demolished. The shades of the brave men whose "carcasses floated in the harbor until they were devoured by sharks and carrion-crows," might have repeated the words of Hosier's "sad troop of ghosts:"

"Sent in this foul clime to languish,
Think what thousands fell in vain."

Another expedition, dispatched from England in September, 1740, has furnished the materials for two of the most interesting relations in our language. Walter's narrative of Lord Anson's voyage and Byron's narrative of his adventures in the ship Wager offer as many stirring examples of courage and fortitude as any of the most exciting records of naval victories. In the qualities which these captains displayed, under severe privations and sufferings which almost forbade hope, we see upon what foundations of national character our maritime greatness has been built. When we read Smollett's description of the brutal and the effeminate commanders under whom he served, we must not forget that the same age produced George Anson and John Byron. The squadron of six vessels under Commodore Anson was to attack the shores of Peru, sailing round Cape Horn. It almost surpasses belief, that the only land troops which these vessels carried consisted of out-pensioners of Chelsea, old men, some wounded, all feeble. Five hundred of these were to have incumbered the squadron. Only about half sailed, the rest having deserted. In the spring of 1741, in attempting to double Cape Horn, the ships were encountered by violent hurricanes, and the Centurion, Anson's ship, was separated from her companions. To understand what were the dangers of the sea a century ago we must turn to the fearful relation of the ravages produced in the Centurion by the scurvy. Anson had determined, under stress of weather, to make for the uninhabited island of Juan Fernandez. Before he reached this refuge on the 10th of June two hundred of his crew had died. The trial sloop arrived at the island, having lost two thirds of her crew. Both ships were soon relieved of the poor out-pensioners of Chelsea, who were the first to sink under the fatal disease, which destroyed far more on ship-board than storm or battle. The Pearl and Severn, two large ships, had put back to the Brazils. The Wager was wrecked on a small desert island. Her crew were saved from drowning, but the prospect of the more terrible death of famine rendered them desperate. Byron, a stern commander, had not the one great quality of kindness by which violent men in seasons of suffering are more controlled than by harshness. They mutinied, seized the long-boat, and left their captain, with the lieutenant, the surgeon, and two midshipmen, on the desert island where the wreck took place. One of these five died. The adventures of the other four will always be read with deep interest by a maritime people. Anson remained at Juan Fernandez, with three vessels, till the autumn. His men were refreshed, his ships refitted, and he was ready for some exploit. In September they sallied forth and secured a valuable prize. Other prizes were made as they cruised about the island. The town of Paita was attacked by a boat's crew, and a large amount of public treasure was obtained. Anson, in the barbarous spirit of earlier times, suffered his sailors to rifle private houses, and even churches, and finally burned the town. When he took prisoners at sea he was courteous, especially to ladies. Captain Basil Hall records that after the lapse of eighty years the kindness of Anson to his Spanish prisoners was remembered at Paita, while his wanton destruction of the town was scarcely dwelled upon. Affliction came again upon the little squadron. The scurvy again broke out. The ships became leaky. The commodore could not man his prizes, and he destroyed them. The fifty-gun ship, the Gloucester, sprung a leak, and there were not hands aboard to work the pumps effectually. The crew were removed to the Centurion, and the doomed vessel was set on fire. Anson was now companionless with his good ship. After a long sojourn in Tinian, one of the Ladrone Islands, where fresh meat and the fruit of the bread-tree restored his crew to health, he again sailed forth in the spring of 1743 to look for Spanish galleons. On the 20th of June the Centurion met with one of these great treasure-ships. After a severe action she carried her prize into Canton, with a million and a half of dollars. Anson returned to Spithead in June, 1744, when England was thinking of more serious matters than his losses or gains.

When Walpole, in 1738, was using all the influence of his experience to prevent England being driven into a war with Spain, he said, in the great debate upon the alleged Spanish depredations, "No man can prudently give his advice for declaring war without knowing the whole system of the affairs of Europe as they stand at present, and how the several potentates of Europe now stand affected toward one another. It is not the power of Spain, and the power of this nation only, that we ought in such a case to consider and compare; we ought likewise to know what allies our enemies may have, and what assistance we may expect from our friends." The orators were too strong for the statesman; but the statesman saw farther than the orators. When the king opened the session of parliament in November, 1740, he inferred that the court of Spain "began to be sensible that they should be no longer able, alone, to defend themselves against the efforts of the British nation." He alluded to "some late extraordinary proceedings." He said, "If any other power should interfere, and attempt to prescribe or limit the operations of the war against my declared enemies, the honor and interest of my crown and kingdoms must call upon us to lose no time in putting ourselves into such a condition as may enable us to repel any insults." Walpole knew, in 1738, that a war with Spain would eventually involve a war with France. The two branches of the house of Bourbon would again be in alliance. France and Spain, as he foresaw, formed a family compact. But there were other complications at the end of 1740 which were also threatening a general European conflict. To these the speech from the throne referred: "The great and unhappy event of the death of the late emperor opens a new scene in the affairs of Europe, in which all the principal powers may be immediately or consequentially concerned." Charles VI. died on the 20th of October. The question of the Pragmatic Sanction was now to be regarded as little more than a parchment edict, even by those who had guaranteed it. Maria Theresa, the daughter of the emperor, became the heiress of his hereditary states. The Queen of Hungary, as she was styled, would have formidable rivals to the succession. A claimant to a considerable portion of her dominions would start up in the person of the prince who, on the death of Frederick William, King of Prussia, on the 31st of May of this same year, became Frederick II. We reserve for another chapter the consideration of the events that gave the first indication that England would be forced into a long and exhausting war—a war not so capable of adjustment as her commercial disputes with Spain would have been if those differences had been managed with temper and common-sense.

The threatening aspect of European affairs produced no moderation in the conduct of parties. Agreeing very slightly upon principles of government, or utterly disagreeing, there was one bond of union for some men of all sides—hatred of Walpole. Notice was given to Sir Robert by Mr. Sandys, a member of no great mark, that he intended to bring forward articles of accusation against him. On the 13th of February the motion of Mr. Sandys, for an address to the king to remove Sir Robert Walpole from his majesty's presence and councils forever, was prefaced by a speech in which the whole course of his administration, for a long series of years, was animadverted upon as a series of national calamities. The mover said that he imputed every public evil to one person, because that one person had grasped in his own hands every branch of government; had attained the sole direction of affairs; monopolized all the favors of the crown; was the dispenser of all honors and preferments. It was proposed that during the debate Sir Robert should retire from the house. The unfair attempt was overruled. Walpole was bitterly attacked by some; was sincerely but feebly defended by others. Shippen, his old Jacobite adversary, said this motion was only a pretence for turning out one minister and bringing in another—he should not trouble himself with such a matter. He left the house, followed by a strong body of his friends. Walpole spoke last, and he spoke admirably. Some of the expressions of his bitter contempt of his adversaries have

been preserved: "Gentlemen have talked a great deal of patriotism. A venerable word, when duly practised. I am sorry to say that of late it has been so much hackneyed about that it is in danger of falling into disgrace. The very idea of true patriotism is lost, and the term has been prostituted to the very worst of purposes. A patriot, sir! Why, patriots spring up like mushrooms! I could raise fifty of them within the four-and-twenty hours. I have raised many of them in one night. It is but refusing to gratify an unreasonable or an insolent demand, and up starts a patriot. I have never been afraid of making patriots; but I disdain and despise all their efforts. This pretended virtue proceeds from personal malice and disappointed ambition. There is not a man among them whose particular aim I am not able to ascertain, and from what motive they have entered into the lists of opposition." He went, step by step, through the various charges against him. More impartial judges than his accusers—those who calmly review the history of their country after a century has intervened—will acknowledge that the great merit which, in the conclusion of his speech, he claimed for himself, is justly his due: "If my whole administration is to be scrutinized and arraigned, why are the most favorable parts to be omitted? If facts are to be accumulated on one side, why not on the other? And why may not I be permitted to speak in my own favor? Was I not called by the voice of the king and the nation to remedy the fatal effects of the South Sea project, and to support declining credit? Was I not placed at the head of the treasury when the revenues were in the greatest confusion? Is credit revived, and does it now flourish? Is it not at an incredible height, and if so, to whom must that circumstance be attributed? Has not tranquillity been preserved both at home and abroad, notwithstanding a most unreasonable and violent opposition? Has the true interest of the nation been pursued, or has trade flourished?" The motion of Mr. Sandys was negatived by a majority of 290 against 106. A similar motion made by Lord Carteret in the House of Lords was also rejected.

The parliament was approaching its natural termination under the Septennial Act. Before it was dissolved a subsidy had been granted to the Queen of Hungary, the determination having been distinctly avowed that his Britannic Majesty would support his guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction. The measure was not unpopular in England; but Walpole's unpopularity went on rapidly increasing. Upon him was thrown the blame of the failure at Carthagena. The king had gone to Hanover, and without the knowledge of his English ministers had entered into a treaty of neutrality for his German states for one year, alarmed at those successes of Prussia against Austria which we shall have to relate. Walpole had to bear the blame of every event that appeared pregnant with danger. The ministry decidedly lost ground in the elections for the new parliament. If we may judge from a passage in a letter of Horace Walpole, his father was sadly changed: "He who at dinner always forgot he was minister, and was more gay and thoughtless than all his company, now sits without speaking, and with his eyes fixed for an hour together." * The parliament met on the 4th of December. Night after night were the old attacks renewed. The ministerial majority dwindled away. In one struggle upon an election petition there was only a majority of seven for the government. Walpole was pressed by his friends to resign. But he held on After a great debate on the 18th of January he had only a majority of three, in the fullest house ever known. On the 28th of January, after another battle, he had only a majority of one. Sir Robert Walpole resigned on the 1st of February, 1742.

Immediately after his resignation Walpole was created Earl of Orford. His fall from power did not abate the hostility of his enemies. When, in December, 1741, the ministerial majority was dwindling away, Horace Walpole wrote to Mann, "I look upon it now that the question is Downing Street or the Tower." Downing Street had been evacuated after a tenancy of twenty years; and a lodging was to be provided, where, said Horace, "there are a thousand pretty things to amuse you—the lions, the armory, the crown, and the axe that beheaded Anna Bullen." On the 9th of March, 1742, a motion for a secret committee to inquire into the administration of Sir Robert Walpole during the past twenty years was made by Lord Limerick. It was rejected by a majority of two. A second motion, to limit the inquiry to the previous ten years, was carried. There was doubtless some difficulty in obtaining evidence; but the wholesale corruption and misappropriation of the public money which had been alleged against Walpole was not substantiated by the testimony before the committee. No charge could be brought against the minister that he was himself venal. In his great defence he exclaimed, "Have I ever been suspected of being corrupted? A strange phenomenon. A corrupter, himself not corrupt!" Secret and special services had amounted in ten years to nearly a million and a half sterling. The committee admit, "that no form of government can subsist without a power of employing public money for services which are in their nature secret, and ought always to remain so." But, with one exception, the application of this amount of a hundred and fifty thousand pounds per annum could not be traced so as to bring home the dealings of the treasury with "the venal tribe" in parliament. As to another species of venality, the evidence was clear enough. During the ten years there had been paid by Mr. Lowther, "no less a sum than £50,079 18*s.* 0*d.* to authors and printers of newspapers, such as 'Free Briton,' 'Daily Courant,' 'Persuasive to Candor and Impartiality,' 'Corn-cutter's Journal,' gazetteers, and other political papers. Your committee leave it to the judgment of the house whether this particular sum was less under the direction of the Earl of Orford than if it had passed through his own hands." * If Walpole ever took the trouble to compare the thing thus bought with the price thus given he must have felt that the folly of his agents was quite on a par with the stupidity of his hacks. The report of the secret committee was received with public contempt, according to Tindal. No proceedings were taken upon it. Lord Orford sat quietly in the House of Lords, where his great rival, Pulteney, soon afterward sat, as Earl of Bath. When they met in that house Orford walked up to Bath, and thus congratulated him on his elevation: "Here we are, my lord; the two most insignificant fellows in England."

* Letter to Sir Horace Mann, October 19th, 1741.

CHAPTER CLIV.

Maria Theresa—Her succession disputed—Claim of Frederick II. upon Silesia—He invades Silesia—Battle of Molwitz—The French in Bavaria—Maria Theresa in Hungary—Elector of Bavaria chosen emperor—Prussia obtains Silesia—Change in the English ministry—Ascendency of Carteret—Hanoverian troops in English pay—The Stuarts—Projected descent on the British coasts—Battle of Dettingen—Administration of the Pelhams—Battle of Fontenoy—Statute against the sons of the pretender—Jacobitism of England and Scotland—Charles Edward in France—Note on the battle of Dettingen—Table of treaties.

Maria Theresa, Queen of Hungary, is wedded to Francis, Grand Duke of Tuscany. The heiress of Charles VI. is twenty-three years of age. Her subjects cheerfully acknowledge the validity of her title, guaranteed as it had been by nearly all the European powers. The Elector of Bavaria first disputed the succession of the young queen. He had a prior claim, he maintained, under the will of the emperor Ferdinand I.—a somewhat antiquated document. France and Spain supported this claim, happy in a chance of lowering the house of Austria. England and Holland adhered to the guarantee which they had given to the late emperor. The German electors were compared to the humbler English electors—they thought it a proper opportunity to make the most of their votes. While other sovereign princes were devising some decent pretext for breaking up the peace of the world, that they might each clutch something in the affray, one prince, stronger and bolder than the rest, dashed into hostilities. Frederick II., King of Prussia, according to most historians, "availed himself of the emperor's death to revive some obsolete claims to certain duchies and lordships of Silesia." † The King of Prussia "demanded of the court of Vienna part of Silesia, by virtue of old treaties of cofraternity which were either obsolete or annulled." ‡ The claim was a somewhat "obsolete" one, dating from the time of the Thirty Years' War, when certain territories, including the castle of Jägerndorf, were seized by Ferdinand II.; and no subsequent kaiser "would let go the hold." § The claim was attempted to be "annulled" in 1686, by "a plan actually not unlike that of swindling

* Report, "Parliamentary History," vol. xii. col. 814.
† Lord Mahon, vol. iii. p. 117. ‡ Smollett, book ii. chap. vii.
§ Carlyle, vol. i. p. 341.

money-lenders to a young gentleman in difficulties and of manageable turn who has got into their hands,"* The father of Frederick II. growled over the thought of his ravished territory. The "sharp little man, little in stature, but large in faculty and renown"—who found himself, in 1740, something higher than a crown prince who had endured manifold beatings in the hope that his own good time was coming—opened the strong boxes that had been filled during twenty-eight years of royal savings, and led thirty thousand of the well-drilled Prussian grenadiers to the invasion of Silesia. It was not a very chivalrous movement. He proposed to Maria Theresa that he would support her claim to the succession generally if she would cede to him the one province which had been taken from his ancestors. While a Prussian soldier is on Silesian ground, replied the spirited queen, I will enter upon no terms. Frederick knew that he should not be without friends in an attack upon the Austrian power. He took the cool view of his position which was to be expected from his nature and his rough training in kingship. To the French ambassador at Berlin he said (if Voltaire reports him rightly) as he set out with his invading army, "I am going, I believe, to play your game; and if I should throw doublets we will share the stakes." The royal philosopher who thus knows his trade at twenty-eight will certainly keep the world stirring in his time, for good or for evil.

Frederick encountered little opposition in Silesia. The Austrian troops retreated into Moravia, while the Prussians had secured the greater part of the territory which they invaded, with the exception of three fortified towns. The Austrian general, Neipperg, returned to Silesia with an army of twenty-four thousand men. On the 10th of April, 1741, a great battle was fought at Molwitz, near the fortified town of Brierg. The Austrian cavalry routed the Prussian cavalry, and Frederick himself was driven far beyond the field of action. A charge of cowardice has been raised against the King of Prussia for his conduct on this occasion. It rests upon a relation of Maupertuis, the French mathematician, who was in his suite. When his attendants seemed in danger from the attack of an Austrian outpost, he rode off, exclaiming, "Farewell, my friends, I am better mounted than you all are." The Prussian infantry redeemed the temporary defeat, and won the battle. Frederick, in his own history of his time, says that Molwitz was the school of himself and his troops, and that he afterward reflected deeply upon the errors which he had committed. He said that Neipperg and himself had been trying which could commit the most faults. But Prussia had won; and France was now ready to make common cause with the victor. England, as we have seen, abided by its old engagements, and voted a subsidy to the Queen of Hungary. But Walpole still tried the effect of negotiations; and the Elector of Hanover, disregarding the feeling of the English parliament, tried the effect of neutrality. Two French armies joined the forces of the Elector of Bavaria, and were moving upon Vienna. Maria Theresa fled into Hungary. At Presburg the diet was assembled, and the beautiful queen, with her infant son in her arms, appealed to the hereditary valor of the Hungarian states to protect her. She spoke not the language of their country, but she spoke Latin, which had not yet ceased to be the language of the high-born and the learned, and which was well understood in Hungary. "We will die for our *king*, Maria Theresa," was the shout of the assembly. The woman-king roused the people as effectually as the cry in our own day would be for "our queen and *governor*." From the most distant provinces of that interesting country the people assembled in arms. They forgot the miseries they had endured from their Austrian rulers. They recollected that at her coronation in the previous June she had taken the oath, which previous Austrian sovereigns had abolished, to maintain the ancient privileges of their nation. The Elector of Bavaria, with his French allies, did not attack Vienna, which the husband of Maria Theresa remained to defend. The elector entered Bohemia, and took Prague by surprise on the 25th of November. Here he was crowned King of Bohemia; and he next reached the summit of ambition by being chosen Emperor of Germany, as Charles VII. But the great quarrel of the Austrian succession was not determined by this success. In 1742 the levies of Maria Theresa, under the command of Prince Charles of Lorraine, held the French in check in Bohemia, and another army defeated the French and Bavarians at Linz. The Austrians entered Bavaria; and Munich, the capital city of the elector, was occupied by his adversaries on the day that he was chosen emperor at Frankfort. The struggle continued with various successes and reverses on either side. Frederick saw that his business was again to press for the cession of Silesia. He again negotiated, and again could not obtain his demand. His army, powerful enough to turn the scale in such a contest as was going forward, took the field; and he defeated the Austrians in Bohemia, on the 17th of May, 1742. On the 15th of July King George, in closing the session, exulted in the success of his endeavors "to bring about an accommodation between those princes whose union was most necessary in this critical conjuncture. The treaty lately concluded between the Queen of Hungary and the King of Prussia, under my mediation, and so highly to the honor of Great Britain, must undoubtedly produce the best consequences to the common cause." That treaty gave Prussia Silesia. It was the first step in the career of Frederick II. toward raising his small kingdom into the position of one of the greater European states—in time to become one of the greatest.

The fall of Walpole was followed by a shifting of some of the officers of government. The people looked on, and saw that nothing else was changed. They had joined the cry of a parliamentary faction to hunt down one man. They looked in vain for any bettering of their domestic condition—for any signal display of national greatness. Some violent demagogues had talked of the scaffold for the minister who had governed the nation without bloodshed or proscription, at a period when a less firm hand would have encouraged the Jacobites, and a less merciful hand would have hunted them into desperation. The mob carried about his effigy. "Satan" and "Bob" figured together in caricatures. The excitement was soon over. Walpole's ascendency was the real keystone of the opposition arch, itself composed of very loose materials. The keystone was displaced, and the arch fell to pieces. Some of the opposition got places, others got none. The only change which could be popularly understood was that an apparent reconciliation took place between the king and the Prince of Wales. The prince went to court, and the king asked his royal highness after the health of the princess. The Duke of Argyle desired to form a coalition ministry—what was then first termed "a broad bottom." The plan would not succeed, and the duke retired in disgust. The king would have nothing to say to the Tories. Instead of a minute relation of the rivalries and jealousies of this period, a clever story, told by Horace Walpole, may stand in the place of graver history. The Duke of Newcastle gave a great dinner at Claremont to his new colleagues. The servants, as was customary at this period, all got drunk. At the inn near the gate of Richmond Park, of which Walpole was ranger, the coachman who was driving Lord Bath [Pulteney], Lord Carteret, Lord Limerick, and Mr. Furness, tumbled off the box—he alone being left of the liveried troop. The innkeeper was asked if he could convey them to town. No, not he; perhaps he could get Lord Orford's coachman to drive them. They accepted the offer. Horace tells the sequel: "Lord Orford has been at court again to-day. Lord Carteret came up to thank him for his coachman, the Duke of Newcastle standing by. My father said, 'My lord, when the duke is near overturning you, you have nothing to do but to send for me, and I will save you.'" A ballad was sung in the streets to the burden of Derry Down, in which this event had its moral:

> "Learn hence, honest Britons, in spite of your pains,
> That Orford, old coachman, still governs the reins."*

Lord Carteret was the only member of the cabinet who possessed high ability. Pitt was not called to office. His exclusion was no doubt owing to the personal dislike of the king. Neither had Chesterfield or Lyttleton places. Carteret was a favorite of George and of his son. He was a general favorite, from his wit, his accomplishments, his gay humor. But he was a very indifferent substitute for the keen and painstaking Walpole, who, like all really great men, did not despise petty things, or think it beneath him to attend to the small details of public affairs. Carteret was satisfied to lead the king, by entering into his majesty's aspirations to hold the scales of European policy, and to command armies. He was asked by the chief justice to make an appointment to some office. "What is it to me," ex-

* Carlyle, vol. i. p. 365.

* Wright, "House of Hanover," vol. i. p. 204.

claimed the dashing minister, "who is a judge and who is a bishop? It is my business to make kings and emperors, and to maintain the balance of Europe." The balance was to be held by taking sixteen thousand Hanoverian troops into English pay. When the king opened the session on the 16th of November, 1742, and mentioned "sixteen thousand of my electoral troops," as sent to the Low Countries, "with the Hessians in the British pay," it was felt that England was getting mixed up with Hanover in a way that Walpole would have scarcely dared to attempt. A grant of 657,000*l.* was proposed by the secretary of war to defray the cost of these troops. Then the national jealousy of foreign mercenaries, which the genius of William III. was unable to stand up against, burst forth in contemptuous disregard of the king's relations with his hereditary state. Sir John St. Aubyn said that undoubtedly his majesty had a most passionate love for his native country—a passion which arises from virtue. "I wish that those who have the honor to be of his councils would imitate his royal example, and show a passion for their native country too; that they would faithfully stand forth and say, that as king of this country, whatever interests may interfere with it, this country is to be his first, his principal care; that in the Act of Settlement this is an express condition." Pitt was even bolder: "It is now too apparent that this great, this powerful, this formidable kingdom, is considered only as a province to a despicable electorate." The ministers commanded a majority. But such invectives went deep into the heart of the nation. It must be borne in mind that England was really not engaged in war with France, though she was paying troops to fight against the cause which France supported. She sent auxiliaries to the house of Austria, and these auxiliaries would necessarily come into conflict with the auxiliaries which France sent against the house of Austria. The absurdity of the situation was well expressed by Horace Walpole: "We have the name of war with Spain without the thing, and war with France without the name."

Twenty-one years have passed since Great Britain was agitated by rumors of Jacobite plots and insurrections. The execution of Layer and the banishment of Atterbury had gradually gone out of the popular mind; and it appeared to be forgotten that the Stuart, who had been hailed as king at Scone in 1716, was residing at Rome, and that he had two sons growing into manhood. As long as Britain was at peace there was little to be apprehended from James Edward or Charles Edward. The son of James II. lived a retired life, although he was treated by the papal court with the homage due to a reigning sovereign. His consort had died in 1735. The two young men, who were called Prince of Wales and Duke of York, had been very imperfectly educated, had displayed no marked abilities, and knew little of the history and real condition of the country which they were sedulously taught was their absolute inheritance, from which an usurper must be some day driven. There were always partisans in England and Scotland ready to communicate every turn in politics to the Duke of Ormond, to the Earl Marischal, to the titular Earl of Dunbar, who formed the principal persons of the little court at Rome. In Scotland there was an association engaged to restore the exiled family—some held together by honest principles—others, such as Lord Lovat, disappointed in some object of selfish ambition, and ready to throw off their allegiance to the government which had not duly bought them. In England Walpole knew all the Jacobites, and counted the greater number as honest enemies. He kept his eye upon the great families, the Somersets and the Wynns; denounced Wyndham in parliament, and propitiated Shippen. But he never went out of his way to pry into plots or to arrest plotters. As long as Walpole was in power, and England was at peace with foreign states, the Stuarts had no chance of winning a throne by revolt and invasion. When Walpole fell, and England was at war with Spain and France—when the pacific French minister, Cardinal Fleury, was succeeded by the more energetic and more wily Cardinal Tencin—the vulnerable point in the position of the house of Brunswick was to be hit. In 1743 a great invasion was projected from France. Charles Edward was urged to leave Rome and repair to Paris. He was nominally to command an army of veterans assembled at Dunkirk, having the great Marshal Saxe to lead the troops which were to drive the Elector of Hanover from his usurped throne. The expedition sailed at the beginning of 1744 from Dunkirk. A great storm destroyed or scattered the fleet of transports, and Sir John Norris, who was ready for a fight in the Channel, was content to pick up a few dismasted vessels. Marshal Saxe went to take the command of an army in the Low Countries, and Charles Edward secluded himself at Gravelines till a more favorable occasion should arise when he should emerge from his obscurity as Regent of Great Britain and Ireland.

When the king prorogued the parliament on the 21st of April, 1743, he announced that, at the requisition of the Queen of Hungary, he had ordered his army, in conjunction with the Austrian troops, to pass the Rhine. His majesty immediately departed for Germany. The British troops in Flanders, under the command of the Earl of Stair, had marched toward the Rhine in February. They were joined by the sixteen thousand Hanoverians in the pay of England, and by some Austrian regiments commanded by the Duke of Aremberg. In May the army had crossed the Rhine, and had taken up a station at Hochst, near Frankfort. Stair was waiting for Hanoverians and Hessians to add to his numbers; for the French Marshal de Noailles, with an army of sixty thousand men, was within a few leagues of the British general's position. Stair made an imprudent movement, by which he was cut off from his supplies at Hanau. King George reached the army on the 19th of June, accompanied by his second son, the Duke of Cumberland. The forty thousand men were reduced to thirty-seven thousand; they were on short rations, and the horses without forage. Their position was an unfavorable one near the village of Dettingen; the French general was at hand with a superior force. It was absolutely necessary that the allies should return to their magazines at Hanau. On the 27th of June, before sunrise, they had commenced their march from Aschaffenburg toward Dettingen. They were ignorant of the exact position of the French, fancying their principal force was toward Aschaffenburg, in their rear. In this belief the king took the command of the rear-guard, as the post of danger. A large body of French were in their front, to contest the passage of the allies through the defile of Dettingen. George immediately rode from the rear to form his army in order of battle, with the almost desperate resolution of forcing the strong French lines. The brave little man was surrounded by dangers. As he marched from Aschaffenburg the French entered the place with twelve thousand men. Behind and before was the enemy, in most formidable numbers, shutting him up in a narrow valley. Grammont, the nephew of Noailles—eager to engage, in the temporary absence of his uncle, who had ridden off to bring up additional force—rushed forward from a formidable position covered by a morass, to charge with his cavalry. George dismounted, drew his sword, and put himself at the head of the right of his British and Hanoverians, exclaiming, "Now, boys, now for the honor of England; fire, and behave bravely, and the French will soon run." The infantry thus led on did behave bravely, and did make the French soon run. The Duke of Cumberland, who commanded the left, displayed the same courage as his father. The battle of Dettingen afforded no display for high military skill on the part of the British commanders. They had desperately to fight their way out of a difficulty; and they had troops upon whose bravery and steadiness they could confidently rely. The battle was not over till four in the afternoon, but the victory was complete on the part of the allies. The French could offer no resistance to the retreat to Hanau, which again gave the half-starved British, Hanoverians, and Austrians the command of abundant supplies. At Hanau they were joined by their reinforcements, and an invasion of France was even talked of. It was wise in King George not to be flushed with his triumph, and to resist the advice of Stair to attempt some perilous adventure. It was complained that the king did not listen to the counsels of his English officers, but had Hanoverian partialities. Stair, the Duke of Marlborough, and others, resigned their commissions. The success of the allies in the campaign was completed by the expulsion of the French armies from Germany, by the forces under Prince Charles of Lorraine. The king was received in England with an enthusiasm which he had never before excited. But the complaints of Lord Stair and others revived the old cry of Hanoverian influence. The Hanoverian White Horse, in cocked hat and jack-boots, riding the feeble British Lion, was the subject of a popular caricature.

In August, 1743, while the king was on the continent, Henry Pelham, brother of the Duke of Newcastle, had been appointed first lord of the treasury. Walpole had identified this office with the position

of a prime minister; but Carteret, the secretary of state, who had accompanied George in his campaign, had really controlled the cabinet. Carteret was now the great object of attack from the opposition. He was the Hanoverian minister—the wicked minister. Succeeding to some of the power of Walpole, he had inherited no inconsiderable portion of the odium which attached to every servant of a king who, unfortunately, had other interests to promote than that of the country which had called his family to the throne. The violent tone of the parliamentary debates led foreigners to believe, as they always believe under such circumstances, that Great Britain was torn to pieces by internal dissensions, and that the time was ripe for dynastic changes, if not for invasion and conquest. It was this belief which suggested the abortive attempt of 1744, which we have briefly noticed. The instant that the country really appeared in danger, the most eloquent opponents of the administration—the most indignant declaimers against Hanoverian partialities—those who would have disbanded every foreign soldier, without any substitute for national defence—raised a voice in parliament for the defence of the nation and the throne, which, as in many similar instances, made foreigners wonder at the inconsistencies of representative assemblies. On the 20th of March, 1744, France declared war against England. There was an end of that anomalous state of things, in which two great states were fighting against each other, not as principals, but as auxiliaries of other governments. The English declaration of war was issued on the 31st of March.

The continental war of 1744 was chiefly marked by the sudden movement of the King of Prussia against the Austrians. He overran Bohemia, but evacuated it before the end of the year. The King of England, very much against his will, was restrained by the general voice of his council, with the exception of Carteret, now Earl Granville, from leaving England. The difference of opinion on these Hanoverian questions soon made it impossible that the ministry could hold together. Pelham had succeeded Walpole in his command of the House of Commons. Granville had the king with him. It was clear which party would triumph. The king was obliged to part with his favorite—a man far more able than those who insisted on his dismissal, but whose very ability was more dangerous than their mediocrity. The Duke of Newcastle and his brother desired a coalition of parties. They wanted old Jacobites, like Sir Hinde Cotton, to be associated with young patriots, like Chesterfield and Pitt. The greatest member of the opposition refused to take an office inferior to that of secretary of state. But Pitt did not oppose the new government. At the risk of that charge of inconsistency which feeble statesmen always dread, he supported a grant for the continuance of the army in Flanders—a measure which he had before opposed. "He showed how much the question was changed from what it was last year, when a certain fatal influence prevailed in his majesty's councils. The object then seemed to be the multiplying war upon war, expense upon expense, and the abetting the house of Austria in romantic schemes of acquisition, such as the recovery of the Avulsa Imperii, without regard to the immediate interest of Great Britain. The object now was, by connecting ourselves closely with Holland, to arrive at a situation which might enable us to hold out fair and reasonable terms of peace, both to our friends and enemies, and not to prosecute the war a moment longer than we could obtain an equitable and sufficient security for our own rights, and those of our allies, pursuant to public treaties. . . . He thought a dawn of salvation to this country had broke forth, and he would follow it as far as it would lead him. He should be the greatest dupe in the world if those now at the helm did not mean the honor of their master, and the good of the nation; if he found himself deceived, nothing would be left but to act with an honest despair." * The great Commoner was no doubt sincere in his belief; yet there was little change in the system of subsidizing foreign powers and paying foreign troops.

The Earl of Chesterfield, before he entered upon the appointment he had accepted as lord lieutenant of Ireland, went upon a mission to the Hague, to concert military operations with the Dutch government. The great object to be attained was that the Duke of Cumberland should be appointed commander-in-chief of the confederate army. Before the campaign of 1745 was opened the Emperor Charles the Seventh died at Munich. His son, the new Elector of Bavaria, withdrew his claim to the Austrian succession, and separated his troops from the army of the French. Maria Theresa restored her conquests in Bavaria. In March, 1745, Lord Orford died. The evils which he had for many years averted by his pacific policy were coming thick upon his country.

The campaign of 1745, in Flanders, was long memorable for such a display of the qualities of the British soldier as have often made the purely military nations of Europe look on with wonder. As often, in the long interval between the days of Marlborough and of Wellington, have they equally wondered at the incapacity of those commanders under whom these qualities were displayed. The French army, seventy-six thousand in number, had taken the field under Marshal Saxe. His name alone was sufficient to give confidence to his men and to induce caution in his enemies. To oppose him was the young Duke of Cumberland, under the tutelage of an old Austrian marshal, and controlled in some respects by the Dutch commander. The united army scarcely reached fifty thousand in number. At the beginning of May the French suddenly invested Tournay. The States-General pressed for the relief of this fortress, the strongest in Flanders, and the Duke of Cumberland advanced at the head of his forces to encounter the sixty thousand French that were collected in advance of Tournay. Marshal Saxe had taken up a strong position on rising ground, with the village of Fontenoy in front. His right rested on the village of Antoin and the Scheldt, his left on the wood of Barré. This position was strengthened by all the resources of military science. Redoubts were constructed; the villages were fortified; abatis were formed in the wood. On the 10th of May [N. S.] the Duke of Cumberland's army had driven in the French outposts, and he issued orders for an attack on the French. At four o'clock on the morning of the 11th the allies advanced; and by nine o'clock the engagement had become general. The French commanders were astonished that an enemy inferior in numbers should attack them in a position so apparently unassailable. Louis XV. and the dauphin had joined the army, and they looked upon a sight which told them of England's strength—perhaps of England's weakness. The Dutch commander, the Prince of Waldeck, had undertaken to carry Antoin and Fontenoy by assault. He could not stand up against the fire of the French batteries, and he retired to some distance from the field, rendering no help to the English and Hanoverians. The ground was too rugged, it is said, for the operations of cavalry. William of Cumberland formed a column of fourteen thousand British infantry, thirty or forty abreast; and with measured tread, regardless of every natural obstacle, undismayed by the cannonade left and right which mowed down their ranks, this terrible column strode on through the enemy's lines, carrying all before them.

Marshal Saxe urged the king and his son to retire; but they had the spirit to remain, and see the end of this unparalleled advance. The Duke de Grammont had fallen—he whose rashness lost the day of Dettingen. The French cavalry had charged the British column again and again. Still it marched on. But where was their support? A column of infantry, without a horse, without a gun, now reduced probably to ten thousand, could not win a battle against sixty thousand, merely through the supremacy of physical strength and moral endurance. Voltaire says that if the Dutch had moved when this wonderful column had broken through the French ranks, there had been no chance even of retreat for Marshal Saxe and his king. At the moment when all was confusion, the young Duke de Richelieu advised that a battery should be brought up so as to fire down the length of the column, while it was attacked in flank by the divisions that had been released from Antoin and Fontenoy. The guns fired right at the advancing front. The French household troops and the Irish brigade charged on all sides. Slowly the compact mass moved back, still facing the enemy. Its ranks were not broken, not a man fled. It moved back, till the cavalry came up to cover the retreat. When the ramparts of Ath were reached, the British had lost above four thousand men killed, and the Hanoverians nearly two thousand. This number of killed is judged to have been underrated. The Dutch loss was about fifteen hundred. The French acknowledged a loss of seven thousand. Nothing was gained by the extraordinary advance of the British infantry—"a noble precursor of the

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xiii. col. 1055—from Mr. Yorke's Journal.

heroic madness of Balaklava."* Yet the battle of Fontenoy was long remembered by the nation as something which added to its military fame—not a victory, but "a soldier's battle," which had its own glory.

We are about to open the last chapter of that tragic volume whose first chapter commences at the eventful period when the great-grandfather of Prince Charles Edward set up the royal standard at Nottingham, at the beginning of that civil war which was to decide whether England was thenceforth to have the freedom of her people as the basis of her government, or whether she was to resign herself to the crushing weight of an absolute monarchy, such as other nations were consenting to endure. In reading this last chapter, it is our belief that freemen ought to read it, as they have read many previous pages of the same eventful history, with the constant feeling that the welfare of the governed is of far higher importance than the personal successes or misfortunes of those who govern them, or claim to be their governors. This is not the romantic view of public affairs; but it is the only rational view. It is the only view that will stand the test of any investigation of the causes of the greatness of nations, and in the greatness of nations we include "the greatest happiness for the greatest number." We may surrender our feelings to the charm of the early chivalry; we may admire, and even reverence, the passionate loyalty of the cavalier; we may drop a tear for the misfortunes of an exiled family, and believe that they had a hard measure of justice; we may especially take a deep interest in the daring adventure of a young prince, who, without foreign aid, threw himself upon the affections of an enthusiastic people, and claimed their allegiance for the descendants of a great line of kings, renowned in story long before the union of the crowns of Scotland and England. But in spite of all these natural emotions, let us never forget that the real fight was on one side for constitutional government, on the other side for irresponsible power; on one side for progress, on the other for retrogression; on one side for spiritual freedom, on the other for an intolerant church, if not for the establishment of a faith that was hateful to the nation, and which it was impossible to bring back, even by the most lavish outpouring of blood on the battle-field and on the scaffold.

In 1744 a bill was passed "to make it high treason to hold correspondence with the sons of the pretender to his majesty's crown, in case they shall land or attempt to land in Great Britain." In both houses the bill was debated with much eloquence; especially a clause by which the term of forfeitures for high treason was extended beyond the life of the pretender to continue during the lives of his two sons. Lord Chesterfield was one of the ablest opponents of this bill; and the chief ground of his opposition was that the politicians and patriots of the reign of Anne thought it necessary to end the extension of penalties to the descendants of traitors when the life of the pretender was ended. If those who passed that law were to return, would they discover any reasons to alter their resolutions? "If they were to cast their eyes over the nation, they would find the faction of the Jacobites, which was then so numerous, so daring, so factious, and so potent, is now shrunk into a sect almost invisible, and equally despicable for the smallness of its number and the absurdity of its principles; a sect without influence, without property, without policy, and without leaders, without money, and without arms; a sect, therefore, from which nothing can be hoped by our enemies, and from which nothing is now to be feared; a sect which its own stupidity will extinguish, and which probably will be scarcely heard of in another generation." We extract this passage to show the conviction of a very eminent statesman that Jacobitism in England was "a creed outworn." Looking at the real prosperity of the people under a mild government—to which the only serious objection that could be made was that its head was a foreigner—we may well believe that in England the system of half a century would be in little danger from an insane passion for the abstract doctrine of hereditary right. And yet, in 1743, after the fall of Walpole, Carte, the historian, an agent of James, thought that the prospects of the exiled house were more hopeful: "Your majesty's cause seems to me to have derived several advantages from that session. Among these I reckon the utter contempt into which Prince Frederick is fallen by his conduct at that time, so that nobody for the future will have any recourse to him, or dependence upon him; but, in case of discontent, will naturally look out for redress from another quarter: and I think the events of that session will naturally enough keep the people from ever expecting redress of their grievances in a parliamentary way, or from any change of a ministry, or indeed in any way but by your majesty's restoration."* These were the blind views of partisanship—views which the Stuarts, who knew little of the workings of representative government, and foreigners, who knew less of the anomalous conditions under which public liberty exists, were always prone to adopt. In a debate in the Commons, on the bill to prevent correspondence with the pretender's sons, it was justly said: "However much we here at home may distinguish between discontent and disaffection, it is not easy for foreigners to comprehend the distinction; therefore, when they hear of general discontents among the people they are apt to conclude that the greatest part of the people are Jacobites, and that they may overset our established government by throwing in a handful of regular troops among us, to give countenance to a general insurrection."†

The popular temper of Scotland was essentially different from that of England. There was not only discontent, there was disaffection. In the Highlands there was a social organization peculiarly fitted to place a large military population under the absolute control of a few daring and ambitious chiefs. The feudal principle, that the will of the lord was the only law for his vassals, was eminently adapted to fit in with the principle of implicit obedience to the right divine of kings. The Highlanders had always despised the industry by which the Lowlanders were slowly advancing in wealth and civilization. The Lowlanders had always regarded with apprehension the bold and predatory habits of the Highlanders—dreaded them as thieves, and looked upon them with contempt as savages. But at the period of which we are speaking, "while the severance between the two races inhabiting Scotland was as distinct as ever—almost more distinct from Lowland progress in civilization—much of the hostile bitterness had passed away on both sides. The mountaineers were looked upon as kindly Scots, who were in some respects the main sufferers from common hardships."‡ It has been objected to Walpole, that, after the suppression of the rebellion in 1715, and during the long continuance of peace, he took no effectual means to make the Highlands a source of strength to the government—to enlist the clans in the common service of the country, and to place confidence in their chiefs. Why should not Highlanders have formed then, as they have formed since, a powerful arm of the British military power? Mr. Burton has answered the question: "To have drafted so many of the clans, with their native hierarchy, into the British army, would have been, in many instances, embodying a force for the use of the exiled house."§ Duncan Forbes, in 1738, proposed that Highland regiments should be raised, to be commanded by an Englishman, but with Highland officers under him; and that these should be sent on foreign service. Chatham adopted this principle, after the last sparks of rebellion had been trodden out; but, in the mean while, the only native forces in the Highlands consisted of the independent companies, known as "The Black Watch"—a sort of police, but wholly under the control of the chiefs of the clans from which they were taken. The Black Watch was abolished, and out of these companies was formed the famous Forty-second. That regiment, when quartered in London in 1743, was exposed to the ignorant scoffs of a rude multitude, who laughed at their peculiar dress and their unintelligible language. "Proud as Spanish hidalgoes," the whole body of rank and file marched off; and, having at length surrendered, some of the more mutinous were sent to the West Indies. The greater number, afterward serving in Flanders, distinguished themselves for their steadiness and bravery. The Scottish Lowlanders at this period were far behind their English neighbors in agricultural and commercial industry. There was progress, but not rapid progress. Wherever there was poverty, it was attributed to the union. The great support of the Stuarts was to be found in the Highlands; and that support almost wholly depended upon the absolute control of the chiefs over their clans. In the Lowlands men

* Rev. J. White "History of France," p. 451.

* Appendix to Lord Mahon's "History," vol. iii. p. 8.
† Mr. Legge, "Parliamentary History," vol. xiii. col. 866.
‡ Burton, "History of Scotland," vol. ii. p. 366.
§ Ibid., p. 383.

judged for themselves, and weighed their real or imaginary grievances in one scale and the danger of revolt in the other. But there was unquestionably a strong disposition to Jacobitism. There was irritation from fiscal exactions; there was irritation from the sensitiveness of national pride. But Jacobitism had also a strong hold upon the imaginative character of the Scottish people. Charles Edward, says Mr. Burton, "became a sort of idol of the imagination, with those whose politics and religion would have compelled them to vote against him, had the question of his succession to the crown been a matter of deliberative adjustment."

Whether Charles Edward understood, or not, the curious complication of motives upon which he was to depend for support in Scotland—whether he correctly saw that in Scotland there were far stronger elements of success than in England—he took the sound resolution of making a bold experiment for the restoration of his house, by throwing himself upon the loyalty of a people who would incur some peril to welcome a descendant of the Bruce. Since the failure of the expedition of 1744 the government of Louis XV. had manifested no inclination to render further assistance of men and money to a perilous enterprise. It has been pointed out "that several Protestant princes, the King of Prussia more especially, had remonstrated against the support which France was giving to the Roman Catholic party in Great Britain." * Charles Edward was indignant at this lukewarmness. But he had made up his mind to a bold step; and he concealed his purpose with an adroitness which scarcely belonged to a young man of twenty-three, but with a sort of hereditary instinct. He writes to his father, in June, 1745, "If your majesty was in this country, I flatter myself you would be surprised to see with your own eyes how I blind several, and impose upon them, at the same time they think to do it to me." † Five days afterward, as he informs his father, Charles Edward has taken his final resolution: "I believe your majesty little expected a courier at this time, and much less from me, to tell you a thing that will be a great surprise to you. I have been, above six months ago, invited by our friends to go to Scotland, and to carry what money and arms I could conveniently get; this being, they are fully persuaded, the only way of restoring you to the crown, and them to their liberties. After such scandalous usage as I have received from the French court, had I not given my word to do so, or got so many encouragements from time to time as I have had, I should have been obliged in honor, and for my own reputation, to have flung myself into the arms of my friends, and die with them, rather than live longer in such a miserable way here, or be obliged to return to Rome, which would be just giving up all hopes. I cannot but mention a parable here, which is—a horse that is to be sold, if spurred he does not skip, or show some sign of life, nobody would care to have him, even for nothing; just so my friends would care very little to have me, if, after such usage, which all the world is sensible of, I should not show that I have life in me. Your majesty cannot disapprove a son's following the example of his father." ‡ He adds, in the same letter, "I have been obliged to steal off, without letting the King of France so much as suspect it."

NOTE ON THE BATTLE OF DETTINGEN.

THE following account of the battle of Dettingen is extracted from an unpublished letter of the Hon. Henry Conway (afterward Marshal Conway), addressed to his brother Lord Conway, from the camp at Hainault, June 30th, 1743, N. S. This letter forms part of a series in the possession of the author of 'The Popular History of England.' It is singular that Conway makes no allusion to the uncommon occurrence of a King of England being in the field.

"On Thursday last, the 26th, we marched at daybreak from our camp at Aschaffenburg, the guards making the rear-guard of the army, which in a retreat is looked upon as the post of honor, but proved quite the contrary on this occasion by throwing us entirely out of the action; which happened thus: Before we were marched much above a league from Aschaffenburg the enemy's cannon began playing very briskly upon our vanguard from the other side of the river, and continued flanking us as we advanced toward a village called Detting upon the Maine; here the French to the number of forty thousand had passed the river upon two bridges of boats, and drew up as we advanced upon a plain before the village. Our army formed in two lines upon the plain, the first consisting of English, and the second of Austrians and Hanoverians. Our brigade, which I told you made the rear-guard with another of Hanoverians and a few horse, marched off to the right, to avoid being flanked by the French camp, and were posted upon a hill with a large wood between us and the rest of the army. This wood covered the right flank of our army, and the river was on the left. The attack was begun by the French horse, chiefly of the Maison du Roi, upon our foot, who broke them entirely and repulsed them with great loss. Some of our horse and dragoons suffered a good deal, particularly Bland's dragoons, of which but one squadron out of three remained fit for service, and very few of the officers escaped. Major Honeywood, who commanded them, received five wounds, and is thought in a dangerous way. They behaved with vast resolution, and broke five squadrons of the enemy. Ligonier's horse suffered a good deal, as did Pembroke's (Honeywood's now) from the cannon. The blues suffered more in their reputation than otherwise; as did Honeywood's at first, by doing what is vulgarly called running away—in the military phrase retreating with too much precipitation. The English foot, particularly Johnstoun's, Onslow's, and the old and new buffs, behaved with astonishing bravery, and contributed greatly to our gaining what may be properly called a victory, as the enemy suffered a good deal in the flower of their troops, and left us master of the field, by retiring very precipitately over the Maine. As soon as the attack began, the guards were missed, and sent for in great haste, but being ill-conducted by our guide, the enemy were retired before we came upon the plain, where we had the honor of sharing the victory by passing one of the wettest and coldest nights I ever felt upon the ground among the slain and wounded of both sides. Our loss is said at most not to exceed a thousand, and that of the French may, I believe, moderately be called four or five; some say seven or nine. What made it heavier to them was, that it fell among the best of their troops, as the Mousquetaires, of whom they say but fourscore remained out of 400. The gendarmerie, Chevaux Legers, and cuirassiers suffered vastly, as one might know from the vast number of breast-plates that were found on the field."

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF TREATIES.

(Continued from Vol. V. p. 733.)

1732 October 7: peace between Sweden and Poland.
1733 October 10: war declared by the King of France against the emperor, on account of the latter combining with the Russians to drive Stanislaus, father-in-law of the French king, from the throne of Poland, to which he had been elected on the death of Augustus II.
1735 October 3: preliminaries of peace signed at Vienna, between France and the emperor. Spain acceded April 15th, 1736.
1736 April 23: war commenced between Russia and Turkey.
1737 May 4: war declared against the Turks by the emperor.
1738 November 18: *the definitive peace of Vienna*, between the emperor and the King of France, the latter power agreeing to guarantee the Pragmatic Sanction. Lorraine ceded to France.
1739 September 18: *Peace of Belgrade* between the emperor and the Turks, the emperor giving up Belgrade and Servia; this was speedily followed by a peace between Russia and Turkey, Russia surrendering Azoph and all her conquests on the Black Sea.
1739 October 23: war declared by England against Spain.
1740 August: a subsidy treaty concluded between Great Britain and Hesse.
1740 October 20: Charles VI., Emperor of Germany, died, and was succeeded by his eldest daughter, Maria Theresa, by virtue of the Pragmatic Sanction, which being opposed by the Kings of Spain and Poland, who supported the right of the Elector of Bavaria, founded on the will of Ferdinand I., gave rise to a war, in which most of the powers of Europe were engaged.
1741 Alliance between Great Britain, Russia, and Holland, with the Queen of Hungary (the Empress Maria Theresa), for the purpose of supporting the interests of the house of Austria; France, Spain, and Sardinia uniting about the same time in the interest of the Elector of Bavaria.
1742 June 28: *Peace of Berlin*, between the King of Prussia and the Queen of Hungary. Silesia given up to Prussia.
1742 November 18: a treaty for mutual defence and guarantee signed at Whitehall, between Great Britain and Prussia.
1743 June 24: a defensive treaty concluded between Great Britain and Russia for fifteen years.
1743 August 7: *Peace of Abo*, between Russia and Sweden.
1744 March 14: war declared formally by Louis XV. against Great Britain, France having been previously engaged merely as ally of the Elector of Bavaria.
1744 April 27: war declared between the Queen of Hungary and King of France.
1745 April 23: *Peace of Fuessen*, between the Queen of Hungary and Elector of Bavaria.
1745 December 25: *Peace of Dresden*, between Saxony, Prussia, and the Queen of Hungary, confirming the treaties of Berlin and Breslau.
1748 April 30: preliminary articles for the *Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle* signed by the ministers of Great Britain, France, and

* Mahon, upon the authority of "Mémoires de Noailles."
† Appendix to Mahon, vol. iii. p. 13. ‡ Ibid., p. 14.

Holland, to which the Queen of Hungary, the King of Sardinia, and the Duke of Modena, shortly after acceded, and Spain and Genoa before the end of June; in September and October the definitive treaty was concluded and signed by the respective powers. By this peace the treaties of Westphalia in 1648, of Nimeguen in 1678 and 1679, of Ryswick in 1697, of Utrecht in 1713, of Baden in 1714, of the Triple Alliance in 1717, of the Quadruple Alliance in 1718, and of Vienna in 1738, were renewed and confirmed.

CHAPTER CLV.

Prince Charles Edward arrives at Eriska—Lands at Borodale—His interviews with chiefs of clans—The gathering at Glenfinnan—Military resources of the government—Sir John Cope—Highland army marches to Perth—Preparations for defence at Edinburgh—Charles Edward at Holyrood House—Cope's army lands at Dunbar—Battle of Preston Pans—Charles Edward's sojourn at Edinburgh—Siege of the castle—English opinions of the rebellion. Note on the Highland costume.

On the 23d of July, 1745, a French vessel, carrying sixteen guns, is lying off Eriska, one of the small western isles between Barra and South Uist. An eagle is hovering over the ship, as if watching the unwonted disturbance of the solitude of these dreary regions; and the presence of the king of birds is hailed as a welcome to a royal stranger who is on board.* Prince Charles Edward is on board, with seven friends or attendants, one of whom is the Marquis of Tullibardine, called by the Jacobites Duke of Athol. The prince has been eighteen days at sea, in La Doutelle the little vessel which he has hired to make a descent upon the kingdom which he deems his patrimony; proposing, with a few hundred muskets and broadswords, and with four thousand louis-d'ors, to overthrow an usurping government, which kept his father and himself from the enjoyment of their hereditary rights. The prince has had some perilous incidents in his voyage from Belleisle. A large French ship-of-war, which was his convoy, has been disabled in an engagement with an English man-of-war; and La Doutelle has been chased by other hostile cruisers. The arms, ammunition, and money are at last put on shore at Eriska, and the prince and his followers land on the dreary island. The night is wet and stormy. They find shelter in the house of Angus MacDonald, the tacksman; but this house, the best of the district, belonging to the principal proprietor, was unprovided with any other vent for the peat smoke than the accustomed hole in the roof. Charles Edward, reared in Italian palaces—he who had lately parted with the luxurious accommodations of the Château de Navarre, the seat of the Duke de Bouillon, at Evreux—was choked with the cloud that arose from the fire in the centre of the room. To the inhabitants of the hovel that smoke was pleasurable warmth. The prince again and again sought the open air. The indignant host, unconscious of the rank of his visitor, at length exclaimed, "What a plague is the matter with that fellow, that he can neither sit nor stand still, and neither keep within nor without door." †

From this rough retreat messengers were sent to various persons of consequence in those remote districts. With the exception of Tullibardine, who was attainted in 1715, there was no man of mark with the royal adventurer. His companions were chiefly Irishmen, "drawn into Scotland by the allurement which the enterprise held out to them of making their fortunes." ‡ The first Scottish gentleman who came to Charles Edward, and saw him on board La Doutelle, was MacDonald of Boisdale, brother of the chief of Clanranald. This prudent adviser—who was accused by the Jacobites of "playing the game of the government"—earnestly discountenanced the attempt to raise an insurrection without better means than the prince could show. He exhorted him to return home. "I am come home, sir," replied the prince; he would not go back: he relied on his faithful Highlanders. §

The little vessel now made sail for the mainland, and anchored in the Loch Na Nuagh, a small arm of the sea between the districts of Moidart and Arisaig. The journal of a Highland officer ‖ describes the appearance of the adventurer, as he presented himself on the deck of La Doutelle, where a tent had been erected. The prince, the young chief Clanranald, and MacDonald of Kinloch Moidart, had been for three hours in the cabin of Charles—they arguing against his project, he resolutely combating all their objections. "Clanranald returned to us, and in about half an hour after there entered the tent a tall youth of a most agreeable aspect, in a plain black coat, with a plain shirt not very clean, and a cambric stock fixed with a plain silver buckle; a fair round wig out of the buckle; a plain hat, with a canvas string having one end fixed to one of his coat buttons; he had black stockings, and brass buckles in his shoes." This is not the heroic costume in which imagination delights to dress up the adventurous prince. He was represented to be "ane English clergyman wha had long been possessed with a desire to see and converse with Highlanders." * The hesitation of the two chiefs was at length overcome by the enthusiasm of a younger brother of Kinloch Moidart. He had watched the eagerness of the tall youth, and the coldness of those whom he sought to convince. "When he gathered from their discourse that the stranger was the Prince of Wales; when he heard his chief and his brother refuse to take arms with their prince; his color went and came, his eyes sparkled, he shifted his place, and grasped his sword. Charles observed his demeanor, and turning briskly toward him, called out, 'Will not you assist me?' 'I will, I will,' said Ranald; 'though no other man in the Highlands should draw a sword, I am ready to die for you.' Without further deliberation the two MacDonalds declared that they also would join." This is dramatic. The narrator of the scene is John Home, the author of "Douglas." † Gradually more offers of support came by messengers to the prince, who remained on ship-board till the 25th of July. On that day he landed at Borodale, and took up his quarters at a farm-house belonging to Clanranald.

Charles Edward was not altogether unprepared to look to special quarters for assistance. He had combated the objections of MacDonald of Boisdale by the assurance that he could rely for aid upon MacDonald of Sleat, and the Laird of MacLeod, two powerful chiefs who could each raise more than his thousand followers. Clanranald, after his adhesion, was sent to the Isle of Skye to secure these personages. On the 3d of August MacLeod wrote from Dunvegan, in Skye, to Duncan Forbes, the lord president, to give information that "the pretended Prince of Wales is come on the coast;" with the intention, with a few followers, "to raise all the Highlands." The chief adds, "Sir Alexander MacDonald and I not only gave no sort of countenance to these people, but we used all the interest we had with our neighbors to follow the same prudent method." In a postscript MacLeod says, "Young Clanranald has been here with us, and has given us all possible assurances of his prudence." ‡ Young Clanranald did not succeed in his mission to these cautious chiefs. Charles Edward was more successful with Cameron of Lochiel. He had determined to persuade the prince to withdraw from his rash enterprise, although he had been one of the associates who was in correspondence with the pretender before the expedition from Dunkirk in 1744. Charles Edward and Lochiel met at Borodale. Lochiel for some time steadily maintained his resolve, although his brother had said to him on his way, "If this prince once sets his eyes upon you, he will make you do whatever he pleases." § Charles Edward at last declared that with the few friends he had he would raise the royal standard, win the crown of his ancestors, or perish in the attempt: "Lochiel, who my father often told me was our firmest friend, may stay at home, and learn from the newspapers the fate of his prince." Lochiel then passionately declared he would share his prince's fate. This is Home's poetical relation. There is a more prosaic version of this interview, "on the result of which depended peace or war;" for "if Lochiel had persisted in his refusal, the other chiefs would not have joined." ‖ Bishop Forbes relates that young Glengarry assured him, upon information derived from Charles Edward himself, that Lochiel "had refused to raise a man, or make any appearance, till the prince should give him security for the full value of his estate, in

* "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 9.
† Ibid., p. 11. This speech is doubtless a paraphrase of the Gaelic.
‡ "Memoirs of the Rebellion," by the Chevalier de Johnstone, p. 4.
§ "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 12.
‖ "Lockhart Papers," vol. ii. p. 479.

* "Lockhart Papers," vol. ii. p. 480.
† Home's "Works," vol. ii. p. 427.
‡ "Culloden Papers," p. 203.
§ Home, vol. iii. p. 7.
‖ Ibid., p. 7.

the event of the attempt proving abortive." * Cluny MacPherson "made the same agreement with the prince before he would join the attempt with his following."

On the 19th of August the prince proceeded to a general gathering of the friendly clans at Glenfinnan, a valley on the border of Loch Shiel. A day or two before, the first blood had been spilt in a skirmish between the Keppoch Macdonalds and a party of the Scots Royals proceeding to Fort William. The advantage was on the side of the daring band of Highlanders. When Charles Edward and his friends arrived at Glenfinnan the valley bore its usual aspect of a few poor inhabitants. But before noon the bagpipe was heard from the hills, and before evening fifteen hundred Highlanders were assembled. Tullibardine then raised a banner of red silk, with a white space in the centre. "The appearance of the standard was hailed by a storm of pipe-music, a cloud of skimmering bonnets, and a loud and enduring shout." † The attainted heir of the dukedom of Athol then read the declaration in the name of James VIII., dated from Rome in 1743, and the commission to his eldest son as prince regent. The "loud huzzas and skimming of bonnets up into the air, appearing like a cloud," ‡ which followed the rearing of the standard, was the tribute of simple men who obeyed the command of their chief, little heeding the arguments of the Stuart declaration, even if they understood its language. That declaration, promising redress of grievances under a lawful king, was to have its effect upon the general discontent of Scotland, in its denunciation of the union and of the fiscal exactions whch the union was held to have entailed. The government of an usurper was pronounced to be the cause of national miseries which a free parliament was to redress. The religious institutions of the country were to be respected. The regent promised indemnity for past treasons to all who should now take arms in his cause. Such arguments and promises were judicious. Nevertheless, "if the phraseology of these documents is examined, it is found that the royal prerogative, as the embodiment of legislative power, is carefully though not offensively or conspicuously reserved." § Few of the discontented in Scotland would carefully examine the phraseology of these documents. The rebellion was begun. Its first success would make the timid bold and the prudent rash. But in England every man not ignorant of the history of his country in the past century could scarcely fail to see that the real question at issue was whether the whole course of government since the expulsion of James II. had been a series of unlawful usurpations, or whether the national will was not something higher than the principle of divine right, asserted by the descendants of a bigoted tyrant. These declarations treated the whole contest for the throne of England as a personal question between the Elector of Hanover and the son of James II. Officers and soldiers were called upon to desert their colors and violate their oaths, "since they cannot but be sensible that no engagements entered into with a foreign usurper can dispense with the allegiance they owe to their natural sovereign." The British parliament rightly designated these proclamations as seditious and presumptuous declarations against the constitution of the United Kingdom.

When Charles Edward landed in Scotland, George II. was in Germany, and the government of Great Britain was directed by a regency. The administration regarded, as most official persons are inclined to regard, only the material means which the adventurer had at his command. They despised the chances of that popular enthusiasm for the exiled family which the apparent hopelessness of the young prince's cause carried forward into a personal admiration for his daring confidence. Had the descendant of their ancient kings landed in Scotland with ten thousand Frenchmen, he would have been eventually less powerful to overthrow the established government than when he set foot on Eriska with his seven followers. The sagacity and experience of the lord president could not see the effect which such undoubting trust has ever produced in converting cold friends into zealous partisans. Forbes wrote to the Marquis of Tweeddale, the Scotch secretary of state in London: "I am confident that young man cannot expect to be joined by any considerable force in the Highlands. Some loose lawless men, of desperate fortunes, may indeed resort to him; but I am persuaded that none of the Highland gentlemen who have aught to lose will, after the experience with which the year 1715 furnished them, think proper to risk their fortunes in an attempt which to them must appear desperate." * Tweeddale wrote to Forbes in reply, dating from Whitehall: "I own I have never been alarmed with the reports of the pretender's son landing in Scotland. I consider it as a rash and desperate attempt, that can have no other consequence than the ruin of those concerned in it." † This indifference was the narrow view of a professional statesman. Charles Edward knew his own power, when he wrote to his father that he was joined by brave people, of whose numbers he could not judge, as he had not yet set up his standard; but manfully adding, "The worst that can happen to me, if France does not succor me, is to die at the head of such brave people as I find here, if I should not be able to make my way; *and that I have promised to them.*" ‡ The enterprise was not altogether so rash and desperate as the members of the government chose to think. The attempt was made when there were few troops in England and Scotland; when the British army in the Low Countries had been seriously crippled in the battle of Fontenoy; when no statesman who possessed the prudence of Walpole or the energy of Pitt was at the head of the British councils. In Scotland, in the August of 1745, there were less than three thousand troops, of which number only fourteen hundred were available to oppose the hostile clans. The commander-in-chief in Scotland was Sir John Cope, an officer of the routine school, scarcely able of himself to deal with a great emergency. Tweeddale expresses his hope that if Sir John Cope should speedily obey the orders he had received, there would be an end of the affair. § These orders were to attack the rebels in the mountains; and they assumed that the general would receive important aid from the well-affected clans. Cope marched from Stirling on the 20th of August toward Fort Augustus; and soon in his progress northward he discovered that he could rely little upon Highland auxiliaries. He heard of the successful gathering of the clans round the standard of the Stuarts; of the rapid increase of their forces as they marched onward. On the 28th Charles Edward was at the foot of Corriaraic, near Fort Augustus. Cope prudently declined to encounter him in the mountain passes, which the traditional victories of Highlanders over disciplined troops made well-trained veterans regard with something like apprehension. Cope resolved to march to Inverness—an extraordinary resolution, by which he left the Lowlands open to the advance of the rebels. The prince was urged to follow him. One account says, "I am assured that their young forward leader called for his Highland clothes; and that, at tying the latchets of his shoes, he solemnly declared that he would be up with Mr. Cope before they were unloosed." ‖ A wiser resolution was taken. The Highland army crossed the Grampians; and, by the road of Blair Athol and Dunkeld, reached Perth on the 4th of September. Blair Castle was left by the Duke of Athol free to its ancient possessor; and Tullibardine became the host of his prince, and summoned the tenantry, not without threats of vengeance for disobedience, to repair to the Stuart banner.

On the 4th of September the prince made his public entry into Perth. A fair was proceeding in the city, which brought traders from the west of Scotland and from England. He gave passports to the travelling merchants, and told a London linen-draper to inform his fellow-citizens that in two months he should see them at St. James's. There was little at Perth to excite these sanguine hopes. There were remembrances of 1716, when the father of the young man who now commanded the popular applause had fled from his camp, after issuing proclamations and fixing the date of his coronation. The grandson of James II. had a far less formidable array of adherents than were in arms for the same cause within the memory of living witnesses of his father's regal pomp and his unheroic retreat. But the bold bearing, the cordial trust, of this young man, won him some supporters; yet not enough to make him feel that the

* "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 22.

† Robert Chambers, "History of the Rebellion of 1745-6"—a work of the highest value, in which the author's nationality does not betray him into any partisanship incompatible with a conscientious desire for historical truth.

‡ "Culloden Papers," p. 387. Letter of Ter. Mulloy, an eye-witness.

§ Burton, "History of Scotland," vol. ii. p. 429.

* "Culloden Papers," p. 204.

† Ibid., p. 209.

‡ "Stuart Papers," in Mahon, vol. iii. Appendix, p. xxii.

§ "Culloden Papers," p. 209.

‖ Ibid., p. 216.

enthusiasm of the Highlands would attend him in the Lowlands. Still he went on. The road was open before him. Two important men joined him—James Drummond, styled Duke of Perth,* and Lord George Murray. Lord George had seen something of war, and was a man of ability. He had been opposed in 1719 to the Hanoverian dynasty, but had made his peace, though he was not trusted or employed. When he joined Charles Edward his qualifications gave him a high place in council, and in military arrangements; but he did not speak the language which hereditary right claims as its absolute due. When the prince used the antiquated tone of the Stuarts of the seventeenth century, Lord George Murray pointed out its unsuitableness to a people who had forgotten to recognize such high pretensions, and he was coldly looked upon. Suspicion and jealousy soon divided the rebel camp into factions. But whatever were the dissensions, the great prize of the capital of Scotland was to be attempted to be won. It was won without much difficulty.

On the 11th of September the little army marched southward. They crossed the Forth at the fords of Frew, about eight miles westward of Stirling. The passage was not disputed by Colonel Gardiner's dragoons, who retired before them. At Callender House, near Falkirk, Charles Edward received the adhesion of Lord Kilmarnock, the first Lowland man of rank who joined his banner. He went on to Corstorphine, within four miles of Edinburgh, without opposition. There was division in the municipal councils of the Scottish capital. Provost Stewart acted in a spirit of corporate rivalry against an able and zealous loyalist, George Drummond, who was for organizing a vigorous resistance. Even if the civic authorities had agreed among themselves, they had to defend old walls which could be easily clambered over or broken down; and all the force which could be mustered was not more than eleven hundred men, not a third of whom were disciplined soldiers. The greater number were rapidly embodied volunteers. On Sunday, the 15th, the citizens were called to arms by the alarming toll of the great fire-bell. The volunteers mustered, but there was no one to command them. They manned the town-walls on that night. On the Monday the dragoons, who, with the town guard, were very near the advancing rebels at Colt Bridge, were seized with a sudden panic as their pickets fled before some mounted Highlanders. The dragoons disgracefully galloped away in a body, and the Edinburgh loyalists were left to their own wretched means of defence. A message was brought to the city that resistance to the prince would be followed by military execution. The magistrates called a meeting, when a formal summons to surrender, containing a similar threat, was read. A deputation was now sent to the rebel camp to offer terms of capitulation. A messenger had meanwhile arrived with the news that General Cope, who had embarked his troops at Aberdeen, was in sight of Dunbar, and would speedily land for the relief of Edinburgh. The deputation returned to say that an unconditional surrender was demanded. A second deputation was sent in the night to entreat for delay. As might have been expected, they obtained no hearing. These baffled negotiators returned to the city before daybreak on the morning of the 17th. The Canongate having been opened to allow the hackney carriages which had brought back the deputation to go out to the suburbs, a party of Highlanders, who had waited in ambush, rushed in. The volunteers had dispersed when they saw the disposition of the authorities to surrender, and had delivered up their arms, which were sent to the castle. There were none to dispute the possession of the city with the alert mountaineers. The other gates were soon opened. "The Parliament Close," says an eye-witness, "was filled with rebels before five in the morning. They were very naked, and several wanted arms, especially firelocks. Their weapons, which were unfit for use, were rubbed up by the armorers, who at this time got constant employment. They set about providing clothes, shoes, and linen, of which they were in great want, the most part having nothing but a short old coat of coarse tartan, a pair of hose much worn, coming scarce up to their knees; their plaids and bonnets in the same condition."† Moving by the south of the city, far out of the reach of the guns of the castle, Charles Edward entered the Palace of Holyrood, and, amid the antique pomp of heralds and pursuivants, King James VIII. was proclaimed at the High Cross of Edinburgh.

While a large number of the populace of Edinburgh huzzaed as Prince Charles rode into Holyrood, and the declarations were read at the High Cross; "while a number of ladies in the windows strained their voices with acclamation, and their arms with waving white handkerchiefs;"* Cope was landing at Dunbar. On the 18th he had completed the debarkation of his troops, artillery, and stores; and he had been joined by the panic-stricken dragoons, who had run away at Colt's Bridge. On the 19th Cope marched toward Edinburgh. "This little army," says Home, "made a great show; the cavalry, the infantry, the cannon, with a long train of baggage-carts, extended for several miles along the road." Home was himself with that army, being, most probably, the volunteer whom he describes as giving information to the English general of the numbers and condition of the Highland forces, as he had observed them before he quitted Edinburgh. He estimated them at about two thousand men. They had no artillery, except "one small iron gun which he had seen, without a carriage, lying upon a cart drawn by a little Highland horse." About fifteen hundred were armed with firelocks and swords; and a hundred or so had each a scythe fastened to the shaft of a pitchfork. The volunteer probably underrated the number of the rebel forces, as Cope and other officers overrated them. In the same way Cope's forces were overrated by those opposed to them. The most trustworthy accounts make the Highlanders amount to less than three thousand men, and the royal troops to somewhat above two thousand.† On the 20th Cope had reached the village of Preston, and he there learned that the prince had marched from Edinburgh to encounter him. The English general resolved to rest here, and wait to be attacked. He had a strong position, thus described by De Johnstone: "We arrived about two o'clock in the afternoon within musket-shot of the enemy, where we halted behind an eminence, having a full view of the camp of General Cope, the position of which was chosen with a good deal of skill. . . . The general had on his right two inclosures, surrounded by stone walls, from six to seven feet high, between which there was a road of about twenty feet broad, leading to the village of Preston-Pans. Before him was another inclosure, surrounded by a deep ditch filled with water, and from ten to twelve feet broad, which served as a ditch to the marshy ground. On his left was a marsh, which terminated in a deep pond; and behind him was the sea." The Highlanders saw the difficulty of getting through the morass, so as to attack their enemy in front. During the evening various movements were made in each army, but Cope clung to the supposed advantage of his position, although doubts had arisen whether it was prudent for his troops thus to be shut up, while the rebels could move freely about, watching for any opportune advantage. The night came on, dark and cold. Pickets of the royal army kept guard along the morass. Fires were lighted. The baggage was sent to the rear. All seemed safe against a surprise. It had been determined by Charles, with the advice of a council of war, to attack at break of day, from a ground below the east of Tranent, and his little army had been moved into this position. The Highlanders were sleeping, wrapped in their plaids. The prince, Lord George Murray, and other chiefs, were lying down in a field of peas. A proprietor named Anderson was brought to Lord George Murray, to tell him that he knew a far more practicable way through the morass than their present position offered. He had often crossed it when hunting, and he would himself lead the way. Another council was held, and Anderson's plan was adopted. In the silence of the dark morning the Highlanders began to move. As the day broke, a frosty mist concealed their advance. The morass was successfully crossed, though some men sank deep in the boggy ground. The column marched northward toward the sea, and then formed in line. Between the two armies was a broad corn-field, the harvest having just been got in. Over the thick stubble rushed the Highlanders. The sun rose; the mist dispersed; the disciplined troops, horse and foot, stood before these wild and ill-armed men, in their firm ranks, their arms glittering in the morning ray, their cannon threatening a

* The title of duke was conferred by James II., after his abdication, upon the Earl of Perth, who had been Lord Chancellor of Scotland. (See vol. iv. p. 629.)

† Andrew Henderson, "History of the Rebellion, 1745."

* Home, vol. iii., p. 73.

† See Note to Chevalier de Johnstone's Memoirs, p. 30.

swift destruction. Some of the rebel officers afterward acknowledged that when they looked upon this array they expected the Highland army to be swept away in a moment.* The Highlanders rushed on. They fired, cast away their muskets, and threw themselves on the astonished line, "with a swiftness not to be conceived," as one of the English colonels described in evidence. According to De Johnstone's account, the Highlanders had been instructed to cut at the noses of the horses, and thus threw the cavalry into confusion. The cannon which Cope had landed was of little use, for he had only one artilleryman; and sailors who were placed to work the guns immediately abandoned them at the rush of the Highlanders. Neither horse nor foot could stand up against these strange and terrible foes. "None of the soldiers," says Home, "attempted to load their pieces again, and not one bayonet was stained with blood." Then commenced a slaughter of which modern warfare has few parallels. The road between the two inclosures was stopped up by the fugitives. "The strength of the enemy's camp," says De Johnstone, "became their destruction. . . . The field of battle presented a spectacle of horror, being covered with heads, legs, and arms, and mutilated bodies; for the killed all fell by the sword." The king's officers, with one exception, seem to have abandoned their men to this terrible slaughter, with very feeble attempts to rally them—with no disposition, certainly, to die with them. The one signal exception to the shame of commanders who were the first to carry the news of their own defeat,† was Colonel Gardiner. Dr. Doddridge has told how this brave and pious man fell, close to the door of his own mansion. He had been wounded in the breast and in the thigh. He had tried, in vain, to rally his panic-stricken troop, who at last made a precipitate flight. Deliberating what his duty next required of him, "he saw a party of the foot, who were then bravely fighting near him, and whom he was ordered to support, had no officer to head them; upon which he said eagerly, in the hearing of the person from whom I had this account, 'These brave fellows will be cut to pieces for want of a commander,' or words to that effect; which, while he was speaking, he rode up to them, and cried out, 'Fire on, my lads, and fear nothing.' But just as the words were out of his mouth, a Highlander advanced toward him with a scythe fastened to a long pole, with which he gave him so dreadful a wound on his right arm that his sword dropped out of his hand; and at the same time several others coming about him while he was thus dreadfully entangled with that cruel weapon, he was dragged off from his horse. The moment he fell, another Highlander gave him a stroke either with a broadsword or a Lochaber axe (for my informant could not exactly distinguish) on the hinder part of his head, which was the mortal blow. All that his faithful attendant saw further at this time was, that as his hat was falling off, he took it in his left hand and waved it as a signal for him to retreat, and added, what were the last words he ever heard him speak, 'Take care of yourself;' upon which the servant retired."

The prince, as related by Home, "remained on the field of battle till midnight, giving orders for the relief of the wounded of both parties." We may add a characteristic passage from a manuscript journal of a Scottish chaplain in the Highland army: "Then I rode straight into the field of battle; and after meeting Invernahyle and his men in the pursuit, I made up to the prince, and wished him joy of the glorious victory! To which he was pleased to reply, with a smile, 'Sir, the Highlanders have done it all.' After the wounded of both sides and the prisoners were taken care of, there was a table spread for his Royal Highness on the field of battle,-at Cope's cannons; and he did me the honor to bid me say grace, to which he rose, and stood very gravely."‡ This triumph was called by the rebels the victory of Gladsmuir—a place about a mile from Preston Pans—there being an old prediction, "On Gladsmuir shall the battle be."

Charles Edward slept on the night of the battle at Pinkie House; and he returned to Edinburgh on the 22d of September, with exulting followers but with a diminished army. The booty of the field of Preston was too great to allow the Highlanders to believe that there was any duty more urgent than to return to their homes in triumph with their spoil, provided they could escape from the control of their leaders. They found serviceable arms and good clothes; money, whose value they comprehended, and watches, whose use they could not readily understand. But the victory which had been gained inspired such confidence in wavering chiefs and hesitating lairds that, during the time of the prince's sojourn in Edinburgh, nearly six weeks, he was enabled, in spite of large desertions, to muster double the number of men that he had been able to oppose to General Cope. Duncan Forbes describes the effect produced by the possession of Edinburgh and the battle of Preston: "All Jacobites, how prudent soever, became mad; all doubtful people became Jacobites; and all bankrupts became heroes, and talked nothing but hereditary rights and victory. What was more grievous to men of gallantry, and if you will believe me much more mischievous to the public, all the fine ladies, except one or two, became passionately fond of the young adventurer, and used all their arts and industry for him in the most intemperate manner."* From the 22d of September to the 31st of October Edinburgh was unwontedly gay in the sunshine of the young prince's successes. There was some terror when the governor of the castle, General Guest, threatened to bombard the city if the blockade which cut off the supplies of the garrison were not removed. Charles was indignant at what he called the barbarity of the governor, although he listened to the prayer of the magistrates that he would not persevere in exposing them to this peril. General Guest was also induced to suspend his resolve till orders had been received from London. There was a sort of armistice, which the Highlanders broke by firing upon men who were carrying provisions up the Castle hill. The governor retaliated, and swept the streets with his artillery loaded with small shot. The prince then yielded to the terror of the citizens, and revoked the order "which made it death to carry provisions to the castle."

The intention of Charles Edward to cross the border was formed immediately after the victory of the 21st of September. He gave authority to a person named Hickson to repair forthwith to England, to notify to his friends the great success he had met with, and "to let them know that it is my full intention, in a few days, to move toward them."† Hickson was apprehended at Newcastle, and attempted to destroy himself.

We shall have to direct our view to the state of affairs in England—to the movements of the administration, the opinions of the parliament, and the temper of the people—under the extraordinary circumstances which had placed the capital of Scotland in the possession of the Jacobites, and which rendered an invasion of the south a very imminent danger. In the illusions of the romance of the Forty-five, or in sympathies with a faded Toryism, writers, otherwise judicious and impartial, have taken little trouble to examine the real difficulties of an attempt, in the middle of the eighteenth century, for the restoration of the Stuarts. In entering upon such an examination, we demur to the conclusion of one excellent historian, who expresses his belief, that if, after the battle of Preston, Charles could have pushed on with two or three thousand men, "he might have reached the capital with but little opposition, and succeeded in at least a temporary restoration."‡ He says "the spirit of the people in no degree responded to the efforts of the government; they remained cold lookers-on, not indeed apparently favoring the rebellion, but as little disposed to strive against it"§ The popular feeling is described as, first, apathy, and then terror. In our view, the public spirit of the people of England, in the crisis of 1745, is not to be estimated by the alarm of timid ministers or the indifference of fashionable triflers. Pelham was not so apprehensive of the strength or zeal of the enemy, as fearful of the inability or languidness of friends. Some politicians went farther. England, Fox thought, would be for the first comer—the English and Dutch battalions from Flanders, or the French and Spaniards. Horace Walpole was alternating between selfish fears and affected nonchalance. On the 6th of September he looks upon

* Note to Home, vol. iii. p. 92.

† A just sarcasm to this effect was addressed by Lord Mark Kerr to Brigadier Waugh and Colonel Lasselles; according to some accounts, addressed to Cope himself.

‡ This MS. Journal, in the possession of the author of the "Popular History," was contributed by him to the "London Magazine" of September, 1828. It appears incidentally in the narrative that the chaplain's name was Mac Lachlan, and that his home was at St. Cowan's.

* "Culloden Papers," p. 250. Letter to Mitchell.

† Ibid., p. 226. ‡ Mahon, vol. iii. p. 368. § Ibid., p. 364.

Scotland as gone. On the 13th he does not despair, yet expects nothing but bad. On the 20th his apprehensions are not nearly so strong as they were. On the 27th, when the news of Preston battle has arrived, he has so trained himself to expect this ruin, that he sees it approach without any emotion. This is the ordinary mode in which the exclusive world looks at great public events that affect a nation. On the 4th of October the smart letter-writer discovers that there is a community who are not about to be conquered by "banditti," as he had termed the Highlanders. "A wonderful spirit is arisen in all counties, and among all sorts of people." The merchants of London, he says, have undertaken to support public credit; noblemen are raising regiments; the Archbishop of York has set an example that would rouse the most indifferent. He then, as was his wont, shuts up his hopes and his fears in matter for a laugh. "As an instance of more spirit and wit than there is in all Scotland," he quotes an address "To all jolly Butchers—My bold hearts, the Papists eat no meat on Wednesdays, Fridays, Saturdays, nor during Lent." *

NOTE ON THE HIGHLAND COSTUME.

Charles Edward, on his march into England, adopted the Highland costume as one of the means of acquiring the affection of the mountaineers. In this costume we do not recognize the picturesque garb which is usually associated with the person of the Highlander—the garb which Scottish gentlemen delight to wear on their high festivals, and which the household-god of the snuff-shop once made familiar to the eyes of the Londoners. Prince Charles Edward is painted as wearing the *truis*, the breeches and stockings in one piece, or hose pantaloon; and not as wearing the *kilt* or *philibeg*, with the knee and part of the leg uncovered. Without entering into any examination of the disputed question of the high antiquity of the reputed Highland costume, it may be satisfactory to show what the ordinary costume really was, as described by a traveller in Scotland at a period between the rebellions of 1715 and 1745: †

"The Highland dress consists of a bonnet made of thrum without a brim, a short coat, a waistcoat longer by five or six inches, short stockings, and *brogues* or pumps without heels. By the way, they cut holes in their *brogues*, though new made, to let out the water when they have far to go and rivers to pass; and this they do to preserve their feet from galling.

"Few besides gentlemen wear the *trowze* [truis], that is, the breeches and stockings all of one piece and drawn on together; over this habit they wear a plaid, which is usually three yards long and two breadths wide, and the whole garb is made of checkered tartan or plaiding; this, with the sword and pistol, is called a full dress, and to a well-proportioned man with any tolerable air it makes an agreeable figure; but this you have seen in London, and it is chiefly their mode of dressing when they are in the Lowlands or when they make a neighboring visit, or go anywhere on horseback; but when those among them who travel on foot, and have not attendants to carry them over the waters, they vary it with the *quelt* [kilt], which is a manner I am about to describe.

"The common habit of the ordinary Highlanders is far from being acceptable to the eye; with them a small part of the plaid, which is not so large as the former, is set in folds and girt round the waist to make of it a short petticoat that reaches half way down the thigh, and the rest is brought over the shoulders, and then fastened before, below the neck, often with a fork, and sometimes with a bodkin or sharpened piece of stick, so that they make pretty near the appearance of the poor women in London when they bring their gowns over their heads to shelter them from the rain. In this way of wearing the plaid they have sometimes nothing else to cover them, and are often barefoot; but some I have seen shod with a kind of pumps made out of a raw cow-hide with the hair turned outward, which being ill-made, the wearer's feet looked something like those of a rough-footed hen or pigeon: these are called *quarrants*, and are not only offensive to the sight but intolerable to the smell of those who are near them. The stocking rises no higher than the thick of the calf, and from the middle of the thigh to the middle of the leg is a naked space, which being exposed to all weathers becomes tanned and freckled. This dress is called the *quelt*."

The kilt, as a part of the dress separate from the plaid, "set in folds and girt round the waist, to make of it a short petticoat that reaches half way down the thigh," is held to have been an innovation occurring between the rebellions of 1715 and 1745. It is ascribed to the genius of an army tailor attached to the troops of General Wade, who saw the inconvenience of the old cumbrous arrangement. Thus the Highland costume, "in its more complete shape, has every appearance of being essentially modern." ‡ The difference of colors in the tartan, as distinguishing various clans, is also held to be of comparatively modern origin.

"Various reasons," says the author of the Letters, "are given both for and against the Highland dress. It is urged against it, that it distinguishes the natives as a body of people distinct and separate from the rest of the subjects of Great Britain, and thereby is one cause of their narrow adherence among themselves to the exclusion of all the rest of the kingdom; but the part of the habit chiefly objected to is the plaid (or mantle), which, they say, is calculated for the encouragement of an idle life in lying about upon the heath in the daytime, instead of following some lawful employment; that it serves to cover them in the night when they lie in wait among the mountains to commit their robberies and depredations, and is composed of such colors as altogether in the mass so nearly resemble the heath on which they lie that it is hardly to be distinguished from it till one is so near them as to be within their power, if they have any evil intention.

"On the other hand it is alleged: the dress is most convenient to those who, with no ill design, are obliged to travel from one part to another upon their lawful occasions, viz., That they would not be so free to skip over the rocks and bogs with breeches, as they are in the short petticoat. That it would be greatly incommodious, to those who are frequently to wade through waters, to wear breeches, which must be taken off upon every such occurrence, or would not only gall the wearer, but render it very unhealthful and dangerous to their limbs to be constantly wet in that part of the body, especially in winter-time, when they might be frozen. And with respect to the plaid in particular, the distances between one place of shelter and another are often too great to be reached before night comes on, and being intercepted by sudden floods, or hindered by other impediments, they are frequently obliged to lie all night in the hills, in which case they must perish were it not for the covering they carry with them."

The preceding is an intelligible description, which may enable us to form a truer conception of the Highland army than we may derive from romances or melodramas. In the act of parliament of 1747, by which "the clothes commonly called Highland clothes," are forbidden to be worn except by officers and soldiers, these clothes are described as "the plaid, philibeg or little kilt, trouze, shoulder-belts;" and it is enacted "that no tartan or parti-colored plaid should be used for great coats or upper coats." In the "Humphrey Clinker" of Smollett, which embodies his remarks on his native country in 1766, we may trace the operation of this statute, which had for its object the amalgamation of Highlanders and Lowlanders: "It must be observed that the poor Highlanders are now seen to disadvantage. They have been not only disarmed by act of parliament, but also deprived of their ancient garb, which was both graceful and convenient; and, what is a greater hardship still, they are compelled to wear breeches—a restraint which they cannot bear with any degree of patience; indeed, the majority wear them, not in their proper place, but on poles or long staves over their shoulders; they are even debarred the use of their striped stuff, called tartan, which was their own manufacture, prized by them above all the velvet, brocades, and tissues of Europe and Asia. They now lounge along in loose great coats of coarse russet, equally mean and cumbersome, and betray manifest marks of dejection. Certain it is, the government could not have taken a more effectual method to break their national spirit." These "breeches" were certainly not the "trouze" of the Highland gentlemen. "The 'breeks' attempted to be forced upon the nether limbs of the brawny Highlanders were the Lowland and English knee-breeches of George the Second's reign, with all the buttons and buckles thereunto belonging." * The author of the interesting letters which we have quoted gives an example to show that the whole people were "fond and tenacious of their Highland clothing" before the eventful period which was to produce such changes in this matter, as well as in greater affairs: "Being, in a wet season, upon one of my peregrinations, accompanied by a Highland gentleman, who was one of the clan through which I was passing, I observed the women to be in great anger with him about something that I did not understand. At length I asked him wherein he had offended them? Upon this question he laughed, and told me his great coat was the cause of their wrath, and that their reproach was, that he could not be contented with the garb of his ancestors, but was degenerated into a Lowlander, and condescended to follow their unmanly fashions." †

---

* Letters to Mann.

† "Letters from a Gentleman in the North of Scotland to his friend in London," 1754, vol. ii. p. 183. These letters, written from 1726 to 1732, by an engineer of the name of —— Burt, are commonly quoted as "Burt's Letters."

‡ Burton, vol. ii. p. 382.

CHAPTER CLVI.

Meeting of the British parliament—New regiments to be raised by peers—Divided counsels in the cabinet and in parliament—The insurgent army crosses the border—Siege of Carlisle—State of public intelligence—The continued march into England—Manchester recruits—Roman Catholic families in Manchester—The rebel army reaches Derby—The Duke of Cumberland's army close at hand—The retreat of the rebels resolved upon—Public feeling in London—The populace—The commercial and moneyed classes—Suspicions

---

* Planché, "British Costume," p. 435.

† Burt's "Letters," vol. ii. p. 191.

attached to Scotsmen in London—Andrew Drummond, the banker—Proceedings against popish priests.

The king returned from Hanover on the 31st of August. The parliament was summoned to meet on the 17th of October. On the 9th of October, "Charles, Prince of Wales, Regent of Scotland, England, France, and Ireland," issued his proclamation from his palace of Holyrood House, warning all his subjects, peers or commoners, to pay no obedience to this summons of the Elector of Hanover, and threatening that if any peers or commoners of Scotland should presume to sit or vote in such parliament they should be proceeded against as rebels and traitors. Nevertheless, in spite of this doughty manifesto, the parliament did meet at Westminster on the 17th of October, although some few Scottish peers did keep away. The king expressed his surprise that any of his Protestant subjects should have been concerned in this rebellion; for throughout the whole course of his reign he had made the laws of the land the rule of his government; and the preservation of the constitution in Church and State, and the rights of his people, the main end and aim of all his actions. Whatever had been the defects of the government of the two Georges, the laws of the land had not been violated; the constitution under which they reigned had been upheld. The freedom of speech which was heard in both houses, at this crisis of danger, is the best proof that no arbitrary power had deadened the old spirit which ejected the Stuarts; that the corruption, by which Sir Robert Walpole had believed that the intrigues of the Jacobites could only be effectually resisted, had not created a parliament of slaves and sycophants. In the Lords the Earl of Westmoreland proclaimed that "the people suspect that both houses are under a corrupt dependency upon the crown." * In the Commons Major Selwyn denounced the system of continually interposing in continental affairs: "We have been doing little else for above twenty years, than pulling down with one hand, and setting up again with the other; so that a drum was never to beat in Germany but we, knight-errant like, thought we must have recourse to arms." † The opposition in the Commons, even at this time of public alarm, supported an amendment to the address as boldly conceived as in the previous days of domestic security: "In order to the firmer establishment of his majesty's throne on the solid and truly glorious basis of his people's affections, it shall be our zealous and speedy care to frame such bills as, if passed into laws, may prove most effectual for securing to his majesty's faithful subjects the perpetual enjoyment of their undoubted right to be freely and fairly represented in parliament, frequently chosen, and exempted from undue influence of any kind." ‡ Lyttelton and Pitt, who had bearded Walpole in the height of his power, and had exercised all their oratory to drive Carteret from office, now spoke against the amendment. Pitt was indeed looking for place, from which the personal dislike of the king alone excluded him; but it was something far nobler than courtly subserviency which prompted him at this juncture to postpone every other consideration to the great question of the defence of his country; for he knew that the stability of the throne was undoubtedly the firmest foundation for the liberties of the people. In his speech on this occasion Pitt said that he had always been a friend to everything that could reasonably be offered to secure the independence of parliament; that, because he was a real friend to every regulation that might appear likely to be effectual for preventing the fatal effects of corruption, he would never propose or advise the introduction of any such regulation into the house but at a proper season. Was this a proper season? "While the nation is engaged in a most dangerous and expensive foreign war, a rebellion breaks out at home. Those rebels have already gained a victory over the king's troops, which has made them almost wholly masters of one part of the United Kingdom. We are under daily apprehensions both of an irruption and a foreign invasion being made upon the other; and that invasion would certainly be attended with an insurrection. In such circumstances, shall we amuse ourselves with contriving methods to prevent the effects of corruption? Shall we spend our time in projects for guarding our liberties against corruption, when they are in such immediate danger of being trampled under foot by force of arms? Would not this be like a man's sitting down to think of ways and means for preventing his being cheated by his servants, at the very time that thieves were breaking into his house?" * This was the language of a statesman. The amendment was negatived. On the 28th of October a motion was made for a committee "to inquire into the causes of the progress of the rebellion in Scotland." The supineness of the ministry was defended on the ground "that they could not have supposed that a few Scotch Highlanders would be so mad as to take it into their heads that without any foreign assistance they could conquer the whole island of Great Britain." † The motion was negatived.

When Charles Edward was marching southward, party jealousies and court intrigues took a shape essentially characteristic of a period when most public men thought their own petty interests and rivalries of far more importance than the welfare of the nation. Fifteen peers had offered to raise regiments. The offer was accepted by the government. Had the Lords "paid them too, the service had been noble," writes Horace Walpole. The king was to pay them; and their colonels, it was alleged, named none but their own relations and dependants for the officers. Walpole insinuates that some of these peers took the pay but did not raise the men; and he distinctly says that not six regiments were raised, and not four employed. The Duke of Bedford, he admits, actually raised and served with his regiment. "The fourteen promised regiments," says Lord Mahon, "all vanished to air or dwindled to jobs." There is no authority for this sweeping statement, even in the sarcasms of Horace Walpole. But there is little doubt that the public spirit of the aristocracy was not very great or very universal. Andrew Mitchell describes, in a letter to Duncan Forbes, this affair of the new regiments with a bitter irony: "It is certain that no job was intended by those who made the first proposal, but your lordship knows this country too well to believe that in the time of public danger any man would attend to his own private advantage." ‡ On the 4th of November a motion was made in the Commons for an address to beseech his majesty "that the officers in the new regiments, now raising, or already raised, may not be allowed any rank from their commissions after these regiments are broke." This address was rejected only by a small majority. The king was against the officers taking rank, but he did not wish to refuse it. Courtiers, patriots, and Jacobites supported the address, which if carried would have put an end to the scheme for raising those regiments. Pitt took a part which may lead us not wholly to believe the calumnies of Walpole; a part best calculated to make any selfish grandee ashamed of his baseness, if any portion of these calumnies were true. The noble peers, he said, who had undertaken to raise these regiments, "have stood like men of fortitude and integrity in the gap at which war and confusion were breaking in upon us, and have by their influence and example raised the same spirit in others, who, had they not been thus animated to resistance and resolution, would inevitably have sunk under their fears, and suffered all the calamities of an invasion, without daring to attempt the means of opposing or preventing them." § The officers, he said, who are to be employed under them are men whose fortunes and whose merit raise them to distinction in their own counties—men who voluntarily serve their country from their zeal for its security. The suspicions of the integrity of the highest in rank, and the differences of opinion in statesmen professing the same principles which these discussions exhibited, were not favorable to the belief that the prayer would be realized which the Archbishop of York so fervently put up at the commencement of the rebellion: "May the great God of battles stretch out his all-powerful hand to defend us; inspire an union of hearts and hands among all ranks of people; a clear wisdom into the councils of his majesty; and a steady courage and resolution into the hearts of his generals." The want of concert among the Whigs in parliament, and the absence of cordiality among the advisers of the king, are described in the letter of Andrew Mitchell just quoted: "Affairs in the House of Commons are not now carried on in the manner they were when your lordship sat in parliament. Their proceedings are now like the operations of an army composed of several nations, where all the leaders must be satisfied, and where there is properly no commander-in-chief. Though the

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xiii. col. 1324.
† Ibid., col. 1335. ‡ Ibid., col. 1342.

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xiii. col. 1349.
† Winnington, ibid., col. 1372.
‡ "Culloden Papers," p. 245. Letter of 19th November.
§ "Parliamentary History," vol. xiii. col. 1388.

influence of some be great, yet in many points they must yield to their new allies. In the cabinet, I fear, there is as little harmony as elsewhere; the consequence of which must be an unsteadiness of councils, and want of all scheme or plan of action."

The parliamentary reports in the "Gentleman's Magazine" and the "London Magazine," from which waverers in England might have learned in October something of the divided opinions of parliament, could scarcely have reached the west of Scotland before Prince Charles entered Cumberland on the 8th of November. His march into England had been regarded with little favor by the Highland chiefs. Some, according to the Chevalier de Johnstone, told him that it was ridiculous to invade England with such a handful of men. Others said they had taken arms to seat him on the throne of Scotland, but wished to have nothing to do with England.* The adventurer had wild notions of a great insurrectionary movement in his favor, after he had crossed the border. The experience of Lord Kilmarnock might have taught the prince that communities flourishing by their industry were not likely to forsake the protection of an established government, to enter into a dispute of hereditary right against a constitutional succession of half a century's duration. The father of Kilmarnock raised a regiment for the pretender in 1715, when claims to feudal service were respected in the Scottish Lowlands. In 1745 the mistaken and unfortunate lord called upon his tenants and the carpet-weaving population of the town of Kilmarnock to follow him to fight for the Stuart; and he was roughly told by all, to a man, of those he called his people, that neither threats nor entreaties should take them from their homes. The young prince was as ignorant of the real condition of the English people—of the rapid progress that had been made in the industrial arts, and in the improved resources of all ranks, since his grandfather left Whitehall in 1688—as he was unconscious of the resolution of the people not to put to risk every good which they enjoyed, for the sake of a dynasty hated by four fifths of the general population, without any zealous support except from the professors of antiquated creeds in religion and politics. The Georges had never been popular. They were disliked as foreigners. There was no comparison to be made between the attractions of the tall young prince, who was playing the part of a hero of romance, and of the little old gentleman, who, although he had flourished his sword at Dettingen, received no greetings of white handkerchiefs from fair ladies in London windows. But George II. had not been a harsh or an unjust king. Archbishop Herring spoke to the hearts of his hearers at York when he said, "not an instance can be pointed out during his whole reign, wherein he made the least attempt upon the liberty, or property, or religion of a single person." The contrast with the last king of the Stuart line was not forgotten, even in Scotland.

"In the year 1745," writes Gibbon, "the throne and the constitution were attacked by a rebellion, which does not reflect much honor on the national spirit; since the English friends of the pretender wanted courage to join his standard; and his enemies—the bulk of the people—allowed him to advance into the heart of the kingdom." The father of the great historian was one of those who had not the courage to take a decided part in a cause to which his inclination tended: "Without daring, perhaps without desiring, to aid the rebels, my father invariably adhered to the Tory opposition. In the most critical season he accepted, for the service of the party, the office of alderman in the city of London."† This covert Jacobitism, "willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike," furnishes an explanation for a portion of the seeming indifference to the result which marked the public demeanor of some men of rank and wealth on the approach toward London of the Highland army. Why the enemies of the leader of this army allowed him to advance into the heart of the kingdom, is capable of very easy solution, if we trace his progress step by step. We doubt if this non-resistance can be fairly ascribed to any want of national spirit in "the bulk of the people."

The Highland army, upon leaving Dalkeith, divided into two columns. One, under the command of Lord George Murray, took the western route into England by Peebles and Moffat; the other, with the prince at its head, marched as if about to proceed by the eastern road to Berwick. The Chevalier de Johnstone attributed to this stratagem the determination of Wade to remain with his large force to protect Newcastle. The prince, suddenly turning westward from Kelso, joined the other division near Reddings. On the 10th the entire army invested Carlisle. The inhabitants of Newcastle were relieved from the fears which they are held to have entertained after the battle of Preston Pans. John Wesley was in the town on the 23d of September. No English or Dutch troops were yet there for the protection of the inhabitants; but, writes Wesley, "the walls are mounted with cannon, and all things prepared for sustaining an assault." This preparation for defence scarcely bears out the belief that at Newcastle the arms of Charles Edward "had struck the deepest dismay."* Wesley says, "Our poor neighbors on either hand are busy removing their goods; and most of the best houses in our street are left without either furniture or inhabitants." When a bombardment is expected, the inhabitants of the threatened town may remove their goods from an exposed to a secure place, without feeling "the deepest dismay." General Wade did not march from Newcastle till five days after the investment of Carlisle. The surrender of that city, before Wade arrived in the neighborhood for its relief, can scarcely be accounted for, except through the disaffection of a few, operating upon the gross ignorance and folly of its magisterial defenders. In the castle the garrison consisted of only one company of invalids, commanded by Colonel Durand. The besieged were not wanting in artillery. The city was surrounded with old walls, within which was the militia of Cumberland and Westmoreland. The siege was conducted by the Duke of Perth with a small force; for the prince, with the greater part of the army, had marched to Brampton, in the expectation of giving battle to Wade. There was a valiant mayor of Carlisle, who wrote to the secretary of state that he had fired on the rebels and made them retire; adding, in his heroic epistle, "And so I think the town of Carlisle has done his majesty more service than the great city of Edinburgh, or than all Scotland together."† The king spoke of this Mr. Patteson, at his levee, with great encomiums. The boasts of the mayor soon came to an end. The besieging army had twelve field-pieces, six of which had been taken at Preston. The city, says De Johnstone, "surrendered the third day after the opening of the trenches, rather from our threatening to fire red-hot balls upon the town and reduce it to ashes, than from the force of our artillery; as we did not discharge a single shot, lest the garrison should become acquainted with the smallness of their calibre, which might have encouraged them to defend themselves."‡ The town authorities compelled the feeble garrison to join in the capitulation; and they had previously ordered them to desist from firing upon the besiegers. In a letter from a gentleman in Kendal, dated the 18th of November, the citizens of Carlisle are represented in no favorable light: "Most of our militia are got home from Carlisle, who generally complained of very ill-usage in that place; and though perhaps some of them may exaggerate matters through resentment, yet, by all accounts, the conduct of that city fell much short of what was expected from a place of so much strength and reputed loyalty."§ The people of Whitehaven, according to the loyal volunteer, James Ray, had raised ten companies of fifty men each for the defence of the place, and had formed breastworks before the town, in which cannon was planted. But when they heard of the surrender of Carlisle the guns were dismounted and put on board ships, that they might not fall into the enemy's hands.

It is at this period, when the newspapers announced the advance of the rebels into England, and their successful attack upon Carlisle, which from early times had been regarded as one of the most formidable barriers against Scottish assault, that we find in the letters of the poet of the Leasowes a slight indication of the popular interest which these stirring events excited in the midland counties. Shenstone, on the 22d of November, thus writes to his friend Mr. Graves: "The rebellion, you may guess, is the subject of all conversation. Every individual nailer here takes in a newspaper (a more pregnant one by far than any of the London ones), and talks as familiarly of kings and princes as ever Master Shallow did of John of Gaunt.

---

* "Memoirs," p. 53.

† "Memoirs of Edward Gibbon." The alderman resigned about two months before the landing of Charles Edward.

* Lord Mahon.

† Walpole to Mann, November 22.

‡ "Memoirs," p. 58.

§ Given in "History of the Rebellion," by James Ray of Whitehaven, volunteer, etc.

Indeed it is no bad thing that they do so; for I cannot conceive that the people want so much to be convinced by sermons of the absurdity of popery, a they do by newspapers that it may possibly prevail. The reasons and arguments, too, in favor of the present government are so strong and obvious, that even I, and every country squire, and every country clerk, and Sam Shaw the tailor, seem to be as much masters of them as the bishops themselves. I must not say we could express them so politely." * Secker and Sherlock and Warburton were preaching like sensible divines against the mischiefs which a change of dynasty would produce; and the newspapers, London and provincial, gave little encouragement to the enterprise of a family that had not been distinguished for a regard to the freedom of the press. A few years later than this, Dr. Johnson, who saw without much favor the fact that "almost every large town has its weekly historian," makes this admission of the utility of newspapers, even in this early period of the development of their mighty influence: "All foreigners remark that the knowledge of the common people in England is greater than that of any other vulgar. This superiority we undoubtedly owe to the rivulets of intelligence which are continually trickling among us, which every one may catch, and of which every one partakes." †

The possession of Carlisle appears to have somewhat influenced the decision of Charles' council to march onward toward London. Some, according to Lord George Murray, proposed returning to Scotland. The cause of the Stuarts was not flourishing there. Although Lord Strathallan, who had been left in command at Perth, had received a considerable accession of force, from clans who had taken arms under the son of Lord Lovat and other chiefs, the large commercial towns had given the most decided manifestations in favor of the established government. Glasgow, Paisley, and Dumfries had raised their militia for the reigning house. Edinburgh had renewed its allegiance. Even at Dundee and Perth "the populace had insisted on celebrating King George's birthday, and a few shots or blows had been exchanged between them and their Jacobite garrisons." ‡ "The populace" may here have a wider significance than "the mob." Lord George Murray (the project for marching back to Scotland not being approved) says that some were for quartering in the country about Carlisle. "Others were for marching forward the west road, and that now we had Carlisle, at worst we had a safe retreat. His Royal Highness declared for this." His own opinion being asked, Lord George said he could not venture to advise "to march far into England without more encouragement from the country than we had hitherto got;" but he added that, if the prince was resolved to make a trial, the army, though small, would follow him. "Upon this he immediately said he would venture." § Murray at that time had resigned his commission, and was determined to serve only as a volunteer. There had been differences between him and the Duke of Perth, who was in especial favor with Charles. But the experience and knowledge of the plain-speaking general could not be safely dispensed with. He soon, he says, "as all the other officers were very pressing with me," laid aside the thought of serving only as a volunteer.

On the 20th of November the van of the Highland army marched from Carlisle; and the main body, in a second division commanded by the prince, followed shortly after. The whole force did not reach five thousand men, according to some accounts; it amounted nearly to seven thousand, upon other estimates. At Penrith the main body halted on the 22d for a day, the van having marched to Kendal. Home says that the second division, "coming to Penrith, occupied the quarters which the van had left." ‖ The chaplain, from whose MS. we have already quoted, says, under the date of the 22d, "The van marched to Kendal, and the main body halted at Penrith." These accounts, corroborated by De Johnstone, refute the statement that "the whole army reunited at Penrith, and halted there one day, in the expectation that Wade was advancing to attack them; but on learning the retreat of that doughty veteran from Hexham they pursued their progress." ¶ On the 27th the two divisions were united at Preston. "Last night they were to be at Preston," writes Walpole on the 29th. He adds, "The country is so far from rising for them that the towns are left desolate on their approach, and the people hide and bury their effects, even to their pewter." We must not cease to bear in mind that the towns, then left desolate, were essentially different from the towns of half a century later—mere hamlets compared with the vast abodes of manufacturing industry into whose localities Charles Edward was now entering. "Manchester," says Volunteer Ray, "was taken by a sergeant, a drum, and a woman, about two o'clock in the afternoon [of the 28th], who rode up to the Bull's Head on horses with hempen halters, where they dined. After dinner they beat up for recruits, and in less than an hour listed about thirty." * This seemingly apocryphal story is confirmed by letters given by Lord Mahon, but more circumstantially by a very interesting narrative of the Chevalier De Johnstone. One of his sergeants, he says, a young Scotsman named Dickson, who had been enlisted from the prisoners of war at Gladsmuir, asked his permission to go forward to Manchester to make sure of some recruits before the arrival of the army. The general laughed at the notion of the adventurous youth, "as bold and intrepid as a lion." But Dickson was not to be balked in this way. He went off with a horse, and with his commander's portmanteau and blunderbuss; and on the evening of the 29th atoned for his insubordination by presenting himself at Manchester with a hundred and eighty recruits. De Johnstone gives with considerable narrative power the history of the surrender of Manchester to Dickson and his blunderbuss: "He had quitted Preston, in the evening, with his mistress and my drummer; and having marched all night, he arrived next morning at Manchester, which is about twenty miles distant from Preston, and immediately began to beat up for recruits for 'the yellow-haired laddie.' The populace, at first, did not interrupt him, conceiving our army to be near the town; but as soon as they knew that it would not arrive till the evening, they surrounded him in a tumultuous manner, with the intention of taking him prisoner, alive or dead. Dickson presented his blunderbuss, which was charged with slugs, threatening to blow out the brains of those who first dared to lay hands on himself or the two who accompanied him; and by turning round continually, facing in all directions, and behaving like a lion, he soon enlarged the circle which a crowd of people had formed round them. Having continued for some time to manœuvre in this way, those of the inhabitants of Manchester who were attached to the house of Stuart took arms, and flew to the assistance of Dickson, to rescue him from the fury of the mob; so that he soon had five or six hundred men to aid him, who dispersed the crowd in a very short time. Dickson now triumphed in his turn; and putting himself at the head of his followers, he proudly paraded, undisturbed, the whole day, with his drummer, enlisting for my company all who offered themselves. On presenting me with a list of one hundred and eighty recruits, I was agreeably surprised to find that the whole amount of his expenses did not exceed three guineas. This adventure of Dickson gave rise to many a joke at the expense of the town of Manchester, from the singular circumstance of its having been taken by a sergeant, a drummer, and a girl. The circumstance may serve to show the enthusiastic courage of our army, and the alarm and terror with which the English were seized." † The "alarm and terror" were perhaps as much produced by "those of the inhabitants of Manchester who, attached to the house of Stuart, took arms," as by the enthusiastic courage of the sergeant, the drummer, and the girl, as the representatives of "our army." The Manchester recruits were formed into a regiment. It "never exceeded three hundred men," says De Johnstone, "of whom the recruits furnished by my sergeant formed more than the half. These were all the English who ever declared themselves openly in favor of the prince; and the chiefs of the clans were not far wrong, therefore, in distrusting the pretended succors on which the prince so implicitly relied." The bell-ringing, the illuminations, the bonfires, which are described as "signs of popular favor upon the entry of the prince," lose a little of their value, when we learn, from one source, that "the bellman has been ordering us to illuminate our houses to-night, which must be done;" ‡ and from Volunteer Ray, that the bellman, who, in the morning, "had been sent about the town requiring all such as had any public

* Shenstone's Works, vol. iii. p. 103. † "Idler," No. 7.
‡ Lord Mahon, vol. iii. p. 395. § "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 48.
‖ "History of the Rebellion," Works, vol. iii. p. 122.
¶ Lord Mahon, vol. iii. p. 397.

* Ray, p. 132. † "Memoirs of the Rebellion," p. 64.
‡ Letter given by Lord Mahon.

money in their hands to bring it in," was, in the evening, "again sent about to order the town to be illuminated." The probability is that the inhabitants generally of Manchester, thriving as they were upon their manufactures of fustians, dimities, laces, and the various small articles of dress known as Manchester ware, and having extensive dealings with distant places, would not very gladly have seen property destroyed and credit suspended by the near prospect of insurrection and civil war. But the ancient and wealthy Roman Catholic families who dwelt among them were in general harmless; and if the bellman ordered illuminations, it was not for the industrious and loyal majority to break the papist windows. The Protestants of this busy town were not likely to be more disaffected than their neighbors. "In every place we passed through," says De Johnstone, "we found the English very ill-disposed toward us, except at Manchester, where there appeared some remains of attachment to the house of Stuart."* The Jacobite sympathy, "the old spirit of loyalty," that displayed itself in kissing the hands of the tall young prince—and which in one instance went so far as to make an ancient lady somewhat irreverently employ the sacred words of the *Nunc dimittis*—is a pretty object to contemplate through the haze of a century. But we cannot join in the historian's sneer at the reasoning loyalty which has taken the place of the old prostration before every wearer of a crown: "How greatly have we now improved upon those unphilosophical times! How far more judicious to value kings and governments, like all other articles, only according to their cheapness and convenience!" †

Having been in Manchester two days, the rebel army marched on the 1st of December to Macclesfield, fording the Mersey near Stockport. It was determined to proceed to Derby; but Lord George Murray, with the van, moved from Macclesfield to Congleton, "which was the straight road to Lichfield; so that the enemy would have reason to think we intended to come upon them, which would make them gather together in a body, and readily advance upon that road, so that we could get before them to Derby." ‡ The manœuvre succeeded. The Duke of Cumberland, who was at Newcastle-under-Lyne with his army, thought the object of the rebels was to get to Wales, where Jacobitism had its adherents. He therefore marched to Stone; and left the road to London open. Murray suddenly altered his course, and passing through Leek and Ashbourn, reached Derby at noon on the 5th. The prince, with the main body, arrived there the same evening. The Duke of Cumberland's spies had been taken prisoners, especially "the famous Captain Weir, well known to all about court," who fell in the way of Lord George Murray. "He was sent to the prince to be examined," writes the Highland officer in his account; § and whether it was clemency or prudence in the prince, Weir was saved from hanging to reveal all he knew of the movements of the English forces. In Derby the rebels obtained only three recruits; and, as was their usual course, they possessed themselves of the money collected for the taxes, which here amounted to 2500*l.* Without these resources, it is difficult to understand how this army contrived to subsist by paying for the necessaries which it wanted. The plunder was really inconsiderable. But the wants of the hardy Highlanders were easily supplied. They could march for a whole day upon a little oatmeal, which they carried in bags, mixed with the water of the streams through which they waded. It is highly honorable to these poor men, who in their own country were not averse to depredations upon a large scale which looked like warfare, that in their march through a rich land they plundered very little, and committed no wanton mischief. William Hutton justly appreciated this behavior: "They frequently," he said, "paid their quarters—more frequently it was not expected." He has an excuse for their petty depredations: "If they took people's shoes, it was because they had none of their own; and no voice speaks so loud as that of necessity." The general expectation in Derby was that the rebels had determined to march on. The same belief prevailed in the surrounding districts. Gray has an amusing anecdote of the temper in which this possible advance was regarded: "I heard three people, sensible middle-aged men, when the Scotch were said to be at Stamford, and actually were at Derby, talking of hiring a chaise to go to Caxton, a place in the high road, to see the pretender and the Highlanders as they passed." * This has been called "indifference," an "unconcern to the interests of the reigning family." It was simply curiosity mixed with a good deal of contempt. The unconcern at the advance into the kingdom of a small army of strangely clad and irregularly armed mountaineers, was produced by the certainty that there were in arms a very powerful force of disciplined soldiers moving to attack them, or to intercept their march to the metropolis; concentrating to put down an insane enterprise by some signal vengeance. Lord George Murray has clearly described the dangers which surrounded the adventurous prince and his men when they had reached Derby: "We did not doubt but that the Duke of Cumberland would be that night at Stafford, which was as near to London as Derby. Mr. Wade was coming up, by hard marches, the east road; and we knew that an army, at least equal to any of these, would be formed near London, consisting of guards and horse, with troops which they would bring from the coast where they were quartered; so that there would be three armies made up of regular troops, that would surround us, being above thirty thousand men, whereas we were not above five thousand fighting men, if so many." †

It is scarcely necessary to believe that, in the face of this danger, there were any especial reasons, which time has not yet developed, to determine Charles' council of war to advise a retreat. Lord George Murray has detailed the solid arguments which were opposed to the obstinate rashness of Charles. The prince did not doubt that the justness of his cause would prevail; he had hopes of a defection in the enemy's army; he was bent upon putting all to the risk. It was vain to tell him that, if a misfortune should happen, "it could not be supposed that one man could escape; for the militia, who had not appeared much against us hitherto, would, upon our defeat, possess all the roads, and the enemy's horse would surround us on all hands." ‡ The Highlanders in the streets of Derby were animated to the highest pitch of enthusiasm, breathing nothing but a desire for the combat with the Duke of Cumberland. "They were to be seen, during the whole day, in crowds before the shops of the cutlers, quarrelling about who should be the first to sharpen and give a proper edge to their swords." § In spite of this ardor, the chiefs, one and all, combated the desire of the prince to give battle on the 6th. They knew, says De Johnstone, that, "in case of a defeat in England, no one in our army could by any possibility escape destruction, as the English peasants were hostile to us in the highest degree." They told the prince that there could be no doubt but that they should easily beat the army of the Duke of Cumberland, though much superior in point of numbers; but then another battle must be fought on Finchley Common before they could enter London; and they very quietly asked, if by a miracle they could arrive at the capital, what sort of figure four thousand men would make amid a population of a million. ‖ This was an exaggerated estimate of the London population—a common error of that period. But the argument was equally strong if applied to a population of half a million. Before we proceed to describe the retreat, which was the result of these sensible opinions, let us, out of very imperfect materials, endeavor to obtain a glimpse of what the people of London were doing and thinking at this period, when war appeared to be closely approaching their peaceful homes.

The chief authority upon which a sober historian rests his belief that, when Charles Edward was known to have reached Derby, the English metropolis presented a frightful scene of terror and want of confidence, is the statement of the Chevalier de Johnstone: "Our arrival at Derby was known at London on the 5th of December; and the following day, called by the English Black Monday, the intelligence was known throughout the whole city, which was filled with terror and consternation." ¶ The 6th of December was a Friday, and not a Monday. With no personal knowledge of the circumstances, De Johnstone goes on to tell us that a run was made upon the bank; that it only escaped bankruptcy by paying in sixpences, and by sending its own agents to be foremost in the crowd, and to present the notes at one door, and take back the sixpences by another door. There was a Jacobite party in London, with one of the city members, Alderman Heathcote, at its head; and a run upon the bank

* "Memoirs," p. 81. † Lord Mahon, vol. iii. p. 405.
‡ "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 53. § "Lockhart Papers," p. 458.

* Letter to Walpole, February 3d, 1746. Works, vol. ii. p. 181, Pickering's edit. † "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 54. ‡ Ibid., p. 54.
§ De Johnstone, p. 67. ‖ Ibid., p. 71. ¶ "Memoirs," p. 75.

was one of the means adopted to produce confusion. But the six-penny story rests upon no other evidence than that of De Johnstone; and no fact is more indisputable than that a very large number of those who are called by Smollett "the trading part of the city, and those concerned in money corporations," gave public notice that they would not refuse to receive the notes of the Bank of England in payment of any sum of money.* Smollett indeed says that the moneyed and commercial persons "prognosticated their own ruin in the approaching revolution, and their countenances exhibited the plainest marks of horror and despair." But Smollett, entertaining himself Jacobite partialities, tells us something more: "The militia of London and Middlesex were kept in readiness to march; double watches were posted at the city gates, and signals of alarm appointed. The volunteers of the city were incorporated into a regiment; the practitioners of the law headed by the judges; the weavers of Spitalfields, and other communities, engaged in associations; and even the managers of the theatres offered to raise a body of their dependants for the service of the government." We do not find these circumstances noticed by the historian, who asks, "Had, then, the Highlanders continued to push forward, must not the increasing terror have palsied all power of resistance?" † The inhabitants of London, according to De Johnstone, fled to the country, with their most precious effects. ‡ A great number certainly left the busy streets, and were crowding up Highgate Hill. But it was to gaze upon the camp at Finchley, in which London artisans were associated with troops of the line, who could inspire courage, if such inspiration were needed, by tales of Dettingen and Fontenoy. A far larger proportion were laughing at caricatures of the pretender, the pope, and the King of France, and at those which, after the unvarying fashion of Englishmen to laugh at themselves, ridiculed Johnnie Cope, and did not spare the Duke of Newcastle. They were reading the "Penny Post," with a border of capital letters forming the words, "No pretender! No popery! No slavery! No arbitrary power! No wooden shoes!" § Hogarth's wonderful print of the "March to Finchley" was not published till 1750; but from this minute embodiment of all the prevailing aspects of the outer life of the London population we may gather some clearer notion of the realities of 1745 than from the most elaborate description. We may here trace the military costume of the time—the Prussian sugar-loaf cap of the grenadier—the fifer then first naturalized in the British army. We may form some notion of the license of the soldiery in those days of cheap intoxication. We may follow all the rough diversions and practical jokes of the London populace, who exhibit in their demeanor any feeling but that of terror. We may notice how the great observer of the life around him alluded to—what was perhaps the only real danger in this crisis—the prospect of a French invasion, by which, in conjunction with the Highland insurrection, "the Jacobites were elevated to an insolence of hope which they were at no pains to conceal." ‖ The French spy, communicating to the eager old Scot the letter which promises a descent from Dunkirk, is one of those Hogarthian groups which we may accept without hesitation as the truth of individuality.

The fashionable world of London was dull at the opening of this winter: "There never was so melancholy a town; no kind of public place but the play-houses, and they look as if the rebels had just driven away the company. Nobody but has some fear for themselves, for their money, or for their friends in the army." ¶ This is the serious fear which becomes a grave nation at a dangerous crisis; but it is not the fear of cowardice. To understand why there should have been fear at all, we must bear in mind how imperfect were the means of public information. The numbers of the rebels were generally estimated at fifteen thousand. But the fidelity of the common people to their government and their aversion to the cause of the Stuarts are unquestionable. A French ship called the Soleil had been taken, with many Jacobites on board, who were coming to join their Scottish friends. There was among them a member of the unfortunate family of Derwentwater. "The mob," says Walpole, "persuaded of his being the youngest pretender, could scarcely be persuaded from tearing him to pieces all the way on the road, and at his arrival. He said he had heard of English mobs, but could not conceive they were so dreadful." The populace of London have, happily, long since ceased to be ferocious. In this instance, and in several others, we recognize no generous pity for the unfortunate; but we have, even in this temper, one of the many evidences of the mistake into which some recent writers have fallen—that of speaking "of the march to Derby as an enterprise, which, had it been continued, was extremely likely to overturn the Hanover settlement and restore the Stuarts to the throne." The sensible and unprejudiced historian from whom we quote truly says, "The country had already pronounced upon the question, in the cold silence with which it received the Highland march." * But there was an influence of public opinion, not only in England but in parts of Scotland, of far more importance than the hostility of the English peasantry, and the rude aversion of a London mob—an influence that rendered even the temporary success of the Stuart cause almost an impossibility. Mr. Hallam has pointed out that the "augmentation of the democratical influence, using that term as applied to the commercial and industrious classes in contradistinction to the territorial aristocracy, was the slow but certain effect of accumulated wealth and diffused knowledge, acting, however, on the traditional notions of freedom and equality, which had ever prevailed in the English people." † The encouragement which Charles Edward undoubtedly received from some considerable portion of the territorial aristocracy, and on which he too confidently relied, was counteracted by the impassive calmness, or decided resistance, of the commercial and industrious classes. It was not till the too confiding prince had got to Derby, that it was pointed out to him that, "after traversing all the provinces which had the reputation of being most attached to his family, in order to enable them to join him, a single person of distinction had not yet declared himself." ‡ The commercial and industrious classes were fairly represented at Liverpool, where a regiment of foot of seven hundred men was raised, clothed, and paid by public subscription. They were represented at Glasgow, where a body of twelve hundred men were raised, half of whom were sent to the defence of Stirling, and half retained to protect the city. In Bristol the same spirit was displayed. We may therefore receive, with considerable suspicion, the statement of Smollett, that the trading part of the city were overwhelmed with fear and dejection. They were subscribing large sums at the beginning of December, to procure additional warm clothing for the troops engaged in the suppression of the rebellion; and the Quakers even provided woollen under-waistcoats for the troops in the North. London had received its abundant share of that commercial prosperity which, in twenty years, had added a third to the value of the country's exports; and which had enabled the wages of the laborer to command a larger portion of subsistence than at any previous period of our history. § The community in general was flourishing and contented; and while Smollett, speaking from his own political prejudices, says that many, who had no property to lose, thought no change could be for the worse, we may, on the contrary, believe that the bulk even of the humblest, who lived under equal laws which protected labor as much as capital, really desired no change, even amid their grumbling against a German king, and their angry recollections of excise and the Gin Act.

In periods of great political excitement, when opposite principles are ripening into active hostility, the prejudices of a people, and the unreasonable suspicions of a government, are almost as destructive of the peace of society as the positive dangers of insurrection and anarchy. There is an instance of the terror produced by apprehensions of popular violence, in the case of the father of Nollekens, the sculptor. The old man, a Roman Catholic native of Antwerp, lived in Dean Street, Soho, at the time of the rebellion. He was a hoarder of his money; and he became so convinced that, as a foreigner and a papist, his house would be attacked by a mob, and his precious savings carried away, that "he lingered in a state of alarm until his death," in 1747. ‖ The suspicions attached during this crisis to Scotsmen in London are described by Sir Andrew Mitchell, in a let-

* Maitland, "History of London," vol. i. p. 646.
† Lord Mahon, vol. iii. p. 413. ‡ "Memoirs," p. 75.
§ Wright, "House of Hanover," vol. i. p. 226. ‖ Smollett.
¶ Horace Walpole to Mann, November 29.

* Burton, "History of Scotland," vol. ii. p. 484.
† "Constitutional History," chap. xvi. ‡ De Johnstone, p. 71.
§ Malthus, referred to by Hallam.
‖ Smith, "Nollekens and his Times," vol. i. p. 2.

ter to Duncan Forbes, of the 23d of October: "Already every man of our country is looked on as a traitor, as one secretly inclined to the pretender, and waiting but an opportunity to declare. The guilty and the innocent are confounded together, and the crimes of a few imputed to the whole nation." * An example of this undiscriminating suspicion may be found in a curious incident in the life of a very remarkable man, the founder of the great banking-house of Drummond. Andrew Drummond was the brother of Sir William Drummond, who became Viscount Strathallan in 1711. Strathallan was taken prisoner at Sheriffmuir, in 1715, but was released, and continued to reside in Scotland. Andrew, like many other younger branches of high Scottish families, felt that he must endeavor to secure independence by a mercantile pursuit. He settled in London soon after the union, uniting the proper business of a banker with that of a goldsmith, according to the fashion of earlier times. His ledger of 1716, in the possession of his successors, shows that he sold and exchanged jewelry, such as diamond ear-rings, buckles, and other personal adornments. In the early years of his banking business he was chiefly intrusted with the management of the pecuniary affairs of the friends of the house of Stuart, particularly of those who were abroad. Without compromising himself, he rendered valuable assistance to many who were exiled or suspected; not in assisting designs against the reigning family, but in a faithful administration of their private funds. "His brother sent up to him his two nephews, Robert and Henry, with whom he shared whatever emoluments he derived from the services he rendered to the Royalists; and in this way grew up the banking establishment which his descendants have ever since carried on." † In 1745, when Lord Strathallan was actively engaged in the rebellion, suspicion not unnaturally fell upon the banker at Charing Cross. A warrant was sent into his house, and his books and papers were seized. A report was spread that he was ruined. It was the crisis of the thriving Scotsman's fortune. He published a notice in the "Gazette" that he would instantly pay all his creditors in full. Confidence did not desert him. The government could find nothing to inculpate him after the most searching examination; and obtained no knowledge from his papers "of what was going on in Scotland." His books and papers were returned; and a round-robin was signed by every member of the cabinet as an approving testimonial of his conduct. The king desired to see him at St. James's; but at that interview the sturdy banker turned his back upon the secretary, Sir Edward Winnington, to whom he attributed the calumny against him. Andrew Drummond's bank became the favored establishment of the aristocracy of all parties. George II. there kept his private account, and so also George III. This is one of the many instances of the rapidity with which, after the final struggle, national and dynastic contests became merged in individual confidence and public tranquillity. There were national prejudices of Englishman and Scot still to be overcome; but these were only as the shifting clouds after a storm. The trust in Andrew Drummond, the banker, of the second and third sovereigns of the Brunswick line, may be regarded as a graceful tribute, not only to his individual integrity and honor, but as exhibiting some sympathy for the misfortunes of his house. The representative of the elder branch of that house, the Duke of Perth, died on shipboard after his escape from Scotland in 1746. The head of the other branch, Lord Strathallan, was killed at the battle of Culloden. ‡

But if the ancient resistance and disaffection of the Jacobite party gradually melted away in the security for good government which the nation enjoyed under the Act of Settlement, the fears of the administration, and the traditional feelings of the people, too long endured in the penal laws against Roman Catholics. There was no attempt at their conciliation at the crisis of the rebellion. At the beginning of December, 1745, a proclamation was issued, calling upon magistrates to discover and bring to justice all Jesuits and popish priests; and offering a reward of one hundred pounds for the apprehension of any such objects of the severity of the earlier statutes. This proclamation called forth a strong remonstrance from the resident ministers of various Catholic states, and especially on the arrest of a domestic of the Venetian ambassador. They contended that the law of nations had been violated; and that the act of Anne, which forbade the arrest upon civil process of the ministers of foreign powers, or of their servants, was infringed in these proceedings. The secretary of state, in his reply, did not approve of the arrest of the Venetian ambassador's domestic; but he rested the justification of the government upon the plea that chapels, with an enormous number of priests, were maintained, wherein mass was celebrated, not for the use of the minister's family, but rather for the sake of allowing the king's converted subjects to be present at mass, contrary to law. "The number of national Roman Catholic priests, who swarm more than ever in this town, was found dangerous to the state, especially at a time of open rebellion in favor of a pretender of the same religion."

* "Culloden Papers," p. 426.

† Memoir of the House of Drummond, in "Histories of Noble British Families," vol. ii. p. 21.

‡ There is a portrait of Andrew Drummond by Reynolds, and a very admirable one by Zoffany, in the possession of his great-grandson, Mr. Andrew Mortimer Drummond, to whose kindness we are indebted for some facts here mentioned.

CHAPTER CLVII.

Charles Edward retreats from Derby—The retreating army pursued—Skirmish at Clifton—Bombardment and capitulation of Carlisle—Charles Edward in Scotland—General Hawley takes the command of the king's troops—Battle of Falkirk—Retreat of Hawley to Edinburgh—Lord Lovat—The Duke of Cumberland in Scotland—Flight of the Highland army from Stirling.

THE retreat from Derby, regarded as a military operation, was highly creditable to the officers by whom it was conducted, and especially to Lord George Murray. He was foremost to advise that retreat; and to his prudence and watchfulness may be attributed, in great measure, that the depressed Highlanders marched back to their own mountains without serious disorganization. "I offered," he says, "to make the retreat, and be always in the rear myself." * Before daybreak, on the morning of the 6th of December, the little army left Derby. The men thought they were advancing to attack the Duke of Cumberland. "As soon," says De Johnstone, "as the day allowed them to see the objects around them, and they found that we were retracing our steps, nothing was to be heard throughout the whole army but expressions of rage and lamentation." † The prince, as blindly confident as the brave and ignorant Highlanders who would have followed him to destruction, was no longer cheerful and alert. "In marching forward he had always been the first up in the morning, and had the men in motion before break of day, and commonly marched himself afoot; but in the retreat he was much longer of leaving his quarters; so that, though the rest of the army were all on their march, the rear could not move till he went, and then he rode straight on, and got to the quarters with the van." Such is the relation of Lord George Murray. The partisans of this young prince have delighted to exhibit his condescending participation in the fatigue and privations of his followers, when leading them, as he and they thought, to the rewards of his bold enterprise. His moody displeasure and haughty indifference when his insane plans were opposed and rejected, show how truly he adhered to his family convictions, that the sovereign will should override every other consideration; that, to use his own words, "he was accountable to no one but God." His physical courage has been doubted, probably with great injustice. But his conduct in this retreat exhibits none of those qualities which appear in heroic minds, when high hopes are suddenly destroyed and serious dangers are to be confronted. Charles Edward had been deceived into the belief that the friends of his house in England were numerous, powerful, and ready to crowd round his standard. Not one of the secret Jacobites or avowed Tories of great families in the North lifted up a voice for him. He expected a descent from France would have been made upon British shores. To make such an invasion in some degree palatable to Englishmen, he had said, in a proclamation of the 10th of October, that when he saw a foreign force brought by his enemies against him—when the Elector of Hanover's allies were called over to protect his government against the subjects of the lawful sovereign—it was high time for the king, his father, to accept the assistance of those who had engaged to support him. That assistance did not come. There was a numerous and vigilant Channel fleet ready to resist every attempt at

* "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 55. † Ibid., p. 72.

invasion. Not in the smoky hut at Eriska—not when he was hiding after the fatal day of Culloden—could the thoughts of Charles Edward have been more cheerless than on the retreat from Derby. His weakness of character displayed itself in a rash trust that his cause was so sacred that some miraculous success would ever attend it: "From the facility with which he had gained the victory at Gladsmuir he was always for fighting; and sometimes even reproached Lord George for his unwillingness to incur the risk of an engagement, when no advantage could be derived from a victory, and for his having prevented him from fighting the Duke of Cumberland at Derby."*

It is one of the many instances of the want of correct intelligence at the headquarters of the English generals, that the rebel army had been two days on its march back to Scotland before the Duke of Cumberland became aware that they were not advancing toward London. He immediately dispatched from his camp at Meriden, near Coventry, all his cavalry to pursue them; and the country people, as the infantry followed, furnished horses to mount foot-soldiers drafted out of various regiments.† A thousand cavalry troops were thus extemporized. "Our foot-soldiers not being accustomed to riding, I thought," says Volunteer Ray, "they looked odd on horseback, with their muskets and knapsacks flung over their shoulders." Marshal Wade was at Wakefield, with his army, on the 10th, when he heard of the retreat; and he also dispatched his cavalry, under General Oglethorpe, in pursuit of the rebels. The Duke of Cumberland and Oglethorpe arrived at Preston on the 13th; and on the 17th they united their mounted forces at Kendal. They were now close upon the rear of the Highland army. The hurried march back of Charles Edward, over ground which he had so recently passed in some sort of triumph, was not accompanied by any encouraging popular demonstrations. At Manchester the Highlanders were now received with "visible marks of dislike." The peaceful and orderly disposition of these men in their advance was now with difficulty kept up. At Lancaster they plundered, and threw open the prisons. As they went onward, "few there were who would go on foot if they could ride; and mighty stealing, taking, and pressing of horses there was among us." The captain, who thus records that the army "began to behave with less forbearance," adds, "diverting it was to see the Highlanders mounted, without either breeches, saddle, or anything else but the bare backs of the horses to ride on, and for their bridle only a straw rope."‡ Near Stockport the Highlanders set fire to a village, the peasants having shot at one of their comrades acting as a patrol. The retreat was now manifestly through a hostile district. The Duke of Perth, having been detached with some horsemen to proceed to Scotland, was attacked by the country people after he had passed Kendal, and was compelled to return. He again rode with a large escort the next day to Penrith, when he was again driven back.

The retreating and the pursuing forces were close together on the 18th of December. Lord George Murray had been detained at Shap on the 17th, from the difficulties of getting along the bad roads and up the steep hills. The weather was wet and tempestuous. "I was stopped," says Lord George, "by what I always suspected—the wagons could not be carried through a water where there was a narrow turn and a steep ascent."§ Horses and men could not overcome the difficulty until nightfall. The van and the rear were widely separated, when Murray reached the village of Clifton, near Penrith, on the 18th. They were encountered by a party of volunteers, but the Highlanders soon dispersed these. A footman of the Duke of Cumberland was taken prisoner, and he said the duke was very close at hand. Lord George had only about a thousand men. He was resolved to wait an attack, even without reinforcements, for which he had applied. He took up a position between the hedges of the village and wall of Lord Lonsdale's park. The night was cloudy, with a feeble moonlight. Creeping along among the inclosures the dismounted dragoons of the royal army were advancing upon the Highlanders. Their main body was on horseback at some distance. Murray's own narrative of this skirmish is clear and spirited: "The dismounted dragoons had not only lined the bottom inclosures, but several of them had come up to two hedges that lay south and north; the others where we were, and the dragoons at the bottom, lay east and west. The Appin battalion were next the lane upon that side, and Cluny's farther to their left. We advanced, and had a good deal of fire on both sides. After the Highlanders on that side had given most of their fire, they lay close at an open hedge, which was the second in these fields. We then received the whole fire of the dragoons that were at the bottom, upon which Cluny said, 'What the devil is this?' Indeed the bullets were going thick enough. I told him we had nothing for it but going down upon them, sword in hand, before they had time to charge again. I immediately drew my sword, and cried, 'Claymore!' Cluny did the same, and we ran down to the bottom ditch, clearing the diagonal hedges as we went. There were a good many of the enemy killed at the bottom ditch, and the rest took to their heels, but received the fire of the Glengarry regiment."* There was no more firing. Murray had secured by his courageous stand a safer continuance of their retreat for the van. Half an hour after the skirmish he also ordered a retreat. "We travelled all night," says the chaplain MacLachlan, "though the moon set at twelve o'clock, and arrived at Carlisle early next day." The van had reached that city the same morning.

On the 20th of December, before break of day, the rebel army, with the exception of a portion of the English regiment raised at Manchester and some Scottish companies, quitted Carlisle. "I could never comprehend the reason," says De Johnstone, "for sacrificing these unfortunate victims." The Duke of Perth was unwilling, naturally enough, to leave any of his men. Murray told him, in the presence of Charles, that if the prince would order him, he would stay with the Athol brigade, though he knew his fate; for as soon as cannon could be brought up from Whitehaven the place would not be tenable. The works might have been blown up, Murray held. At any rate, if the Scottish army returned, Carlisle could not harm them. "I was little at the prince's quarters that day," says Murray, "but I found he was determined on the thing. It was very late next day before we marched. The prince had some difficulty about those who were to stay at Carlisle, who were very unwilling." Dr. King, who was in correspondence with Charles Edward for some years after these events, says, "I never heard him discover any sorrow or compassion for the misfortune of so many worthy men who had suffered in his cause."† Their sufferings, in his view, were nothing but the just tribute of loyalty to their rightful master. Upon the same principle he had no remorse in determining, against all remonstrance, to sacrifice a band of brave men to "that egotistic fanaticism, which made every calamity endured by his followers in the cause of his house a simple incident in their line of duty."‡ The callous obduracy with which Charles Edward resolved to leave this unhappy garrison to the first vengeance of the English, by military slaughter or civil proceedings against traitors, is, in our view, as odious as the barbarities which procured William of Cumberland the title of "the Butcher." The duke came up to Carlisle on the 21st. He invested the place, which resisted with its small means of defence; but there was no artillery to compel an immediate surrender. Large guns, as Murray had expected, were brought up from Whitehaven. Ray records his own share in procuring these means of attack: "I was sent to Whitehaven, to order the battering cannon from thence. The people rose in a body, and got horses and carriages with all expedition. They were ten pieces of eighteen-pounders, of which four were drawn by forty horses of Sir James Lowther, which went along pretty briskly; but I saw sixteen or eighteen of the country horses to a gun, and often set, the roads being very soft."§ When Ray returned on the 22d he found Carlisle invested on all sides. "A great many people," he says, "came out of the country to assist the duke's army, with clubs and staves, and such other weapons as they had; the game-laws forbidding the use of firearms. The countrymen being most of them no use, and their number being about ten thousand, his royal highness ordered them all to return home, except a few who were employed in cutting fascines for the batteries. The duke's regular forces at this time were about four thousand." The bombardment of Carlisle began on the 28th. "The rebel garrison," continues the Volunteer, "were as

* "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 84. † Ray, p. 187.
‡ "MS. Memoirs of Captain Daniel," quoted by Lord Mahon, vol. iii. p. 418. § "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 62.

* "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 70.
† "Anecdotes of his own Times," p. 201.
‡ Burton, vol. ii. p. 497. § Ray, p. 201.

much surprised as if they had felt the shock of an earthquake, wondering from whence these roaring guns came." It has been alleged as an excuse for the sacrifice of this garrison by Charles Edward, that he believed the duke "had no battering artillery at his disposal." On the 30th a white flag was hung out from the walls. The firing ceased. John Hamilton, the governor, asked to know what terms would be given upon the surrender of the city and castle of Carlisle. The stern answer was, "All the terms his royal highness will or can grant to the rebel garrison of Carlisle, are that they shall not be put to the sword, but be reserved for the king's pleasure." The garrison capitulated. The number of prisoners was a hundred and fourteen English, two hundred and seventy-four Scotsmen, and eight Frenchmen. This enumeration, made by Ray, sufficiently confutes the calumnious charge that the abandonment of this garrison by Charles Edward "originated in a spirit of vengeance against the English nation, as no one of all the persons of distinction in England, who invited the prince to make a descent in Great Britain, had declared themselves openly in his favor, by attaching their fortunes to his, as the Scots had done." *

The Duke of Cumberland, after the surrender of Carlisle, was summoned to London to take the command of the forces that were assembled to guard the south coast against a threatened French invasion. A portion of the army of the duke was left under the command of General Hawley, to advance into Scotland. Marshal Wade's troops were to return to their post at Newcastle. On the 20th of December the Highland army quitted England. This day was the anniversary of the prince's birth. When the impulsive race whom he had led to a promised conquest—those who had gloomily turned back from the rich prize which they fancied within their reach—had crossed the border-river Esk, wading up to their arm-pits, "the bagpipers having commenced playing, the Highlanders began all to dance, expressing the utmost joy at seeing their country again." They forgot the chagrin "which they had continually nourished ever since their departure from Derby." † Passing through Dumfries—a town described by De Johnstone as full of fanatical Calvinists, who had seized some ammunition wagons, and who now were punished by a considerable fine—they reached Glasgow on the 24th. When the Highland army was in the neighborhood of that city in September, a demand of fifteen thousand pounds was made under the sign-manual of the prince, as the price the citizens were to pay to save themselves from confiscations enforced by Highlanders in arms, who had long been their terror. They compromised the matter by a payment to the amount of five thousand five hundred pounds, part in money and goods, and part in bills. Their enemies had now come to make heavier demands in the shape of thousands of Highland coats, shirts, shoes, tartan hose, bonnets, and money. There was no escaping. They were told that they were rebels. Parliament afterward voted ten thousand pounds as a compensation to the loyal traders.

After remaining a week at Glasgow, the Highland army marched to Stirling. They were sturdily opposed by the people; but they got possession of the town. General Blakeney, the governor of the castle, met them with defiance. The prince had now been joined by large numbers of Highlanders from Perth, under the command of Lord Strathallan; and by refugees who had been landed from France. His army now reached nine thousand men. He was turned aside from the siege of Stirling by the intelligence that General Hawley had marched from Edinburgh, through Linlithgow, and had reached the neighborhood of Falkirk. Hawley, who had fought under Argyle at the battle of Sheriffmuir, and had served in Flanders in the army of the Duke of Cumberland, was appointed—perhaps more on account of his repute for ferocity than for his military talents—to the most important command at this juncture. "He is called lord chief justice," says Horace Walpole; "frequent and sudden executions are his passion. . . . He is very brave and able; with no small bias to the brutal." ‡ His ability was tested in the field of Falkirk. He set out to meet the Highland army with a presumptuous contempt for what he called "undisciplined rabbles." He must have recollected something of the mode in which Highlanders fought, and of the extreme caution with which it was necessary to guard against their rapid surprises of an enemy. He was satisfied that with his disciplined troops he could easily destroy the insurgents. De Johnstone truly observes that the Highlanders "proved that bravery may supply the place of discipline at times, as discipline supplies the place of bravery;" and that the Highland mode of attack "is so terrible that the best troops in Europe would with difficulty sustain the first shock of it." * Hawley took no care to enable his men steadily to bear the first shock. He neglected the ordinary prudence of so disposing his troops that the Highlanders should not have that advantage of situation which they always sought for, and that no sudden attack by his enemy should produce a panic equivalent to a victory.

John Home, who joined General Hawley's army as a lieutenant in the Glasgow volunteers, has described the battle of Falkirk with care and impartiality. On the morning of the 17th of January Hawley's army had been joined by a regiment of dragoons, and by a thousand Highlanders under the command of Colonel Campbell, afterward Duke of Argyle. When they encamped near Falkirk some Highland horse and foot were seen moving about with their colors displayed, upon the high-road from Stirling to Falkirk, through the middle of the Torwood. The parade thus made was a stratagem to divert attention from the principal attack, which had been skilfully planned. About one o'clock two English officers climbed a tree, and saw the main body of the Highlanders marching toward them, by the south side of the Torwood. Hawley was spending a pleasant morning at Callander House, and being apprised of this movement of the enemy, he said the men might put on their accoutrements, but there was no necessity for them to be under arms. The report of the officers who had climbed the tree was confirmed by horsemen well mounted, who came in upon the spur. The troops became alarmed. The officers were heard to exclaim, again and again, Where is the general? In his continued absence, they formed their regiments in front of the camp. The general at last came, and ordered three regiments of dragoons to march to the moor, and take possession of the high ground between them and the advancing enemy. The infantry were commanded to follow. "At the very instant," says Home, "the regiments of foot began to march, the day was overcast; and by and by a storm of wind and rain beat directly in the face of the soldiers, who were marching up the hill with their bayonets fixed, and could not secure their pieces from the rain. The cavalry was a good way before the infantry, and for some time it seemed a sort of race between the Highlanders and the dragoons, which of them should get first to the top of the hill." The rebel army was marching in two columns. Three Macdonald regiments, who were at the head of the columns to the north, got to the top of the hill before the dragoons, and, taking ground where they had a morass on their right flank, turned their backs to the storm. This struggle for the advantage of position determined the course of this sudden contest. The Highland columns were formed in two lines, with a reserve in the rear, among which the prince was stationed. The royal army was also formed in two lines, with a reserve. The hurry in which the troops on both sides were formed, the inequality of the ground, and the darkness of the storm, produced a scene of confusion which could scarcely be called a battle. It was, says Sir Walter Scott, "as confused an affair as can well be imagined." † Before the infantry of Hawley's army were completely formed, he sent an order for the cavalry, in number about seven or eight hundred, to attack the two lines of eight thousand Highlanders. The bold general had seen at the battle of Sheriffmuir the discomfiture of the flank of the rebel army by a charge through a morass. He repeated the movement at Falkirk. There was a slight difference of circumstances. At Sheriffmuir a severe frost had rendered the morass passable. At Falkirk the dragoons plunged into a bog "where," says Scott, "the Highlanders cut them to pieces with so little trouble that, as one of the performers assured us, the feat was as easy as slicing *baacon*." ‡ It was then nearly four o'clock. The storm continued. The darkness rendered the movements of either army scarcely perceptible. But the Highlanders, pursuing the discomfited dragoons, received

* De Johnstone, p. 201. † Ibid., p. 100.
‡ Letter to Mann, January 17th, 1746.

* "Memoirs," p. 114.
† "Quarterly Review," vol. xxxvi. p. 179. ‡ Ibid.

the fire of the English infantry, which they returned, and then, throwing away their muskets, attacked after their fashion with broadsword and dirk. "It seemed a total rout," says Home, "and for some time General Hawley did not know that any one regiment of his army was standing." But one regiment remained steady, and, being joined by other infantry, drove back the pursuers. The Highlanders now, in turn, fancied themselves defeated. "Part of the king's army, much the greater part, was flying to the eastward, and part of the rebel army was flying to the westward." Hawley, before it became quite dark, tried to set fire to his tents, but they would not burn; and he retreated to Linlithgow, through Falkirk, leaving his baggage and his guns. The next day he marched to Edinburgh with an army not greatly reduced in numbers, but sadly degraded in the senseless conduct of this battle of half an hour. The leaders of the rebel army scarcely exulted in their victory. They blamed each other for its incompleteness. Hawley took no blame to himself, but caused several officers and soldiers to be tried by court-martial, of whom two soldiers were condemned to be shot, and more than one officer was cashiered. In a letter from General Wightman to Duncan Forbes, he says, "everything would have gone to wreck, in a worse manner than at Preston, if General Huske had not acted with judgment and courage, and appeared everywhere. Hawley seems to be sensible of his misconduct; for when I was with him on Saturday morning at Linlithgow, he looked most wretchedly; even worse than Cope did a few hours after his scuffle, when I saw him at Fala." * The writer of this letter says, "This is an odd scene of things, and altogether an unexpected occurrence; and will doubtless shock the king and the ministry, as well as the whole English nation." The king and the ministry sent off the Duke of Cumberland to Scotland, in the confidence that he would retrieve this disaster. The English nation was not greatly shocked, if we may accept an interesting passage in a letter of Gray to Walpole as an evidence of the general feeling: "Our defeat, to be sure, is a rueful affair for the honor of our troops; but the duke is gone, it seems, with the rapidity of a cannon-bullet to undefeat us again. The common people in town at least know how to be afraid: but we are such uncommon people here † as to have no more sense of danger than if the battle had been fought when and where the battle of Cannæ was. The perception of these calamities and their consequences, that we are supposed to get from books, is so faintly impressed, that we talk of war, famine, and pestilence, with no more apprehension than of a broken head, or of a coach overturned between York and Edinburgh."

In the accounts of the battle of Falkirk we find mention of Lord Lovat's regiment as one of those which repulsed the dragoons. Simon Fraser, Lord Lovat, was not with his clan, but his son was with them. The chief of the clan, who had exhibited the passions of an untamed savage in his youth; who, in his maturer age, pursued the same system of barbarian violence in his transactions with his neighbors; now, in his extreme old age, covered his actions with what he considered an impenetrable shield of craft. It was still the cunning of the uncivilized man rather than the honorable reserve of a gentleman engaged in high and dangerous political enterprises. There are no more curious exhibitions of human character than the letters of this remarkable person, at the crisis of 1745. After the landing of Charles Edward, Lovat wrote to the lord advocate, that he was ready to serve the king and the government as in 1715, when he did more in suppressing that rebellion than any other man of his rank. But he begged to have a thousand stand of arms delivered to him and his clan at Inverness.‡ To Lochiel he wrote at the same time: "My service to the prince. I will aid you what I can, but my prayers are all I can give at present." In a letter of the same period to the lord president he calls the landing of Charles "a mad enterprise;" and weeps to think that "this desperate prince" would be the cause of much bloodshed. When Cope was beaten at Preston Pans, Lord Lovat thought the Stuart cause would prosper; and he compelled his son, by threats and entreaties, to join the insurgents. The Master of Lovat, as he was styled, was too late to join the march into England. He remained, with other clans, at Perth. Meanwhile the old man, still doubtful which might be the winning side, poured forth his protestations to Duncan Forbes that he himself was entirely innocent of his son's proceedings: "I do solemnly declare to your lordship that nothing ever vexed my soul so much as my son's resolution to go and join the prince." * In another letter he says, "Since my son was determined on that mad foolish project, I never spoke to him about it but he always flew in my face like a wild cat." † We may thus explain how Lord Lovat's regiment was at the battle of Falkirk, when the old man had himself been playing fast and loose. After the retreat from Derby he tried to make his son faithless to the cause he had himself driven him to adopt. The honor of the son, in clinging to the side on which he was fighting, is a pleasing contrast to the habitual perfidy of the father.

The Duke of Cumberland, travelling post night and day, arrived at Edinburgh on the 30th of January. All London was in anxious expectation to hear news of another battle. "Nothing," says Walpole, "was talked of but the expectation of the courier." The duke set out on his march on the 31st to raise the siege of Stirling. That siege had been very inefficiently conducted. There was little hope that the French engineers would be able to silence the fire of the castle by their ill-constructed batteries. The prince, with his own immediate advisers, was for protracting the siege, and remaining to fight the Duke of Cumberland. More prudent counsel enforced the necessity of a retreat. A paper was addressed to him on the 29th of January, signed by Lord George Murray, Lochiel, and six other chiefs, pointing out that the army had been much reduced by desertions, and that if the enemy should march before the reduction of Stirling, they anticipated a speedy destruction through the inequality of their numbers. John Hay, who was officially employed by the prince, says that Charles being in bed, he went into his room with this dispatch; and that when the prince read the paper "he struck his head against the wall till he staggered, and exclaimed most violently against Lord George Murray. His words were, 'Good God! have I lived to see this!'" Hay adds that the number of men said to be absent was greatly exaggerated. The Chaplain MacLachlan has recorded that, on the night of the battle of Falkirk, some of the men went off in the hurry; that three of the prince's aides-de-camp entreated him to rally them, because he could speak Erse to them; that he succeeded with many; and that he then rode off to the Duke of Perth, to entreat him to place a strong guard at the fords of Frewe to intercept these deserters.‡ The amount of desertion was increased by a circumstance peculiarly characteristic of Highland clan jealousies. One of the Clan Clanranald accidentally shot a younger son of Glengarry. It was not sufficient to appease the anger of the Glengarry tribe that the poor fellow who fired a musket, without knowing that it was loaded, was condemned and shot. They went off in a body to their mountains. The prince had no choice but to yield to the advice of the chiefs who had counselled an immediate retreat. But he is held to have shown his anger, like a petted child, by deranging all the precautions that had been taken for an orderly march. In their hurry to destroy their magazine of powder, the rebels blew up a church in which it had been deposited. MacLachlan says this was the act of a rash young fellow who, without any orders, fired a pistol at the powder, by which folly he killed himself, and killed and wounded others. Murray records that, at a council of war held at Crieff, he "complained much of the flight, and entreated to know who had advised it. The prince did not incline to lay the blame on anybody, but said he took it on himself." § When the news arrived in London that "the moment the rebel army saw the duke's they turned back with the utmost precipitation," it was concluded that this flight, as Murray termed the retreat, "looked exceedingly like the conclusion of this business." ‖ Unhappily there is more of this business to be related; and much of it of a painful nature, from which we would gladly turn our view.

* "Culloden Papers," p. 267.
† This letter is dated from Cambridge, February 3d, 1746.
‡ "Culloden Papers," p. 210.

* "Culloden Papers," p. 234.
† Ibid., p. 236. It is satisfactory to know that the younger Fraser, thus destined to be the scapegoat of an unnatural father, was pardoned for his share in the rebellion, and became a distinguished officer in the British army.
‡ MS. Journal.
§ "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 100.
‖ Walpole to Mann, Feb. 7.

CHAPTER CLVIII.

Charles Edward at Inverness—The Duke of Cumberland at Aberdeen—The passage of the Spey—The duke at Nairn—The prince at Culloden—Projected night attack on the king's camp—The victory of Culloden—Barbarities after Culloden—Impolicy of the treatment of the rebels—Trials and executions—Trials of the rebel lords—Their demeanor—Balmerino, Kilmarnock, and Lovat—Hidings of Charles Edward—His return to France.

The Highland army, marching rapidly in two divisions—one by Blair Athol and one by the coast—reached Inverness on the 18th of February. The Duke of Cumberland, moving much more slowly, took up his head-quarters at Aberdeen. Five thousand Hessian troops had arrived to strengthen the forces of the British government. While Cumberland remained inactive at Aberdeen, Charles had taken the citadel of Inverness; and Fort Augustus had been destroyed by one of the Highland parties. Fort William and Blair Castle held out against him. The interval which elapsed between the prince's arrival at Inverness and the duke's advance to attack him was unfavorable to the success of the insurrection. The insurgents were cut off from the abundant supplies of the Lowlands. The king's ships intercepted the provisions and the gold which were occasionally dispatched from France. The active and hardy mountaineers engaged in various expeditions; but the advantages which they gained were of little importance in the great issue which was approaching. Time was working to their destruction. The Highland army was without pay; and they sold their allowances of oatmeal "for their other needs, at which the poor creatures grumbled exceedingly."* They were certainly not in the best fighting condition when, on the 8th of April, the Duke of Cumberland commenced his march from Aberdeen. As he advanced along the coast, his army of about nine thousand men were abundantly provided from the transports, which "moved along shore with a gentle breeze and a fair wind."† On the 11th the army reached the Spey. As the duke approached, Lord John Drummond, who was posted to guard the passage of the deep and rapid river, fell back. The Highland officer says in his journal, "To guard the Spey was an easy matter." Volunteer Ray confirms this opinion, in his description of the passage of the English troops: "I was in my station at the head of the regiment, where I very narrowly escaped being shot; for some of the rebels fired at us across the river, kneeling and taking sight as at a blackbird. We entered the river with a guide wading on foot to show where the ford lay; which was bad enough, having loose stones at the bottom, which made it very difficult for man or horse to step without falling, the water belly-deep and very rapid. The ford not lying right across, we were obliged to go midway into the river, then turn to the right, and go down it for about sixty yards, and then turn to the left, inclining upward to the landing-place. In this situation, had the rebels stood us here, it might have been of bad consequence to our army, they having a great advantage over us, and might have defended this important pass a long time, to our great loss; but they wanted to draw our army over, and farther into their country, from whence, in their imagination, we were never to return. When we got up the banks on the other side of the river, the rebels were all fled, and appeared on a hill about half a mile distant, from which they retreated out of sight as we advanced."‡ On the 15th the duke's army reached Nairn, and there halted. The prince's army was encamped on Culloden Moor, about twelve miles distant. The greater part of the moor is in the parish of Daviot. The district is not mountainous. "The land rises like a broken wave from the sea, in some places with a bank of considerable steepness and height; then sinks into a vale of moss land (from which, till reduced to cultivation, the town of Inverness used to be supplied with rushes); thence it ascends again to the parish of Croy and the Moor of Culloden, which extends along the ridge."§ On this flat moor, so unsuited to their peculiar tactics, the Highland army awaited the coming struggle. But doubts came over their leaders, and something bolder might be attempted.

In the afternoon of the 15th a night attack upon the royal army was resolved upon. The English, it was deemed, would be sleeping, after the drunken revels of the duke's birthday, which they had halted at Nairn to celebrate. The Highland officer says, "We set out about eight o'clock that night, with express orders to observe the profoundest silence in our march. Our word was 'King James the Eighth.' We were likewise forbid in the attack to make any use of our firearms, but only of sword, dirk, and bayonet; to cut the tent strings, and pull down the poles, and where we observed a swelling or bulge in the fallen tent there to strike and push vigorously."* The project utterly failed. The darkness of the night made the way uncertain over the rough and swampy waste. The men were weary and half famished. Lord George Murray had the command of the van. About two o'clock he halted; for there were four miles still to march, and there was a great interval between the two columns. A surprise had become impossible. "It was found impracticable," says Lord George, "to be near the enemy till it was within an hour of daylight; and as our only hope was surprising them, and attacking them before day, we were forced to give it up and return to Culloden, where we got about five."†

On Monday, the 14th of April, says a narrative of the period, "the young chevalier mustered his troops in the town of Inverness, and marched along the lines, encouraging them as he passed. Never were men in more exalted spirits."‡ On the 15th, writes the chaplain, MacLachlan, in his journal, "our prince royal had a review in the Muir of Culloden. And as I chanced to come close to him stepping up the hill, I saluted him in my ordinary way, 'God bless and prosper your royal highness.' To which he vouchsafed a reply in a familiar manner, and with a charming smile, 'It will be Gladsmuir, wherever it be.'" Never under any circumstances did this confidence in his destiny appear to have deserted the adventurer—a confidence that might have betrayed him earlier to his ruin, had he not been surrounded by men of judgment and experience. The projected surprise at Nairn would probably have terminated fatally had the attack upon the royal camp been made after the sun had risen—if the desire of the prince to attack at any hour had been complied with. The jaded men who returned to Culloden Moor after that night march were in a very unfit condition for the final struggle of the morning of the 16th. Great exertions were made to procure them food upon the dreary waste; but many had gone to Inverness to seek refreshment for themselves. The Duke of Cumberland was close at hand. Murray had been convinced the day before that the open muir "was certainly not proper for the Highlanders." He caused the ground "on the other side the water of Nairn" to be viewed. "It was found to be hilly and boggy, so that the enemy's cannon and horse could be of no great use to them there."§ When it was proposed to take this better position, the old confidence in some miraculous success prevailed, and the insurgents prepared for battle.

It was eleven o'clock when the king's army was seen advancing. It was formed in three lines, one of which was a reserve. The two foremost lines were so disposed that if the first line were broken by the Highland charge, the second line should stand firm. Cannon were placed between the battalions, and cavalry on the flanks. The men had been trained to remain steady under a rush such as that which had been so fatal at Preston Pans; and they had been instructed to direct the bayonet against the right breast of each opposing Highlander, so as not to be met by his target. The battle-field, so unfavorable to Highland onslaughts and surprises, rendered these precautions in some degree unnecessary; but they evince the judgment of the young commander, who had profited by the fatal lessons of the past. Charles Edward, according to some accounts, was in considerable danger while in the heart of his ranks, which had been drawn up in two lines. "As soon as the duke's cannon were placed, he began cannonading; which was answered by the prince's, who rode along the lines to encourage his men, and posted himself in the most convenient place to see what passed, where one of his servants was killed by his side."‖ The chaplain, MacLachlan, one who from his pushing character always endeavored to be near the prince, says, "From the time I entered the field, especially after the action began, I sat on horseback near our prince royal; and observing

* "Lockhart Papers," vol. ii. p. 508.
† Ray, p. 312.
‡ Ibid., p. 317.
§ "Statistical Account of Scotland."—Inverness-shire.

* "Lockhart Papers," p. 508.
† "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 122.
‡ "The Young Chevalier," p. 2.
§ "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 121.
‖ Colonel Ker's Narrative in "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 141.

many cannon-bullets flying over our heads, whereof one did knock dead his highness's principal groom that stood at twenty paces distance behind us, I rode up to Sir Thomas Sheridan, and begged of him to take notice of the imminent danger the prince was exposed to, without any occasion for it, and therefore to persuade him to withdraw a little. Whereupon Sir Thomas addressed him, and prevailed with him to retire." This is scarcely compatible with the statement that after the servant was killed, while the prince was in the lines, "he coolly continued his inspection."* The cannonade upon which Cumberland wisely relied, in the first instance, to renew in the Highlanders that awe of artillery which they had once felt, had caused deadly havoc in their ranks, before a charge was ordered. It was made at great disadvantage, for a violent storm was driving hail and sleet in their faces. But that terrible onset, which few disciplined troops could stand, carried the Highlanders partly through the first line. The second line stood firm. Then one volley from the unbroken ranks, three deep, utterly disordered the right and centre of the rebel army. They fled in irredeemable confusion. The Clan MacDonald, which had been placed in the left wing, and were offended, to use the words of one of their officers, at not having "this day the right hand in battle," the honor which "Robert the Bruce bestowed upon Angus MacDonald, Lord of the Isles"†—refused to make an onset. Their chief, Keppoch, fell, exclaiming, "My God! have the children of my tribe forsaken me!" The contest became an indiscriminate slaughter. The conduct of Charles Edward has been variously represented. He has been accused of want of courage; but the disproof of this charge was manifested on too many occasions to allow an implicit credit to the statement of Lord Elcho, in his manuscript memoirs, that he "requested the chevalier to charge in person at the head of the left wing, after the right was routed, and that on his not so advancing, Lord Elcho called him an Italian scoundrel, or a worse epithet, and declared he would never see his face more."‡ We again quote from the Chaplain MacLachlan, who followed the prince from the field: "I chanced to meet the Duke of Athol, coming off from his retreating brigade; and as I had the honor to be well known to him, he told me with an oath, 'The Highlanders are broken.' To which I replied, 'I am heartily sorry to hear it, my lord duke; I fear all is lost.' The prince, knowing of the disaster, stepped on, and a good number of retreaters followed him." This battle, which conclusively ended a dynastic contest of fifty-seven years, did not continue for fifty-seven minutes.

If we could here close the narrative of the battle of Culloden, and of the military proceedings which resulted from the victory of the established government, we should not have necessarily to excite the indignation of every reader against the author of barbarities which, happily, very rarely occur in the wars of civilized nations. We scarcely know how to deal with the details of those atrocities which a young prince of the house of Brunswick deemed it necessary to perpetrate. In the valuable collection of "Jacobite Memoirs," there are a hundred and seventeen pages headed "Barbarities after Culloden." To enter minutely into a view of these disgusting occurrences is scarcely necessary for any lessons of historical importance. To slur them over would be a vain attempt to cancel a very black page in our country's annals. We doubt, however, whether a rapid summary, or a minute exposition, of these facts, can have its use "in showing how liable an improved system of government, like that of the Brunswick family, is to fall into the worst errors of that which preceded it; and how liable the people are to be disappointed in their most sanguine expectations of political perfection."§ The editor of these memoirs would compare the atrocities after Culloden with "the tyrannical barbarity of the latter Stuarts," upon the principle of the one being "a good offset" to the other. It appears to us that the only real advantage to be derived from such narratives is to make us grateful that we live in times when "an improved system of government" has gradually produced such a state of public opinion that the ordinary tyrannies of the days of James II., and the exceptional cruelties of the days of George II., could not be repeated without more danger to the throne than the revolts which they sought to crush. The national prejudices of the English at that period, and at subsequent times when these prejudices were even more intense, never led them to countenance the barbarity after Culloden. It is some satisfaction to know that William of Cumberland was "during many years one of the most unpopular men in England."* The alderman of London, who, when it was proposed to present the duke with the freedom of some city company, exclaimed, "Then let it be of the butchers," anticipated the feeling of a better time, when bravery and compassion would be held as inseparable in the character of the great soldier. The people of the Duke of Cumberland's day dreaded that he might be the man to subject them to a military despotism. His nephews feared him. He was compared with the Crookback Richard, who murdered his nephews in the Tower. All this was unjust enough, no doubt, but it showed the feelings of the English nation with regard to the great blot upon the character of one who was blunt, brave, and honest, but who believed too much in the power of brute force in countries under military government. He lived for many years in the retirement of Windsor Great Park. He amused himself by planting hills with Scotch firs, and in making an artificial lake and a cascade, as if to produce a miniature resemblance of the scenery in which he had earned his glory and his twenty-five thousand a year. Perhaps in some moments his favorite Virginia Water, then a wild and uninclosed tract, might have suggested a compunctious remembrance of the solitary lakes, the woods and the wastes, among which he had hunted Highlanders as beasts of prey.

The slaughter of the wounded rebels upon the field of Culloden, the atrocious treatment of the prisoners, and the cold-blooded murders committed on the first and second days after the battle, are much too circumstantially detailed by many witnesses to allow us to believe that the odium which ultimately rested upon the Duke of Cumberland, was the effect of national or party violence. Indifferent to the disgrace he was bringing upon the English nation, he looked at the rebellion as a crime against his house, to be dealt with in a spirit of revenge. "I tremble," he wrote from Scotland, "for fear that this vile spot may still be the ruin of this island and of our family." In another letter he says that "a little blood-letting has only weakened the madness, and not cured it." The "little blood-letting" is the opprobrium which a century of equal justice to Scotland has scarcely yet obliterated. The accursed story may be thus briefly told.

On the day of the battle the wounded rebels that lay on the field received none of that aid which brave men usually offer to their vanquished enemies. The soldiers went up and down knocking such on the head as had any remains of life in them. The weather was cold; the dead, and those supposed to be dead, had been stripped. But, naked and starving, some wretched creatures were still alive on the morning of the 17th of April. A resident in Inverness, who claims to be regarded as a supporter of the government, writes to Bishop Forbes, that although the report of the cruelties was much aggravated, "it is certain that a resolution was taken, that it was not proper to load or crowd this little town with a multitude of wounded and incurable men of our enemy's; and, therefore, a party was ordered to the field of battle, who gathered all the wounded men from the different corners of the field, to one or two parts; and there, on a little rising hillock or ground properly planted, they were finished, with great dispatch; and this, as you and everybody else must own, was, as to them, performing the greatest act of humanity, as it put an end to many miserable lives, remaining in the utmost torture, without any hopes of relief."† This "greatest act of humanity" is termed a most bloody and ruthless deed by a more modern authority,‡ by whom it is stated that the wounded men still alive were collected in two heaps, and a six-pounder applied to each heap. The following evidence to the fact is then adduced: "One Mac Iver, a private, though mutilated in several parts of his body, survived this massacre, a dismal memorial of Cumberland's tender mercies. The man died near Beauly, about the year 1796, where many

* Mahon, vol. iii. p. 455.
† "Journal of Highland Officer—Lockhart Papers," p. 51.
‡ "Quarterly Review," vol. xxxvi. p. 213.
§ Introduction to this Section of "Jacobite Memoirs," by the editor, Mr. R. Chambers.

* Macaulay. "Essay on Chatham."
† "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 273.
‡ "Statistical Account of Scotland—Parishes of Croy and Dalcross."

are still living who may have known him. But to put the bloody deed beyond the shadow of doubt, the writer of this account knew for several years a John Reid, who fought that day in the second battalion of the Royal Scots, and heard from his lips that he saw the cruel deed, and thanked God that he had nothing to do with the *black wark*. John fought at the battles of Dettingen and Fontenoy, and only died about the year 1807, in the 105th year of his age, and in the full enjoyment of all his mental faculties. He was a lively little man, and retained a correct and vivid recollection of what he had seen and heard."

The slaughter of the miserable survivors found in the field was not the only atrocity of that week of triumph and of shame. To a little cot-house, where goats or sheep used to shelter, about a quarter of a mile distant from the battle-ground, many of the wounded men had crawled in the night-time. They were found by the soldiers. The door of the hut was shut; fire was put to the frail building; and thirty-two persons, including some beggars who had come to the field for plunder, perished in the flames.* On the 18th, parties were sent to search the houses in the neighborhood of the battle; to remove the wounded, and to kill them. John Fraser, called Mac Iver, an officer in Lovat's regiment, with eighteen other officers, had been carried wounded to Culloden House, the residence of the Lord President Forbes. They were treated with kindness by his agent, "who performed acts of beneficence to the wounded in and about the house of Culloden, at the hazard of his life." These nineteen men were tied with ropes, thrown into a cart, carried some distance, and shot under the park-wall. Fraser, though left for dead, after some hours dragged his mangled carcass to a little distance. Lord Boyd, riding by, espied him; had him removed and concealed, and the poor fellow recovered, to remain a crippled memorial of these atrocities.

To go over the afflicting details of military executions—of men whipped to extort confession; of boys, women, and old men murdered and maltreated; of prisoners left to perish upon insufficient allowance in filthy dungeons—would be as disgusting to our readers as the perusal of the documents has been to ourselves. The folly of these proceedings is as manifest as their wickedness. A Londoner, who travelled in the north of Scotland in 1750, writes to his friend, "I happened to fall in with a venerable old gentleman, an honest Whig, who, looking me seriously in the face, asked if the Duke of Cumberland was not a Jacobite?' 'A Jacobite!' said I, 'how comes that in your head?' 'Sure,' replied the old gentleman, 'the warmest zealot in the interest of the prince could not possibly devise more proper methods for sowing the seeds of Jacobitism and disaffection than the Duke of Cumberland did.'" The same letter-writer relates two circumstances sufficiently characteristic of the temper and manners of some commanders of that day—their contempt for civilians, and for civil authority. We must indeed receive with the doubt that ought always to attach to hearsay evidence the anecdotes thus related. But if not strictly to be relied upon, they show something of the prevailing opinions of the time. The provost and aldermen of Inverness went to the levee of the Duke of Cumberland. One of their number, Mr. Hossack, a friend of Duncan Forbes, presumed to say, that he hoped mercy would be mingled with judgment; upon which Hawley cried out, "D—n the puppy! does he pretend to dictate here? Carry him away." Another cried, "Kick him out," and he was kicked out. Duncan Forbes—himself the wisest and truest friend of the Hanoverian government, who expended large sums in opposing the rebellion, which sums he was never repaid—in an interview with the Duke of Cumberland at Inverness, ventured to make mention of the laws of the country. The duke's reply, if we can rely upon the fact, was an example of the insolence that might have plunged England and Scotland into another civil war, had the power of princes to do evil not been sufficiently abridged in the tenure upon which the family of the unwise young man was called to the highest estate among a free people. This was the reputed answer to the Lord President of Scotland: "The laws of the country! My lord, I'll make a brigade give laws, by G—d." †

Among the papers of Duncan Forbes were found some thoughts upon the extent and degree of punishment that ought to be awarded to those concerned in the rebellion. He was for severity toward the leaders. He thought that severity toward the crowd of common people would do more harm than good, by raising pity, "the rather, that it is most certainly true that great numbers were compelled to join the active rebels, by threats which were justly terrible to them."* It would have been well if these sound views could have been more regarded by the members of the government, which had a task before them, where no passion or party zeal could furnish even the shadow of an excuse for excess of punishment. The opinion of dispassionate writers upon the legal severities that followed the rebellion of 1745, which were more extensive than those of 1715, was that they were really less necessary for any purpose of warning than at the former period. In England, Jacobitism, as the march to Derby had proved, was rather a form of discontent shown to the Whig ministries than any active partisanship for the exiled family. England, therefore, could only feel disgusted at wholesale hangings on Kennington Common, and at seeing crowds of plebeian heads on Temple Bar. In Scotland the commercial towns had been adverse to Charles Edward, and, as Forbes pointed out, the numbers of those of the clans who had not actually rebelled, although their chiefs were Jacobites, were greater than those who were in arms.† An act had been passed, suspending that portion of the law of high treason which required that bills should be found in the counties where the offence was alleged to have been committed. The object was to try Scottish prisoners in England. The first persons brought to trial were eighteen officers of the Manchester regiment who were left to their fate at Carlisle by the prince for whom they had risked their lives and estates. Mr. Townley, the colonel, and seventeen of his companions, were tried, and nine were executed on the 30th of July. James Dawson, the son of a Lancashire gentleman, the hero of the ballad of Shenstone, was among the number. The catastrophe which followed the determination of the lady to whom he was betrothed, to witness his execution, is not a poetical fiction:

"The dismal scene was o'er and pass'd,
The lover's mournful hearse retir'd;
The maid drew back her languid head,
And, sighing forth his name, expir'd."

Three of the Scottish officers who were left at Carlisle were condemned and executed at Kennington Common in August; and five others, taken at various places, suffered in November. A special commission was opened at Carlisle in August. There were three hundred and eighty-two prisoners in the castle; but they were allowed to draw lots, that one in twenty might be selected for trial. Thirty-three were executed. At York twenty-two were also subjected to the brutal penalties of high treason. We shall dismiss this painful subject with a brief relation of the fate of the rebel lords who were taken prisoners.

While the populace of London were gazing upon the heads of Mr. Townley and other Manchester rebels upon Temple Bar, "where people make a trade of letting spy-glasses at a halfpenny a look,"‡ three rebel lords were in the Tower awaiting their fate. The trials of Lord Kilmarnock, Lord Cromartie, and Lord Balmerino, began on the 28th of July. "London," wrote Walpole to Montagu, "will be as full as at a coronation." There was to be a show which, happily, England had not seen for more than thirty years. The anecdotes connected with this melancholy exhibition have a more enduring interest than the formal proceedings of the trials themselves. These proceedings took the usual course when the evidence is too strong to involve any doubt of the legal guilt of the accused. Their personal demeanor is, in such cases, the chief object of attention. Bills of indictment had been found by the grand jury of Surrey against the three noblemen, and they were tried by the Peers in Westminster Hall. Walpole says it was the greatest and most melancholy scene he ever saw, the whole ceremony being conducted with the most awful solemnity and decency. Walpole expected to look on without emotion. He thought of the crimes of the prisoners, and of the dangers that the country had passed. Their first appearance shocked him; their behavior melted him.§ Kilmarnock and Cromartie pleaded guilty. Balmerino stood his trial. Walpole describes him as "the most natural brave old man I ever saw; the highest intrepidity, even to indifference." He played with his fingers upon the

* "Jacobite Memoirs," p. 274. † Ibid., p. 334.

* "Culloden Papers," p. 284. † Ibid.
‡ Walpole to Mann, August 16th, 1746.
§ Letter to Mann, August 1.

axe. A little boy wanted to see what was going on, and he placed him near himself. Murray, the solicitor-general, after the Lords had pronounced Balmerino guilty, went up to him, and asked him how he could give the Lords so much trouble when he had been told that his plea was useless. Balmerino met the impertinence with a cool retort: "Oh, Mr. Murray, I am extremely glad to see you; I have been with several of your relations; the good lady, your mother, was of great use to us at Perth."* Kilmarnock, upon being brought up for sentence, expressed deep contrition for having joined the rebellion at a rash moment. Cromartie manifested a similar feeling of remorse. Balmerino simply desired the Lords to intercede for mercy. Gray, who was present at the trials, describes the conduct of these noblemen in a letter to Wharton: "Kilmarnock spoke in mitigation of his crime near half an hour, with a decent courage, and in a strong but pathetic voice. His figure would prejudice people in his favor, being tall and genteel; he is upward of forty, but to the eye not above thirty-five years of age. What he said appears to less advantage when read. Cromartie (who is about the same age, a man of lower stature, but much like a gentleman) was sinking into the earth with grief and dejection; with eyes cast down, and a voice so low that no one heard a syllable that did not sit close to the bar; he made a short speech to raise compassion. It is now, I see, printed, and is reckoned extremely fine. I believe you will think it touching and well-expressed; if there be any meanness in it, it is lost in that sorrow he gives us for so numerous and helpless a family. . . . As to Balmerino, he never had any hopes from the beginning. He is an old soldier-like man, of a vulgar manner and aspect, speaks the broadest Scotch, and shows an intrepidity that some ascribe to real courage, and some to brandy. . . . The Duke of Argyle, telling him how sorry and how astonished he was to see him engaged in such a cause, 'My lord (says he), for the two kings, and their rights, I cared not a farthing which prevailed; but I was starving; and if Mahomet had set up his standard in the Highlands, I had been a good Mussulman for bread, and stuck close to the party, for I must eat.'" This latter speech sounds like an invention of the day. Cromartie was pardoned. Kilmarnock and Balmerino were executed on Tower Hill, on the 18th of August. When the deputy-lieutenant, as they passed out of the Tower, cried out, according to the usual form, "God bless King George," Kilmarnock bowed; Balmerino exclaimed, "God bless King James." When the two parted, Balmerino embraced his companion in misfortune, saying, "My lord, I wish I could suffer for both." Walpole then relates a circumstance of some historical import. Balmerino, after their parting, desired again to see Kilmarnock, and then thus addressed him: "'My Lord Kilmarnock, do you know anything of the resolution taken in our army, the day before the battle of Culloden, to put the English prisoners to death?' He replied, 'My lord, I was not present; but since I came hither, I have had all the reason in the world to believe that there was such order taken; and I hear the duke has the pocket-book with the order.' Balmerino answered, 'It was a lie raised to excuse their barbarity to us!' Take notice, that the duke's charging this on Lord Kilmarnock (certainly on misinformation) decided this unhappy man's fate."† Kilmarnock suffered with resolution. Balmerino's behavior is noticed by Shenstone, as either "to have wanted coolness, or else to equal that of Adrian, Cato, Sir Thomas More, or any of those heroes who had spirit enough to make an ostentation of their unconcern." He wore the regimentals which he had worn in the rebellion—a blue coat turned up with red—(the dress which, curiously enough, was afterward known as the Windsor uniform of the time of George III.); and when on the scaffold he took off his periwig and put on a night-cap of Scotch plaid. "He died, says Walpole, "with the intrepidity of a hero, but with the insensibility of one too."

The last of the titled sufferers was Lord Lovat. In December, 1746, he was impeached by the House of Commons. His trial commenced before the Peers on the 9th of March. The chief evidence against him was John Murray, of Broughton; who had been secretary to Charles Edward, and, with Sir Thomas Sheridan, was held to be the adviser of many rash measures which the young prince obstinately pressed. It was a pitiful exhibition to behold this man giving evidence against the old chief, whose cunning could not save him from these treacherous disclosures of his long career of double dealing. Lovat's conduct upon his trial was as little dignified as his ordinary mode of life. He died decorously, quoting the line of Horace, which was a bitter satire upon his course of selfish tyranny and unprincipled ambition: "It is pleasant and honorable to die for one's country." There were forty-three persons attainted by parliament. Some of them were of noble families, but a large proportion were of inferior rank, including a few engaged in commercial and professional employments.

There was one fugitive from the field of Culloden whose adventures have the same sort of interest as those of Charles II. after the battle of Worcester. For the purpose of a general history of our country it is unnecessary here minutely to detail them. Charles Edward quitted the large body of horsemen who had accompanied him from the fatal moor, having resolved to make his way, with a few of his personal friends, to the west coast, in order to embark for France. He rested at Gortuleg, a house belonging to one of the Frasers, where, for the first time, he met Lord Lovat. According to one account, the old chief reproached the prince, when he avowed his intention to quit Scotland without hazarding another battle. Riding past the ruins of Fort Augustus, he halted at Invergarry, an almost deserted house of MacDonell of Glengarry. Here he was left to pursue his course, with two of his companions, and a poor Highlander, Ned Burke, who had been his guide from the battle-field. On the 24th of April he was sailing in a small boat from Loch Na Nuagh, where, nine months before, he had landed with few companions, but with the support of the most sanguine hopes. These solitary lakes and islands were now unsafe. Parties of soldiers penetrated into the most remote places, hunting down rebels, burning cabins, and chasing women and children from their desolate homes. Soon after the wanderings of Charles Edward had begun, the Duke of Cumberland fixed his head-quarters at Fort Augustus, in the very heart of the district where the young prince was hiding, for whose apprehension a reward of thirty thousand pounds had been offered. For five months did this ill-fated adventurer lead a life of constant privation and alarm; generally evading observation; sometimes known; but never betrayed. When he had gained a place of shelter in the house of the elder Clanranald, in the island of South Uist, he was soon disturbed by parties of militia who landed, and by vessels of war cruising about the coast. Obliged to quit his hospitable abode, he wandered alone among the hills, till he was enabled to escape to Skye. This he effected through the compassionate courage and sagacity of Flora MacDonald, a name ever to be numbered in the illustrious roll of heroic women. Charles was dressed as a female when, with Flora and a faithful Highlander, he went to sea in an open boat. They landed at last in the country of Sir Alexander MacDonald, who was opposed to the Jacobite cause. Flora boldly appealed to the sympathy of the wife of the chief, Lady Margaret MacDonald, and through her aid Charles was enabled to escape from the danger which he might have encountered in this hostile district. The kind Lady MacDonald employed her kinsman, Kingsburgh, to be his guide, in company with Flora. He thus safely got out of Skye; and, taking leave of his companions, he reached the Isle of Rasay, alone, disguised as a man-servant. Day after day the prince sustained new hardships. He returned to Skye, and early in July was conveyed in a boat to the mainland. He wandered long among the glens between Loch Shiel and Loch Hourn. He had to elude the sentinels who watched the head of the two lochs. He dwelled among freebooters in a cave, and lived on the plunder which they brought in. In August he returned to the Glengarry country, which was then cleared of troops. Finally, on the 20th of September, he, for the third time, sailed from Loch Na Nuagh; but he now sailed in a French vessel, accompanied by Lochiel and three other of his fugitive adherents.

* Letter to Mann, August 1. † Walpole to Mann, August 21.

CHAPTER CLIX.

Parliamentary calm—Mr. Pelham and the Duke of Newcastle—Mr. Pitt—Naval successes—Defeats by land—Battle of Lauffeld—Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle—Charles Edward sent out of France—Pacification of the Highlands—The peace regarded as a hard necessity for Britain—Measures of the parliament—Reduction of interest on the

national debt—Combination laws—Parliamentary privilege—Reform of the calendar—Death of Frederick, Prince of Wales—Official changes—Act for dissection in cases of murder—Act for preventing thefts and robberies, and for regulating places of public entertainment—Gin Act—The Jew Bill—The Marriage Act—Note on the Stuart family.

The interval between the suppression of the Scottish rebellion in 1746, and the conclusion of the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748, is perhaps as little interesting in its details as any period of our history. Nor are there many exciting events to give spirit to a narrative of the remaining six years of that administration which was broken up by the death of Mr. Pelham in 1754. Opinion became torpid, after the excitement of the rebellion had passed away. Jacobitism slunk to its hiding-places. Patriotism looked out for pensions and sinecures. Party contests had nearly subsided into personal struggles for place and power, which those who are curious as to such mysterious affairs may drowsily meditate upon in the sober narrative of Coxe,* or laugh over in the sarcastic anecdotes of Walpole. During the agony of the rebellion, immediately after the defeat at Falkirk—at a time when it might be supposed that English statesmen would have cast away their petty ambitions—there came what is termed a ministerial crisis. Lord Granville (Carteret), although out of office, had the confidence of the king; while the Duke of Newcastle, and his brother, Mr. Pelham, his majesty's chief ministers, were not favorites with him. They resolved to try their strength. They demanded office for Mr. Pitt, rather from their fear of him than from their love. The king refused to give a place to one who had so bitterly thwarted his Hanoverian partialities. The Pelhams and the whole body of their Whig followers resigned. Granville became minister—for forty eight hours; for he could command no parliamentary support. The Pelhams returned triumphantly to power, upon their own terms, giving Pitt an office, but one which would not necessarily bring him into personal intercourse with the king. "Lord Granville left St. James's laughing," says Walpole.† After this victory the Pelhams had little to fear even from the dislike or the coldness of their sovereign. The cabinet had little to dread but jealousies and dissensions among its members. It continued its temporizing course through eight years of a monopoly of the real authority of the state. Opposition was hushed. The great parliamentary orators, Pitt, Fox, Murray, were propitiated into silence by office, and bided their time for power. The bitter opponents of Walpole and Carteret were no longer "the boys." Pitt professed to have cast away some of the extreme opinions of his nonage. "Never," says a reviewer of the Pelham administration, "was the tempestuous sea of parliament lulled into a profounder calm."‡ This is meant as commendation. Something of the calm was produced by the almost complete absence of publicity from parliamentary proceedings. Cave, the proprietor of "The Gentleman's Magazine," and Astley, the printer of "The London Magazine," were so terrified at the bar of the House of Lords in 1747, where they stood in custody of the usher of the Black Rod for publishing the proceedings on Lord Lovat's trial, that no glimpse of what Lords or Commons were doing met the public eye for several years; and then so briefly and obscurely that Pitt might, for any gratification of general curiosity, have as well harangued upon the sea-shore like his great model. But the parliamentary calm was chiefly produced by influences far more cunningly devised than the despotic privileges which controlled the public journals. Mr. Pelham and his brother divided the labors of administration pretty equally. The one quietly conducted parliamentary and treasury business; the other managed the more complex affairs of his private levee. Pelham was a skilful financier in the open management of the public money. Newcastle was the most adroit and experienced trafficker for seats in the House of Commons. He bought boroughs with a profuse employment of his own wealth, that made his family power almost irresistible. He bought members with the secret-service money, exercising a tact that put Walpole's coarser operations to shame. He cajoled; he promised; and, if wheedling and lying were in vain, he freely paid. This was Newcastle's peculiar talent. He hugged the dirty work to his bosom as if it were the great glory of his life. He would share with no man the distinction of bribing for votes. It can scarcely be matter of surprise that under such a system the nation resigned itself to the comatose symptoms which the opiates of the state-physicians were gradually producing. The scheme of corruption which Walpole instituted to keep things quiet, while the contests for the restoration of the Stuarts were truly formidable, was perfected under the Pelhams, when the danger had passed away. The agency which had been resorted to for the support of the crown was perpetuated for the aggrandizement of an oligarchy. The parliamentary domination of the great Whig families, divided as a party but united as a caste, had almost ceased to be regarded as unconstitutional.

The appointment under the Pelhams of William Pitt to an office, however secondary, is an event of historical importance. The king refused to nominate him secretary at war—a post in which his energy might have produced some more decided successes than were obtained previous to the peace of 1748 by the supine Pelhams. Pitt was first appointed vice-treasurer of Ireland, and within a few months was promoted to be paymaster-general. The character of Pitt, who, without wealth or high birth, had made himself the marked man of his time, was now developed in a way that must have been somewhat incomprehensible to the greedy aspirants for the emoluments of place. He received his salary; he disdained to pocket more than his salary. The paymaster-general used to retain a hundred thousand pounds as a balance in his own hands, which he invested in government securities, for his private benefit; the public thus paying interest upon their own money to their own salaried servant. Pitt sent every balance, as it accrued, to the Bank of England, to be available for its proper purposes. The indirect modes in which ministers of state grew rich, through other means than the legal receipts of their highly-paid offices, received another illustration from the self-denial of this extraordinary paymaster. When a subsidy was advanced to a foreign power, it had been customary for the itching palm of office to demand half per cent as its honorarium. Pitt astonished the King of Sardinia by sending him the sum without deduction which parliament had voted; and he raised his majesty's astonishment still higher when he refused a present as a compliment to his integrity. Pitt was a poor man; but he had higher aspirations than the "auri sacra fames" of a venal age. His pride, which betrayed him into many errors, saved him from the degradation of the meanest of passions. Amid their general contempt for the government, the people came to know that there was one man who professed some regard for public virtue.

When the British troops, and foreign troops in the pay of Great Britain, had been withdrawn from the Low Countries to put down rebellion and defend our own shores, the successes of the French were rapid and decisive. All the Austrian Netherlands submitted to their arms. On the other hand, the French were driven out of Italy by the Austrians and Sardinians. The year 1746 offered no prospect of a speedy termination of the war. In 1747 the maritime power of the country was signally asserted. Admiral Anson, on the 3d of May, captured, sunk, or destroyed the French fleet off Cape Finisterre. The fleet thus annihilated had for its principal object to attempt the recovery of Cape Breton, which had been taken from the French in 1745. Commodore Fox, on the 16th of June, took forty French ships, richly laden from the West Indies. Admiral Hawke, on the 14th of October, defeated a French fleet off Belleisle. England had acquired full confidence in the might of her naval arm. Her Channel fleet had rendered invasion almst impossible during the troubles of 1745. She had bold and skilful admirals. She had hardy seamen, confident in their national superiority if they were well commanded. The land operations of 1747 were of a different character.

The political importance of Holland had for some years been frittered away by an imbecile government. The republic was losing its ancient place among the European nations. Its thriving cities appeared likely, in the apparent decay of the old warlike spirit, to become the prey of the same enemy that had been driven back by the energy of William of Orange. Upon the death of that prince the office of hereditary stadtholder had been merged in that of grand pensionary. Louis XV. in 1747 sent an army of twenty thousand men to invade Brabant. The hearts of the Dutch people were roused as in 1672; and they sought the same means of deliverance as

* "Administration of Henry Pelham."
† "Memoirs of the Reign of George II.," vol. ii. p. 174, 8vo edit.
‡ "Quarterly Review," vol. 50, p. 90.

at that period. Prince William of Nassau was proclaimed stadtholder; and to him were intrusted the means of national defence. This young man had succeeded, as captain-general and lord high admiral, to the powers held by William III.; but the popular acclamation could not evoke in him those qualities which made his great predecessor the savior of his country. He was the son-in-law of George II. The favorite son of George, and the husband of his daughter, were to command the allied forces of British and Dutch. "Our two young heroes agree but little," wrote Mr. Pelham. "Our own is open, frank, resolute, and perhaps hasty; the other assuming, pedantic, ratiocinating, and tenacious." On the 2d of July, at Lauffeld, near Maestricht, the "two young heroes," with an Austrian army commanded by Marshal Bathiany, were to encounter the French headed by Marshal Saxe. The Duke of Cumberland with his British fought with desperation. "His royal highness's valor has shone extremely," says Walpole, "at the expense of his judgment. . . . His prowess is so well established that it grows time for him to exert other qualities of a general."* The Prince of Nassau, with his Dutch, got out of the fight as soon as possible. The Austrian marshal never moved from his intrenched position. There was a terrible slaughter of the British and the French. Sir John Ligonier, who had commanded the English cavalry, was taken prisoner. Louis XV., who was present at the battle, hinted to this general, who first came to England as a French Protestant refugee, that it would be better to think of peace than to witness the destruction of so many brave men. Marshal Saxe talked confidentially with the prisoner upon the same subject. The war still went on unfavorably for the allies, Bergen-op-Zoom having surrendered to the French in September. Louis expressed sentiments of moderation; and finally Ligonier was sent by the French king to the Duke of Cumberland, to intimate his desire that they should meet, and agree upon terms of peace. The English ministry did not believe that the duke was exactly fitted for a negotiator; and, much to his father's annoyance, sent the Earl of Sandwich to watch over him. But it was many months before peace was accomplished. The "two young heroes" wanted more fighting. George II. wanted to obtain some paltry advantage for his beloved Hanover which might be won by another campaign. A congress was opened at Aix-la-Chapelle in March, 1748; even while the war of British, Dutch, and Austrians against the French was going on in Flanders. In April it became pretty clear that Cumberland, always ready to fight, was no match for De Saxe, who fought only when he saw his advantage in fighting. The French marshal had so conducted his operations that for Cumberland to hazard another battle before Maestricht would have been a rashness too great for an English ministry to sanction. The pacific members of the cabinet outvoted the warlike; and Mr. Pelham wrote to Lord Sandwich, that as it was impossible to check the progress of the French army, or to reconcile the discordant pretensions of the allies, the king resolved to accept the conditions of peace proposed by France, without having the concurrence of the other powers. The preliminaries were signed by the plenipotentiaries of England, Holland, and France, at the end of April.

The king, in his speech on opening the session of the new parliament in November, 1747, had announced that overtures of pacification had been made by France. He looked back to the origin of the war: "By the advice of my parliament I entered into the war against Spain to vindicate and secure the trade and commerce of my subjects." The bells were ringing in October, 1739, upon the declaration of hostilities against Spain. They were ringing in April, 1748, upon the conclusion of the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, by which not a single point was gained for which England had been fighting with Spain and France for eight years. The peace was such as a nation makes when it is weary of blood-shedding; when its government can no longer trust to the repetition of the parrot words, "just and necessary war." All conquests, in all parts of the world, that had been made by any of the powers engaged in the war, were to be restored. The English grumbled about the restitution of Cape Breton. They grumbled more, that the right of search claimed by Spain off her American coasts should have been left precisely in its former position—a constant source of violence and animosity. One point was gained, which George and his ministers not unnaturally held of importance. The pretender and his descendants were to be renounced. Charles Edward was to be expelled from France. The French government intimated its intention to behave compassionately to the young prince who had dared and endured so much for his family. They proposed to establish him at Fribourg, with an adequate pension, and the honors that attached to the empty title of Prince of Wales. The young man, with characteristic obstinacy, refused to quit Paris. He was entreated; he was threatened; but he defied what he termed the orders of the house of Hanover. He was at last arrested as he was going to the opera, imprisoned for a few days at Vincennes, and then turned loose on the frontier of Savoy. He wandered about Europe for many years, bearing a fictitious name. He contracted debasing habits of intoxication. He outraged his few remaining supporters, by refusing to give up a mistress whom they regarded as a spy. There is a relation by Dr. King of a venturous visit which Charles Edward made to England in 1750. The Jacobite principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, saw the prince several times during the five days which he remained in London. "The impatience of his friends who were in exile had formed a scheme which was impracticable; but although it had been as feasible as they represented to him, yet no preparations had been made, nor was anything ready to carry it into execution. He was soon convinced that he had been deceived." To have remained long in England would have been rash beyond the usual rashness of the prince. The servant of Dr. King remarked the resemblance of the gentleman who had come to drink tea with his master, to "the busts which are sold in Red Lion Street, and are said to be the busts of Prince Charles."* The brother of the unhappy prince had been named a cardinal in 1747; and this was considered by Charles and his friends as a fatal barrier to the restoration of the house of Stuart to the throne of Protestant Great Britain—an event more fatal than the defeat of Culloden. †

The measures of the English government in relation to Scotland were of much greater importance to the security of the house of Brunswick than the humiliation of Charles Edward or the dedication to the papacy of Cardinal York. The pacification of the Highlands was gradually being accomplished by a series of enactments, one of which was of unquestionable public benefit. The disarming act of 1748, and that for the abolition of the Highland dress, might be regarded as unnecessary severities, and as sources of national irritation. But the great measure for the abolition of heritable jurisdictions was open to no objection beyond the complaints of a few interested nobles. It was carefully considered by the law authorities of England, and was carried through under the advice of the Scottish Court of Session. The sum of a hundred and fifty thousand pounds was wisely expended in buying up the emoluments which great and petty chiefs of clans derived from the exercise of their arbitrary and dangerous powers. The sheriff courts were taken as the foundation of local tribunals, where justice should be administered by responsible judges. The exclusive privileges which were thus abolished destroyed that power which, whether it be regarded as feudal or patriarchal, was a real tyranny, as dangerous to the state as oppressive to the people. There was one indication of an attempt to revive the disaffection of the Highland chiefs. In 1753 the execution of Dr. Archibald Cameron, upon a previous attainder, renewed some of the odium which attached to the severities of 1746. He had not come to Scotland solely upon his private affairs, as alleged, but "to inquire about a considerable sum of money which had been remitted from France to the friends of the exiled family," and he had a commission to hold intercourse with M'Pherson of Cluny, who kept up the correspondence between Charles Edward and his friends. Sir Walter Scott, who relates these circumstances, holds that the execution of Dr. Cameron might have been justified upon reasons of a public nature, had the king's ministers thought it prudent to develop the channel of information which they possessed as to the plots of Charles Edward.‡

The termination of the war was publicly celebrated as if it had been the glorious result of sagacious counsels and military bravery. On the 27th of April, 1749, there was an unequalled display of fireworks in the Green Park. Handel composed a grand overture of

* Letters to Mann, July 2 and July 3.

* "Anecdotes," p. 196. † See note at the end of this chapter.
‡ Introduction to "Redgauntlet."

warlike instruments. An Italian artist designed a temple, a hundred and fourteen feet high, with statues and pictures—heathen gods and cardinal virtues; Neptune drawn by sea-horses; Mars drawn by three lions. The king was recorded in Latin inscriptions as having given peace to Europe, secured the faith of treaties, restored and enlarged commerce. Britannia joined hands with France and Spain, in renewed concord and for mutual benefit. The people were pleased, and cared little for caricatures in which the fireworks were called "The grand whim for posterity to laugh at." But the shouts of the multitude were not echoed in parliament. Mr. Pelham, who carried political candor somewhat beyond the point of prudence, spoke of the necessity for this peace in a tone which indicated very much of that prostration of national spirit of which there were too many evidences at this particular period. In a speech on the 5th of February, 1750, in reply to a motion of Lord Egmont on the article of the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle respecting Dunkirk, Mr. Pelham, as head of the administration, said that the wonder was that England could have obtained such good terms as she did; that another campaign would have made the French masters of the Dutch provinces; that if the Dutch had joined France in alliance against this country, we should not long have preserved our superiority at sea, "the loss of which would soon have put an end to our sitting here, to debate about the demolition of Dunkirk, or any other point relating to the honor or interest of Great Britain." * This timid minister even went farther in the course of this speech: "I think myself in duty bound to declare, that in our present loaded condition, when the people are so burdened with taxes, and most of those taxes mortgaged for the payment of debts, it is my opinion that we are not able to stand single and alone in a war against the whole house of Bourbon; and the circumstances of Europe are such at present that it would be impossible for us to form a confederacy upon the continent that would not be a burden rather than an advantage to us." Pelham wrote in the same desponding temper to the Duke of Newcastle: "Dear brother, we are conquered; we have little strength of our own, and less of other people's." With such a humiliated spirit in the prime minister of a country, it is easy to understand how, during the years which remained of the Pelham administration, the nation was held to be sunk and degraded. A mighty change was produced by the genius of one man—he who, having been thrust upon the king as a subordinate member of the government in 1746, came gradually to be looked up to as the most influential man in the state, especially after the death of Henry Pelham in 1754. The extraordinary abilities of William Pitt at length rose above the control of incapable colleagues. In five years he raised a dispirited nation to an unprecedented height of honor and power. The history of this great man's administration is a history of which England may well be proud, even after a century has elapsed of events too wonderful, and of changes too vast, to have presented themselves to the imagination of the most sanguine believer in his country's future greatness, who lived in the last years of George the Second. But before we reach the history of that period, we have first to trace the less stimulating occurrences of six or seven years of peace. In those years Great Britain was husbanding the means of triumph. Her people were carrying forward their industry with a success which gave them the sinews of war. Some important social reforms were made; others were attempted, and were deferred through antiquated prejudices. A careful examination will show that, amid much that was rotten and corrupt, the nation was unusually prosperous; and that the common predictions of its decline were the fallacies of superficial observers.

The parliament which commenced its sittings in November, 1747, was continued through its full septennial period until April, 1754. This tenth parliament of Great Britain holds an honorable place in history for two measures of permanent utility—the Reform of the Calendar, and the Marriage Act. Other portions of its legislation are interesting as bearing upon some questions which are still not wholly settled, or as illustrating the state of public morality. During the remaining years of the Pelham administration we may follow the course of parliamentary proceedings as the best outline of the progress of the nation.

Mr. Pelham, though a timid war minister, was sufficiently bold as a financier. At the opening of the session the king recommended to the Commons "to be watchful to improve any opportunity of putting the national debt in a method of being reduced, with a strict regard to public faith and private property." In a fortnight the proposal of the minister was entertained, to reduce the 4 per cent annuities to a lower rate of interest. The whole unredeemed capital of the funded debt amounted, in round numbers, to seventy-one millions, of which forty-three millions were due to the Bank of England, the South Sea Company, and the East India Company, at varying rates of interest—namely: 4 per cent, 3½ per cent, 3 per cent. Of the other public debt, nearly nineteen millions were in 4 per cent annuities, and eight millions in 3 per cent consolidated annuities. Mr. Pelham proposed that all persons or bodies corporate entitled to any part of the redeemable national debt, which carried interest at 4 per cent, who should consent to receive interest at 3 per cent, commencing on the 25th of December, 1757, should receive 3½ per cent in the intermediate years. The scheme, according to Tindal, was regarded as a very bold and even dangerous measure by many friends of the minister. Smollett says that foreign nations looked on with wonder, to see such a proposition carried without disturbance, and asked where money could be found to pay off the dissentient fund-holders. But there were very few who chose to be paid off. The confidence in the government, and the convenience to many persons of these public investments with their certain dividends, enabled the minister to accomplish his plan without the disquiet which some had dreaded. The public benefit of the reduction of interest was sensibly felt when, after the death of Mr. Pelham, the nation became engaged in the Seven Years War. After languishing for a year or two, this contest was conducted to a successful close, with a lavish expense wholly unprecedented on the part of England. In 1749, when the funded debt was seventy-one millions, the interest was very nearly three millions. In 1759, when the funded debt was eighty-nine millions, the interest was still under three millions.*

In the middle of the eighteenth century such a change had taken place in the relations between employers and workmen that the old system of regimenting labor by prescribing the rate of wages and the hours of work was coming quickly to an end. Four hundred years before that time the labor question, as it is called, was putting strife between masters and servants. The laborers of the reign of Edward III., in consequence of a pestilence which had reduced the amount of labor seeking employment, demanded a rise in wages—as they justly might, according to the natural law which regulates wages. They founded their demand upon sound principles, although these were not reduced into a science. But it was held that the laborers of the time of Edward III. demanded what the employers considered excessive wages; and the legislature stepped in to compel a rate of hire, and to confine laborers to one locality. This was the stronger tyranny; and the precedent was ever at hand in future contests.† Statutes for the regulation of wages and the hours of labor went on multiplying, even against the growing conviction that they were inefficient. There was a constant and gradual tendency in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries for the prices of commodities to advance; and this inevitable result of the discovery of the precious metals in America baffled every attempt to fix a stationary scale of wages. A statute of 1548 endeavors to grapple with what it held to be two flagrant evils. Sellers of victuals were to be punished for conspiring and covenanting to sell their commodities at unreasonable prices. This was to be a boon to those who labored for subsistence. But, on the other hand, combinations of workmen were prohibited by this statute, under severe penalties. It would appear from this enactment that workmen, under a system of promises and mutual oaths, then engaged in a confederacy against the liberty of other workmen; and to this extent the legislators were right, even in enacting their harsh penalties of imprisonment and pillory. We here see the commencement of statutory regulations against combinations of workmen; which, however, were always punishable at common law as well as combinations of masters. We go on to the eighteenth century, and we then find special laws against combinations in particular trades. A statute of the 7th George I. is "for regulating journeymen tailors," especially those of London and Westminster,

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xiv. col. 678.

* See "Parliamentary Return of the National Debt," etc. Ordered to be printed 19th July, 1858.

† See *ante*, vol. i. p. 140.

"who have lately departed from their services without just cause, and have entered into combinations to advance their wages to unreasonable prices, and lessen their usual hours of work." A statute of the 12th George I. extends the penalties against combinations to "workmen employed in the woollen manufacture." The next step is the Act of 1749, which especially extends the provisions of the two previous statutes to those employed in hat-making, and to the workers in all textile substances, and in leather; and, moreover, provides the usual supposed remedies of legal punishments against all combinations of workmen whatever. It required the experience of three quarters of a century to show that such legislation was essentially a mistake. The statutes against combinations had been so multiplied that when these laws were repealed in 1824 they amounted to thirty-five different enactments. It was inconsistent with the principle of justice to all classes that they should continue on the statute-book in their original arbitrary and unequal provisions. Adam Smith, in 1776, proclaimed this inequality: "We have no acts of parliament against combining to lower the price of work, but many against combining to raise it."* The injustice has been remedied, and workmen are free to combine not to work under certain wages, and to regulate the hours of work; always provided that they do not by violence, threats, or otherwise, interfere with the freedom of action in other workmen. We shall have to note hereafter the repeal of the combination laws and the effects of that repeal. This change and its consequences form an important consideration in the history of our social state, and in any estimate of its possible future. The change could not be avoided. But the rude contest of four centuries ago still subsists under different forms scarcely less rude. Legislation is not competent to deal with the evil. Its remedy can only be found in a better appreciation by employers and workmen of their mutual rights and duties. The preparation for a happier system than that which results in the ruin and misery of strikes is to be sought in the real and solid instruction of all classes in the great natural laws by which the relations of capital and labor must inevitably be adjusted, whatever be the disturbing forces which interfere with an adjustment. The gross ignorance of these laws exhibited by the legislators of trades-unions, in the middle of the nineteenth century, is even more deplorable than that of the lawgivers of the nation in the fifteenth century. Untaught workmen of the time of Edward III. had the laws of political economy with them when they demanded an increase of wages in consequence of the decrease in the number of laborers. Half-educated artisans of the days of Queen Victoria demand an increase of wages because the number of laborers has increased. On the other hand, we are not to conclude that the ignorance, grosser than that of the dark ages, which says, "If political economy is against us, we are against political economy," and the tyranny against fellow-workmen by which that ignorance is upheld —that these are to be met by the capitalist, in a partial triumph over combinations, requiring conditions which appear to interfere with the free action of the individual laborer. Let us have no class despotism, on one side or the other; no arbitrary regulations, if not quite as odious, certainly as ineffectual, as the partial and unjust distinction of the days of the first and second Georges between the rights of capital and the rights of labor.

The question, so often raised, and on which different opinions are still continued to be held—the question of parliamentary privilege—agitated the nation in 1750 and in 1751. On the 22d of November, 1749, an election was held for Westminster, in which the ministerial candidate, Lord Trentham, was opposed by Sir George Vandeput, supported by a strong body of persons calling themselves the Independent Electors. A scrutiny was demanded, upon Lord Trentham being returned. On the 22d of February, 1750, no return having been made to the writ, the high bailiff was called to the bar of the House of Commons; but he was dismissed, upon his assurance being given that he would use his endeavors to expedite the election. Parliament was prorogued before the return was made, which return was in favor of Lord Trentham. Soon after the opening of the session in 1751, a petition was presented from the inhabitants of Westminster, complaining of an undue return, arising out of the partiality of the high bailiff. This officer accused three gentlemen, Mr. Crowle, the Hon. Alexander Murray, and Mr. Gibson, of having illegally interfered to obstruct the proceedings on the scrutiny, and to influence him in the return. Crowle was reprimanded and discharged. Gibson was sent to Newgate. When Murray was brought to the bar, to receive his sentence of a close committal to Newgate, he refused to kneel, as commanded by the speaker. Horace Walpole has related the scene which took place: "He entered with an air of confidence, composed of something between a martyr and a coxcomb. The speaker called out, 'Your obeisances! Sir, your obeisances!' and then, 'Sir, you must kneel.' He replied, 'Sir, I beg to be excused; I never kneel but to God.' The speaker repeated the command with great warmth. Murray answered, 'Sir, I am sorry I cannot comply with your request; I would in anything else.' The speaker cried, 'Sir, I call upon you again to consider of it.' Murray answered, 'Sir, when I have committed a crime, I kneel to God for pardon; but I know my own innocence, and cannot kneel to anybody else.' The speaker ordered the sergeant to take him away and secure him."* In April Murray was brought by Habeas Corpus into the King's Bench, where his case was argued. But the validity of his commitment being affirmed by three judges, he was remanded to Newgate. Upon the prorogation of parliament he was conducted in triumph to his own house, attended by the sheriffs of London. In the next session of parliament a motion was made that Murray should be apprehended, and again committed to Newgate for contempt of privilege. It was fortunate for the honor of parliament that, upon the motion being carried, Murray absconded. A reward of five hundred pounds was offered for his apprehension, but without effect. A prosecution against the publisher of a pamphlet on this subject was ordered by the house. A London jury acquitted the defendant. The public sympathy with Murray was a manifestation of the growing temper with which the proceedings of their representatives had come to be regarded by the people—a temper which in a few years was to convulse the nation almost to the verge of anarchy.

The Reform of the Calendar, in 1751, is a measure of which no one can be more sensible of the advantage than he who has to write the annals of his country. The change which Pope Gregory XIII. had introduced in 1582 had gradually been adopted by all European states except England, Russia, and Sweden. Thus, in reading a French historian, we not only find an event bearing date ten or eleven days in advance of the date of an English narrative, but the year is made to begin from the 1st of January in the foreign annalist instead of the 25th of March, as in the English. To prevent mistakes arising out of this confusion requires perpetual vigilance in the historical writer. To attempt to reconcile these discrepancies in all cases would be needless; and most annalists are generally content to take the dates as they find them. The energy of Lord Chesterfield—a man of great and various ability, who had filled high offices, but in 1751 had retired from ministerial business—carried this reform through, with the learned aid of Lord Macclesfield, who was afterward president of the Royal Society. The commencement of the year on the 1st of January was not calculated to disturb any popular prejudice; for the 25th of February, 1751, on which day the bill was introduced into the House of Lords, was ordinarily written, 25th February, 1750-51. But the necessity for another change was thus indicated by Lord Macclesfield: "The same day which, in each month, is with us the first, is called the twelfth day of the month throughout almost all the other parts of Europe; and in like manner through all the other days of the month, we are just eleven days behind them." To make the legal year correspond in all future time with the solar year was the result of scientific calculations, the rationale of which is now generally understood. It was necessary also to make a change in the calendar as to the time of finding Easter. There were many minor regulations essential to be provided for in consequence of the great change. The payments of rents, annuities, and salaries for public service were not to be accelerated; and thus the 5th of July, the 10th of October, the 5th of January, and the 5th of April, long held their place as rent days; and the dividends upon stock are still paid at those periods. It may be supposed that such a reform, however valuable, would not be made without some popular discontent. The timid Newcastle told Chesterfield that he hated new-fangled things—that he had better not meddle with matters so long established. The witty earl was wiser. He made a speech of which he has given a

* "Wealth of Nations," book i. c. 8.

* "Memoirs of the Reign of George II.," vol. i. p. 29.

most ingenuous account in a letter to his son: "I consulted the ablest lawyers and the most skilful astronomers, and we cooked up a bill for that purpose. But then my difficulty began. I was to bring in this bill, which was necessarily composed of law-jargon and astronomical calculations, to both which I am an utter stranger. However, it was absolutely necessary to make the House of Lords think that I knew something of the matter; and also make them believe that they knew something of it themselves, which they do not. For my own part, I could just as soon have talked Celtic or Sclavonian to them, as astronomy, and they would have understood me full as well; so I resolved to do better than speak to the purpose, and to please instead of informing them." The Peers were amused by Chesterfield; the thinking part of the nation were convinced by Macclesfield, who published his speech. Hogarth has immortalized the vulgar opposition to the reform of the calendar in his picture of an election feast, in which the popular prejudices are flattered by the Whig candidate in his banner inscribed with "Give us our eleven days."

In 1751 an event occurred which for some time disturbed all the calculations of the scheming politicians of this intriguing age. Frederick, Prince of Wales, died after a short illness on the 20th of March. Leicester House, his town abode, had long been the central point of opposition to the government. We have seen how far the unhappy estrangement of the prince from his parents was carried before the death of Queen Caroline. Years had passed over, and yet the animosities between the reigning king and the heir-apparent were never subdued. In 1751 George II., although a hale man, was in his sixty-eighth year. The worshippers of the rising sun grew bolder in their devotion. Bubb Doddington, the treasurer of the navy, resigned his office in March, 1749, having received a message from the prince that the principal direction of his royal highness's affairs should be put in the skilful intriguer's hands. He saw the prince at Kew, and was told that "what he could not do for me in his present situation must be made up to me in futurity." The prince further said, "that he thought a peerage, with the management of the House of Lords, and the seals of secretary of state for the southern provinces, would be a proper station for me, if I approved of it." * Such was the mode in which England was to be governed by favoritism had she endured the misfortune of a King Frederick I. A worthy junto took counsel with the prince as to "the immediate steps to be taken upon the demise of the king, more particularly in relation to the civil list." † The prince directed the movements of the opposition through the indefatigable borough-monger who had now the chief direction of his affairs; suggesting, among other modes of embarrassing his father's ministers, that the business of Dunkirk "was an opportunity to abuse them." ‡ This system was broken up by the event of the 20th of March. The king felt the premature death of his son rather keenly, and appeared desirous that the remembrance of their differences should pass away. The managers of state ceremonials otherwise interpreted the sovereign's wishes. Frederick was interred without all the usual honors bestowed upon the remains of the first prince of the blood royal. None of his family followed him to the grave; and, except certain lords appointed to hold the pall, the whole tribe of courtiers studiously kept away:

"No pitying heart, no eye, afford
A tear to grace his obsequies."

He had bid high for popularity; but even the patriots of the city soon forgot their idol. The public sympathy was directed toward the princess dowager and her eight children. She conducted herself with great prudence, refusing to enter into any of the cabals of those called her husband's friends, and throwing herself entirely upon the guidance of the king. George, her eldest son, was created Prince of Wales. The princess had an adequate revenue assigned to her; and the education of the heir-apparent, now twelve years of age, was provided for by the appointment of a governor and sub-governor, a preceptor and sub-preceptor. A Bill of Regency excited great public attention, and produced long and agitating debates in both houses. The king wished the unpopular Duke of Cumberland to be sole regent. The princess dowager had the public feeling in favor of her claims. The matter was compromised by the act of parliament, which provided that in the event of the demise of the crown before the Prince of Wales attained the age of eighteen, his mother should be guardian of his person; but, as regent of the kingdom, she should act with the advice of a council, composed of the Duke of Cumberland and nine principal officers of state.

By the death of Frederick, Prince of Wales, the organization of a parliamentary opposition was broken up. But as long as there were places to be filled—as long as there were rivalries in the struggles for office, and jealousies among its possessors—there would be personal contests, which had their interests for their little hour, and may still interest those who believe that in getting hold of the clew to court and ministerial intrigues they are in the road to historical discovery. There was a partial change of ministry in 1751, when the Duke of Newcastle desired to be rid of his brother secretary of state, the Duke of Bedford. These great peers, from the very nature of their offices, were not likely to act with perfect union, unless they were warm friends. The one held the seals of the southern department, the other of the northern department—a division of labor which involved correspondence of the one secretary with one half of Europe, and of the other secretary with the other half. Lord John Russell has described this arrangement somewhat humorously: "It was as if two coachmen were on a box of the mail-coach, one holding the right-hand rein the other the left." * Newcastle wanted a partner on the box who would only pretend to hold the one rein. Bedford was therefore got rid of, and a very tractable successor appointed in his place, who would make no pretence to the management of the rein or the whip. Those who are curious to know how this change was effected may find it agreeably told by Horace Walpole.† We turn to more vulgar matters. We advert to those legislative proceedings which were designed to remedy the grosser immoralities, and to check the atrocious crimes, which were as characteristic of this period as the political corruption and the loose examples of the higher orders of society.

In 1752 an act was passed "for the better preventing thefts and robberies, and for regulating places of public entertainment, and for punishing people keeping disorderly houses." In the same year an act was also passed, directing that in cases of wilful murder immediate execution should take place after the criminal had been sentenced, and that his body should be given to the surgeons to be dissected and anatomized. The Surgeons' Theatre in the Old Bailey was built for the convenience of this process. Hogarth's print of the Progress of Cruelty shows how the practice was popularly regarded. The real cruelty to society consisted in causing dissection to be viewed as an infamy, when it was essentially necessary for that instruction in anatomy which was to make skilful surgeons and competent physicians, that some of the dead should thus benefit the living. These views of a more enlightened age repealed the law which was so short-sighted in its aim. The enactments of 1752 appear to have in some degree been consequent upon the publication in 1750 of Henry Fielding's "Inquiry into the Causes of the late Increase of Robbers." In that treatise the first section is devoted to a view of the consequences "of too frequent and extensive diversions among the lower kind of people." He proposes "to stop the progress of vice by removing the temptation. . . . Now what greater temptation can there be to voluptuousness than a place where every sense and appetite of which it is compounded are fed and delighted; where the eyes are feasted with show, and the ears with music, and where gluttony and drunkenness are allured by every kind of dainty; nay, where the finest women are exposed to view, and where the meanest person who can dress himself clean may in some degree mix with his betters." The places of entertainment, he says, are almost become numberless. There are not only places where the nobleman and his tailor, the lady of quality and her tire-woman, form one common assembly; but others, "where the master of the house, the wells, or gardens, catches only the thoughtless and tasteless rabble." When we see written up on a public house or garden, "Licensed for music under the act of 25th George II.," we see the relics of this somewhat inadequate provision for the morality of the people. Experience has shown how limited in their usefulness are such restraints upon vice;

* Doddington's "Diary," July 18th, 1749.
† Ibid., November 12. ‡ Ibid., February 5th, 1750.

* Quoted by Lord Mahon from note in "Bedford Correspondence."
† "Memoirs of George II.," vol. i. pp. 185 to 198.

how, if they were strictly enforced, they would be positively injurious. If allowed to interfere with harmless recreations, such as the intellectual pleasure of cheap music in public places, the gross, sensual gratifications, such as drunkenness, would have a stronger hold upon many who now turn aside from that temptation.

Fielding's second section treats of drunkenness. Against gin he directs his strongest reprobation. "The legislature must once more take the matter into their hands." Of the evils of gin, as the parent of crime, he adduces his experience as a magistrate. "Wretches are often brought before me, charged with theft and robbery, whom I am forced to confine before they are in a condition to be examined; and when they have afterward become sober, I have plainly perceived, from the state of the case, that the gin alone was the cause of the transgression." The consumption of gin had increased to a frightful extent under the prohibitory act of 1736, which was impossible to be enforced; and the statute of 1743, which reduced the excessive duty, was in operation when Fielding wrote. In 1751 Mr. Potter, a rising member of parliament, "produced several physicians and masters of workhouses to prove the fatal consequences of spirituous liquors, which laid waste the meaner parts of the town, and were now spreading into the country." * He proposed an increase of the duty. Mr. Pelham believed no remedy could be found for the evil. Additional duties were imposed from time to time; and the consumption of the liquid fire became gradually diminished, not so much, perhaps, by the operation of the duties as by the general improvement of all classes of society. Drunkenness in the time of George II. was the vice of the high as well as of the low. When it became a disgrace for a gentleman to be drunk, it might reasonably be expected that the artisan would see that his own character and his own happiness were compromised by drunkenness. It has been most wisely said, with reference to habits of intoxication, by a magistrate than whom no one has more nobly labored for the repression of crime by prevention rather than by punishment, "From whatever point of view we regard the subject, we shall see that our hopes of improvement have no solid foundation except in the enlightened sentiment of the people." †

"Gaming among the vulgar" is placed by Fielding as one of the causes of robbery. He honestly touches upon the pestilent example of the great, and recommends a more laudable method of employing their time to "the nobility and gentry." He might well do so, when peers went out of town to Richmond, to play at whist on Saturday and Sunday; and Lord Sandwich, a minister of state, when he hunted with the Duke of Cumberland, carried dice in his pocket, to throw a main under a tree when the hounds were at fault. ‡ Fielding held that the magistrate was armed with sufficient power to destroy all gaming "among the inferior people." This was the creed of that age with regard to every vice; and was one of the chief causes that the inferior people so stoutly rebelled against the Gin Act of 1736.

The statutes for the further prevention of thefts and robberies, and for putting a mark of infamy, in addition to the punishment of death, upon the crime of murder, were preceded in 1750 by a royal proclamation, offering a reward of a hundred pounds for the discovery of any offender who had committed a murder, or a robbery with violence, within London and Westminster, or five miles round. Fielding had said, "I make no doubt but that the streets of this town, and the roads leading to it, will shortly be impassable without the utmost hazard; nor are we threatened with seeing less dangerous gangs of rogues among us than those which the Italians call the banditti." But he in the same page declares, "that there are at this time a great gang of rogues, whose number falls little short of a hundred, who are incorporated in one body, have officers and a treasurer, and have reduced theft and robbery into a regular system." This testimony from a police magistrate, who made most unusual exertions for the discovery of offenders, shows how completely the metropolis was without a police; how, when the gallows was the only instrument of repression and the great teacher of honesty, crime flourished to an extent which makes us look back upon the polite days of Lord Chesterfield, and the glorious days of the first Pitt, as a period not far removed, in some respects, from barbarism. The folly of the public was quite equal to the atrocity of the robbers. M'Lean, a highwayman, who mixed with genteel society, was sentenced to be hanged. "The first Sunday after his condemnation three thousand people went to see him; he fainted away twice with the heat of his cell. You can't conceive the ridiculous rage there is of going to Newgate; and the prints that are published of the malefactors, and the memoirs of their lives and deaths set forth with as much parade as—as—Marshal Turenne's—we have no generals worth making a parallel." * What could legislation do in such an age for the better preventing thefts and robberies?

The opposition to the measure known as the Jew Bill, and the ultimate fate of this attempt to render some justice to an industrious and thriving portion of the community, is one of the many proofs of the difficulty which attends a government when it is more enlightened than the people it governs. A bill was introduced in the Commons, in the session of 1753, "which enabled all Jews to prefer bills of naturalization in parliament, without receiving the sacrament, as ordained by statute 7 Jac. I." † It was not a sweeping bill for the naturalization of the whole body of Jews at once. The clamor which arose against this measure was not more illiberal than the arguments by which it was opposed in parliament. "If the Jews should come," said the city member, Sir John Barnard, "to be possessed of a great share of the land of the kingdom, how are we sure that Christianity will continue to be the fashionable religion?" But the worthy merchant delivered a sentiment which would come more home to his fellow-citizens: To put Jews, or any other foreigners, upon an equal footing with natives, would be only to take the bread out of the mouths of our own people, without adding anything to the national commerce. To naturalize Jews, said another member, was to rob Christians of their birthright. To allow Jews, said another, to purchase and hold land estates, was to give the lie to all the prophecies of the New Testament: they are to remain without any fixed habitation until they acknowledge Christ to be the Messiah. The bill was passed in the Commons by a majority of forty-one. In the Lords it was also carried, and received the support of many bishops. The prelates who had thus the courage to advocate this truly Christian measure were libelled by pamphlets and hooted by mobs. The Duke of Newcastle was so terrified by this outburst of popular ignorance that on the opening of the next session of parliament he moved for the repeal of the obnoxious statute. The cowardice of the government resulted from the dread of the effects of an honest perseverance, if the prevailing cry of "No Jews" should be raised against their candidates in the elections for a new parliament that would take place in 1754.

The Marriage Act of 1753 was almost as unpopular as the Act for Jewish Naturalization. The bill introduced by the Chancellor, Lord Hardwicke, required that a marriage should be preceded by the publication of banns in a parish church, and that the marriage should be there celebrated; that a license might be granted for a marriage to take place also in a parish church, but with the consent of parent or guardian if granted to a minor, or minors; that special licenses might, as previously, be granted by the archbishop of a diocese. The proposed measure passed the Peers; but in the Commons it was resisted with a violence which is amusing to look back upon. Mr. Fox, who had clandestinely married the daughter of the Duke of Richmond, was among the most strenuous of its opponents. It was carried, however, by a large majority. Goldsmith, who published his History of England in 1771, sums up, with much gravity, his belief in the injurious consequences to society which this measure had produced: "The poor, by being prevented from making alliances with the rich, have left wealth to flow in its ancient channel, and thus to accumulate, contrary to the interests of the state. It has been found to impede marriage, by clogging it with unnecessary ceremonies. Some have affirmed that lewdness and debauchery have become more frequent since the enactment of this law; and it is believed that the numbers of the people are upon the decline." Goldsmith had no foundation for his assertion that the law had been found to impede marriage. "The number of marriages before the act of 1753 is not known. Since the act came into operation the registers of marriage have been preserved in England, and show an increase from

* Walpole, "Memoirs of George II.," vol. i. p. 66.
† Charge to the Grand Jury of Birmingham, by the Recorder, Mr. M. D. Hill, January, 1855. ‡ Horace Walpole to Mann.

* Horace Walpole to Mann, October 18th, 1750.
† Blackstone, Kerr's edit., vol. i. p. 377.

50,972 in the year 1756, to 63,310 in 1764." * One thriving occupation was seriously damaged by the new Marriage Act; and we do not find that any compensation was voted to the sufferers. Mr. Robert Nugent, one of the parliamentary orators against the act, said, "How fond our people are of private marriages, and of saving a little money, we may be convinced of by the multitude of marriages at Keith's chapel, compared with the number at any parish church." The Reverend Alexander Keith originally officiated in May Fair; but being excommunicated, and committed to the Fleet, he continued to carry on the old trade by the agency of curates. According to Mr. Nugent, "at Keith's chapel there have been six thousand married in a year." Keith published a pamphlet during the progress of the bill, in which he said that the pure design of the measure was to suppress his chapel—a very worthy design, however Mr. Nugent might approve of the celerity and cheapness of Keith's ceremonials. May Fair was the fashionable "marriage shop;" but the Fleet Prison had the advantage of being open to the humblest seekers of conjugal happiness. Keith generously records of this rival establishment, "I have often heard a Fleet parson say that many have come to be married when they have had but half a crown in their pockets, and sixpence to buy a pot of beer, and for which they have pawned some of their clothes." The motto which worthy Mr. Keith affixed to his pamphlet was, "Happy is the wooing that is not long a-doing;" and he avers that of the many thousands he had married, the generality had been acquainted not more than a week, some only a day, or half a day.†

The Marriage Act of 1753 has been justly regarded as the great step in the improvement of the conjugal relations of the people of England, high and low. Marriage was to become a solemn contract in every case; not to be rushed upon without deliberation; not to be ratified without witnesses and public record. Like every other improvement in manners, the social tendency had preceded the legislative action to some limited extent; and then the legal reform hastened on the social amelioration. To the great change in the family relations of this country, of which the Marriage Act was an exponent as well as a cause, has been attributed the wondrous growth of the population in the short space of one century. A minister of state, gifted with prophetic power, has been imagined thus to address the people of Great Britain, in 1751: "These islands, and Ireland, are occupied by the men of many separate states that are now happily united. After the settlement on the land of tribes, fleets, and armies of Celts, of Saxons, of Danes, and of Normans, and after centuries of patient culture, its fertile soil sustains *seven millions* of people in its whole length from the Isle of Wight to the Shetland Islands. We cannot—for the mighty power is not given us—say, let there be on the European shores of the Atlantic Ocean *three* Great Britains. But the means exist for creating on this land, in less than a hundred years, two more nations, each in number equal to the existing population, and of distributing them over its fields, in cottages, farms and towns, by the banks of its rivers, and around its immemorial hills; and they will thus be neither separated by larger roads, nor wider seas, but be neighbors, fellow-workers, and fellow-countrymen on the old territory; wielding by machines the forces of nature, that shall serve them with the strength of thousands of horses, on roads and seas—in mines, manufactories, and ships. Subsistence shall be as abundant as it is now, and luxuries, which are confined to the few, shall be enjoyed by multitudes. The wealth of the country—its stock and its produce—shall increase in a faster ratio than the people. All this shall be accomplished without any miraculous agency, by the progress of society—by the diffusion of knowledge and morals—by improvements—and improvements chiefly in the institution of marriage—'that true source of human offspring,' whence,

> 'Founded in reason, loyal, just, and pure,
> Relations dear, and all the charities
> Of father, son, and brother, first were known.'" ‡

NOTE ON THE STUART FAMILY.

After Canova's return from England to Rome, in 1816, a monument was erected by him to the three last members of the Stuart family. James Francis Edward, called the elder pretender, died at Rome in 1765. Charles Edward, who in the latter years of his life took the title of Count of Albany, died on the 31st of January, 1788. His younger brother, Henry Benedict, who became Cardinal York, survived till 1807. He died at Rome, at the age of eighty-two. By his will he directed that the title of Henry IX. should be inscribed on his tomb.

CHAPTER CLX.

Death of Mr. Pelham — Newcastle's ministry — Negotiations with Fox—Pitt passed over—Parliament meets—Fox a cabinet minister—Retrospect of Indian affairs—Clive—Capture and defence of Arcot—North American colonies—Contests on the Ohio—Naval victories—Subsidies agreed upon by the king—Parliament—Great debate—Single-speech Hamilton—Pitt—Fox secretary of state—Pitt dismissed from his office of paymaster—Earthquake at Lisbon.

The prime minister, Mr. Pelham, died on the sixth of March, 1754. Horace Walpole, who underrates the public services of this statesman, has this tribute to his moderation and disinterestedness: "Let it be remembered that, though he first taught or experienced universal servility in Englishmen, yet he lived without abusing his power, and died poor." * The king clearly saw what a hubbub of conflicting ambitions would result from the necessity of a new cast of characters for the political drama. "I shall now have no more peace," exclaimed the old man. The Duke of Newcastle achieved the great object of his ambition, in succeeding his brother as the head of the treasury. If experience could give a politician claims to be the ruler of a great nation, and moreover of a nation very difficult to manage, Newcastle had claims above most men. He had been secretary of state in 1724, under Sir Robert Walpole. Carteret had kept him in the same office, though he despised him. His thirst for power was insatiable. He impaired his estate to maintain and extend his parliamentary influence; and thus, whoever was turned out, Newcastle always kept in. Jealous of every man of ability to whom it was necessary to intrust some share of authority, he was always in terror that his subalterns might be called to command, although ever professing his anxiety for their promotion. Always seeking the doubtful support of "troops of friends," he never offended any man by a plain "No," and was often "under the same engagements to at least ten competitors," as Lord Waldegrave affirms. But he was in many respects incompetent to manage any public business that required resolution and steadiness; and his ignorance was so manifested in his flighty and inconsistent talk that what looks like a joke in Smollett's novel has been received as a reliable fact. He had heard that thirty thousand French had marched to Cape Breton. Where did they get transports? was asked. "Transports," cried he, "I tell you they marched by land." "By land to the island of Cape Breton!" "What! is Cape Breton an island?" It was pointed out in the map; and the delighted minister, hugging his informant, ejaculated, "Egad! I'll go directly, and tell the king that Cape Breton is an island." †

In the House of Lords the duke's performances are thus described by a just and impartial observer: "Hear him speak in parliament, his manner is ungraceful, his language barbarous, his reasoning inconclusive. At the same time he labors through all the confusion of a debate without the least distrust of his own abilities; fights boldly in the dark; never gives up the cause; nor is he ever at a loss either for words or argument." ‡ He has had many successors in this line; but at that period the House of Commons required to be managed by a different species of oratory. Three of the great masters of eloquence were in that house—Pitt, Fox, and Murray. Newcastle offered the seals of secretary of state, with the lead of the Commons, to Mr. Fox. The offer was fully justified by the ability and the experience of this gentleman, who started in public life—"a needy political adventurer," as he has been called—"at a time when the standard of integrity among statesmen was low." § This adherent of Sir Robert Walpole would not shrink from any participation in the corruption which gave ascendency to the Duke of Newcastle.

---

* "Census Report," 1851, p. lvii.
† Burn's "Fleet Registers," p. 99.
‡ "Census Report," 1851, p. lxiii.

* "Memoirs of Reign of George II.," vol. i. p. 371.
† "Humphrey Clinker."
‡ Lord Waldegrave, "Memoirs from 1754 to 1758," p. 12.
§ "Edinburgh Review," vol lxxiii. p. 562.

Fox desired to be actively engaged in working the parliamentary system. As secretary of war he had no seat in the cabinet; no responsibility beyond the routine duties of his office. The prospect of a place which would give him real power raised all the ambition of Fox, who, says Lord Hardwicke, "within a few hours of Mr. Pelham's death had made strong advances to the Duke of Newcastle and myself."* But there was a hitch in the completion of the arrangement proposed by Newcastle, which is singularly indicative of the political degradation of those times. Fox agreed to accept the secretaryship and the management of the House of Commons. He very reluctantly gave up the disposal of the secret-service money, but he stipulated that he was to know how the bribes were disposed of. The next day Newcastle receded from this condition. How am I to understand, said Fox, how to talk to members of parliament, when some have received "gratifications," and others not? His brother, said Newcastle, had never disclosed these things, nor would he. How, asked Fox, are the ministerial boroughs to be filled up? That is all settled, said the duke. Fox rejected the secretaryship; and Newcastle had to look out for a more pliant tool.†

The prime minister and the lord chancellor appear now to have turned their thoughts to Mr. Pitt. There are apologetical letters to him from these great personages obscurely intimating the difficulties which they had encountered in their abortive endeavors to add his strength to their party. Sir Thomas Robinson, a dull diplomatist, was appointed to the office which Fox had rejected. Pitt was indignant. The humiliation of his proud spirit may be read in this passage of a letter to Lord Hardwicke: "The weight of irremovable royal displeasure is a load too great to move under; it must crush any man; it has sunk and broke me. I succumb; and wish for nothing but a decent and innocent retreat, wherein I may no longer, by continuing in the public stream of promotion, forever stick fast aground, and afford to the world the ridiculous spectacle of being passed by every boat that navigates the same river."‡ Pitt found his consolations in a happy marriage with Lady Hester Grenville, a sister of Earl Temple. The calm of the domestic life of this eminent man presents a refreshing contrast to the agitations of his public career. Whenever we have glimpses of him in his country retreat at Hayes, we see him in the full enjoyment of as much tranquil pleasure as his infirm health would allow—exercising his taste in improving his little property: reading; educating his children; an exemplary husband and father in a dissipated age. Of those wonderful powers which gave him, without vanity, the right to claim the highest position among public men, his contemporaries were fully aware. We cannot judge, as they could, of that eloquence of which the admiration may appear to us overcharged, when we regard the fragmentary state in which it has come down to us. His faults were patent to all the world. They have been much paraded of late years—his haughtiness, his intractability, his self-assertion. But after a century has passed, and all the petty men and paltry interests of the first William Pitt's time are hastening to oblivion, his grand figure stands out—a giant among pigmies. In the words of Frederick of Prussia, England had at length brought forth a man.§

The Newcastle ministry, formed out of very fragile materials, had some months of respite from parliamentary opposition. The septennial term of parliament was nearly out when Mr. Pelham died. It was dissolved within a month of his decease. The new parliament met on the 14th of November. Pitt and Fox continued in their subordinate offices—Pitt as paymaster, Fox as secretary of war. But they each writhed under the arrangements by which Robinson had taken the management of the House of Commons. "The duke might as well send his jack-boot to lead us," said Pitt to Fox. They could not decently obstruct public business, but they might attack persons. The feeble leader of the Commons had an uneasy time between these two malcontents. "They have already mumbled poor Sir Thomas Robinson cruelly," writes Walpole on the 1st of December. But about this time a scene was acted which startled the House of Commons out of its habitual slumber. An election petition is presented, which the younger Mr. Delaval ridicules; and the house is in fits of laughter about a complaint of bribery and corruption. Pitt is sitting in the gallery. He rushes down, and instantly rises to speak. "Do members laugh on such a subject as bribery? Do we try within the house to diminish our own dignity, when such attacks are made upon it from without?" "At his first two periods he brought the house to a silence and attention that you might have heard a pin drop."* He called upon the speaker to extend a saving hand to raise the character of the house. "He called on all to assist, or else we should only sit to register the arbitrary edicts of one too powerful a subject."† Newcastle was as much terrified by "this thunderbolt thrown in a sky so long serene," as the audience of Pitt were confounded. The minister contrived, by giving Fox a seat in the cabinet, to detach him from his concert with Pitt. Pitt felt the desertion; and told Fox that "they were upon different lines." It appears that the devotion of Fox to the will of the Duke of Cumberland, "whose soldier Mr. Pitt was not," was an additional cause for this separation of their political action.‡ Newcastle had silenced one of his formidable opponents. The other gave him no trouble for the rest of the session.

Events were maturing at this period which rendered it essentially important that England should have a firm and capable government. On the 25th of March, 1755, the king sent a message to both houses, to acquaint them that "the present situation of affairs makes it necessary to augment his forces by sea and land, and to take such other measures as may best tend to preserve the general peace of Europe, and to secure the just rights and possessions of his crown in America." The danger to America was from France, with whose colonists there had been perpetual disputes as to boundaries and alleged rights, from the period of the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. In another part of the world there had been similar disputes, amounting to actual warfare. But the affairs of the East Indies were held to belong rather to a trading company than to the government, and were therefore allowed to follow their own course, without being regarded as a matter of national policy. It may be useful if, in this place, we take a review of the affairs of India and of those of America, as they affected British interests. We begin with India.

We have incidentally traced, at various periods, the progress of the East India Company, from the first establishment of a factory in Surat, in 1612,§ through the various contests between rival interests which ended in the union of two companies in 1702. The company gradually acquired great wealth and influence, lent large sums of money to the government, and received corresponding charters and privileges. The Mogul power was hastening to decay, while its viceroys or subahdars had become independent, or yielded only a very limited submission to a phantom of sovereignty at the court of Delhi. A settlement had been made at Madras in 1640. Bombay had been ceded to Charles II. by the Portuguese, as a part of the dowry of Catherine of Braganza, and had been assigned by the king to the East India Company. Dutch, Portuguese, and English had settled on the River Hooghly, a branch of the Ganges; and after some imprudent contests in the time of Aurungzebe, the English finally obtained a grant of land in 1698, where they built Fort William, and laid the foundation of Calcutta. These were the three presidencies, each having a president and council, appointed by the court of directors. A formidable rivalry arose, in the time of Louis XIV., in a French East India Company. This company had a station at Chandernagore on the Hooghly, and another station on the coast of the Carnatic, where their fort was called Pondicherry. The French possessed also the Isle de France (Mauritius) and the Isle de Bourbon.

From the period of the breaking out of the war between England and France, in 1744, to the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1748, the English and French settlers had been in active hostility. The advantages in this warfare were decidedly on the side of the French. La Bourdonnais, the Governor of the Presidency of the Isle de France, carried a force of three or four thousand Frenchmen, sepoys, and negro slaves, in French vessels across the Indian Ocean, and sud-

* "Chatham Correspondence," vol. i. p. 91.
† Walpole, "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 382.
‡ "Chatham Correspondence," vol. i. p. 105.
§ "Il faut avouer que l'Angleterre été long-tems en travail; et qu'elle a beaucoup soufferte pour produire Monsieur Pitt; mais enfin elle est accouchée d'un homme."—"Chatham Correspondence," vol. i. p. 445.

* Fox to Hartington. Appendix to Waldegrave's "Memoirs," p. 54.
† Fox and Walpole agree in their account of this outburst.
‡ "Grenville Papers," vol. i. p. 144. § *Ante*, vol. iii. p. 408.

denly attacked Madras, in September, 1746. He bombarded Fort St. George for five days, which then capitulated. La Bourdonnais stipulated to restore the settlement to the English company upon the payment of a ransom. Dupleix, the Governor of the Presidency of Pondicherry, expressed great wrath at the terms of the capitulation. Madras was within his jurisdiction, and he would not ratify the treaty. He looked forward to the expulsion of the English from India, and desired to see their thriving settlement of Madras razed to the ground. Dupleix annulled the capitulation, and insolently carried the Governor of Fort St. George, and other officers, in triumph to Pondicherry. In the counting-house of a merchant at Madras was a young Englishman, Robert Clive, who at the time of the capitulation was in his twenty-first year. He fled to the settlement of Fort St. David, a dependency of Madras, and there obtained an ensign's commission in the company's service. The war of the two companies was becoming serious; and a considerable force was sent from England in 1748. With a larger European army than had appeared in India in modern times, the siege of Pondicherry was undertaken. After a great loss, the English raised the siege. The peace came, and under its conditions Madras was restored. But the English and French, although no longer able to fight as principals, could carry on their hostilities as supporters of rival native princes. Dupleix had more ambitious views than the heads of the English presidencies, or than the court of directors in Leadenhall Street. They looked to the extension and security of trade. The bold Frenchman aimed at empire. The Nizam of the Deccan died in 1748. The succession of his son, Nazir Jung, was disputed by a claimant to the throne. In the Carnatic, a province dependent upon the Deccan, the reigning prince was also assailed by a rival. Dupleix gave his well-timed assistance to the two pretenders. In a battle in August, 1749, the Nabob of the Carnatic was slain. His son, Mahomed Ali, fled to Trichinopoly, and Arcot fell into the hands of the Nabob set up by Dupleix. The same success attended the pretender to the throne of the Deccan. Nazir Jung was slain by treachery, as he sat upon his elephant at the head of his army, looking with contempt upon the few French who were drawn up in battle to oppose him. Dupleix received the new Nizam at Pondicherry, and was declared governor, under the Mogul, of the country upon the eastern coast, from the River Kistna to Cape Comorin. There never was a period in the previous history of our commercial relations with India when it was more probable that the power of the English company, like that of the Dutch, was hastening to an end. And yet, within a third of a century, a great orator in the House of Commons took the English dominion over the vast peninsula as a theme for reflection on the inconstancy of human greatness, and the stupendous revolutions that had happened in an age of wonders. "Could it be believed, when I entered into existence, or when you, Mr. Speaker, a younger man, were born, that on this day, in this house, we should be employed in discussing the conduct of those British subjects who had disposed of the power and person of the Great Mogul?" *

The boy who fled from Madras, when Dupleix violated the capitulation of Fort St. George, was destined to lay the foundation of the British empire in India. In Trichinopoly Mahomed Ali prolonged a feeble resistance to Chunda Sahib and his French allies, in their rapid steps toward the complete dominion of the Carnatic. The last stronghold was invested. There was no force to attempt raising the siege. There was no officer at Madras to head the handful of English and native troops to any such daring enterprise. Ensign Clive had now become Captain Clive, and his abilities had procured him the employment of commissary to the troops in the Presidency of Madras. The inspirations of military genius in cases of great emergency are bold even to rashness. The young captain of twenty-five, who had never seen a field of battle, but who rightly estimated what daring might effect, in the first place, and who knew the possibility of combinations with native powers to secure what daring might win, conceived the plan of attacking Arcot, the capital of the Carnatic. A circumstance almost as extraordinary as Clive's bold project is, that the heads of the presidency listened favorably to his plans, and gave him the command of an expedition, consisting of three hundred sepoys and two hundred Europeans. He had eight officers under him, four of whom were factors of the company. Clive and his little band marched up to the gates of Arcot, while a violent storm terrified the superstitious natives who composed the garrison. He entered the city of a hundred thousand people without striking a blow. His success induced the besiegers of Trichinopoly to detach a large force, which finally amounted to ten thousand men, to attack the ruinous fort at Arcot in which Clive had established his small garrison. The siege went on, week after week, with little hope of succor from the company's settlements of Madras and St. David's, where scarcely troops enough were left for their own defence. But Clive thought of a wavering Mahratta chief, who might become his ally. He put himself in communication with Morari Row, who was encamped on the hills of Mysore. Their captain's courage and sagacity inspired all around him with confidence. The garrison began to feel the assaults of hunger. His sepoys begged, not for more food, but that they, who could subsist on scantier fare than the Europeans, might have the liquid in which the rice was boiled, while their fellow-sufferers ate the grain which they more needed. The Mahratta chief, the head of a tribe ever conspicuous for bravery, was touched with the resolution by which Arcot was defended. He never thought before, he said, that the English could fight, but now he would help them. Rajah Sahib, who commanded the besiegers, offered Clive a large bribe if he would surrender; but threatened inevitable death to the commander and his garrison if they should compel him to take the fort by storm. Clive sent him a message of defiance. The 14th of November, the fifteenth day of the siege, was the great festival of Hossein, when all true believers are assured that they who died on this day, battling against the infidels, would be forgiven all the sins of their lives, and enter upon every joy of the Mohammedan paradise. Fired with superstition, and not less with stimulating drinks, crowds rushed to the assault of Arcot. Elephants with plates of iron on their foreheads were driven against the gates. Terrified by the musketry from the walls, they turned upon the multitudes that followed them, and trampled them down. Clive was the soul of the defence. He even took the management himself of a piece of artillery, and destroyed the assailants who were crossing the ditch on a raft. In an hour the attack was at an end. At two o'clock the next morning the besiegers were no more seen.

The wonderful success of the inexperienced captain inspired a confidence in Madras that was justified by the result. Large reinforcements were sent to him, and he went forth to attack Rajah Sahib in the open field. The victory of Arnee opened the way to more successes. The contest was prolonged by Rajah Sahib, who marched upon Madras in January, 1752, and committed some ravages. But Clive was at hand, and again he won a great victory. Trichinopoly was feebly defended, although the siege had now become a mere blockade. Clive was appointed to head a new expedition to raise the siege; but his senior officer, Major Lawrence, having arrived from England, took the command. The two acted together without jealousy. The besiegers of Trichinopoly capitulated, and Chunda Sahib was put to death by the Mahrattas. But Dupleix continued to struggle against the powerful rivals whom he thought to have swept from the Indian territory. Clive, after less important successes, found his health fail. He returned to England, with the lady he had married, a sister of Maskelyne, the eminent astronomer. Honors awaited him; and he had acquired a large amount of prize money. His presence in India had become unnecessary; for in 1754, under the direction of English and French commissioners, hostilities had been suspended; and it was agreed that the rival companies, and the subjects of both nations, should in future abstain from interference in the affairs of the native princes. It was a vain stipulation; for it was perfectly clear that upon the renewal of a European war, hostilities, whether as principals or auxiliaries, would be renewed by the English and French in India. The man upon whom reliance could be placed in such a contingency was Clive. In 1755 he was appointed Governor of Fort St. David; and he received from the king the commission of lieutenant-colonel in the British army before he sailed for India. Dupleix had been superseded by his government; and he returned to France, to be neglected and to die in poverty.

The North American colonies of Great Britain were looked upon as possessions to be defended at all cost from foreign assault. Any invasion of their territorial limits was regarded as a just cause of hos-

* Burke's speech on Fox's India Bill, December 1st, 1783.

tility. Any settlement near their boundaries was viewed with intense jealousy. Their inhabitants were, for the most part, of the same race as the English nation; speaking the same language; governed by laws nearly identical; imbued with the same love of liberty. The original settlers of the New England States had left their own land, to found communities where freedom and toleration might flourish in a more congenial region than that governed by the Stuarts. An American historian has shown, by minute investigations, that twenty-one thousand Englishmen had settled in these New England States before the time of the Long Parliament; that the number of subsequent settlers from Britain, or any other part of Europe, after 1640, to some time beyond the commencement of the present century, was very inconsiderable; and that from these stout-hearted Puritans are descended one third of the present vast population of the United States.* Many of the people of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut † had thus, in their English origin, old family associations, if not existing family connections, with the parent country. Their commercial intercourse kept up among all classes a mutual interest in a common prosperity. Of the Middle States, Pennsylvania ‡ and Maryland had the same English origin, and were bound to England by the same ties. New York had been settled by the Dutch, and New Jersey by Danes and Swedes; but each of these States had been ceded to England before the close of the seventeenth century. Of the Southern States, Virginia was the earliest English settlement, as Georgia was the latest. The two Carolinas were settled in the middle of the seventeenth century.§ These were the colonial possessions on the North American continent which the English government had to defend and protect at the period when the peace, or rather armistice, of Aix-la-Chapelle was likely to be broken. Though all the colonists had occasional causes of complaint, they showed no doubtful allegiance to the British crown. Nova Scotia, or Acadia, as it was called by the French, who had been several times its masters, was held by Britain after 1711. In 1749 a large grant was made by parliament for the encouragement therein of a new settlement. Four thousand emigrants, with their families, established themselves in the province; and by them was Halifax founded. This settlement was made in the belief that France was again looking to the possession of Nova Scotia, and that those of the French race who occupied considerable portions of the territory, and took the name of neutrals, would, with the aid of the Indians, overpower the small British garrison kept at the port of Annapolis Royal. New Brunswick, ceded at the peace of Utrecht by France, was a mere fishing station. Newfoundland was colonized by England under a charter of 1610. Numerous British settlements were made on its east coast; and the French had their settlement of Placentia on the south. By the Treaty of Utrecht the island was ceded to Great Britain, but a limited right of fishery was reserved to the French. Here, therefore, was a cause of perpetual dispute. Prince Edward Island received its present name in honor of the father of Queen Victoria. Before 1799 it was called St. John's Island. We may here add that, at the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, the West Indian possessions of Great Britain were the islands of Antigua, Barbadoes, Jamaica, Montserrat, Nevis, St. Kitt's, Tortola and Anguilla, Bahamas, Bermudas, Honduras. The East India Company possessed St. Helena at this period; and in Africa there was a settlement in Gambia, and there were some forts on the Gold Coast.

The possession of Canada by France was a perpetual source of disquiet to the British colonists of New England, and of Virginia and Pennsylvania. The French Canadian settlers had penetrated to the Ohio, and had there built a fort which they named Duquesne. On the Ohio the Virginians had also a fort called Block's Town. The settlement of Virginia, at this period, extended about two hundred miles from the seacoast, and spread over about one third of the State, according to its present limits. Its population was about two hundred thousand, of whom more than a fourth were slaves. The territory then unoccupied by the descendants of the colonists of the reign of James I. was the hunting-ground of Indians; and the Virginians upon the Ohio were traders in skins. The French, also, were seeking a participation in that commerce which quickly perishes as the extension of civilization creates more profitable industries. The old families of Virginia were engaged in far more lucrative and less adventurous occupations than in exchanges with the Indians. They were cultivating tobacco upon every estate. Their tobacco-fields were the Potosi of the first settlers of North America. Tobacco was their sole article of export. It brought them all the comforts and luxuries which England and Scotland could supply. It was the general measure of value, and the principal currency. Public officers, ministers of the Church, had their salaries paid at so many annual pounds of tobacco. In 1758 the colony exported seventy thousand hogsheads of the precious weed, equivalent to seventy millions of pounds. The price was ten times higher than the present rate. Virginia was thriving. Her planters lived luxuriously on their estates, surrounded by their slaves, and affecting the aristocratic habits of grand old English families, from which many of them claimed to have sprung. Hospitable they were to profusion.* In such a state of society was George Washington born; who, in 1754, then a young man of twenty-two, was fighting for the integrity of the colonial territory against the aggressions of the French. At the age of nineteen he became an adjutant-general, having the rank of major, and taking the direction of one of the military districts into which the province of Virginia was divided for the purpose of resisting the encroachments of the French and the depredations of the Indians. These divisions were reduced to four, in 1752, and the young major had the command of the northern division. In the capacity of commissioner, in 1753, he went into the territory occupied by the French, to negotiate with their commander. He had no success in his diplomacy; but he brought back with him a plan of the fort which the French had constructed in the neighborhood of Lake Erie. He had been employed, when at the age of sixteen, as a public surveyor, and in the wild district of the Alleghanies had acquired that practical mode of viewing large tracts of country which was of essential importance to him in his future great career. In 1754, under the command of an English officer, Colonel Fry, he was sent to occupy the British posts of the Ohio, in the presence of a French force. He defeated a detachment of the enemy, but was finally compelled to capitulate to superior numbers, who surrounded his intrenched fort. He was allowed to retreat with his men, with what are termed military honors. The feuds of the two nations were the subject of official discussions in Paris; but it was clear that this sort of half-warfare in America could not long endure.

In January, 1755, although no formal declarations of hostilities had taken place, General Braddock, with a body of English troops, was sent to the succor of the colonists in Virginia. His campaign was a most unfortunate one. Braddock was a commander of the old routine cast, who fancied that well-dressed and well-equipped soldiers, who could go through all the manœuvres of the Prussian drill, were sure to be victorious over any number of irregular troops. He marched against the French fort on the Ohio, taking Washington with him, although he despised the American militia and their officers. What the Highlanders were to Cope and Hawley the Indians were to Braddock. In a valley between two woods, within ten miles of Fort Duquesne—utterly neglecting all precautions against surprise—the English general fell into an ambuscade of Indians. A few French only encountered him; but the unerring marksmen of the woods picked off his officers; and Braddock himself, fighting with desperate courage, was mortally wounded. Half his troops fled in confusion, abandoning their artillery. The other half were killed or wounded; and the terrible Indian scalping-knife left few to tell the tale of this fatal reverse.†

While British and French were fighting in the waste regions of North America, their ships were engaged in the Atlantic. Admiral Boscawen, with eleven ships of the line, had been sent to watch a French expedition that had sailed from Brest. Off Newfoundland

* Palfrey, "History of New England during the Stuart Dynasty."—Boston, 1858.

† Maine and Vermont were not then separate States.

‡ Delaware was originally part of Pennsylvania.

§ Florida was a Spanish possession till 1763. Of the Western States, Louisiana and Missouri were French. The other Western States, now so populous, were deserts, where one Indian tribe would occupy a hundred square miles.

* See Tucker's "Life of Jefferson," chap. i.

† The incidents of this little war on the Ohio have been told by Mr. Thackeray, in his "Virginians," with a spirit and fidelity which show how Fiction may borrow interest from History without compromising her truth.

the squadrons met in a fog. Captain Howe, having received a signal to engage, took two of the French vessels. The others got into Louisbourg, the fortified harbor of Cape Breton. In the autumn of 1755 Sir Edward Hawke, upon a sudden resolve of the government, made some captures of French merchantmen in the Channel. Of the regency—for the king had gone to Hanover—some were inclined for immediate hostilities and some for delaying them. The time had passed for any sudden and decisive blow ; while the ministers were trembling at their own responsibility, afraid to declare war, and not taking sincere and active measures to preserve peace.

After the session had been terminated in April, 1755, the king, in opposition to a strong parliamentary feeling, had set out for Germany. He had left the regency to take care of the great national interests of Britain, while he looked after the usual means of fencing round his own Hanover by subsidizing auxiliary powers. He was now in dread of Prussia ; and to counteract the growing strength of Frederick II. Russia was to receive a subsidy as well as the Elector of Hesse and smaller potentates. "A factory was opened at Herrenhausen, where every prince that could muster and clothe a regiment might traffic with it to advantage." * With the Elector of Hesse, the king, without the approval of his ministers at home, signed a contract for a large annual payment by England, with an additional stipulation for paying levy money for every Hessian soldier. Fox expressed himself in private against all subsidies. Legge, the chancellor of the exchequer, took a bolder step. The king had sent home the treaty with Hesse. The members of the council of regency had signed it, as a matter of course. Legge refused his signature to the treasury warrants which were to open the public purse. Newcastle was terrified, and applied to Pitt to throw his shield over him, offering him a seat in the cabinet if he would support the subsidies. Doddington relates what Pitt told him of his interview with the duke. He implored his grace not to complete the ruin which the king had nearly brought upon himself by his journey to Hanover. "A king abroad at this time, without one man about him that has one English sentiment, and to bring home a whole set of subsidies!" The duke hinted that Pitt's support might be rewarded with the seals of secretary of state. He replied that he did not want the office. The duke's system of carrying on business in the House of Commons would not do. "There must be men of efficiency and authority in the house ; a secretary, and a chancellor of the exchequer at least, who should have access to the crown ; habitual, frequent, familiar access, he meant, that they might tell their own story, to do themselves and their friends justice, and not be the victims of a whisper." Pitt stoutly argued against the system of subsidies. Newcastle talked of the king's honor being engaged to Hesse and to Russia. Let his majesty give, said Pitt, a hundred thousand to one, and a hundred and fifty thousand to the other, out of the fifteen millions he had saved, to be let off these bad bargains.† Fox was more tractable than his rival. He saw promotion at hand, whatever might be his abstract dislike to subsidies, if he would be prudent.

The parliament met on the 13th of November. The king announced the increase of the naval and land forces, and mentioned the treaties he had concluded with Russia and Hesse. In the address of each house especial reference was made to Hanover. The address of the Commons said, "We think ourselves bound in justice and gratitude to assist his majesty against insults and attacks that may be made upon any of his majesty's dominions, though not belonging to the crown of Great Britain." An amendment to omit such a pledge was moved in the Lords by Earl Temple, Pitt's brother-in-law. A similar amendment was proposed in the Commons. These were of course rejected ; but they gave occasion to two remarkable orations. William Gerard Hamilton, a young member, made his maiden speech in favor of the original address—that one harangue, antithetical and familiar, argumentative and declamatory, which handed him down to after times as "Single-speech Hamilton." Pitt made a speech on that famous battle night, of which no fragment remains to us but one which has been preserved by Walpole. The younger Pitt said he would prefer the recovery of a speech of Lord Bolingbroke to the restoration of the lost books of Livy or Tacitus. The contemporary accounts of his father's speeches would almost induce a similar wish, even if the recovery were confined to this effort of the 13th of November. Walpole, in a letter of the 15th of November to Conway, after rapturously noticing Hamilton's success, says, "You will ask what could be beyond this? Nothing, but what was beyond what ever was, and that was Pitt. He spoke at past one, for an hour and thirty-five minutes. There was more humor, wit, vivacity, finer language, more boldness, in short more astonishing perfections, than even you, who are used to him, can conceive." In a letter of the following day to Bentley, Walpole gives the fragment which, with similar detached passages of various other speeches, enable us to form some idea of the lustre which a rich imagination gave to Pitt's eloquence. "The most admired passage was a comparison he drew of the two parts of the new administration." By the new administration Walpole means the coalition between Fox and Newcastle. "It is," said Pitt, "as the conflux of the Rhone and the Saone, which I remember to have seen at Lyons ; the latter a gentle, feeble, languid stream, languid but not deep ; the other a boisterous and overbearing torrent. But they join at last, and long may they continue united, to the comfort of each other, and to the glory, honor, and happiness of this nation." The next morning Fox received the seals of secretary of state, as the reward for his support of the ministerial address. Pitt, on the 20th of November, was dismissed from his office of paymaster ; and Legge and George Grenville were also superseded.

From the agitations of party—from the impending calamities of war—the minds of men were suddenly turned to a convulsion of nature, upon which all the civilized world looked with dread and wonder. The earthquake at Lisbon was announced to parliament by a royal message on the 28th of November, desiring the concurrence of the houses in sending "such speedy and effectual relief as may be suitable to so afflicting and pressing an exigency." The Commons immediately voted a grant of a hundred thousand pounds. It was indeed an event to make men pause in their ordinary career of thoughtless indulgence or selfish ambition. Every church of Lisbon was crowded with worshippers on All Saints Day ; and almost every church was shaken to its foundations, and thousands perished in the ruins. One fourth of all the houses in Lisbon fell. The pier of the Tagus was overthrown, with hundreds who had fled to the banks of the river to avoid the falling houses. Fires broke out all over the devoted town. The great granaries were consumed, and the people were without bread. Robbers came forth from their dens, and murdered those who clung to their movable property. The English people met this terrible infliction with the generous relief and sympathy that they have always extended to the sorrows of other nations. They bethought themselves, for a while, of their own sins, which might draw down the vengeance of heaven. The fashionable world took the necessity of repentance into its earnest consideration, and resolved—to abolish masquerades.

CHAPTER CLXI.

Dread of invasion—Defence of the country by foreign troops—French fleet at Minorca—Admiral Byng—Surrender of St. Philip, in Minorca—Popular rage against Byng—Commencement of the Seven Years War—Successes of Frederick of Prussia—Household of George, Prince of Wales—Changes of Ministry—Newcastle retires—Administration of the Duke of Devonshire and Mr. Pitt—Altered tone of the king's speech—Militia Bill—Foreign troops sent home—Subsidy to the King of Prussia—Trial of Byng—His execution—Pitt and Legge dismissed from their employments—National feeling—Coalition of Newcastle and Pitt—Affairs of India—Black Hole at Calcutta—Surajah Dowlah occupies Calcutta—It is retaken by Clive and Watson—The battle of Plassey—Surajah Dowlah deposed and killed—Meer Jaffier, Subahdar of Bengal—Establishment of the British ascendency in India.

In a fortnight after his dismissal from office, Pitt, from his place in parliament, sent forth a voice whose echoes would be heard throughout the land. The nation was dreading a French invasion—sullenly trembling at the possible consequences of an assault upon the capital, and without confidence in the government to which the public defence was intrusted. Pitt seconded the motion of the secretary of war, for an army of thirty-four thousand men, being an increase of fifteen thousand. He had wanted even a larger increase in the pre-

* Walpole, "Memoirs of George II.," vol. ii. p. 35.
† Doddington's "Diary," Sept. 3.

vious year. The king's speech of the preceding session had lulled the nation into a fallacious dream of repose. "He wanted to call this country out of that enervate state, that twenty thousand men from France could shake it. The maxims of our government were degenerated, not our natives." An opinion had gone forth, which in 1757 was embodied in a book of extraordinary popularity, alluded to by Cowper:

> "The inestimable Estimate of Brown
> Rose like a paper-kite, and charm'd the town." *

The nation was told, "We are rolling to the brink of a precipice that must destroy us."† Effeminacy, vanity, luxury, rapacity, universally prevailed. Religion was despised. The principle of honor was lost or totally corrupted. The national capacity was lowered. The national spirit of defence was impaired. There were no better fighting men upon earth than the common people of England; but in the better sort there was "such a general defect in the spirit of defence as would alarm any people who were not lost to all sense of danger." ‡ The danger was from an outward enemy. "The French, in land armies, are far our superiors. They are making large and dreadful strides toward us in naval power. . . . Should the French possess themselves of North America, what eye can be so weak as not to see the consequence? Must not a naval power come down upon us, equal, if not superior, to our own?" § A diminished population had accompanied increasing commerce. Excess of trade and overflow of wealth had impaired our bodily strength.‖ It is easy to detect the fallacies of this course of reasoning; but there can be little doubt that the nation required to be roused from its lethargy. Happily there was a man capable of rousing it. Pitt, in his speech of the 5th of December, had expressed his earnest wish to "see that breed restored, which under our old principles had carried our glory so high." The king, on the 23d of March, announced the probability of an invasion, and informed the houses that he had made a requisition for a body of Hessian troops, in pursuance of the treaty recently concluded. Both houses acknowledged with gratitude his majesty's care for the national defence. On the 29th of March Mr. Fox moved, "that an humble address be presented to his majesty, that, for the more effectual defence of this island, and for the better security of the religion and liberties of his subjects against the threatened attacks by a foreign enemy, he would be graciously pleased to order twelve battalions of his electoral troops, together with the usual detachment of artillery, to be forthwith brought into this kingdom." The address was voted by the large ministerial majority; but not without strong dissatisfaction. That state alone, exclaimed Pitt, is a sovereign state, "quis suis stat viribus, non alieno pendet arbitrio"—which stands by its own strength, not by the help of another country. The Hanoverians and Hessians came, and were encamped in various parts of the kingdom. Yet the common people of England were ready to deserve the eulogium of Brown as to their capacity for fighting. They enlisted freely, when called upon. Hogarth's print of the recruit who wanted to add "a cubit to his stature" is an evidence of this disposition.

For half a century Great Britain had held possession of the island of Minorca, which General Stanhope and Admiral Leake had conquered during the palmy time of the War of the Succession. Port Mahon, the best harbor of the Mediterranean, was thought a more important British possession even than Gibraltar. The English ministers had received intimation very early in the spring of 1756 that a formidable expedition was in preparation at Toulon, not provisioned for a long voyage. They shut their eyes to the exposed state of the island that lay within a few days' sail from the shores of Provence. The defence of Port Mahon was intrusted to a small garrison commanded by an aged and infirm general. The government was at last alarmed. They dispatched Admiral Byng (son of Lord Torrington, the Admiral Byng of Queen Anne's time) with ten ships, from Spithead, on the 7th of April. On the 10th of April the French fleet, of twelve ships of the line, sailed from Toulon, with transports, having sixteen thousand troops on board. They were off the coast of Minorca on the 18th, and began to disembark at the port of Ciudadella. The only chance of defence against such an armament was in the strong castle of St. Philip. General Blakeney got together between two and three thousand troops, the officers of the English regiments being for the most part absent; and he prepared for resistance. The natural and artificial strength of the fortress prevented the French from proceeding in the siege without much cautious delay. On the 19th of May Admiral Byng's fleet, having been joined by two more men-of-war, arrived within view of St. Philip, while the batteries of the French were carrying on their fire against the fort, where the flag of England was still flying. Byng, who had touched at Gibraltar, had written home to explain that he could obtain no necessaries at that station; that the place was so neglected that he was unable to clean the foul ships with which he had sailed from England; and that if he had been sent earlier he might have been able to have prevented the landing of the French in Minorca, whereas it was now very doubtful whether any good could arise from an attempt to reinforce the garrison. This was something like an anticipation of failure, with an indication of the neglect which made success difficult. On the 21st of May De la Galissonnière, the French admiral, bore down upon the British fleet. Byng did not engage with that alacrity which the naval traditions of our country point out as the first duty of an admiral, even with a doubtful advantage. Rear-Admiral West, on the contrary, with his portion of the squadron, had attacked with impetuosity, and had driven some of the French vessels out of their line of battle. Byng was scarcely engaged, except at the beginning of the action, when his own ship, being damaged in the rigging, became for a short time unmanageable. He hesitated about advancing, for fear of breaking his line. De la Galissonnière leisurely retired. Byng called a council of war; represented that he was inferior to the enemy in number of men and weight of metal, and proposed to return to Gibraltar. The council agreed to the proposal. The admiral sent home his dispatches; and on the 16th of June Sir Edward Hawke and Admiral Saunders were ordered to supersede Byng and his second in command. The unfortunate admiral was taken home under arrest, and was committed as a prisoner to an apartment in Greenwich Hospital. Admiral West was received with favor at St. James's. After a defence as resolute as it was possible to make against an overwhelming force, St. Philip was surrendered, after an assault on the 27th of June headed by the Duke de Richelieu. The garrison marched out with the honors of war, and were conveyed to Gibraltar. A tempest of popular fury had arisen, such as had rarely been witnessed in England. The news of Byng's return to Gibraltar, without having attempted to relieve the garrison in St. Philip, first came to London through the French admiral's dispatch to his government. "It is necessary," says Walpole, "to be well acquainted with the disposition of a free, proud, fickle, and violent people before one can conceive the indignation occasioned by this intelligence." * But when Byng's own dispatch came, in which he assumed the triumphant tone of a man who had done his duty, his effigy was burned in all the great towns. Every ballad-singer had a ditty in which he was execrated. When he arrived at Portsmouth he was saved with difficulty from being torn in pieces by the mob. A chap-book related "A Rueful Story, by a Broken-hearted Sailor." A coarse print exhibited Byng hanging in chains. A medal was struck, having a figure of the admiral, with the inscription, "Was Minorca sold for French gold?" Addresses went up to the throne from London, and from almost every county and city, calling for inquiry and signal punishment. To the address of the city the king was made to pledge his royal word that he would save no delinquent from justice. Newcastle, "with a volubility of timorous folly, when a deputation from the city had made representations to him against the admiral, blurted out, 'Oh! indeed he shall be tried immediately—he shall be hanged directly.'" † The fate of the unhappy man was not determined until the spring of the following year.

In closing the session of parliament on the 27th of May, the king announced that the injuries his subjects had sustained from the French having been followed by the invasion of Minorca, which had been guaranteed to the British crown by all the great powers of

* "Table Talk."

† "Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times," ed. 1758, p. 15.

‡ Ibid., p. 89. § Ibid., p. 144. ‖ Ibid., p. 189.

* "Memoirs of the Reign of George II.," vol. ii. p. 215.

† Ibid., p. 230.

Europe, he had formally declared war against France. Important changes had taken place since, in the previous summer, the king had negotiated for a subsidy to Russia, to protect his Hanoverian possessions against the probable attacks of Prussia. George II. and Frederick II. were not exactly fitted for any cordial friendship. They had been fighting on opposite sides for eight years in the war of the Austrian Succession. George took the side of Maria Theresa, and—to use the words of Mr. Carlyle—"needed to begin by assuring his parliament and newspapers, profoundly dark on the matter, that Frederick was a robber and villain for taking the other side."* Frederick cared little for what parliaments or newspapers might say of him. Perhaps to those who have followed his last historian in tracing the origin of the claims upon Silesia, he may be thought to have had justice upon his side—that sort of justice which encourages sovereigns to imperil the happiness of millions for the assertion of personal rights. The War of the Succession came to an end, and Frederick got Silesia guaranteed to him. Beyond the public differences of George and Frederick, the Prussian king had indulged his unhappy talent of sarcasm; and his sharp sayings about his Britannic majesty were not easily to be forgiven. But the time was come when they became politically necessary to each other. A treaty was concluded at Westminster, on the 16th of January, 1756, by which the King of Great Britain and the King of Prussia, fearing that the peace of Europe might be disturbed in consequence of the disputes in America, entered upon a convention of neutrality, by which they were each bound not to suffer any foreign troops to enter Germany, and their several dominions were reciprocally guaranteed. The scheme of subsidizing Russia was thus renounced. Some old money differences were at the same time adjusted. This treaty was not submitted to parliament till the close of 1756. In the mean time the terrible contest known as the Seven Years War had commenced. The loss of Silesia was the one great grief of Maria Theresa. From the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle her dominant thought, which almost became a ruling passion, was the hope of its recovery. If France could be induced to take part with Austria—if each could forget the hatreds of two centuries, Prussia would return to her old insignificance in the affairs of Europe. The ridicule which King George felt it politic to overlook in his satirical nephew rankled in the heart of the real ruler of France, Madame de Pompadour. Louis XV. had himself writhed under this hornet's sting. The profligate Bourbon resolved to make common cause with Maria Theresa. The Czarina Elizabeth of Russia joined the coalition, with a similar sense of personal affronts. Augustus, King of Poland and Elector of Saxony, and the King of Sweden, entered into the same concert. The King of Prussia saw that his enemies were gathering on every side, and that his sole friend was England.

Frederick, at the commencement of the Seven Years War, was in his forty-fourth year. He had enjoyed ten years of repose since the peace of Dresden in 1746, during which period, by his wisdom as a financier and his strictness as a military disciplinarian, he was prepared to go to war with a full treasury and a well-trained army. His will was law among his five millions of subjects; and, except in his military code, he was a merciful and just despot. Arbitrary sovereigns with eager troops waiting upon their nod are not retarded in their movements by the hesitations of counsellors or the scruples of parliaments. Sir Andrew Mitchell, the English envoy at Berlin, was endeavoring to dissuade Frederick from immediate hostilities. "What, sir!" exclaimed the king. "What do you see in my face? Was my nose made, do you think, to receive fillips?"† Frederick had demanded an explanation of her views from the Empress of Austria, and had received no specific answer. He would not receive an answer, he had said, "in the style of an oracle." He was perfectly informed of the confederacy against himself, and he resolved to anticipate its hostile movements. Toward the end of August he whispered Mitchell, who was at a court supper, to come to him at three o'clock the next morning. Frederick carried the envoy to his camp, and told him, "there were a hundred thousand men setting out that instant, they knew not whither; and bade him write to his master that he was going to defend his majesty's dominions and his own."* To the most feeble of his antagonists, the Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, Frederick allowed no breathing time. He was in possession of Dresden on the 10th of September. The Saxon army was in the fortified camp of Pirna, a position which Frederick deemed impregnable, and therefore was contented to blockade it. He called himself Protector of Saxony, but in truth was its conqueror. Yet, although helping himself to the military stores of the arsenals, and dealing with public money as if it were his own, he exhibited one species of moderation which the conqueror of the next great period of European warfare had the self-denial to imitate at Dresden, whatever was his plunder of other cities. Frederick visited the famous picture-gallery. The director of the gallery trembled, as he saw the master of the capital, and of all its treasures, pause before some of the great works of art which were the pride of the electorate. In his imagination the Madonna di San Sisto of Raffaelle, the Notte of Correggio, were destined to be packed off to Berlin. "Sir," said Frederick to the director, "I suppose I may be permitted to have copies." The King of Prussia was not so moderate or courteous when his greater interests were concerned. It was important that he should obtain possession of the state papers which would prove the designs of the confederacy against him. Augustus was at the camp of Pirna. Maria Josepha of Austria, his consort, was at Dresden. The spirited lady refused to give them up, except by force; and, according to some accounts, sat upon the trunk in which they were contained, which had been carried to her bedchamber; according to other accounts, placed her back against the door of the muniment-room in which they were. The Prussian commandant of Dresden did obtain them by force. The discourtesy was long remembered to Frederick's disadvantage; but by the publication of these papers he showed to Europe that in striking the first blow against the coalesced powers he was justified by the necessity of self-preservation. The military operations which followed secured to him Saxony. An Austrian army, commanded by Marshal Browne, was advancing from Bohemia. Frederick left the camp of Pirna to be dealt with by Prince Ferdinand; and with a force of twenty-five thousand men defeated the Austrian army of forty thousand in the plain of Losowitz. This battle, which was most severely contested, took place on the 1st of October. Frederick returned to Dresden. The Saxon army in Pirna, strictly blockaded, had only the prospect of famine or of surrender. They surrendered unconditionally. Some of these seventeen thousand men were compelled, and some were persuaded, to enter into the Prussian service. The elector retired to Warsaw, and Frederick went into winter quarters in the capital of the country that had, in a few months, been reduced to the condition of an enslaved province.

On the 4th of June, 1756, George, Prince of Wales, completed his eighteenth year, the period determined by the Regency Act as that of his majority in case his grandfather had been dead. The king wished to give the prince a separate establishment, with an allowance of 40,000*l.* a year, thus removing him from the control of the princess dowager. The young prince entreated the king not to separate him from his mother, although he was deeply grateful for the proposed royal bounty. They were both anxious that Lord Bute should be groom of the stole in the new household. Lord Waldegrave relates that he was present at a cabinet council, for the consideration of this appointment; when the chancellor, Lord Hardwicke, said, "he would not give credit to some very extraordinary reports; but that many sober and respectable persons would think it indecent."‡ The court scandal, which Walpole dwells upon with peculiar gusto, continued some time after Prince George came to the throne, and was one of the misfortunes of the early part of his reign. Bute, in spite of the "extraordinary reports"—which are now held by most unprejudiced inquirers to have had their origin in party virulence and vulgar credulity—was appointed to the office in the household, very reluctantly on the part of the king. In this influential position, the favorite of the heir-apparent, he had considerable participation in the politics of the time. One curious example of the mode in which Lord Bute kept the future before the view of great parliamentary leaders may be seen in a passage of a letter to Mr. Pitt, during that first short time of his power which we shall have

* "Friedrich II.," vol. i. p. 15.
† "Frederick the Great and his Times," edited by Thomas Campbell, vol. ii. p. 426.

* Walpole, "Memoirs of George II.," vol. ii. p. 240.
‡ "Memoirs," p. 67.

presently to notice: "I am certain the firm support and countenance of *him* who is some day to reap the fruits of my friend's unwearied endeavors for the public safety would make him perfectly easy under the frowns of prejudiced, deluded, fluctuating men." *

Mr. Fox had held the seals of secretary of state about ten months, during which period a heavy burden of obloquy had to be borne by the ministry. In October, 1756, he resigned his office. He probably was justified in abandoning his colleagues to the approaching censures of parliament in regard to measures of which he had been allowed no direction. The popular indignation about the loss of Minorca was taking a new direction. In September, "the whole city of Westminster was disturbed by the song of a hundred ballad-singers, the burden of which was, 'to the block with Newcastle and the yard-arm with Byng.'" † In October "Poor Byng is the phrase is every mouth, and then comes the hackneyed simile of the scapegoat." ‡ The resignation of the secretary of state was a sudden blow to Newcastle, "who meant that Fox should have continued in a responsible office; with a double portion of dangers and abuse, but without any share of power." § The prime minister was left without any support in the House of Commons. Murray, the attorney-general, insisted upon being appointed lord chief justice, a vacancy having occurred by the death of Sir Dudley Ryder. Newcastle offered the great lawyer the choice of sinecures of fabulous amount—a pension—any terms if he would remain in the House of Commons. Murray was immovable, and to the enduring advantage of the nation became chief justice and Lord Mansfield. Pitt stood alone without a rival—"no orator to oppose him who had courage even to look him in the face." ‖ Newcastle, in his extremity, induced the king to consent that an overture should be made to the awful Commoner. Pitt refused to treat, saying that "a plain man, unpractised in the policy of a court, could never be the associate of so experienced a minister." ¶ The unhappy duke went about imploring this nobleman and that commoner to take the seals. "No man would stand in the gap," says Waldegrave. At last Newcastle himself resigned. "Perfidy, after thirty years, had an intermission," writes Walpole. Lord Hardwicke, the learned and able chancellor, who desired retirement, followed his old friend. A coalition was proposed between Fox and Pitt, which Pitt refused to agree to. At last, in November, the Duke of Devonshire was appointed first commissioner of the treasury; Pitt, secretary of state; his brother-in-law, Temple, at the head of the admiralty; Legge, chancellor of the exchequer.

On the 2d of December the parliament was opened with a speech from the throne, "which," says Lord Waldegrave, "by its style and substance, appeared to be the work of a new speech-maker." Never was a vital change of policy more boldly indicated. It declared that the succor and preservation of America "demand resolutions of vigor and dispatch." That, for a firm defence at home, "a national militia may in time become one good resource." "Relying with pleasure on the spirit and zeal of my people," said the king, "the body of my electoral troops, which I ordered hither at the desire of my parliament, I have directed to return to my dominions in Germany." Finally, his majesty said, "Unprosperous events of war in the Mediterranean have drawn from my subjects signal proofs how dearly they tender my honor and that of my crown." To recommend a militia, which his majesty had always ridiculed; to trust to the British people for the defence of their country, instead of trusting to the Hessians and Hanoverians; to call uncourtly addresses and popular clamor signal proofs of affection—these were indeed evidences of a new speech-maker. The king, says Waldegrave, "in common conversation made a frank declaration of his real sentiments." A spurious speech had been circulated in town and country. This production was burned by the common hangman, and the printer was ordered to be prosecuted. George, who sometimes displayed a quaint sarcastic humor, "hoped the man's punishment would be of the mildest sort, because he had read both speeches, and, as far as he understood either of them, he liked the spurious speech better than his own." **

The electoral troops were sent home. A Militia Bill was now passed, although a similar bill had been rejected in the previous session. Under this act thirty-two thousand men were to be called out in England and Wales. The measure was received with popular approbation, until it began to interfere with individual ease and freedom. The Protestant dissenters in London and the provinces remonstrated against the possible insertion of a clause in the bill that the militia might be exercised on Sundays; but the notion, although it did not appear to excite any displeasure among the clergy of the Established Church, was very wisely given up. Reinforcements were sent to the Earl of Loudoun, who now commanded in America. The regular army had been increased to 45,000 men; and Pitt, at this time, adopted the politic suggestion made by Duncan Forbes in 1738, that the Highlanders should be enlisted in the service of the state, instead of being prompted to disaffection by needy chiefs. Two Highland regiments were raised, the command of one being given to Simon Fraser, son of Lord Lovat; of the other, to Archibald Montgomery, brother of Lord Eglington. Twenty years afterward, in one of his great speeches, in which Chatham urged conciliation toward "our brethren in America," he looked back upon the success of this first measure of his bold statesmanship: "I remember, after an unnatural rebellion had been extinguished in the northern parts of this island, that I employed these very rebels in the service and defence of their country. They were reclaimed by this means; they fought our battles; they cheerfully bled in defence of those liberties which they attempted to overthrow but a few years before." * As the war minister of George II., Mr. Pitt had to modify some of his former opinions with regard to continental alliances. He brought down a message from the king on the 17th of February, to ask from his faithful Commons that they would assist his majesty in maintaining an army of observation to protect his electoral dominions, and to fulfil his engagements with his good ally, the King of Prussia. This was the first day that Pitt had entered the House of Commons since his accession to office. His appearance there had been delayed by continued illness. He followed this demonstration of his individual opinions by moving a grant of 200,000*l.* in compliance with the message. Fox twitted his rival with a saying of the previous year, that "German measures would be a millstone about the neck of the minister." Yet Pitt was not inconsistent in proposing this measure. He had told Lord Hardwicke, in September, 1755, that "he thought that regard ought to be had to Hanover, if it should be attacked on our account." † Lord Mahon has very justly defended Pitt against the sneer of Fox. "The French were preparing to invade the electorate, not from any injury, real or pretended, which the electorate had done them, but notoriously and avowedly as a side-blow against George II.—as a retaliation for the measures which his majesty had adopted in British America." ‡ Hanover was about to be attacked on our account. Walpole, with reference to the Prussian subsidy, bitterly remarks, "One cannot say which was most ridiculous—the richest prince in Europe [Frederick] begging alms for his own country, or the great foe of that country [George] becoming its mendicant almoner." § Frederick of Prussia commissioned the British envoy to express his thanks to Mr. Pitt for his speech of the 18th of February; and to inform him that he regarded the resolutions of parliament as the strongest assurances that can be given of the favorable and friendly disposition of the British nation toward him. Pitt, in his reply, expressed his "sentiments of veneration and zeal for a prince, who stands the unshaken bulwark of Europe, against the most powerful and malignant confederacy that ever yet has threatened the independence of mankind." ‖

Among the difficult questions which the recently-formed administration had to deal with, was that of the fate of Admiral Byng. A court-martial upon the unfortunate officer commenced at Portsmouth on the 28th of December. In every town and village through which the admiral was conveyed from Greenwich, escorted by horse-guards, he was insulted by the populace. The trial lasted till nearly the end of January. Before the close of the proceedings the court-martial had submitted a question to the admiralty—whether they were at liberty to mitigate the 12th Article of War, which was in these

* "Chatham Correspondence," March 2d, 1757, vol. i. p. 223.
† Potter to Grenville, "Grenville Papers," vol. i. p. 172.
‡ Wilkes to Grenville, ibid., p. 176.
§ Waldegrave, "Memoirs," p. 82.
‖ Ibid. ¶ Ibid., p. 83. ** Ibid., p. 39.

* Thackeray, "History of William Pitt," jun., vol. ii. p. 339.
† Doddington, "Diary," Sept. 2d, 1755.
‡ History, vol. iv. p. 196.
§ "Memoirs of George II.," vol. ii. p. 314.
‖ "Chatham Correspondence," vol. i. p. 224 and p. 226.

words: "Every person in the fleet who, through cowardice, negligence, or disaffection, shall, in time of action, withdraw or keep back, or not come into the fight or engagement, or shall not do his utmost to take or destroy every ship which it shall be his duty to engage, and to assist and relieve all and every of his majesty's ships, or those of his allies, which it shall be his duty to assist and relieve, every such person so offending, and being convicted thereof by the sentence of a court-martial, shall suffer death." The admiralty returned for answer that the court could not modify the Article of War. The unanimous verdict was that Admiral Byng had not come under that article by treachery or disaffection; but that he had not done his utmost to relieve the Castle of St. Philip, or to defeat the French fleet; and he was therefore adjudged to be shot to death. But the court also agreed to recommend the admiral to the mercy of the crown. Byng, rejoiced at being acquitted of cowardice, heard his sentence with composure. It was perhaps difficult for the crown to exercise its prerogative of mercy, amid the popular clamor for the execution of the sentence. "Pitt and Lord Temple," says Waldegrave, were desirous to save Byng; "but to avoid the odium of protecting a man who had been hanged in effigy in every town in England, they wanted the king to pardon him without their seeming to interfere." The king, he adds, "not choosing to be their dupe, obliged them to pull off the mask, and the sentence against the admiral was not carried into execution till, by their behavior in parliament, they had given public proof of their partiality." It is a singular commendation of the king, that he wished to damage his ministers by exhibiting them opposed to a popular cry. They had the House of Commons with them, in their desire for mercy. Pitt told this to his sovereign. "Sir," said George, "you have taught me to look for the sense of my subjects in another place than the House of Commons." Every effort to save Byng was made in vain. His execution was delayed, while a bill passed the Commons to absolve the members of the court-martial from their oath of secrecy, as it was alleged that they had something of importance to say with regard to their sentence. The bill was sent to the upper house. But the law lords, Hardwicke and Mansfield, having examined all the members of the court-martial upon oath, and finding that they could not declare their knowledge of anything which had passed previous to the sentence which would show it to be unjust, or of any undue practice or motive to influence the sentence, the bill was rejected. The 14th of March was fixed for the execution of Admiral Byng. He was shot on the quarter-deck of the Monarque, in which he had been confined; and to the last he displayed a calmness and resolution which were sufficient of themselves to exonerate him from the charge that, in his neglect of his duty, he had acted from a want of that courage which is the most essential, as it is the commonest attribute of every sailor and every soldier, whatever rank he may hold in the service of his country.

At the beginning of April, 1757, Pitt, Temple, and Legge were suddenly dismissed from their high offices. The nation could not understand this. One feeling, however, prevailed—that these ministers had labored to benefit the nation, and that pitiful court intrigues had been too powerful for them. Smollett, whose "Continuation" of his history was nearly contemporaneous, speaks very vaguely of "the old junto," who had "found the new associates very unfit for their purposes." The "Memoirs of the Earl of Waldegrave," which were not published till 1821, throw light upon the proceedings of the royal closet. In February this nobleman saw the king, who expressed his dislike to Pitt and Temple in very strong terms. The secretary, his majesty said, made him long speeches, which might be very fine, but were above his comprehension. Temple was pert, sometimes insolent, and when he meant to be civil was troublesome. "Go to Newcastle," said George; "tell him I do not look upon myself as a king while I am in the hands of these scoundrels; that I am determined to get rid of them at any rate; that I expect his assistance, and that he may depend on my favor and protection." Newcastle was quite ready to second the king's wishes; but he thought it more prudent to get the supplies first, and obtain an acquittal of himself and his colleagues of 1756, under the inquiry pending in parliament.* The Duke of Cumberland, Waldegrave says, pressed the king very strongly that Pitt and Temple should be turned out without further deliberation; and that a new administration should be formed before he went to Hanover to take the command of the electoral forces. To depend on Pitt for supplies; to have the popularity of Pitt ravish half his laurels, if fortune should once smile upon him—were apprehensions, as Walpole alleges, which made the duke urge his royal father to take such a perilous step. When the dismissal of the ministers was known, without any official delinquency or public misfortune being made a charge against them, the voice of the nation was expressed in the most unequivocal manner. Pitt and Legge received the freedom of London from the common council, presented in gold boxes. A dozen corporations of great cities followed the example. "It rained gold boxes," says Walpole. Pitt kept very quiet. He took no decided part in the inquiry about Minorca, which resulted, not in a vote of approbation or a vote of censure, but in a long recapitulation of the circumstances, ending in declaring that no more ships and no more troops could have been sent on that service. Twelve weeks were now spent in negotiations for the formation of a government. Newcastle was sent for. The duke, dreading Pitt's popularity, wished to coalesce with him. Pitt would not accept office without the entire direction of the war. Newcastle then told the king, under a solemn promise, that he would have nothing to do with so intractable a man. The old scheme of Newcastle and "his footmen," as the king termed the duke's ministerial dependants, was then resorted to. That would not answer; and Newcastle and Pitt were brought together again, by the mediation of Lord Chesterfield and Lord Bute. The king was enraged that Pitt had once more been applied to, under the violation of Newcastle's pledge. George then tried his own hand at making a ministry, and proposed to associate his personal friend, Lord Waldegrave, with Mr. Fox. Lord Holderness, one of the secretaries of state, and the remaining powerful body of the Newcastle "footmen"—powerful in their votes, if not in their abilities—threatened to resign. There was no resource. Pitt saw that if his magnificent boast, "I am sure that I can save this country, and that nobody else can"—if that grand ambition was to be realized—he must not trust alone to oratory or popularity; he must command parliamentary support. Newcastle could bring that capital into a political partnership. The king had no choice. He empowered Lord Hardwicke to negotiate with Newcastle and Pitt. The eloquent commoner again became secretary of state upon his own terms. The influential duke returned to the head of the treasury, without any real power in the direction of the great affairs of the nation, at a memorable crisis in its fate. On the 29th of June commenced what is emphatically termed "Mr. Pitt's administration." It mattered not to contemporaries or to posterity who was first lord of the treasury, or who presided over the admiralty, or who was commander-in-chief. It was "Mr. Pitt's administration."

From the midsummer of 1756 to the midsummer of 1757, while England was lying under the dread of foreign invasion; calling for vengeance on those who had lost Minorca; distracted by political rivalries—events were taking place in the most distant settlement of the East India Company, of which the nation had no instant cognizance, but which were as important to its future destiny as the changes to be produced by the altered character of its government. There first came, slowly travelling for months from the Ganges to the Thames, the news of a terrible atrocity of Oriental despotism which filled every heart with grief and indignation. Six months later the report came of a swift retribution, inflicted by the hero of Arcot; and six months after that, the great intelligence arrived, that a victory had been won—the victory of Plassey, which raised the British merchant settlers of India into the condition of conquerors and dictators, and laid the foundation of an empire which can scarcely be contemplated by us at this day without a mixed feeling of awe and of pride. The fearful tragedy known as that of the Black Hole of Calcutta took place on the 20th of June, 1756, after the city had been taken by the Subahdar of Bengal. Calcutta was retaken by Clive on the 2d of January, 1757. The battle of Plassey was won by Clive on the 23d of June of the same year. We must briefly relate these consecutive events.

The rulers of Bengal, Orissa, and Bahar, called subahdars, or nabobs, professed to hold allegiance to the Great Mogul, but really exercised all the powers of sovereignty. They dwelt at their capital city of Moorshedabad. In April, 1756, Surajah Dowlah, a cruel, de-

* Waldegrave, "Memoirs," p. 96.

bauched, and ignorant boy of nineteen, succeeded his grandfather as the lord of these vast provinces. He coveted the wealth which he imagined was accumulated in the British factory of Calcutta; and he marched from Moorshedabad to Fort William with a great army. The governor, and the English captain in command, escaped in terror, and left the defence of the factory to the servants of the company. The Subahdar having bombarded the fort for two days, further resistance was unavailing. Mr. Holwell, a civil officer of the company, who had been chosen to act as a commander during the two days of their defence, was called before the despot. He was dissatisfied to have found only fifty thousand rupees as his prize; but he assured Mr. Holwell that the lives of himself and of his fellow-prisoners should be spared. There were a hundred and forty-five men, and one woman, of this devoted company. They were to be secured for the night in the dungeon of the fort. Into that den, eighteen feet by fourteen, with two small windows, were these hundred and forty-six adults forced by the ferocious guard that the tyrant had set over them; and the door was closed. Mr. Holwell spoke from the window to an old officer, who appeared to have some human pity, promising a reward of a thousand rupees if a portion of the prisoners by his influence could be removed to another room. The officer went to make his humane attempt. He returned to say that the nabob was asleep, and could not be disturbed. Of that night of horror, the relation given by Mr. Holwell is one of the most powerful narratives of the extremity of suffering which was ever penned.* The expedient of the prisoners to obtain more room and air, some sitting down, never to rise again, through their companions falling upon them; the calling out to the guard to fire and relieve them from their misery; the raging thirst; the delirium; the stupefaction; the many dead trampled upon by the few living—these are horrors without a parallel in history or fiction. An order for the release of the prisoners came from the Subahdar at six o'clock in the morning. One hundred and twenty-three had been released by death. The English lady survived, to endure the harder fate of being consigned to the harem of the Subahdar. Surajah Dowlah called for Mr. Holwell. Unable to stand, he was borne before the despot, who exhibited no remorse for the acts of his murderous guards. All he talked of was buried treasure. He sent Mr. Holwell and two of the chiefs of the factory to his capital as prisoners; the others were set at liberty. Fort William was occupied by a Mohammedan garrison of three thousand men; and the victor returned to Moorshedabad, and decreed that, in honor of his triumph, Calcutta should be called by the name which signified the Port of God.

Colonel Clive, upon his return to India, had co-operated with Admiral Watson, who was in command of a British squadron off Bombay, to effect the destruction of a formidable body of pirates, who issued from their fortified headland of Gheriah, to the terror of every merchant-vessel on the Indian Ocean. This stronghold was taken without much effort. Clive returned to his command as governor of Fort St. David, in June. It was not till August that the news of the terrible occurrences at Calcutta reached Madras. Admiral Watson was at anchor in the roads. Clive was sent for by the presidency, and the command of an expedition was offered to him. There was a struggle about the claims of a senior officer, who thought that his rank, whatever was his inexperience of Indian warfare, ought to outweigh the deference paid to a young man who had captured and defended Arcot, and won the great victory of Arnee. The presidency were firm; and so was the jealous Colonel Adlercron. The council at Madras gave the command to Clive. The colonel, who had the control of the king's stores, refused him the royal artillery. With nine hundred Europeans—which number included the 39th regiment—that regiment which, after many glorious campaigns, proudly bears on its colors the suggestive inscription, "Primus in Indis"—the armament set sail. The winds were contrary. Two months elapsed before they entered the Hooghly. Calcutta was taken on the 2d of January, with little trouble. At the head of forty thousand men, Surajah Dowlah marched from Moorshedabad and encamped near Fort William. Clive went forth to a night attack upon the camp, but retired after some loss, having been embarrassed by a thick fog. Yet the Subahdar, terrified by this exhibition of prowess, sought to conclude a peace with the English, and yielded to every condition that was proposed for the future security of Calcutta. There was no satisfaction for the murders of the 20th of June. Clive even consented to a treaty of alliance with this miscreant. The honest admiral refused to sign this agreement. The Calcutta merchants had pressed it upon Clive, as they thought the alliance would enable them to get rid of the rival French station at Chandernagore. The Subahdar gave a doubtful answer to their proposal to attack this settlement, which Clive interpreted as an assent. The French were overpowered, and surrendered their fort. Surajah Dowlah was now indignant against his recent allies, and sought the friendship of the French officers. Clive, called by the natives "the daring in war," was also the most adroit, and—for the truth cannot be disguised—the most unscrupulous in policy. The English resident at the court of Moorshedabad, under Clive's instructions, encouraged a conspiracy to depose the Subahdar, and to raise his general, Meer Jaffier, to the supreme power. A Hindoo of great wealth and influence, Omichund, engaged in this conspiracy. After it had proceeded so far as to become the subject of a treaty between a select committee at Calcutta and Meer Jaffier, Omichund demanded that a condition should be inserted in that treaty, to pay him thirty lacs of rupees as a reward for his service. The merchants at Calcutta desired the largest share of any donation from Meer Jaffier, as a consideration for themselves, and were by no means willing that three hundred thousand pounds should go to a crafty Hindoo. Clive suggested an expedient to secure Omichund's fidelity, and yet not to comply with his demands—to have two treaties drawn; a real one on red paper, a fictitious one on white. The white treaty was to be shown to Omichund, and he was to see with his own eyes that he had been properly cared for. Clive and the committee signed this, as well as the red treaty which was to go to Meer Jaffier. Admiral Watson refused to sign the treacherous document. On the 19th of May, 1773, Clive stood up in his place in the House of Commons, to defend himself upon this charge against him, among other accusations. He boldly acknowledged that the stratagem of the two treaties was his invention—that Admiral Watson did not sign it; but that he should have thought himself authorized to sign for him in consequence of a conversation; that the person who did sign thought he had sufficient authority for so doing. "He [Clive] forged Admiral Watson's name," says Lord Macaulay. Clive thus defended his conduct: "The treaty was immediately sent to Omichund, who did not suspect the stratagem. The event took place, and success attended it. The house, I am fully persuaded, will agree with me, that when the very existence of the company was at stake, and the lives of these people [the conspirators] so precariously situated, and so certain to be destroyed, it was a matter of true policy and justice to deceive such a villain."* The courage, the perseverance, the unconquerable energy of Clive, have furnished examples to many in India who have emulated his true glory. Thank God, the innate integrity of the British character has, for the most part, preserved us from such exhibitions of "true policy and justice."

The English resident, Mr. Watts, left Moorshedabad. Clive wrote a letter of defiance to Surajah Dowlah, and marched toward his capital. The Subahdar had come forth from his city, as populous as the London of a century ago, to annihilate the paltry army of a thousand English, and their two thousand sepoys disciplined by English officers, who dared to encounter his sixty thousand. He reached the village of Plassey with all the panoply of Oriental warfare. His artillery alone appeared sufficient to sweep away those who brought only eight field-pieces and two howitzers to meet his fifty heavy guns. Each gun was drawn by forty yoke of oxen; and a trained elephant was behind each gun to urge it over rough ground or up steep ascents. Meer Jaffier had not performed his promise to join the English with a division of the Subahdar's army. It was a time of terrible anxiety with the English commander. Should he venture to give battle without the aid of a native force? He submitted his doubt to a council of war. Twelve officers, himself among the number, voted for delay. Seven voted for instant action. Clive reviewed the arguments on each side, and finally cast away his doubts. He determined to fight, without which departure from the opinion of the majority, he afterward said, the English would never have been

* Printed first in the "Annual Register" for 1758.

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xvii. col. 876.

masters of Bengal. On the 22d of June his little army marched fifteen miles, passed the Hooghly, and at one o'clock of the morning of the 23d rested under the mango-trees of Plassey. As the day broke, the vast legions of the Subahdar—fifteen thousand cavalry, forty-five thousand infantry—some armed with muskets, some with bows and arrows, began to surround the mango-grove and the hunting-lodge where Clive had watched through the night. There was a cannonade for several hours. The great guns of Surajah Dowlah did little execution. The small field-pieces of Clive were well served. One of the chief Mohammedan leaders having fallen, disorder ensued, and the Subahdar was advised to retreat. He himself fled upon a swift camel to Moorshedabad. When the British forces began to pursue, the victory became complete. Meer Jaffier joined the conquerors the next day. Surajah Dowlah did not consider himself safe in his capital, and he preferred to seek the protection of a French detachment at Patna. He escaped from his palace disguised; ascended the Ganges in a small boat; and fancied himself secure. A peasant whose ears he had cut off recognized his oppressor, and with some soldiers brought him back to Moorshedabad. In his presence-chamber now sat Meer Jaffier, to whose knees the wretched youth crawled for mercy. That night Surajah Dowlah was murdered in his prison by the orders of Meer Jaffier's son, a boy as bloodthirsty as himself. At the installation of Meer Jaffier as Subahdar of Bengal, Clive conducted him to the seat of honor. His gratitude was not withheld from those who had raised him to his power. Under the treaty made before the battle of Plassey large concessions were to be made to the Presidency of Calcutta; and money amounting to two millions and three quarters sterling was now granted as a payment to the fleet, the troops, and the committee, by whose agency this revolution was effected. Clive was content with something under three hundred thousand pounds. He subsequently declared in the House of Commons that when he walked through the treasury at Moorshedabad, and saw gold and silver and jewels piled up to the right and the left, he might have helped himself to what he pleased. He added, with an oath, "at this moment do I stand astonished at my own moderation." When Omichund was denied his expected gratuity, and was told of the disgraceful fraud that had been practised upon him, he fainted, and was carried home, to exhibit during the small remainder of his days an impaired intellect, and to die a broken-hearted idiot.

A statue of Clive has recently been erected in Whitehall. It is highly characteristic of a man of strong will and undaunted courage —"not a man to do anything by halves." Macaulay uses this phrase in speaking of Clive's participation in the fraud and forgery by which Omichund was deceived. But this determination to do nothing by halves, though it betrayed Clive into a dishonorable action, made him a "heaven-born general," as Pitt called him. His wondrous energy led him, after he had placed Meer Jaffier on the throne of Bengal, never to rest until the ascendency of the English company in that province was supreme, undisturbed by French or Dutch rivalry. Exactly a year after the battle of Plassey a commission arrived at Bengal from London, remodelling the presidency, and not including Clive in the nomination of officers. The news of the great victory had not reached the India House when the court of directors thus threw a slight upon the only man who could preserve their ascendency. But the members of the presidency at Bengal had the good sense to request Clive to take the government upon himself. By his exertions, and through his example, the French were gradually driven from every stronghold; and in six months after the accession of George III. not a vestige of the supremacy which Dupleix and Bussy and Lally had won for them remained in the peninsula.

CHAPTER CLXII.

The administration—Pitt's sole conduct of the war and of foreign affairs—Frederick's second campaign—Victory of Prague—Defeat at Kolin—Failure at Rochefort—Convention of Closter-Seven—Failure of expedition against Louisbourg—Riots about the Militia Act—Frederick's victory of Rosbach—Subsidy to Prussia—Cherbourg taken and its works demolished—St. Maloes—Operations on the African coast—Successful expedition against Louisbourg—The turning-point in Pitt's administration—Frederick's third campaign—Zorndorf—Hochkirchen—Wolfe appointed to command an expedition to Quebec—The battle of Minden—Canada—Operations in North America—Wolfe in the St. Lawrence—His desponding letter—Heights of Abraham—Death of Wolfe—Quebec surrendered—Hawke's victory in Quiberon Bay—Death of George the Second.

The appointments of several of Mr. Pitt's political friends to high offices, in the final arrangement of the administration, excited no surprise. Earl Temple became lord privy seal, and Mr. Legge chancellor of the exchequer. But the reappointment of Lord Anson to the admiralty—unpopular as he was, abused as he had been by those who were now to be his associates—was regarded as "a most surprising phenomenon." * He had been himself a wretched administrator—"an incapable object," as Walpole terms him. It is stated that Pitt took effectual means to neutralize Anson's incapacity. He stipulated with the king that the correspondence with naval commanders should be in his own hands, and that the board of admiralty should sign the dispatches without reading them. † Doubtful as this statement may appear, it is unquestionable that Pitt, from the hour of his triumphant return to that post which involved the whole conduct of foreign affairs and of the war, determined that no coadjutor should interfere with his plans. The prospect before him was not very brilliant. The nation was committed to its alliance with Frederick II.; and at the very moment when the new ministry had entered upon their duties came the news of a great disaster—"the reversal of all the King of Prussia's triumphs." ‡ Frederick had commenced his second campaign at the end of April. Even in the days of Marlborough Europe had not seen such a vast array of mighty armies moving in every direction—Austrians, troops of the Empire, French, Swedes—four hundred and thirty thousand men gathering together to crush the prince of a small German state, who had only a hundred and fifty thousand men in the field to encounter this overwhelming allied force. The Russians in the campaign of 1757 were merely committing ravages in the provinces beyond the Vistula. The English and Hanoverian army, commanded by the Duke of Cumberland, was relied upon to prevent the French attacking Prussia. There were vast odds against the success of Frederick, according to ordinary calculations. The great writer and statesman, Edmund Burke, who at this time influenced public opinion, not from his place in parliament but from Messrs. Dodsley's shop in Pall Mall, thus describes the one resource that enabled Frederick "to sustain the violence of so many shocks"—his vast powers of mind: "His astonishing economy, the incomparable order of his finances, the discipline of his armies beyond all praise, a sagacity that foresaw everything, a constancy that no labor could subdue, a courage that no danger could dismay, an intuitive glance that catches the decisive moment—all these seemed to form a sort of balance to the vast weight against him, turned the wishes of his friends into hopes, and made them depend upon resources that are not within the power of calculation." § At the opening of this campaign Frederick saw that he should first have to encounter Austria. He marched from Saxony into Bohemia by four different mountain passes, purposing to unite his detachments in the environs of Prague. Before this city the Austrian marshal, Browne, was encamped, in a position almost impregnable. Frederick waited for his gallant companion-in-arms, Marshal Schwerin, to join him; and then, on the 6th of May, he fought one of the most sanguinary battles on record. The conflict lasted eleven hours, the Prussians losing eighteen thousand men and the Austrians twenty-four thousand. The brave old marshal fell, leading his regiment, which had given way, to the thick of the battle, waving the national standard of the black eagle which he had snatched from an ensign. The Austrian commander, Marshal Browne, was also mortally wounded. The king displayed that personal intrepidity which never failed him after his first battle of Molwitz. His victory was complete. Prague was then bombarded, and for three weeks did its unfortunate inhabitants endure the horrors of war, with more than its usual calamities. Twelve thousand famished victims, whose houses had been destroyed, were turned out of the gates of Prague,

---

* Waldegrave, "Memoirs," p. 155.
† Thackeray, "Life of Chatham," vol. i. p. 293.
‡ Walpole to Mann, July 3.
§ "Annual Register" for 1758—the first of the series. There is no more spirited or, in the main, more correct narrative of this eventful period than in the annual miscellany which the genius of Burke at once raised to a high reputation.

that more food might be left to its defenders. They were driven back again by the unpitying Prussians. The city resolutely held out. A great division of the Austrian army under Marshal Daun was advancing for its relief. On the 17th of June Frederick fought the battle of Kolin, with an inadequate force, and he was defeated with the loss of thirteen thousand men. Six times did he lead his cavalry to the charge against the Austrian position. He was advancing the seventh time, with only forty men, when an English officer said to him, "Is your majesty going to storm the battery by yourself?" He at last ordered the retreat; and, riding off alone, he was found seated by the side of a well, drawing figures in the sand with his stick. The siege of Prague was raised, and the Prussians hastily marched out of Bohemia.

Under this great reverse of their one ally the English government turned its attention to naval enterprises. Something, indeed, might be expected from the army under the Duke of Cumberland; and a great success on the coast of France would raise the spirits of the people, who were lamenting over the fatal day of Kolin. Such an enterprise would operate as an important diversion of the French from the war in Germany. An expedition was sent out, in September, under the command of Sir Edward Hawke and Sir John Mordaunt. Sixteen ships of the line and ten regiments of foot were destined for an attack on the great arsenal of Rochefort. The French coast was without many troops for its defence. Louis XV., when he heard of the arrival of an English armament at the mouth of the Charente, was fully convinced that Rochefort would fall. The fortified island of Aix was attacked by Captain Howe, who anchored his ship within fifty yards of the fort, and after an hour silenced the French batteries. General Conway took possession of the citadel.* After a week spent in councils of war, it was agreed that the expedition should return home. Mordaunt and Hawke were at issue. The general required to be assured by the admiral that if any mishap occurred in the attack upon Rochefort, such arrangements could be made as would allow the troops to re-embark. Hawke said that must depend upon wind and weather. We have a letter of General Conway, in which he writes to his brother about "resolutions and irresolutions." . . . "I am sorry to say that I think, on the whole, we make a pitiful figure in not attempting anything. . . . For the only time of my life I dread to come back to England."† Colonel Wolfe, when these miserable discussions were going on between the commanders, said that if they would give him three ships and five hundred men he would take Rochefort. Pitt, when he wanted such a soldier, did not forget Wolfe. Mordaunt was acquitted by a court-martial. Other evil tidings had travelled to England thick and fast. The news had come that the Duke de Richelieu had compelled the Duke of Cumberland, after a series of retreats, to leave Hanover to the mercy of the French; and, being pursued to Stade, he had agreed to a capitulation, known as the Convention of Closter-Seven, under which all his Hessians and Brunswickers were to be disbanded, and all his Hanoverians were to be sent into various cantonments. The duke was insulted by his father when he came home, and resigned his post as commander-in-chief. George had turned his back upon his favorite son when they first met, and said aloud, "He has ruined me and disgraced himself." The indignation of the English people was extreme. They associated in their minds the retreat from Rochefort and the surrender at Stade as the result of some treachery or court intrigue. "The people will not be persuaded that this pacific disposition [at Rochefort] was not a preliminary for the convention of Stade."‡ The public discontent was at its height when the intelligence arrived that Lord Loudoun, having the command of a force of twelve thousand men, furnished by large reinforcements from home, had shrunk from attacking Louisbourg, and that Admiral Halbourne, the naval commander, hesitated about imperilling his squadron of eighteen ships of the line in an attack upon the French squadron of nineteen ships of the line. When this account came Horace Walpole might well write, "It is time for England to slip her cables and float away into some unknown ocean."§ To crown the misfortunes of the first three months of Pitt's administration, there were serious disturbances in various parts of the country about the Militia Act, which came into operation at that time. The people were persuaded that, when enrolled, they were liable to be drafted into the king's forces and be sent abroad. It was in vain to urge the precise words of the statute. Yeomen, farmers, and laborers were obstinately incredulous; and in some places the timid magistrates were obliged to postpone their meetings for enrolling men, to prevent the violence which the ignorant multitudes threatened. Such were the blessings produced by the want of publicity for parliamentary proceedings, and by the utter deficiency of ability in the conductors of provincial newspapers to treat any social question as a matter for elucidation.* Their local "Accidents and Offences," the appointment of the parish beadle, or the marriage of the squire's daughter, constituted their notion of public instruction.

At the end of October Pitt wrote to Grenville, "The King of Prussia keeps the field, and his cause is still alive. An event or two may yet change the gloomy prospect. Immense expense I see is unavoidable, and the heavier load of national dishonor threatens to sink us with double weight of misfortune."† An event did come which did change the gloomy prospect. On the 15th of November Pitt wrote to Grenville, "The King of Prussia has gained a complete victory over the Prince de Soubise, near Weisenfels in Saxony."‡ Wondrous change of fortune, produced by the unshaken constancy of one man surrounded by dangers on every side. The Russians were desolating Frederick's eastern provinces. Silesia was filled with Austrians. He was under the ban of the empire, every German state being forbidden to give him aid. A letter published in the English papers at the end of August says, "Many persons who saw the King of Prussia, when he passed lately through Leipsic, cannot express how much he is altered. They say he is so much worn away that they scarce knew him."§ The final catastrophe—a ruin as complete as that of Charles the Twelfth at Pultowa—seemed fast approaching. The Prince de Soubise, with an army of forty thousand French and twenty thousand troops of the Empire, was encamped near Mucheln. Frederick, with twenty-two thousand of his Prussians, had marched to encounter this unequal force. After some changes of position on either side, on the 5th of November Soubise was suddenly attacked, when he thought that the king was retreating. Never was victory more complete than in this short battle of Rosbach. It was one universal rout. The French and the Imperial troops vied with each other in the swiftness of their flight. They left seven thousand prisoners, guns, colors, baggage—all that could manifest the extent of their humiliation. Before the battle Soubise had sent a dispatch to Louis to announce that he might be expected soon to arrive in Paris with the King of Prussia as his captive. The French officers looked upon the little Prussian army, and laughed at the presumption of Monsieur le Marquis de Brandenbourg. Frederick indulged himself, as was his custom whether victorious or defeated, by writing some very indifferent occasional verses to bid farewell to the runaway French. He then turned to real business. He would recover Silesia before the approaching winter should prevent any military operations. By forced marches he reached the neighborhood of Breslau. Here Prince Charles of Lorraine was at the head of an army of Austrians, exceeding sixty thousand men. They met at the village of Leuthen, near the woods of Lissa, on the 5th of December; and thus this greatest of Frederick's battles is known by either name. This was no sudden rout like that of Rosbach. The Austrians fought bravely, but the genius of the Prussian leader gave him a mighty victory, which Napoleon said was of itself sufficient to place Frederick in the rank of the greatest generals. When this wonderful campaign shall come to be described by a historian equal to the theme, we may perhaps understand the meaning of the words, "There were great kings before Napoleon." The writer to whom this task is allotted has briefly told us what he thinks of Rosbach and Leuthen: "Austerlitz and Wagram shot away more gunpowder—gunpowder probably in the proportion of ten to one, or a hundred to one; but neither of them was tenth part such a beating to your

* Captain Rodney's letter of September 23, in "Grenville Papers."
† MS. collection of "Conway's Letters."
‡ Potter to Pitt, "Chatham Correspondence," vol. i. p. 277.
§ Letter to Mann, September 3.

* Mr. Edward Baines, in the life of his father, says—speaking of the Leeds paper which for half a century has held so distinguished a place among journals—"Up to the year 1801 the 'Mercury,' like almost every other provincial paper, had no editorial comments whatever."
† "Grenville Papers," vol. i. p. 227.
‡ Ibid., p. 229.
§ "Annual Register," 1758, p. 20.

enemy as that of Rosbach, brought about by strategic art, human ingenuity and intrepidity, and the loss of four hundred and seventy-eight men. Leuthen too, the battle of Leuthen (though so few English readers ever heard of it) may very well hold up its head beside any victory gained by Napoleon or another. For the odds were not far from three to one; the soldiers were of not far from equal quality; and only the general was consummately superior, and the defeat a destruction." * The English people of 1757 did know something of Rosbach and of Leuthen. They forgot their own national misfortunes and disgraces in the triumphs of their great ally, the King of Prussia. "All England has kept his birthday," writes Walpole. "The people, I believe, begin to think that Prussia is some part of old England."

The defeat of the French at Rosbach led the King of England to refuse to ratify the Convention of Closter-Seven. "Some trifling infractions of the neutrality on the part of the French," according to Walpole, "were pretended to cover this notorious breach of faith." † Others hold that these "trifling infractions of the neutrality" consisted in the grossest cruelties and extortions exercised by the French on the electorate. Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, a distinguished officer in the Prussian army, was recommended by Frederick to assume the command of the Hanoverian troops, who were thus freed to take part in the campaign of 1758. The session of the English parliament was opened on the 1st of December. The king recommended that his "good brother and ally," the King of Prussia, "should receive all the support which his magnanimity deserved." A subsidy of 670,000*l.* was voted, with only one dissentient voice. His majesty by a message announced that the army formed in his electoral dominions was "to be put again into motion" to act in concert with the King of Prussia; and a present supply for the payment of that army was asked, in consideration of "the exhausted and ruined state of the electorate." One hundred thousand pounds was immediately voted. The votes for supplies amounted to ten millions. Pitt rarely went to the House of Commons, being laid up with the gout; but, whether confined to his chair or his bed, he issued his orders for the manning of fleets or the movement of armies, in every quarter of the globe. Some of his plans were successful; others were failures. He had not yet trodden down the system under which family connections and parliamentary influences were the paramount considerations in the choice of generals and admirals to command expeditions. Early in the session Pitt had hurled his thunderbolts against Lord Loudoun, who, he said, might have recovered affairs in America if he had not loitered from the 9th of July to the 5th of August, inquiring whether or no the French force was superior. "Our ill success has hurt my quiet and tainted my health." He had again to bear a repetition of ineffectual proceedings on the French coast, imputed by some to his want of knowledge of the defences of the place to be attacked—St. Maloes. An armament sailed on the 1st of June. The fleet was commanded by Lord Anson, the troops by the Duke of Marlborough. At St. Maloes a landing was effected without opposition. A number of small vessels were burned, and then the soldiers re-embarked. "The French learned," writes Walpole, "that they were not to be conquered by every Duke of Marlborough." ‡ The success, such as it was, was called by Mr. Fox "breaking windows with guineas." On the 8th of August Cherbourg was taken without opposition; its forts and basin were destroyed, with its hundred and seventy iron guns. Its brass guns were brought to the Tower of London. From Cherbourg the same expedition proceeded to make another attempt upon St. Maloes. The place was found too strong for assault; and the English troops, who were in a wretched state of discipline, disgraced themselves by their excesses as they wandered about in the district. A large French force was coming down upon them. All was hurry to rejoin the ships in the Bay of St. Cas; but the rear-guard of fifteen hundred men was cut off, and a thousand were killed or made prisoners. There needed some decided success to counteract the influence of these misfortunes. The French were dispossessed of their settlements on the African coast. An expedition sent against Fort Louis, on the Senegal River—a project suggested to Pitt by Thomas Camming, a commercial Quaker, who hoped that the French might be deprived of their monopoly of the gum trade without shedding a drop of blood. He went with the expedition, and Fort Louis was taken without slaughter. Goree surrendered to a stronger armament, but not without many broadsides from our ships, which showed Pitt's "good and worthy Friend," as the minister addressed him, that gentle warfare was not a possible thing. There were greater conquests in America. Pitt had not only publicly censured the Earl of Loudoun; he did what was more effectual—he recalled him. He now chose his commanders, not by seniority, but by their reputation for ability. General Amherst was dispatched to take the command of the troops, with Wolfe as his second in seniority, with the rank of brigadier-general. Admiral Boscawen was to command the fleet. There were now an admiral and a general who would co-operate. On the 2d of June a fleet of a hundred and fifty ships, bearing twelve thousand troops, appeared off Louisbourg. The soldiers were conveyed to the shore in boats, and Wolfe was the first to jump into the surf, and lead his men to the attack of the French, who were drawn up to oppose their landing. The defences were very strong, and it was nearly the end of July before Louisbourg capitulated, with nearly six thousand prisoners of war. Cape Breton once more formed a part of our dominions. The French fleet in the harbor was utterly destroyed. Throughout England there was universal exultation. This great success was regarded as a proof that the nation was beginning to reap the fruit of vigorous councils. This was the turning-point in Mr. Pitt's administration. There came disasters. This boldest of war ministers had a vast scheme of operations, each portion of which had reference to some ultimate object. He was already looking to the conquest of Quebec, and proposed to General Abercrombie to reduce the French forts on the borders of Lake George and Lake Champlain. An attack upon Ticonderoga, a strong fort, was repulsed by the Marquis de Montcalm, an experienced French general, with a loss to the British regiments and the American militia of two thousand killed and wounded. In a previous skirmish Lord Howe, who appears to have been "what every man in arms should wish to be," fell at the head of his regiment. The American campaign was concluded by the surrender to the British of Fort Duquesne, the original cause of the war. Its name was changed to Pittsburg.

In this year, while Prince Ferdinand kept the French in check, Frederick, on the 25th of August, fought the great battle of Zorndorf, near Frankfort-on-the-Oder, in which he defeated the Russians with a fearful slaughter. To show the short step from the sublime to the ridiculous, Walpole writes: "Well! the King of Prussia is found again—where do you think? only in Poland, up to the chin in Russians. Was ever such a man! He was riding home from Olmutz; they ran and told him of an army of Muscovites, as you would of a covey of partridges; he galloped thither and shot them." * The smart letter-writer then speaks of the extreme popularity in England of the great Fritz: "The lowest of the people are perfectly acquainted with him; as I was walking by the river the other night, a bargeman asked me for something to drink the King of Prussia's health." A large portion of the English public—a portion somewhat above the bargemen on the Thames and the ale-house keepers who set up the head of "the Protestant hero" as their sign—looked with intense interest upon the man who had fought six pitched battles in one year, and, undepressed by failure as he was calm under success, was still fighting for his little kingdom against a host of enemies. They looked with wonder upon the versatility and unconquerable gayety of this most extraordinary of kings who gave Europe a poem when he had no materials for a gazette. His poems, translated well or indifferently, unequal as their originals, found their way into popular miscellanies. When he, in his Epistle to Voltaire, talked of "the insipid farce of tedious state," "the fickle multitude's caress," "the thorny pomp of scepter'd care," critics might believe that there was the affectation of philosophy in all this; but the general sympathy would acknowledge that Frederick did not claim more for himself than he was entitled to when he said that he must be,

> "To face the tempest's rage,
> In thought, in life, and death, a king." †

He had need of fortitude. He was triumphant over the Russians in

* Carlyle, "Friedrich II.," vol. i. p. 10.
† "Memoirs of George II.," vol. iii. p. 81. ‡ Ibid., p. 185.

* Letter to Mann, September 9.
† This translation is in the "Annual Register" for 1758.

August. In October he was surprised by the Austrians in his camp, in a combined operation of General Daun and General Laudohn. As the church-clock of Hochkirchen struck five, on a cold and foggy morning of October, Frederick was awakened with the news that his batteries were stormed, and that a hostile army was in the centre of his camp. His presence of mind saved his troops from complete destruction, but after fighting five hours he was obliged to abandon his tents, his baggage, and his artillery. He halted about half a league from the field of battle, but he had brought off his men in such good order that the Austrians did not dare again to attack him. The great loss on that day was Marshal Keith.

The parliament met on the 23d of November. "It is all harmony," says Walpole, "and thinks of nothing but giving away twelve more millions." The lavishness of Pitt has been objected against him, but it must be borne in mind that there can be no greater waste than results from the false economy of what Wellington called "a little war." The official mode of looking at a war expenditure is thus described, with reference to the period when Pitt entered upon his ministerial career: "The heavy debt of the nation served as an excuse to those who understood nothing but little temporary expedients to preach up our impossibility of making an effectual stand. They were willing to trust that France would be so good as to ruin us by inches." * But Pitt took other means to rescue the nation from its ignoble lethargy and its slow decay than the common lavishness even of weak ministers. He infused his own energetic spirit into every one whom he intrusted with the execution of his plans. In choosing men for military command he passed over the ancient formalists "who had grown old on a very small portion of experience." He wanted men who would not shrink from difficulties. On the 22d of September, 1758, a letter was addressed to the minister by the youthful general who had first leaped into the surf at Louisbourg. Wolfe had returned home in ill health. He was then in his thirty-third year. He informed Mr. Pitt that he had no objection to serve in America, and particularly in the River St. Lawrence, if any operations were to be carried on there. He asked only a little time to recover the injury done to his constitution, that he might be "the better able to go through the business of the next summer." † Pitt at once promoted Wolfe to the rank of major-general, and gave him the command of the projected expedition to Quebec. Lord Mahon has related, upon private authority, a most interesting anecdote of circumstances attending the last interview between the minister and the young soldier to whom he had intrusted so heavy a responsibility. Pitt invited Wolfe to dinner, Lord Temple being the only other guest. "As the evening advanced Wolfe —heated, perhaps, by his own aspiring thoughts and the unwonted society of statesmen—broke forth into a strain of gasconade and bravado. He drew his sword, he rapped the table with it, he flourished it round the room, he talked of the mighty things which that sword was to achieve. The two ministers sat aghast at an exhibition so unusual from any man of real sense and real spirit." ‡ Was there not some other exciting cause than Wolfe's own aspiring thoughts? —some inspiration beyond the ordinary sober talk in the society of statesmen? It is well known that Pitt would harangue in other places than in parliament. He harangued George II. He harangued every one to whom he gave important instructions. It has been said that no officer went into his presence to receive his commands without coming out a bolder man. According to a joke at the court of Louis XV., he so frightened Bussy, the French envoy, by his declamation that the terrified negotiator jumped out of the window. The bravado of Wolfe might be the almost unconscious tribute of an impulsive nature to the warlike eloquence of Pitt.

The year 1759 is one of the most memorable years in the annals of Britain. On the colors of our 12th, 20th, 23d, 25th, 37th, and 51st regiments are inscribed the name of "Minden." At the great battle of Minden, on the 1st of August, Prince Ferdinand defeated the French generals the Duke de Broglie and the Mareschal de Contades, who commanded a force very superior to that of the Hanoverians and English. In the preceding April Ferdinand had been compelled to retreat before these generals, after having been defeated at Bergen. The electorate of Hanover seemed again ready to be a prey to the rapacity of the French, when another like the Duke de Richelieu might build a palace out of its spoils. But the skilful tactics of Ferdinand stood between the French and their expected conquest. Cassel, Munster, and Minden were in their possession. A small detachment of the Hanoverians and English appeared before Minden, exposed, as it appeared to the French officers, to inevitable destruction. De Broglie marched out from his strong position to surround them, when the whole allied army was seen, drawn up in order of battle. De Contades then joined him, and the two, with their cavalry, made repeated attacks upon the solid English and Hanoverian infantry. Again and again they were driven back, and at length the French generals commanded a retreat. The cavalry, under Lord George Sackville, had not been engaged. Ferdinand sent him orders to charge the French before they could rally. Sackville would not understand the messages brought to him by three aides-de-camp, two of whom were English. The opportunity was lost for the entire rout of the enemy, although the victory was complete, as far as it went. That evening the Englishman whom his countrymen were to brand as a coward appeared at Ferdinand's table. Surprise was expressed at the marvellous audacity. In the general orders issued the next morning, in which the troops and some distinguished officers received the thanks of their commander, the name of Sackville was not mentioned; and the Marquis of Granby, the second in command, was referred to as one who, if he had been at the head of the cavalry, would have made the decision of that day more complete and brilliant. Lord George begged to return home and to resign his command. He came to England, was deprived of all his offices, and, being tried by court-martial in the following year, was found guilty of disobeying Prince Ferdinand's orders, and was declared unfit to serve in any military capacity. The haughty and ambitious man, in despite of public contempt, made his way to civil employment in the next reign. But, in spite of Sackville, Minden was a British triumph. Other triumphs succeeded. The French were preparing for our invasion. Pitt sent Admiral Rodney to destroy their gunboats in the port of Havre, which service was effectually accomplished. Brest was blockaded. Admiral Boscawen on the 17th of August defeated a French fleet in the Bay of Lagos on its way from Toulon to assist in the operations in the Channel. Guadaloupe had capitulated to an English armament in May that was employed in attacks upon the French West India Islands.

The French colony of Canada, in 1759, contained forty thousand souls. Lower Canada, or Canada East, was occupied almost exclusively by the French settlers, who had been established there since 1608, on the spot now occupied by the city of Quebec. The Red Indians ranging over the vast surface of unoccupied country were, for the most part, in friendship with the French, and assisted them, as we have seen, in their inroads upon the British North American colonists. Two millions of civilized men, whether of French or of British descent, incorporated into a great people, now inhabit that fine country of Canada, and, through the sure effect of the wise measures of the imperial government, however tardy, are among the most attached of British colonists, sending their surplus population to add to the home defence of the state which they honor. The Marquis de Montcalm, in 1759, commanded the French troops in Canada —a brave and honorable man, untainted with the profligacy of the court of Louis XV. The plans of Mr. Pitt for the campaign in America were of a wide but comprehensive character. There were three armaments. Two of these had a field of operations calculated to attain partial advantages in themselves, but intended to combine in one great undertaking. In the middle of July a body of the American militia, and of Indians in amity with them, commenced the siege of Niagara, a strong fort on that river, near the Falls. Six hundred men defended the place. A large force, chiefly of Indians, approached to the relief of the garrison, and during the battle which ensued the Indian war-whoop was heard above the cataract's roar— a singular contrast to many European battles in which the thunderclap has mingled with the boom of the gun. The garrison capitulated, and the fall of Niagara was numbered among the triumphs of that year. General Amherst had succeeded to the command held by General Abercrombie, who had failed, not without incurring blame, in his attack upon the fortress of Ticonderoga in 1758. In July Amherst reduced this stronghold, the French retreating to an-

* Walpole, "Memoirs of George II.," vol. iii. p. 173.
† "Chatham Correspondence," vol. i. p. 370.
‡ "History," vol. iv. p. 228.

other fort on Lake Champlain, called Crown Point. This place was also secured. But at the upper end of the lake the French had taken up a strong position. The English general had to build boats before he could attempt to dislodge them. He had been instructed, after securing the navigation on Lake Champlain, to march along the River Richelieu, and combine his operations with those of Wolfe on the St. Lawrence. Amherst embarked on Lake Champlain. He was driven back by storms; and then came the winter. Wolfe, with eight thousand men, had sailed in a fleet commanded by Admiral Saunders; and by the aid of some charts of the river which had been taken on board a French vessel, the difficult passage of the St. Lawrence was accomplished. On the 27th of July the small British army landed on the Isle of Orleans, opposite Quebec, where they found abundance to recruit them after their long voyage.

The highest hopes of the English people attended the progress of these operations in North America. The force sent out was large. There was confidence in the skill and bravery of the commanders. On the 14th of October there arrived in London a letter addressed by Wolfe to the Earl of Holderness, one of the secretaries of state, which appeared to annihilate every hope, as did a letter addressed to Mr. Pitt. On the 16th Walpole writes: "Two days ago came letters from Wolfe, despairing, as much as heroes can despair." The letter to Holderness, dated on the 9th of September, "On board the Sutherland, at anchor off Cape Rouge," is singularly interesting; written with great care, and with the solemnity of a brave man who feels that he is likely to fail in doing the state service. Quebec, he says, he could have taken, if Montcalm had shut himself up in the town; "but he has a numerous body of armed men, and the strongest country, perhaps, in the world to rest the defence of the town and colony upon." He had attacked their intrenchments on the 31st of July, but accidents prevented the success of the attempt, and the post had been so strengthened that another attempt would be too hazardous. The English fleet blocks up the river, but can give no assistance in an attack upon the Canadian army. The heat of the weather and great fatigue had thrown him into a fever, and he had begged the generals to consider what was best to be done. They recommended that a considerable corps should be conveyed into the upper river, to draw the enemy from their inaccessible situation and bring them to an action. "I agreed," he says, "to the proposal; and we are now here with about three thousand six hundred men, waiting an opportunity to attack them, when and wherever they can best be got at." The fleet of transports had carried the army, reduced to this small number, up the St. Lawrence, several miles above Quebec, where they disembarked. "So far recovered as to do business," he waited "an opportunity to attack." Genius makes its own opportunities. The Heights of Abraham form a continuation of the steep ridge of rocks on which Quebec is built—an almost natural barrier against any assaults from troops landing near the city. It was one o'clock in the morning of the 13th of September when the little band were crowded into boats, to float down the broad river with the flowing tide. In darkness and in silence they embarked. Wolfe, who had the poetical element in his composition, repeated in a low voice to his brother officers as they sat in the boat the famous poem which he had retained in his memory—Gray's "Elegy in a Country Churchyard."* They reached a little inlet about two miles above Quebec, now called "Wolfe's Cove." They landed at the foot of a cliff, with one narrow path which led up to a wide table-land. The men struggled up with the aid of boughs and stumps of trees, or clinging to projections in the rock. Foremost among those who scaled the cliff was one of the new Highland regiments. A French picket fired and fled. The height was gained. The troops formed in line, and anxiously waited for another detachment which the boats had gone back to bring. When the day broke a compact army stood, as if brought thither by magic, on the high ground at the back of Quebec. Montcalm would not believe the intelligence. He saw with his own eyes, and then led his troops forth from their intrenchments. "If I must fight, I will crush them," he said, and prepared for battle.

Wolfe had disposed his little force with admirable judgment. Montcalm was advancing with French and Canadian regiments intermingled, while his Indian allies were detached to outflank the British on their left. This left wing was commanded by Brigadier-General Townshend, while Wolfe was with the right wing, where the hottest work was expected. He had ordered his men not to fire till the enemy came within forty yards. Montcalm's troops had fired as they advanced, and Wolfe had received a shot in his wrist. He bound the wound with his handkerchief. The volley of the British stopped the advance. Wolfe headed his grenadiers to the charge, when another shot struck him in a vital part. Still he issued his orders and pressed on. A third ball hit him in the breast. He fell, and was carried to the rear. His eyes were growing dim as he looked upon the battle. He sank on the ground, when an officer near him exclaimed, "They run." The dying man raised himself on his elbow, and asked, "Who run?" "The enemy, the enemy." "I am satisfied," said Wolfe. The second in command, General Monkton, had also fallen. General Townshend completed the victory. The brave Montcalm was mortally wounded, and, being carried into the city, died the next day. Quebec capitulated on the 18th of September.* The hearts of the people were probably never more stirred than by Wolfe's gloomy dispatch of the 9th of September, followed by the intelligence of the capture of Quebec, and of the death of Wolfe, which arrived three days later. "They despaired, they triumphed, and they wept."† The popular admiration of Wolfe was not a passing sentiment. A quarter of a century afterward, when Cowper published his "Task," it was

> "praise enough
> To fill the ambition of a private man,
> That Chatham's language was his mother tongue,
> And Wolfe's great name compatriot with his own."

Parliament was opened by commission on the 13th of November. Peace was talked of, but it was urged that such supplies should be given as would enable his majesty "to sustain and press, with effect, all our extensive operations against the enemy." In the course of the session fifteen millions and a half was voted for supplies—an enormous sum by comparison with the estimates of previous years of war. Pitt on the 20th moved that a public monument should be erected to the memory of General Wolfe. He moved also the thanks of the house to the generals and admirals, "whose merit," he said, "had equalled those who have beaten armadas—'May I anticipate?' cried he, 'those who *will* beat armadas.'"‡ At the hour at which Pitt used this remarkable expression a naval battle was being fought, which made his anticipation look like some mysterious sympathy which outran the ordinary means of intelligence—the "shadows before" which a sanguine mind sees in "coming events." Admiral Hawke was driven by the equinoctial gales from his blockade at Brest. Conflans, the French admiral, came out with twenty-one ships of the line and four frigates. Admiral Duff was off Quiberon Bay with his squadron, and Conflans hoped to attack him before Hawke could come to the rescue. But Hawke did return; and then Conflans hurried to the mouth of the Vilaine—fancying himself secure amid the rocks and shoals on that shore to which the Britons sailed to the aid of the Veneti. The danger of a sea-fight in such a perilous navigation had no terrors for Hawke. The pilot pointed out the danger. "Lay me alongside the French admiral," was Hawke's reply to the pilot's remonstrance. "You have done your duty, but now obey my orders." The fight went on till night while a tempest was raging. Signal guns of vessels in distress were heard on every side. When the morning came two British ships were found to be stranded, but their crews were saved. Four of the French fleet had been sunk, among which was the admiral's ship. Two had struck. The rest had fled up the Vilaine. This final victory put an end to all those apprehensions of a descent upon England which prevailed before Pitt had infused his spirit into commanders by land and sea. The French admiral, Thurot, was to have co-operated with Conflans in an attempt at invasion. He landed in the north of Ireland, attacked Carrickfergus,

* Strange as this may seem in such a moment of anxiety, it was the relief from the weight of an overwhelming thought; such as Shakespeare has exhibited when he makes Cinna and Casca discuss where the coming day was to break, in the interval that preceded the resolve that Cæsar should die.

* An obelisk erected in the gardens attached to the Government House bears on one side the name of "Wolfe," on the other that of "Montcalm."

† Walpole, "Memoirs," vol. iii. p. 219. ‡ Ibid., p. 230.

which was bravely defended by seventy-two men, and then went again to sea, having plundered the town, and carried off the mayor and three other inhabitants as his prisoners.

It was the determination to believe nothing impossible to a strong will, and to think no loss irretrievable, which sustained Frederick of Prussia through the reverses of 1759—the most disastrous of all his campaigns. The defeat by the Russians at Kunersdorf would have annihilated a less resolute man. But he rallied, and he fought through another year of checkered fortune, during which his own territories suffered the extremities of misery, to win the two victories of Legnitz and of Torgau.

The year 1760 was not a year of excitement to the English people. The war went on, but even the defence of the conquests of 1759 required no great exertions. Quebec was besieged, but the besiegers were compelled to retire, when an English fleet appeared in the St. Lawrence. There was little domestic agitation, except a ministerial difference with the court, which somewhat detracts from the dignity of Pitt, in his exhibition of contempt for that influence which prevented his brother-in-law, Earl Temple, from obtaining the Garter. Parliament had little more to do than vote supplies. "Success," said Pitt, "had produced unanimity, not unanimity success." A sudden event came, destined in a short time to change the whole aspect of affairs—to involve England once again in political contests more to be dreaded than the ordinary course of party warfare—more to be dreaded, because other leaders appeared than those of parliament, and the representatives of the people were not on the popular side. The reign of George II. came suddenly to a close on the 25th of October. The king had risen at his usual hour of six, had taken his cup of chocolate, and had been left alone by his attendants. A noise as of a heavy fall was heard, then a groan. The old man lay on the ground, and never spoke more. The right ventricle of his heart had burst.

CHAPTER CLXIII.

Accession of George III.—His education and character—Lord Bute—The king's first speech—Policy of the new reign—Independence of the judges—The new parliament—The king's marriage—Coronation—Negotiations for peace—Warlike operations—Affairs of the Continent—Frederick of Prussia—Negotiations broken off—The Family Compact—Resignation of Mr. Pitt—His pension—Debates in parliament—War declared against Spain—Conquest of the Havana, and other successes—Preliminaries of peace signed—The Peace of Paris—Conclusion of the Seven Years War—The cost of the war, and its uses.

It is related that, on the morning of the 25th of October, George, Prince of Wales, taking an early ride in the neighborhood of Kew, where he was residing, a messenger came to him, bearing a note from a German valet-de-chambre who was about the person of George II., which note bore a private mark, as previously agreed, that declared the king was dead. The prince, suddenly become George III., showed no surprise or emotion, dropped no word to indicate what had happened, but, saying his horse was lame, turned back to Kew, and, dismounting, thus addressed his groom: "I have said this horse is lame; I forbid you to say to the contrary." This is Walpole's relation, and this his comment: "The first moment of the new reign afforded a symptom of the prince's character, of that cool dissimulation in which he had been so well initiated by his mother, and which comprehended almost the whole of what she had taught him." * We place this gossip of the servants' hall at the commencement of our narrative. It is quoted by Lord John Russell as a trifling incident which showed the power which the young king had acquired over his countenance and manner.† It is referred to by Mr. Massey, to show that George III. "was not always scrupulous on the point of veracity." ‡ Our readers will form their own opinion of this symptom of the royal character. Princes, as well as others of the higher orders of society, have been immemorially trained not to exhibit emotion; and the artifice by which the pupil of an adroit mother desired to conceal his irregular knowledge of a great fact may be paltry enough, but yet not a manifestation of habitual unveracity. Lord Waldegrave, who had unusual opportunities for studying the character of the prince, assigns to him, in his twenty-first year, qualities which may certainly be traced in his maturer life: "His parts, though not excellent, will be found very tolerable, if ever they are properly exercised. . . . He is strictly honest, but wants that frank and open behavior which makes honesty appear amiable. . . . His religion is free from hypocrisy, but is not of the most charitable sort. . . . He has spirit, but not of the active kind; and does not want resolution, but it is mixed with too much obstinacy. . . . He has great command of his passions, and will seldom do wrong, except when he mistakes wrong for right; but as often as this shall happen it will be difficult to undeceive him, because he is unusually indolent, and has strong prejudices. . . . Whenever he is displeased his anger does not break out with heat and violence, but he becomes sullen and silent, and retires to his closet; not to compose his mind by study or contemplation, but merely to indulge the melancholy enjoyment of his own ill-humor. Even when the fit is ended, unfavorable symptoms very frequently return, which indicate that on certain occasions his royal highness has too correct a memory. . . . Though I have mentioned his good and bad qualities, without flattery and without aggravation, allowances should still be made, on account of his youth and his bad education." * With regard to the education of the prince, his mother told Doddington that it "had given her much pain. His book-learning she was no judge of, though she supposed it small or useless; but she hoped he might have been instructed in the general understanding of things." Speaking of Mr. Stone, the sub-governor, the princess dowager said, "she once desired him to inform the prince about the constitution; but he declined it, to avoid giving jealousy to the Bishop of Norwich." † The bishop had the title of preceptor. These instructors, according to Lord Waldegrave, though men of sense, men of learning, and worthy good men, "had but little weight and influence. The mother and the nursery always prevailed." The partisans of Lord Bute, Walpole says, "affected to celebrate the care he had taken of the king's education. . . . His majesty had learned nothing but what a man who knew nothing could teach him." ‡ It has been, we think, hastily assumed that this king, in his maturer life, added nothing to his scanty stores of knowledge.

Burke has described, in emphatic words, the state of the country at the period of the death of George II. "He carried the glory, the power, the commerce of England to a height unknown even to this renowned nation in the times of its greatest prosperity; and he left his succession resting on the true and only true foundations of all national and all regal greatness; affection at home, reputation abroad, trust in allies, terror in rival nations." § These triumphs of the last four years of George II.'s reign are thus pointed out, to contrast with the change that had taken place in ten years after the accession of George III. Junius, in the first of his celebrated letters, holding that "to be acquainted with the merit of a ministry we need only observe the condition of the people," proceeds to say that if "we see an universal spirit of distrust and dissatisfaction, a rapid decay of trade, dissensions in all parts of the empire, and a total loss of respect in the eyes of foreign powers, we may pronounce, without hesitation, that the government of the country is weak, distracted, and corrupt." ‖ Making every abatement for the party griefs of Burke and the virulent hostility of Junius, we cannot doubt that during the first decade of the reign of George III. the times were "out of joint;" that a great change in the relations of the crown to the aristocracy had been effected; that a change of equal importance in the exercise of the power of the sovereign, as distinguished from the power of a ministry, had also been partially accomplished; and that the popular element in the House of Commons had been greatly diluted by the preponderance of the courtly element. Without entering minutely into the vast details which time has accumulated

* "Memoirs of the Reign of King George III. Now first published from the original MSS. Edited by Sir Denis Le Marchant, Bart.," 1845. Vol. i. p. 6.
† "Bedford Correspondence."
‡ "History of England during the Reign of George III.," vol. i. p. 59.

* "Memoirs," p. 8.
† "Diary," August 6, 1755.
‡ "Memoirs of George III.," vol. i. p. 55.
§ "Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents." 1770.
‖ January 21, 1769.

for the history of this period, we shall endeavor to present an impartial view of the events which indicate the policy systematically acted upon from the day of George III.'s accession—not passionately or inconsistently, but with a calm determination which showed that if Mr. Stone had neglected to teach the Prince of Wales something about the constitution, Lord Bute had labored to supply the deficiency. That policy, as set forth by Doddington, was "to recover monarchy from the inveterate usurpation of oligarchy;" and, further, to get rid of the necessary result of that domination, which was expressed in the lamentation of George II. to his chancellor, "Ministers are the king in this country." These conceptions could not be realized without difficulty and danger. Perhaps the greatest danger was in that partial success which made the House of Commons more odious to the people in its subserviency to the crown than was the crown itself at any past period of its conflicts with the House of Commons. In these early struggles of his reign the character of the young prince, as indicated by Lord Waldegrave, comes out with tolerable clearness: an intellect not deficient, but not highly cultivated—honesty without frankness—resolution, approaching to obstinacy—indolence, soon overcome by a strong will—violent prejudices, liable to mistake wrong for right—sullen anger—enduring animosity. But we must not, on the other hand, forget that the party hostility, and even national dissatisfaction, which George III. provoked in many circumstances of his long reign, did not alienate from him the personal loyalty and even love of his people. They respected the example of his private life—his strong domestic affections; his simple tastes and unostentatious habits; his manly piety, of which no one doubted that it was "free from hypocrisy." We respect these qualities now; and knowing how much good was effected by the influence of his example, we may speak of his political errors with compassion rather than with virulence. Those errors, as far as the king's personal character was concerned, were more the subject of animadversion in the first twenty years of his reign than in the subsequent period in which he exercised the regal authority. That he might possess the power as he advanced in life of correcting some of the original defects of his character was anticipated by Lord Waldegrave, in a passage which is omitted in the printed edition of the "Memoirs," and which neutralizes in some degree the generally unfavorable opinion which the governor had formed of the pupil. "When the prince shall succeed to his grandfather, there may possibly be changes of greater consequence." Lord Waldegrave refers to the confidence in Lord Bute which had succeeded the authority of the nursery. "He will soon be sensible that a prince who suffers himself to be led is not to be allowed the choice of a conductor. His pride will then give battle to his indolence; and having made this first effort, a moderate share of obstinacy will make him persevere." The pride and resolution of George III. subdued his indolence in a remarkable degree. Never did any ruler work harder, certainly too hard, in the endeavor to understand and influence public affairs. He did his best, within the limits of his ability. Lord Waldegrave adds, "His honesty will incline to do what is right; and the means cannot be wanting where a good disposition of mind is joined with a tolerable capacity; for a superior genius does not seem to be a *sine quâ non* in the composition of a good king." *

The king for some time did "suffer himself to be led," and was not "allowed the choice of a conductor." The Earl of Bute prepared his majesty's first address to the privy council. The Earl of Bute, the groom of the stole, was not only named by the king as a member of the privy council, but also of the cabinet.† To Mr. Pitt this nomination must have been especially offensive; for in the king's speech to the council he alluded to "a bloody and expensive war." The great minister, who had conducted that war to an issue which redeemed even its cost of blood and treasure, by raising England out of her abject prostration to a height which was her safety as well as her glory, was indignant at this tone, and insisted that the passage should go forth to the world as "an expensive but just and necessary war." But the Duke of Newcastle and Mr. Pitt continued their alliance as ministers under the new sovereign. They were not very cordial. The influence of Bute was recognized in the smothered cry of "No Scotch favorite;" and the uncertainty of the final preponderance of the rivals for power was expressed in the joking question, whether the king would burn in his chamber Scotch coal, Newcastle coal, or Pit coal.

On the 18th of November the king opened the parliament. Lord Hardwicke prepared the speech, of which he sent the draught to Mr. Pitt. When it was to be settled in the cabinet the words were inserted in the king's own writing, which were long treasured up in loyal memories: "Born and educated in this country, I glory in the name of Briton; and the peculiar happiness of my life will ever consist in promoting the welfare of a people whose loyalty and warm affection to me I consider as the greatest and most permanent security of my throne." The House of Commons voted a Civil List of 800,000*l.*, upon the king surrendering the hereditary revenue. The annual subsidy to the King of Prussia was renewed. Supplies were given to the extent of twenty millions. The enthusiasm with which the king was greeted by his subjects was in striking contrast with the coldness that had attended the appearance in public of George II. At the play the whole audience sang "God save the king" in chorus. The few remaining Jacobites gave up their hatred to the house of Hanover, and flocked to St. James's.

How short a time this happy calm was to last may be inferred from the revelations in Bubb Doddington's Diary. This ancient intriguer was now intriguing with Bute against the king's ministers. On the 20th of November they had "much serious and confidential talk." On the 29th Doddington pressed Bute to take the secretary's office, and get rid of Lord Holderness. On the 20th of December "we had much talk about setting up a paper." Their great object appears to be embodied in the following passage regarding the ministry, which has especial reference to Pitt: "I think," writes Doddington, on the 2d of January, 1761, "they will continue the war as long as they can, and keep in, when it is over, as long as they can; and that will be as long as they please, if they are suffered to make peace, which will soon be so necessary to all orders and conditions of men that all will be glad of it, be it what it will, especially if it comes from those who have all the offices and the powers of office. All which can never end well for the king and Lord Bute." How it would end for the nation was not a matter to be considered. Among the weapons which this pair devised to damage Pitt in popular estimation, they "agreed upon getting runners," hawkers of pamphlets and bills. Their desire also to return to one of the practices of the good old times is thus indicated: "We wished to have some coffee-house spies, but I do not know how to contrive it." * The habit in which Bute already indulged of using the name of the king as an authoritative recommendation of any political action—even of the nomination of a member for a borough under government influence—must have excited strong doubts of the wisdom of his majesty's constitutional training. Bute informed Doddington, on the 2d of February, "that he had told Anson that room must be made for Lord Parker; who replied that all was engaged; and that he (Bute) said, 'What, my lord! the king's admiralty boroughs full, and the king not acquainted with it!'—that Anson seemed quite disconcerted, and knew not what to say." Within a week after the accession Walpole wrote, "The favorite took it up in high style." Three months later the favorite could even venture to proclaim the policy of the new reign, in an insolent message to Pitt. "Mr. Beckford, dropping in conversation that he wished to see the king his own minister, he (Lord Bute) replied that his great friend Mr. Pitt did not desire to see the king his own minister, and he might tell him so, if he pleased, for that it was very indifferent to him (Bute) if every word he said was carried to Mr. Pitt." † One of the consequences of Mr. Beckford's wish was manifest when, in 1770, he, being lord mayor, harangued the king on the throne in words which assumed that, although the constitutional principle holds that the sovereign can do no wrong, no ministerial responsibility was recognized to shield that sovereign from the reproof of a subject. The lord mayor had a constitutional right, which he had exercised, to present the address of the city to the sovereign. To that address the king had read a reply, which reply was the act of his ministers. When Beck-

* First given in the "Edinburgh Review," vol. xxxvii. p. 17.

† Sir Denis Le Marchant has pointed out that this nomination to the cabinet, and not that to the privy council, was the subject of animadversion at the time. Note to Walpole's "George III."

* "Diary," January 9, 1761. † Ibid., February 21.

ford added his personal remarks upon what the king had replied, he forgot that the king could not answer him, according to the theory and practice of the constitution.

When the king went to parliament on the 3d of March, to recommend an alteration in the tenure of office by the judges, he did not assume that the measure then proposed was more than supplementary to a far greater measure of the period of the revolution. His majesty said: "In consequence of the act passed in the reign of my late glorious predecessor King William III., for settling the succession to the crown in my family, their commissions have been made during their good behavior; but notwithstanding that wise provision, their offices have determined upon the demise of the crown or at the expiration of six months afterward, in every instance of that nature which has happened." The king recommended that "further provision may be made for securing the judges in the enjoyment of their offices during their good behavior, notwithstanding any such demise;" and that their salaries "should be absolutely secured to them during the continuance of their commissions." Lord Hardwicke, on moving the address of the peers in reply to the king's speech, gave that tone of somewhat extravagant eulogy in which it has been customary to speak of this measure. But the great lawyer treated the proposed change, not as the remedy of a crying evil, though admirable as the assertion of a principle—"The judges were sworn to one king, and depended upon a future king in expectancy; his majesty demonstrated his wisdom in choosing to shut this door." In reviewing historically the operation of the laws affecting the judicial independence, he dwelt upon the evils of the three reigns before the revolution, when the judges held their office *durante bene placito*. Compared with these times, his majesty found the law in a happy state. Upon the accession of Queen Anne "three judges were left out, and all the rest had new commissions. Upon the demise of George I. the like happened, but only one left out." "A cloud," Lord Hardwicke truly said, "might arise *in futuro*."*

On the 21st of March the parliament was dissolved by proclamation. Previous to the close of the session the Speaker Onslow, who had filled the chair for thirty-three years, announced his intention of retiring. The Commons united in a vote, asking the crown to bestow upon Onslow some signal mark of its favor. He received a pension of 3000*l*. There were changes in the ministry. Legge ceased to be chancellor of the exchequer. Holderness was removed from his office of one of the secretaries of state. The Earl of Bute was appointed in his place. That change was made without the knowledge of Pitt, the other secretary. He bore the neglect patiently. He still directed the conduct of foreign affairs, and of the war. He was listening to overtures made by France to negotiate for peace. But he was also meditating some further enterprises that might result in a success that would give greater weight to the terms upon which he desired to insist. The general election took place. Venality was never carried further. Mr. Hallam says, "The sale of seats in parliament, like any other transferable property, is never mentioned in any book that I remember to have seen of an earlier date than 1760."† Bribery, in the approved form of selling a pair of jack-boots for thirty guineas, and a pair of wash-leather breeches for fifty pounds, was notorious enough to be laughed at by Foote. Dr. Johnson maintained that "the statutes against bribery were intended to prevent upstarts with money from getting into parliament." He held that "if he were a gentleman of landed property, he would turn out all his tenants who did not vote for the candidate whom he supported."‡ The struggle between the "upstarts with money"—the commercial interest—against what Johnson called "the old family interest," was fast becoming a formidable one. Bribery was the readiest weapon in the hands of the weaker of the political combatants of a hundred years ago. The weapon was too powerful to continue in the exclusive hands of one party. It was more efficient even than the intimidation of the owner of "permanent property," which Johnson thought was a proper restraint upon "the privilege of voting." A century of legislation has done little beyond exhibiting the character of the evil. It has probably only lost its shamelessness to become more dangerous.

The intended marriage of the king to the Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz was announced in an extraordinary gazette of the 8th of July, detailing the communication to the privy council of his majesty's choice of a consort. In the "Annual Register" this document is given; and it is observed, that although the people were desirous of seeing their young sovereign united to a princess worthy of his affection, "a few thought he might find in a subject one every way qualified to wear a crown, and made no difficulty of pointing her out." Lady Sarah Lennox, the sister of the Duke of Richmond, was the lady thus glanced at. The king's passion for her was notorious. The mother of the king and Lord Bute are held to have turned him aside from this beautiful object of his love, to accept a bride chosen from some petty German court. Colonel Græme, a Jacobite, was employed by the princess dowager "to visit various little Protestant courts, and make report of the qualifications of the several unmarried princesses."* On his representation, the Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg was chosen. There was a testimony of more importance to the character of the princess than that of this ambassador, who was congratulated by David Hume "in having exchanged the dangerous employment of making kings for the more lucrative province of making queens."† Frederick of Prussia had sent a letter to George II., which the Princess Charlotte, then a girl of sixteen, had addressed to him, when his troops were overrunning the territory of her cousin, the Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin. The letter is bold and eloquent. Even conquerors, she says, would weep at the hideous prospect before her. The husbandman and the shepherd have forsaken their occupation; the towns are inhabited only by old men, women, and children. The rival armies insult and oppress the people, even those to whom they might look for redress. She can scarcely congratulate the King of Prussia on his victory, when it has covered her country with desolation. On the 8th of September the princess arrived at St. James's, and the marriage was celebrated that afternoon. She who for fifty-seven years was queen-consort, and in many important matters influenced the destinies of the country, was not to be compared in personal appearance with Lady Sarah Lennox, or with another object of early passion, whose name lingered on the lips of the blind and aged king, when his distempered brain called up the ghosts of buried fantasies.‡ Of the queen, as she appeared on her bridal night, Walpole says, "She looks very sensible, cheerful, and is remarkably genteel." Her good sense and cheerfulness appear to have been the characteristics of Queen Charlotte through her long and anxious life. We greatly doubt whether she can fairly be described as "of narrow and uncultivated understanding."§ In the experiences of Fanny Burney we may trace many evidences of her quick capacity and her shrewd judgment; with a kindly nature, often breaking through the restraints of courtly etiquette, to be considerate and unaffected. In our own early days at Windsor we heard many anecdotes of Queen Charlotte to confirm this view of her character, with not a few stories of her majesty's economical habits, not altogether of a royal complexion.

The coronation of the king and queen took place on the 22d of September. More serious considerations were coming upon the government than the omissions in the ceremonial of the banquet—omissions of which the king complained to the deputy earl marshal, and the provident functionary replied that he had now given such directions that the next coronation would be perfectly well regulated. The negotiations for peace with France were at an end. A more extended war was imminent.

At the beginning of 1761 the foreign affairs of France were under the direction of the Duke de Choiseul, who had been first elevated to power by the influence of Madame de Pompadour. Louis XV. at that time was still disturbed by those apprehensions of personal danger which had preyed upon him since the attempt of Damiens upon his life in 1757. The country was in a state of great misery, which presented a striking contrast to the extravagance of the court. France, upon the verge of a general national bankruptcy, was humiliated by the extraordinary successes which had accompanied the administration of Pitt. The Duke de Choiseul had proposed a general negotiation for peace, and plenipotentiaries had been named by Eng-

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xv. col. 1008. Notes of Lord Hardwicke's Speech. † "Constitutional History," chap. xvi.
‡ Boswell, under date of April 5, 1775.

* Walpole, "George III.," vol. i. p. 65. † Ibid.
‡ See note in "Quarterly Review," vol. cv. p. 477.
§ Massey, vol. i. p. 118.

land and Prussia to treat at a congress at Augsburg. But he also suggested a previous negotiation between France and England. M. de Bussy arrived at London as the French minister; and Mr. Hans Stanley was sent to Paris as the English negotiator. The dispatches of Stanley to Pitt detail the progress of these conferences at Paris. The basis of pacification proposed was the *uti possidetis*—the continued possession of whatever territory each of the contracting powers might hold upon a day named—in Europe, for example, on the 1st of May ensuing—or an equivalent to such possession. The instructions which Mr. Stanley received were, that he should contend that the *uti possidetis* should date from the day when the treaty was signed. Pitt, as we have said, was looking to further conquests, which would give England a claim for larger equivalents. On the 9th of June Choiseul told the English minister that Bellisle was taken; and "he did not express much concern or any resentment. The capture of Bellisle, an island near the mouth of the Loire, on the west coast of France, could not be regarded by the English government as a conquest of any permanent value. But Pitt, never relaxing from a vigorous conduct of the war until peace was absolutely secured, did not hesitate to send an expedition of nine thousand men to attack the fortresses of these rugged shores, where a few thousand fishermen obtained a precarious livelihood. There was a great sacrifice of life; and it was two months before the garrison of Palais capitulated. About the same period the West Indian island of Dominica had been captured; and the French dominion in the East Indies had been finally destroyed by the surrender of Pondicherry. These successes gave some additional force to Pitt's demands. He required that Minorca should be restored in exchange for Bellisle. He demanded other concessions, which France was unwilling to yield. With a consistency and firmness highly honorable he insisted that in making a separate peace with France England should not be restrained from lending her aid to the King of Prussia. Frederick was truly in a condition to require her aid. The Austrians were in possession of the most important posts in Silesia. In Pomerania the Russians had overpowered his commanders. All his resources were fast failing, except his own indomitable energy. In a remarkable letter which Frederick wrote to Pitt about this time, he declares his resolution to take for his examples, Hannibal after the battle of Cannæ; Elizabeth, at the time of the Spanish armada; Gustavus Vasa, when he drove Christian from Sweden; the Prince of Orange, who founded the republic of the United Provinces. The King of England, said Frederick, has to choose one of two courses; to think only of the interests of England, and forget those of his allies; or to unite the interests of his own nation with theirs, and thus uphold his good faith and his glory. "I am persuaded," he added to Pitt personally, "that you think like me. All the course of your ministry has been one series of noble and generous actions, and the minds that heaven has made of this temper never belie themselves." * Pitt gave Frederick the assurance of "the constancy of the king my master." Pitt was compelled to leave to others the interpretation of that assurance. The British, the Hanoverians, and the Prussians had been fighting together as allies, in the campaign of 1761. The results of that campaign left the war without any decisive results; but the skill of Prince Ferdinand and the valor of the British under the Marquis of Granby and General Conway were signally displayed through a series of difficult operations, and especially in the battle of Kirch-Denkern, on the 15th of July.

As the negotiations advanced between Great Britain and France, the demands of the Duke de Choiseul were enlarged and his attitude became more firm. M. de Bussy delivered the *ultimatum* of his court on the 5th of August; in answer to which Pitt complained that France had not scrupled to interpose new perplexities in opposition to the blessing of peace, "by intermixing, too late, matters so foreign to the present negotiation between the two crowns, as are the discussions between Great Britain and Spain." He had previously written to Bussy in a tone of high indignation that France should "presume a right of intermeddling in any differences between the two crowns." The motive for this intermeddling was soon apparent. On the 15th of August the Duke de Choiseul and the Marquis of Grimaldi, the Spanish ambassador at the court of France, signed the treaty known as "The Family Compact;" by which the two branches of the house of Bourbon agreed to consider the enemy of either as the enemy of both; to guarantee each other's territories; to give each other mutual succors by sea and land. Pitt obtained early and precise information upon the subject of this ominous alliance. He broke off the negotiations with France, recalling Mr. Stanley and dismissing M. de Bussy. He contemplated a bolder measure. He could scarcely hope for the cordial approbation of his colleagues when he proposed an immediate declaration of war against Spain; for a considerable number of the cabinet had been adverse to the strong language he had held to M. de Bussy. But he trusted to the possibility of infusing his own spirit into the temporizing policy which Bute and others advocated. In a debate in the House of Lords in 1770, on the seizure of the Falkland Islands, Lord Chatham alluded to his conduct toward the Spanish ministers in 1761: "After a long experience of their want of candor and good faith, I found myself compelled to talk to them in a peremptory, decisive language. On this principle I submitted my advice to a trembling council for an immediate declaration of a war with Spain." * The scene before that "trembling council" has been recorded by Burke, who had especial means of accurate information. Pitt called upon his colleagues to strike the first blow against Spain, instead of waiting for a joint attack upon Great Britain by Spain and France; he maintained that no new armament was necessary; that the time was propitious for seizing the Spanish treasure-ships, before their arrival in port. Temple was the only minister who stood by Pitt. His proposal, Bute contended, was rash and unadvisable. Newcastle saw that his great coadjutor would be in a minority, and he supported the favorite. Pitt had to succumb, or to quit office. He thus declared himself: "This was the time for humbling the whole house of Bourbon; if this opportunity were let slip, it might never be recovered; and if he could not prevail in this instance, he was resolved that this was the last time he should sit in that council. He thanked the ministers of the late king for their support; said he was himself called to the ministry by the voice of the people, to whom he considered himself as accountable for his conduct; and that he would no longer remain in a situation which made him responsible for measures he was no longer allowed to guide." Lord Granville (Carteret), the president of the council, thus replied: "I find the gentleman is determined to leave us, nor can I say I am sorry for it, since he would otherwise have certainly compelled us to leave him; but, if he be resolved to assume the right of advising his majesty, and directing the operations of the war, to what purpose are we called to this council? When he talks of being responsible to the people, he talks the language of the House of Commons, and forgets that at this board he is only responsible to the king. However, though he may possibly have convinced himself of his infallibility, still it remains that we should be equally convinced before we can resign our understandings to his direction, or join with him in the measure he proposes." † On the 5th of October Pitt resigned the seals of secretary of state; and Temple followed him in his retirement. When Pitt waited on the king to give up the seals, his majesty testified his regret at losing so able a servant; offered him any reward in the power of the crown to bestow; but expressed his concurrence in the decision of the cabinet. The reply of Pitt was marked by that reverential demeanor with which he always approached the royal person: "I confess, sir, I had but too much reason to expect your majesty's displeasure. I did not come prepared for this exceeding goodness. Pardon me, sir—it overpowers, it oppresses me." He burst into tears. ‡ The immediate popularity of the great minister was seriously damaged by his acceptance of a pension of 3000*l.* a year, and of a peerage for his wife, who was created Baroness Chatham. Burke says that a torrent of low and illiberal abuse was poured out on this occasion. Pitt, for a little while, became the object of lampoons and caricatures, ascribed to persons "in the interest or pay of Bute." § Great was the rejoicing at the fall of the man who had rescued his country out of the hands of venal and incapable tricksters to replace her in the position which had been lost by their imbecility and corruption. "The court," says Walpole, "impatient to notify their triumph, and to blast his popularity at once, could not

* "Chatham Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 107

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xvi. col. 1094.
† "Annual Register," 1761, pp. 43, 44. ‡ Ibid., p. 45.
§ Wright, "House of Hanover," vol. i. p. 395.

resist the impulse of publishing, in the very next night's "Gazette," Mr. Pitt's acceptance of their boons—the first instance, I believe, of a pension ever specified in that paper." * Bubb Doddington wrote to congratulate Bute "of being delivered of a most impracticable colleague, his majesty of a most imperious servant, and the country of a most dangerous minister." If Bute, in addition to the announcement in the "Gazette" of the pension and the peerage, had published the letter in which Pitt acknowledged the court boons, would the public of that day have seen in the "imperious servant" what in our times has been with some slight injustice regarded as an imitation of "the fulsome prostration of Queen Elizabeth's courtiers?" † The time was not yet come when even those who rejected and despised the doctrine of the crown being held by divine right, thought themselves free to regard the constitutional wearer of the crown as only the first civil servant of the state—as any other than as "our sovereign lord the king." What may appear sycophancy to us was the decorum of a century ago. We are inclined to believe that Pitt—who is said to have knelt when he was with George II. in his closet, and to have bowed so low at the *levée* that his hooked nose was seen between his legs—adopted this style systematically and upon principle, to mark the compatibility of his strongest objections to the measures of the crown, with the profoundest reverence for the wearer of the crown. He might be "prostrated with the bounteous favor of a most benign sovereign and master" ‡ without surrendering the opinions which had compelled him to leave the service of that master. Earl Temple, who carried his political independence to greater extremes than Pitt, said that his brother-in-law would have been the most factious and insolent man living had he waived the offer of his sovereign's favors; that their acceptance bound him to nothing "but to love and honor his majesty. . . . He is as much a free man as myself." §

The popularity of Pitt did not sustain any lasting damage by his acceptance of the king's favors. Gray might exclaim, "Oh! that foolishest of great men, that sold his inestimable diamond for a peerage and pension!" ‖ Walpole might talk of the giant who "stalking to seize the Tower of London, stumbled over a silver penny, picked it up, and carried it home to Lady Hester." ¶ But the multitude saw more clearly than the secluded poet or the fashionable satirist. Alderman Beckford wrote to Pitt to entreat him to come to the lord mayor's dinner at the Mansion House, on the 9th of November, where the king and queen were to go in state. He went with Lord Temple; and he has been blamed for going. His reception by the people is thus recorded: "At every step the mob clung about every part of the vehicle, hung upon the wheels, hugged his footmen, and even kissed his horses. There was an universal huzza; and the gentlemen at the windows and in the balconies waved their hats, and the ladies their handkerchiefs." ** Lady Chatham recorded in a note upon Beckford's letter, that her husband in this display acted against his better judgment. The hour was fast approaching when the national approbation of the great war-minister would rest upon a more solid foundation than the shouts of the multitude.

The new parliament met on the 3d of November. The king's speech promised a vigorous prosecution of the war. Lord Egremont had been appointed secretary of state in the place of Pitt. George Grenville became leader of the House of Commons, holding the office of treasurer of the navy. The chief point of interest was the conduct and demeanor of the minister who had abdicated. Walpole has recorded the debates of this interesting period, and has thus supplied the *hiatus* in our parliamentary history. †† "He had resigned the seals," Pitt said, "in order not to be responsible for measures he was no longer suffered to guide, and from seeing the question of Spain in the light he saw it. He had acted from conviction, as he supposed the great lords who had opposed him had done likewise." He boldly maintained the necessity of continuing the German war. "America had been conquered in Germany." In another debate George Grenville, who had supported Pitt's German policy during his tenure of power, now openly opposed it. A ruder assailant than Grenville was now loosened upon Pitt. Colonel Barré, a new member, denounced him as a profligate minister, who had thrust himself into power on the shoulders of the mob. Attack upon attack was made upon the ex-minister; but he preserved a wonderful calmness. To the rude assaults of Barré he deigned no reply, but turning round to Beckford, asked, pretty loud, "How far the scalping Indians cast their tomahawks?" Walpole regrets that Pitt did not utter a few words, "stating to Barré the indecence of treating an infirm and much older man with such license; showing him that insult could not be resented when offered in a public assembly, who always interpose; and putting both him and the audience in mind that a man who had gained the hearts of his countrymen by his services, could only forfeit them by his own conduct, and not by the railing of a private individual." The attacks which had been prompted by those who had rejoiced in forcing Pitt from the power which he had wielded so well, contributed to their own confusion; when events which they could not control soon manifested the wisdom of the policy which he had advocated. What he knew, and what in a written paper he had told the cabinet he knew, of the alliance of Spain and France, became manifest when the opportunity had passed away of striking a great blow at the power of one party to the Family Compact. On the 2d of January, 1762, the king declared in council his resolution of making war on Spain. "The ministers, who had driven out Mr. Pitt rather than embrace this necessary measure, were reduced to adopt it at the expense of vindicating him and condemning themselves." * The Count de Fuentes, upon being ordered to leave London, attributed the approaching rupture between Great Britain and Spain, "to the pride and to the unmeasurable ambition of him who has held the reins of the government, and who appears still to hold them, although by another hand." There was no other hand to take the helm which Pitt had resigned. But the chart which he had laid down for the course of the state-vessel was found to be the only possible guide, through that perilous sea upon which Bute and his adherents had embarked, in the confidence with which mediocrity sometimes presumes to carry on the work which genius has begun. The ministers adopted the war-policy of Pitt with regard to Spain; but they could not see the principle upon which he had endeavored to make the efforts of England and her allies, in one scene of action, have a corresponding effect upon the particular operations of England in another scene. They could not understand what he meant in declaring that "he had conquered America in Germany." While therefore they prepared to carry out his plans in an attack upon the Havana, and upon islands in the West Indies, they at the same time alienated forever the King of Prussia, by meanly evading the annual grant of the subsidy which Pitt had engaged to obtain from parliament during the continuance of the war. In the king's speech Frederick was "our magnanimous ally;" but Bute took every means to withhold that support which the English nation were eager to recognize as the just tribute to a brave man struggling with misfortune. The King of Prussia finally overcame his host of enemies, and built up the great kingdom which now so largely influences the policy of all European states. But the base desertion of the cabinet of George III. in the hour of his need was never forgotten.

With disjointed plans, the government of Lord Bute—for he became really supreme long before the retirement of the Duke of Newcastle in June, 1762—set about the conduct of hostilities. The parliament met on the 19th of January. The king in his speech announced the war with Spain, resting its cause upon the Family Compact. What the ministry put into the mouth of the king was of less importance than the sentiments uttered by Pitt. He did not shrink from vindicating, but with modesty, his own claims to the honor due to his intelligence and foresight. But the real patriotism of the statesman burst forth when he exclaimed, "What imported it what one man or another had thought three months before? The moment was come when every man ought to show himself for the whole. I do, cruelly as I have been treated in pamphlets and libels. Arm the whole! Be one people! This war, though it has cut deep into our pecuniary means, has augmented our military faculties. Set that against the debt—that spirit which has made us what we are. Forget everything but the public! For the public I forget both my

* Walpole, "George III.," vol. i. p. 128.

* Walpole, "George III.," vol. i. p. 83.
† "Quarterly Review," vol. cv. p. 469.
‡ "Chatham Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 149.
§ "Grenville Papers," vol. i. p. 404. ‖ Letter to Wharton.
¶ Letter to Countess of Ailesbury.
** "Annual Register," 1761, p. 237.
†† "Memoirs of the Reign of George III.," vol. i. pp. 99 to 120.

wrongs and my infirmities." * The man who was thus rousing the spirit of England was the author of projects that were to give new confidence to the heart of the nation by success. Pitt had arranged an expedition against the French island of Martinique, before he quitted office ; and he had intended that the same expedition should proceed against the Havana in the event of a rupture with Spain. Admiral Rodney commanded a fleet, carrying twelve thousand men, under the command of General Moncton. They disembarked at a creek in Martinique on the 7th of January, reduced several strong posts, and the island was speedily surrendered, although some of its works had been deemed impregnable. Grenada, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent were as quickly taken. All men gave Pitt the credit of this triumph. On the 5th of March an expedition sailed from Portsmouth, under Admiral Sir George Pocock, with land forces commanded by the Earl of Albemarle. At Martinique they were joined by a portion of the forces that had effected the conquest of that island. The British naval force consisted of nineteen ships of the line, with smaller vessels ; the transports carried ten thousand troops. The Havana was finally taken, but with a tremendous sacrifice of life. The city had been strongly fortified. The entrance to the harbor, within which were twelve Spanish ships of the line, was defended by two forts, the Pantal and the Moro. From the 12th of June to the 30th of July the soldiers and sailors vigorously pursued the siege of the Moro, suffering greatly from the climate. On that day the Moro was taken by assault. The Havana was then besieged, and was finally surrendered on the 12th of August, with all the ships in the harbor. To complete the triumphant operations which Pitt had devised, the Philippine Islands were captured by an expedition sent out from Madras.

On the 25th of November the session of parliament was opened with an elaborate speech from the throne. The king reviewed the circumstances in which he found the country upon his accession, "engaged in a bloody and expensive war." He resolved to prosecute it with the utmost vigor ; "determined, however, to consent to peace upon just and honorable terms, whenever the events of the war should incline the enemy to the same pacific disposition." His majesty then noticed the failure of negotiations, and the subsequent exertions of national strength. "History cannot furnish examples of greater glory, a greater advantage acquired by the arms of this or any other nation, in so short a period of time." The king then announced that through these exertions his enemies had been brought to consent to terms of peace, and that the preliminary articles had been signed. "The conditions of these are such that there is not only an immense territory added to the empire of Great Britain, but a solid foundation laid for the increase of trade and commerce." The interests of his majesty's allies had not been forgotten. "I have made peace for the King of Portugal, securing to him all his dominions ; † and all the territories of the King of Prussia, as well as of any other allies in Germany and elsewhere, occupied by the armies of France, are to be immediately evacuated." The speech thus concluded : "We could never have carried on this extensive war without the greatest union at home. You will find the same union peculiarly necessary, in order to make use of the great advantages acquired by the peace ; and to lay the foundations of that economy which we owe to ourselves and to our posterity ; and which can alone relieve this nation from the heavy burdens brought upon it by the necessities of this long and expensive war."

The preliminaries of this peace were signed at Fontainebleau on the 3d of November. In the previous negotiations Lord Bute had manifested an anxiety for an immediate pacification, which exhibited more of the character of a humiliated than a triumphant nation. While the results of the expeditions against the Havana and the Philippine Islands were as yet unknown, he was willing to consent that they should be restored to Spain without conditions, if the British arms had been successful. The Spanish minister thought the expeditions would fail, and therefore delayed signing the preliminaries, that he might take advantage of a defeat. When the success was known, Bute would have given up Havana and Manilla, without any equivalent. His colleagues differed from him ; and Florida, then a very useless possession, was at length accepted, and the great Indian colonies of Spain were restored. The other acquisitions of Great Britain were—the whole of the French provinces in North America ; the West India islands of Tobago, Dominica, St. Vincent, and Granada ; Minorca restored in exchange for Bellisle. Spain gave up the points in dispute between her and Great Britain, upon which she had ventured to risk a war. As to the contest still continuing in Germany, it was agreed that France and England should withdraw altogether from interference. The definitive treaty of peace was signed at Paris on the 10th of February, 1763. On the 15th of the same month peace was concluded between the Empress Maria Theresa, the Elector of Saxony, and the King of Prussia. The Seven Years War ended by replacing the parties to this great quarrel in the exact position in regard to territory in which they stood before its commencement.

It is scarcely necessary now to enter upon an examination of the question whether England could have obtained better terms in the final pacification, had Pitt been permitted to carry his great plans onward to their maturity. His complaints against the conditions of the peace were vehemently urged in parliament. He thought that the house of Bourbon had not been sufficiently humbled. "He prayed for the house of Brunswick ; stood on revolution principles alone against France ; had a deep-rooted alienation from France ; acted on the spirit of King William, on whose maxims, and on the maxims in which they came hither, the house of Brunswick must rest, or could never be secure." * The great Commoner had truly stated the debtor and creditor account of this war, when he proposed to set against its cost "that spirit which has made us what we are." In 1755 the unredeemed capital of the national debt of Great Britain and Ireland was 72,505,572*l.* In 1763 it amounted to 132,716,049*l.* A burden upon posterity had been created by this war of sixty millions. The interest upon the debt in 1755 was 2,650,041*l.* In 1763 it had increased to 5,032,733*l.* Looking to the mere question of figures, we may assume that we are paying at the present hour very nearly two millions and a half annually for the glories of Mr. Pitt's administration. The nation at that day scarcely felt the pressure of increased taxation occasioned by the war ; for it was the constant boast of Pitt—a boast which is inscribed upon his monument in Guildhall—that under his administration commerce had flourished in company with war. This is an anomalous prosperity which may partially stimulate the enterprise of a maritime nation, and irregularly add to its powers of production. But the waste of capital, the necessary imposition of high prices upon the laboring classes, and the heaping up of burdens for a coming generation, are evils which can never be compensated by military glory or territorial acquisitions. But they are compensated when a nation is awakened by war out of a degraded condition ; when the principle of an exalted patriotism and a generous loyalty takes the place of a venal self-seeking and a miserable abnegation of public duty. England was in this apathetic state when Pitt took the direction of her affairs. When he

> "Consulting England's happiness at home,
> Secured it by an unforgiving frown
> If any wrong'd her." †

He raised the people to a just appreciation of the spirit in which he had labored for the elevation of his country. That some of that spirit has been transmitted to us during the lapse of a century may be, even now, a compensation for the two shillings a head that every one of the twenty-five millions of the existing population has annually to pay toward the perpetual burden of taxation created by the war that was terminated by the peace of Paris.

CHAPTER CLXIV.

Lord Bute prime minister—Policy of the favorite—John Wilkes—Lord Bute resigns—George Grenville's ministry—"North Briton," No. 45—Arrest of Wilkes—Negotiation for Mr. Pitt's return to power—The king's desire to govern—The Wilkite agitation—Hogarth, Wilkes, and Churchill—Wilkes ordered to be prosecuted

* Walpole, "George III.," p. 134.

† Upon the English rupture with Spain, war had been declared by France and Spain against Portugal to compel her to depart from her neutrality.

* Walpole, "George III.," vol. i. p. 229.

† Cowper, "Task," b. 2.

—Expelled the House of Commons—Great debates on general warrants—Officers dismissed for votes in parliament—Restrictions on the American colonies—Grenville's resolutions on American taxation—The Stamp Act passed—Resistance in America—Motives for passing the Stamp Act.

The influence of Pitt upon the action of the government was at an end when the war which he had directed, and to which he continued to lend his spirit, came to an end. The policy in the conduct of the internal affairs of Great Britain, which now commenced its development, provoked an opposition, resulting in a conflict, in some respects the most lamentable, if not the most disgraceful, which had been witnessed in any previous antagonism of the authority of government and the popular sentiment. The Earl of Bute became ostensibly, as he had been for some time in reality, the prime minister, when the Duke of Newcastle resigned his office of first lord of the treasury. There might have been surprise that a Scottish peer, of no marked ability, known only as the favorite of the king's mother, and the chief officer of the household of the young sovereign when he was Prince of Wales, should become the supreme director of affairs, and receive the highest honors, such as that of the Garter. But the temper of the nation would not have been blown into a flame had not the constitutional guardians of public opinion shut up the safety-valves which allow that mighty power of a free state harmlessly to exert its irresistible influence. The House of Commons quickly became unpopular; and that unpopularity left the throne open to the rude assaults of a headlong force, which threatened to destroy its claims to respect and obedience. In attempting to restore the influence of prerogative by weakening the power of the oligarchical dispensers of patronage, Bute endangered the success of a scheme in some respects desirable, by failing to cultivate the support of the people. Party contests had been utterly suspended during the triumphant administration of Pitt. When his power was at an end they were renewed with a virulence which it would be difficult perfectly to understand, if we did not see in this change a natural result of a more deep-seated change in the social organization. From the revolution of 1688 to the rebellion of 1745 the contest was between the adherents to the Bill of Rights and to the Act of Settlement, and the gradually decreasing partisans of the Stuarts; and, coincident with the existence of these factions, a perpetual struggle between High Church and Low Church, between orthodoxy and dissent. The crown, during the whole period from the revolution to the death of George II., had, with the exception of the short ministry of Harley and Bolingbroke, chiefly looked for its support to the great Whig party, and in their successive phases of administration the popular element necessarily preponderated. There had been at many seasons a fierce struggle for supremacy; but at no period were the notions of prerogative advanced as the principle upon which the monarchy was to be upheld. It was not attempted to be disguised that the new minister of George III., who had supplanted, or was endeavoring to supplant, the old family influences, had resolved to place the power of the crown upon a broader basis—to bring back something of the old ascendency of prerogative. He had shown his disposition to contend against the force of public opinion, by displacing the popular minister. The portion of history which we have now to trace has been justly described as "equally anomalous and disagreeable." *

Upon the resignation of the Duke of Newcastle in June, 1762—on the alleged plea of his difference with the cabinet on the question of continuing a subsidy to the King of Prussia, but more probably from his perception that the parliamentary foundation of his power was to be cut from under his feet—the Earl of Bute left his office of secretary of state to become the head of the treasury. George Grenville then became secretary of state, and Sir Francis Dashwood chancellor of the exchequer. But whatever were the minor arrangements, the real power of the government was centred in Bute; and upon him fell that storm of popular indignation which Wilkes and Churchill embodied in the bitterest of personal attacks. In June, 1762, the first number appeared of "The North Briton." This paper, which afterward acquired such a dangerous celebrity, was set up by John Wilkes, with the assistance of Charles Churchill. It was marked by no great display of talent; but it was daring in its personality. "The North Briton" did not observe the old decorum of giving names by initials. The king was not softened into the K —, nor was Bute pointed to as B—. The minister's name was not disguised as "the Jackboot," nor as the "Thane," as the caricatures exhibited him. More paltry than the assaults upon the favorite's political character was the attempt to lower him in the estimation of an English as a Scot. Wilkes did this coarsely. Churchill, with extraordinary skill, in his "Prophecy of Famine," which appeared in January, 1763. We can read this production as we read Dryden's "Absalom and Achitophel," utterly forgetting the partisan to admire the poet. Lord Temple, the friend of Wilkes, deprecated the system pursued in "The North Briton" of "attacking at once the whole nation of Scotland, by wholesale and retail, in so very invidious a manner." * He shrunk also from having "Lord B.'s name at full length." Much of the odium that fell upon this minister is to be ascribed rather to the belief that he was a favorite, than to his actions as a statesman. It was to the suspicious circumstances which made him the ruler of Leicester House that the people attributed the confidence placed in him by the young king. The common parallel of the libellers was Mortimer and Queen Isabel. That a minion should have displaced such a minister as Pitt was sufficient to make his name execrable without any very odious acts of power. His precipitation in concluding the peace without obtaining the full advantage of the war would have been quickly forgotten. But his rash dismissal of three of the greatest among the peers from the lord-lieutenancies of their counties, for their presumption in offering objections to the conditions of the peace, indicated a temper in which thinking men saw something like an attempt to go back to arbitrary power. The dislike of Bute became so intense that in many places a jack-boot and a petticoat were publicly burned, as types of the favorite and his patroness. When a bill for laying a tax upon cider was passed, amid great opposition, the popular clamor reached its height; and at last the unhappy minister was afraid to appear in the streets without the escort of a gang of bruisers. Suddenly, on the 8th of April, 1763, Lord Bute resigned all his official employments. It would seem, from a correspondence between him and George Grenville, that Bute had the sole power of forming a new ministry, previous to his resignation. Upon offering the great post of first lord of the treasury to George Grenville, he made use of the phrase "the king's friends," in recommending Grenville cordially to take the assistance of those who came under this designation. Grenville became the head of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer; Lord Egremont and Lord Halifax the two secretaries of state. Upon the retirement of Bute, Fox was raised to the peerage as Lord Holland. Although he ceased to take any part in public affairs, he clung to the great sinecure of his office of paymaster, and had the gratification of still receiving those vast irregular emoluments which Pitt despised. The voice of public execration might scarcely reach him amid the fantastic buildings which he raised at Kingsgate, near Margate; where, though

"Old, and abandon'd by each venal friend," †

he might hug himself in the satisfaction that he had done as much as any man in his time to play the great game of politics solely with reference to his own private advantage; and had won by his talents and perseverance the real prize of statesmanship, while his eloquent rival had only the barren fame.

On the 19th of April, eleven days after the resignation of Lord Bute, the king closed the session of parliament. His majesty dwelled upon the conditions of the definitive treaty of peace, as advantageous to his own subjects; and he then added, "My expectations have been fully answered, by the happy effects which the several allies of my crown have derived from this salutary measure. The powers at war with my good brother, the King of Prussia, have been induced to agree to such terms of accommodation as that great prince has approved; and the success which has attended my negotiation has necessarily, and immediately, diffused the blessing of peace through every part of Europe." On the 23d of April came out No. 45 of "The North Briton," in which the comment of Wilkes upon this passage was considered by some, to use Walpole's expression, as giving "a flat lie to the king himself." Wilkes used these words: "The in-

* Dr. Arnold, "Lectures on History," p. 263.

* "Grenville Papers," vol. i. p. 457.

† Gray, "Impromptu on Kingsgate."

famous fallacy of this whole sentence is apparent to all mankind; for it is known that the King of Prussia did not barely approve, but absolutely dictated as conqueror, every article of the terms of peace. No advantage of any kind has accrued to that magnanimous prince qui pro our negotiation; but he was basely deserted by the Scottish minister of England." In this famous "North Briton" Wilkes cautiously abstained from giving the lie to the king himself. It was, he said, "the minister's speech"—an imposition as great upon the sovereign as upon the nation: the sanction of the king's name was given to the most unjustifiable public doctrines. The proceedings of the government against Wilkes not only made the witty profligate the most famous man in England, but rendered him the centre of a constitutional resistance to the prerogative of the crown and the privilege of parliament, which, mixed up as it was with the cause of a man in many respects worthless, eventually placed the liberties of the people upon a firmer foundation of legal right than had previously been acknowledged. On the 30th of April a "general warrant" was issued against the authors, printers, and publishers of a seditious and treasonable paper entitled "The North Briton," No. 45, etc. By a "general warrant" is understood an authority to apprehend any person supposed to be implicated in a particular charge. Balfe, the printer, and Kearsley, the publisher, were taken at once. The king's messengers entered the house of Wilkes at midnight on the 29th, but he protested against their intrusion at such an hour; and they quitted him, to return in the morning. He was carried before the two secretaries of state, and was by them committed to the Tower, his papers being seized and examined. At first he was closely confined, and was debarred all intercourse with his friends, or the use of pen and paper. When these severe restrictions were laid aside, he was visited by Earl Temple and the Duke of Grafton. On the 3d of May he was brought to the Court of Common Pleas, upon a writ of habeas corpus granted by Sir Charles Pratt, the lord chief justice. Sergeant Glynn argued the case, and Wilkes spoke himself with that boldness approaching to effrontery which was one of his characteristics. The court postponed its decision till the 6th. The crown lawyers had contrived not to have the question then raised of the legality of a general warrant; but the chief justice, speaking in the name of himself and his fellow judges, determined that his privilege as a member of parliament protected Wilkes from arrest. That privilege, Pratt said, held good in all cases except treason, felony, and an actual breach of the peace. A libel was not a breach of the peace, but only tended to such breach. "Let Mr. Wilkes be discharged from his imprisonment." The next day Earl Temple was dismissed from the lord-lieutenancy of Buckinghamshire, and his name was struck off the list of privy councillors. Wilkes was deprived of his commission as a colonel of the Buckinghamshire militia. For seven years did the battle go on—a battle in which every supposed victory of the government was a real defeat. Of this extraordinary contest, in its various aspects, we shall have to take up the narrative from time to time as we proceed. At every step it will be impossible not to see the weakness and folly of the ministry and the parliament; and, however we may despise the reckless audacity of the demagogue over whom public opinion threw its shield, we cannot but rejoice that in his case the eternal principles of justice were asserted from the judgment seat, and that the majesty of the law was not sullied by any such subserviency to power as had disgraced earlier periods of our history.

The interval between the proceedings against Wilkes and the meeting of parliament in November was marked by an attempt to call back Mr. Pitt to the direction of affairs. George Grenville had been tried by Bute, and had not given satisfaction. A dry, formal man, with very precise notions of the mode of conducting public business, he could not brook the interference of the ex-minister who had given him his office. Bute was close at the royal ear to give advice to the young sovereign, in the capacity of "the king's friend." Lord Egremont, one of the secretaries of state, died suddenly of apoplexy. Bute, who, when he got rid of Pitt, had said that the king would never suffer those ministers of the late reign, who had attempted to fetter him, to come again into his service, now advised his majesty to give his confidence to the man whom he used contemptuously to term "the people's darling." On the 27th of August the well known sedan-chair of Pitt (built in a singular fashion to accommodate his gouty foot) was moving through the park to Buckingham House, the king having commanded his attendance. The king was gracious, the great Commoner authoritative and firm. Pitt maintained that it would be for his majesty's interest to restore to his confidence those steady friends of the house of Hanover who had been driven from his counsels. The king, according to Pitt's report to Lord Hardwicke, appeared to be convinced by his arguments, and desired to see him again on the following Monday, the first interview being on Saturday. In the mean time Bute and Grenville had been with his majesty; and when Pitt had another audience the king continued to discuss his proposals as if he had not intimated to Grenville that he was to continue his minister, but finally said, "I see this won't do." Lord Shelburne congratulated Pitt "personally and very sincerely on a negotiation being at an end, which carried through the whole of it such shocking marks of insincerity." The only result of this negotiation was that it became manifest that Bute still influenced public affairs. Grenville had been affronted by the course which had been taken in endeavoring to supersede him, and he only consented to remain in office upon the condition that there should be no "secret influence." The Duke of Bedford became president of the council, and Lord Sandwich secretary of state.

It is impossible to look upon this extraordinary proceeding on the part of George III. without in some degree regarding it as a manifestation of his peculiar character. He had been brought up with certain notions, and in many respects very proper notions, of his own power and prerogative. As far as he was acquainted with the history of his country, and we have no right to assume that he was ignorant of it, he had seen no sovereign since the time of William III. who took a direct and active part in the administration of public affairs. So far from indulging the indolence which Lord Waldegrave thought was constitutional, he exhibited an amazing anxiety to suggest, to control, to dictate, in every operation of government. He was impatient under the triumphant administration of Pitt, because the personal supremacy of the minister overshadowed the authority of the king. It is possible that he was wearied with the tutelage of Bute, when he thought it possible to call back the greatest man in his kingdom to be the instrument of his will. Pitt's firm bearing, in that memorable audience of the 27th of August, satisfied him that he could not put his government into the hands of a responsible minister who proposed to act as the representative of a great party. When Grenville saw the king on the Sunday evening after his first interview with Pitt, he found him "in the greatest agitation"—the terms, his majesty said, which Pitt had demanded were "too hard." The prevailing desire of George III. to have a ministry moulded to his own views was a constant struggle against the shackles imposed upon a king by the very conditions of a limited monarchy. He had force of character enough to be determined that he should be consulted, and if possible obeyed, in the smaller as well as in the greater affairs of state; but he had not sufficient strength of understanding to know how much to leave to the responsibility of his servants—how far he could safely direct, and at what point he could best defer to the opinions of those to whom he purported to have given his confidence. Through this tendency to govern of himself he weakened his own real power and influence. Lord Brougham has truly said, "It is not to be denied that George III. sought to rule too much; it is not maintained that he had a right to be perpetually sacrificing all other considerations to the preservation or extension of his prerogative. But that he only discharged the duties of his station by thinking for himself, acting according to his conscientious opinion, and using his influence for giving those opinions effect, cannot be denied." * But it was a lamentable circumstance of this constitutional and not unreasonable rule of conduct, that the king personally did many harsh acts to mark his resentment of those who differed from him; that though to some of his ministers he was a confiding and even affectionate master, to others he was wayward and distrustful; that during the first nine years of his reign there were six successive administrations, and that, to use the words of Burke, "the question at last was not, who could do the public business best, but who would undertake to do it at all." † In Burke's parliamentary language, it was "the arbitrary fiat of an all-directing favorite" that prevented men of talents and integrity accepting employments where they could

* "Statesmen of the Time of George III.," vol. i. p. 14.
† "Parliamentary History," vol. xvi. col. 879.

not exercise their judgment or their honesty. But it is now well known that the influence of Lord Bute had wholly come to an end after a few years; and we cannot therefore shut our eyes to the fact that the king, however right in his determination not to be a cipher in the state, had not the discretion to prevent that desire becoming a source of national disunion.

The seven years of Wilkite agitation could not have been a pleasant epoch in the life of any friend of rational liberty and well-balanced authority. The principles of constitutional freedom were mixed up with the quarrel of a profligate demagogue and the outrages of an unthinking multitude. Sober men naturally turned from the support of such a cause. On the other hand, the course of the government was so paltry, so passionate, so vindictive, so obstinate, that the most strenuous loyalty could scarcely give an honest assistance to measures which transformed a nation's willing obedience into a dull submission to the powers that be. During this period of hateful controversy there was a perpetual excitement of libels and mobs; the decisions of the law coming in conflict with the desires of the crown; the will of the people opposed to the votes of the parliament. The bystanders looked with surprise and alarm upon this extraordinary game, in which statesmen seemed to be puppets moved by some machinery, rather than by their own natural impulses. Time has partially lifted up the curtain, and we see the hands that pulled the strings.

John Wilkes, although filling an influential position—a Buckinghamshire magistrate, a bon vivant in what was called the best society—was a needy man, and little able of himself to carry on the great legal contest in which he became engaged. His chief friend was Earl Temple, who had left office with Pitt, and bore no good-will to the influence which had thrust him and his more eminent brother-in-law from high employment. His connection with Wilkes was not entirely political; for Wilkes was a colonel in Lord Temple's militia regiment. But his open support of the writer of the "North Briton" indicated pretty clearly that Temple was in some degree identified with Wilkes; and this led to the immediate revenge of the court, in his dismissal from the lord-lieutenancy of Buckinghamshire. From that time the correspondence of Wilkes and the Lord of Stowe on the subject of the libellous paper, and the prosecutions connected with it, are very frequent. The patriotic effusions of Wilkes are generally accompanied with requests for the loan of money. "I have this cause at heart, and I feel the spirit of Hampden in it, but I have not his fortune. . . . £500 I must contrive to get, and, after your lordship's goodness, I even blush to mention it."* Wilkes adds, "I believe the causes will in time pay themselves." At this time one of the journeymen printers who had been arrested under the general warrant had obtained a verdict against the secretary of state, with three hundred pounds damages, for false imprisonment. Chief Justice Pratt had summed up decidedly for the journeyman printer. Other "causes" of the same character were depending; and Temple gives Wilkes advice as to the course of legal proceedings in "the business of the devils, your friends."† The "North Briton" was now printed at a private press in Wilkes' own house in Great George Street, where other productions were printed, one of which became the object of a movement on the part of the government, as unwise as the proceedings under the general warrant.

While an inevitable parliamentary battle in the next session was in preparation, the town was amused by lampoons and caricatures on both sides of this stirring question. Hogarth had been attacked by Wilkes in an early number of the "North Briton," for Hogarth had published a caricature called "The Times," of which Pitt was the subject. The pictorial satirist took his revenge of the "North Briton" by issuing a portrait, scarcely a caricature, which he had sketched when Wilkes was brought before Chief Justice Pratt. Churchill came to the aid of his friend, and published his bitter "Epistle to William Hogarth." The painter was not to be put down, even by Churchill's compliment to his genius sweetening the assaults upon "The Man." He published his print of the "The Bruiser, C. Churchill, once the Reverend"—the poet's face moulded into that of a bear, with a pot of porter in one hand and a club in the other. Pitiful were these effusions of personal spite. More pitiful even was the revenge against Wilkes that was being concocted in the highest places. On the 5th of November the Earl of Sandwich writes to Mr. Grenville to inform him of conferences between his lordship, the lord chancellor, and Bishop Warburton, on the subject of his proposal to bring before the House of Lords a complaint against Wilkes as the author of a blasphemous and impious work; and he tells Grenville, "I mean to carry the affair into execution; so that I think we have now nothing to do but to settle the mode of bringing it on."* Among the profligate nobles of that age, few had obtained a more unenviable reputation than Lord Sandwich. A boon companion of Wilkes himself, we have evidence that at the very time at which he was dining with him at a convivial weekly club Sandwich was employing spies to watch and report all Wilkes' daily movements.† This might be proper official caution; but no official necessity could excuse the baseness of bribing a printer to purloin the proof-sheets of a poem of which Wilkes had printed twelve copies at his press, for private distribution. On the 15th of November the parliament was opened. In the House of Lords, before the speech from the throne was taken into consideration, Lord Sandwich made a complaint of a printed paper entitled "An Essay on Woman," with notes to which the name of Dr. Warburton was affixed; and of another printed paper entitled "The Veni Creator paraphrased." The "holy secretary," as Walpole calls him, read many of the atrocious passages, to the great disgust of all decent peers, and the amazement of some who saw the Earl of Sandwich employed in the vindication of religion and morality.‡ The compositor employed by Wilkes in his own house, receiving there 25s. a week, and bed and board, was examined; and he produced some proof-sheets, with corrections in the handwriting of Wilkes, to establish the authorship. The house then resolved to address his majesty to desire that he would give immediate orders for the prosecution of the author or authors of this scandalous and impious libel. The whole force of the state, of king, Lords, and Commons was arrayed against one demagogue. In the lower house, after a series of debates, it was resolved that the "North Briton" No. 45 was a false, scandalous, and seditious libel, and that it should be burned by the common hangman. A riot took place when this resolution was carried into effect. Meanwhile, in consequence of Mr. Martin, on the first night of the session, having termed the writer of the "North Briton" a cowardly, malignant, and infamous scoundrel, Wilkes had challenged him, and in a duel the next day was dangerously wounded. The measures contemplated against him were therefore delayed. His position appearing very perilous, he sought safety in France before his wound was healed. On the 20th of January he was expelled the House of Commons.

The question of the legality of a general warrant had been formally decided in an action tried before Chief Justice Pratt, on the 10th of December, 1763. At the time of the arrest of Wilkes, Lord Halifax and Lord Egremont were the two secretaries of state. Egremont died, and the proceedings which Wilkes had instituted against him were necessarily abated. Halifax, by a series of legal evasions, prevented the action against himself being tried. But the action for false imprisonment against Mr. Wood, the under secretary of state, resulted in a verdict against him by a special jury, with damages of a thousand pounds. The opinion of the chief justice was now given in the most unequivocal words. "There is no authority in our law-books that mentions this kind of warrants; but in express terms condemns this. Upon the maturest consideration I am bold to say, this warrant is illegal." This judgment was subsequently affirmed by Lord Mansfield upon the arguments on a bill of exceptions.§ But the legality of general warrants formed the subject of a series of debates in the House of Commons, conducted with all the energy that is naturally elicited by great constitutional questions. The house, on the 13th of February, examined witnesses and debated this question for eleven hours, and the next day for seventeen hours. The de-

* "Grenville Papers," vol. ii. p. 75. Wilkes to Temple, July 9th, 1763.

† Ibid., p. 78.

* "Grenville Papers," vol. ii. p. 154.

† See their report to the secretaries of state, October 31st to November 13th, in "Grenville Papers," vol. ii. p. 155.

‡ See Chesterfield's Letters.

§ The received legal doctrine is thus laid down by Blackstone: "A warrant to apprehend all persons, guilty of a crime therein specified, is no legal warrant; for the point upon which its authority rests is a fact to be decided on a subsequent trial, namely, whether the person apprehended thereupon be really guilty or not."—Kerr's edit., vol. iv. p. 342.

bate was renewed three days after, and then the ministerial majority was only fourteen. Walpole gives a ludicrous account of the appearance of the house on this occasion: "You would have almost laughed to see the spectres produced on both sides. . . . Votes were brought down in flannels and blankets till the floor of the house looked like the pool of Bethesda." * There was no record of the debate on this occasion except Walpole's letter, until the publication of his "Memoirs of George III.," where a summary is given of the arguments of many speakers. The ministry went upon precedents for their defence, and alluded to the issue of such warrants during the administration of Mr. Pitt. The great orator boldly said that he knew them to be illegal when he issued them. He preferred the general safety in a time of danger to any personal consideration. He did an extraordinary act at any risk, even of his head, to procure the arrest of a suspicious foreigner, who was concealed at different times in different houses. "What was there in a libel so heinous and terrible as to require this formidable instrument?" Their honest convictions made some of the ordinary supporters of the government vote with the minority on this question of general warrants. It is pitiable to trace the persevering desire of the king to carry out what he deemed a proper punishment for their offence. On the first day of the session, when the question of parliamentary privilege was discussed, General Conway, the colonel of a regiment, voted in the minority. The king immediately wrote to Grenville, "General Conway's conduct is amazing. I am hurt for Lord Hertford [brother of Conway, and ambassador at Paris]. I shall propose to Mr. Grenville the dismissing instantly, for in this question I am personally concerned." † On the 25th his majesty urged the dismission of Conway and others; and that it should be given out "that the next would have the same fate if they do not amend their conduct." ‡ Grenville's diary shows that he repeatedly advised the king to defer this resolution with regard to Conway, although he supported the king in his determination to take this course of exhibiting his power. On the 18th of February, after the great debate upon general warrants, the king wrote to Grenville, "Firmness and resolution must now be shown, and no one's friend saved who has dared to fly off; this alone can restore order, and save this country from anarchy, by dismissing . . . I am not to be neglected unpunished." § In April Conway was dismissed from his regiment and from his office. The same mode of resentment was adopted in the case of Lord Shelburne, Colonel Barré, and General A'court, as well as toward persons holding civil offices. The disposition of George III. to look at public measures as personal questions was one cause of many serious calamities of his reign. He told Grenville on the 14th of December that he took no notice of Lord Shelburne at the levée; "but spoke to two people on each side of him; which, he thought, was the treatment he deserved for having broke his word and honor with him, having pledged both upon not going into opposition, and then taking the first opportunity to oppose a measure which personally regarded the king." ‖ The dismissal of Conway for a conscientious vote in parliament—a man who had distinguished himself in Germany; was remarkable for his fairness, and his aversion to faction; and was a general supporter of the government—is truly described as a step whose boldness was almost unprecedented. Sir Robert Walpole had dismissed three military men from their employments, the famous "cornet of horse" among the number; but they had incurred the penalty "by a personal, violent, and constant opposition." ¶ The dismissal of Conway and others, for their parliamentary conduct, excited considerable alarm as to the arbitrary tendencies of the court; and it did much to establish that unpopularity which a king, who had many qualities to recommend him to the affection of his people, was by his own manifestations of self-will bringing down upon his head. The question of the proceedings against Wilkes became merged in higher questions. The demagogue was prosecuted for libels, was found guilty, and was outlawed on the 1st of November for non-appearance to receive sentence. But he was now considered a persecuted man. When the common council voted thanks to Chief Justice Pratt for his judgment on the question of general warrants, and requested him to sit for his picture to be placed in Guildhall, they expressed the prevailing opinion even of temperate politicians. The ministry had the sense of the nation against them. The king was not shielded by ministerial responsibility, for he had unwisely exhibited that individual sensitiveness—those resentments and animosities—which are scarcely compatible with the functions of a constitutional sovereign.

We shall see, in a few years, John Wilkes, and all the chorus of his political drama, passing away, "like an insubstantial pageant faded." Another scene was to be opened, which, devoid of interest as it might at first appear, was to be developed in a series of long-continued action which involved not only the interests of England, but eventually the destinies of the Anglo-Saxon family, and incidentally of all the human race. The triumphant administration of Mr. Pitt had given a firmness and compactness to the British empire in North America which appeared to promise a long continuance of prosperity to the mother country and her colonies. These colonies were founded upon principles of freedom and toleration, by a race nurtured in those principles, and, in some cases, seeking for a happier field for their establishment than they could find under a temporary suspension of the old English right to be well governed. The colonial assemblies, or parliaments, of the thirteen provinces of North America, elected by the people, trained men of industry and ability to the consideration of questions of public policy and local administration. Thus, whatever might be the authority and influence of the governor of each State appointed by the crown, there was always an energy and freedom in their discussions which called out those qualities of good sense, and even of eloquence, which are fostered, more or less, by all representative institutions. From these assemblies complaints often arose against the commercial policy of the mother country, and especially after the peace of 1763, when the attempt to carry out our navigation laws by a rigid prohibition of the contraband trade of the American with the Spanish colonies produced the most serious dissatisfaction. The trade between Great Britain and her colonies had been always based upon principles wholly opposite to those of commercial freedom. The Englishman was forbidden to smoke any other than Virginian-grown tobacco, and the Virginian could wear no other coat than one of English-made cloth. It was an age of regulation and balance in small matters as well as in great—in commerce as in war. No particular injury was contemplated toward the colonists in the trade regulations, although the monopoly of the English merchants was regarded as the supreme advantage of colonial possessions. From very insignificant beginnings the North American provinces had become great and prosperous, and contained a population somewhat exceeding two millions. The state regarded these colonists as a happy family of good children, to be kept in order by that paternal authority which knew best what was for their advantage. It was not a very harsh authority, although its exercise was unwise in its persistence. If it vexed them with restrictions, it soothed them with privileges. But the privileges were thought inadequate to the restrictions. At last the parent took up the fancy of compelling the children to pay something in acknowledgment of the heavy cost of past protection, and as a contribution toward the expense of that protection in future. A Stamp Act to raise sixty thousand pounds produced a war that cost a hundred millions.

"What mighty contests rise from trivial things."

On the 10th of March, 1764, Mr. Grenville moved in the Commons a series of resolutions for imposing small duties on certain articles of American commerce, to "be paid into the receipt of his majesty's exchequer, and there reserved, to be from time to time disposed of by parliament, toward defraying the necessary expenses of defending, protecting, and securing the British colonies and plantations in America." Following this resolution for the appropriation of the produce of duties upon the foreign trade of the American colonies came the 14th of the series, in these words: "That toward further defraying the said expenses, it may be proper to charge certain stamp duties in the said colonies and plantations." * The notion of imposing stamp duties on the colonists was considered to have originated with Mr. Jenkinson, the secretary of the treasury. But there was found among Mr. Grenville's papers a letter to him from one

* Letter to Lord Hertford. † "Grenville Papers," vol. ii. p. 162.
‡ Ibid., p. 166. § Ibid., p. 267.
‖ Ibid., p. 238, Diary of Grenville.
¶ Walpole, "George III.," vol. i. p. 402.

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xv. col. 1427.

Henry M'Culloh, dated July 5th, 1763, in which he says that a stamp duty on vellum and paper in America would amount to upward of sixty thousand pounds sterling per annum.* Mr. Jenkinson writes to the minister in July, 1764, to urge him forward with the Stamp Act, which had been postponed in the previous session to obtain "further information on that subject." On the 10th of January, 1765, the parliament met. The question of general warrants was again debated in full houses, and again the ministry had a small majority. The question of taxing America by stamp duties produced only a feeble debate and only one division. On the 6th of February Grenville introduced fifty-five resolutions, which were to be ingrafted into the Stamp Act. Walpole says, "This famous bill, little understood here at that time, was less attended to. . . . The colonies, in truth, were highly alarmed, and had sent over representations so strong against being taxed here that it was not thought decent or safe to present their memorial to parliament."† The colonists could not see in Grenville's proposition for a paltry tax any other than the beginning of an attempt to tax them largely without their own consent. They denied the right of the House of Commons to tax them unless they had representatives in that house. Grenville had rashly termed his resolution for a Stamp Act as "an experiment toward further aid." Where was the system, thus begun, to end? The Stamp Act was passed, without a debate or division in the House of Lords, and it received the royal assent on the 22d of March. Benjamin Franklin, as agent for the province of Pennsylvania, had come to London to oppose the passing of the act. When it was passed he wrote to a correspondent in America, "We might as well have hindered the sun's setting. That we could not do. But since it is down, my friend, and it may be long before it rises again, let us make as good a night of it as we can. We may still light candles. Frugality and industry will go a great way toward indemnifying us." The prudential submission of Franklin to an evil which he thought inevitable was not the prevailing feeling of the colonists. The act was to come into operation on the 1st of November. When the enactment first became known, there was a deep expression of grief, but scarcely any manifestation of resentment. But in the State assemblies a determination not to submit without remonstrance was quickly manifested. Virginia, the most attached to the monarchy of all the provinces—the most opposed to democratic principles—was the first to demand a repeal of the statute by which the colonists were taxed without their own consent. The resolutions of the assembly of Virginia went forth as an example to the other provinces, many of which passed similar resolutions. But in Virginia there was an orator of no common order. Patrick Henry, who was born in 1736, had received no regular education—had been a farmer and then a shopkeeper—when he adopted the law as a profession. He obtained a brief in a great public cause, and then manifested qualities which left every competitor far behind. As a member of the House of Burgesses at Williamsburg he is held by Mr. Jefferson to have given "the earliest impulse to the ball of revolution." Jefferson, then twenty-two years of age, first heard Patrick Henry in the assembly in May, 1765, when he brought forward certain resolutions against the Stamp Act; and, fifty years afterward, Jefferson declared that he never heard such eloquence from any other man.‡ One specimen of Henry's oratory on the Stamp Act, in this assembly, has been preserved: "Cæsar," he exclaimed, "had his Brutus; Charles the First had his Cromwell; and George the Third—" "Treason," cried the speaker; "Treason," cried many of the members—"may profit by their example," was the conclusion of the sentence. "If this be treason," said Henry, "make the most of it." The House of Burgesses in Virginia was dissolved by the governor of the province, but the torch which had been lighted was carried from State to State, and delegates were appointed by several of the assemblies for a general congress to meet at New York.

The cry of "treason" in the assembly of Virginia, although followed by the strong remonstrance of the burgesses, was a manifestation of the desire which then almost universally prevailed among the colonists to regard themselves as bound in allegiance to the British crown. The alienation was a gradual result of a mistaken view of the policy that ought to prevail between a colony that had grown to a real capacity for independence and the parent state. It was a result, also, of that system of parliamentary corruption and of court influence which at that time entered so largely into the government of England. Walpole says that the Stamp Act "removed the burden of a tax to distant shoulders;" that Grenville contemplated his measure "in the light of easing and improving an overburdened country."* Burke, in his memorable speech on American taxation, on the 19th of April, 1774, exhibited this fact more distinctly. He points out that upon the close of the war "the necessity was established of keeping up no less than twenty new regiments, with twenty colonels capable of seats in this house. . . . Country gentlemen, the great patrons of economy, and the great resisters of a standing armed force, would not have entered with much alacrity into the vote for so large and expensive an army, if they had been very sure that they were to continue to pay for it. But hopes of another kind were held out to them." He then traces in this speech the policy of Mr. Grenville, and the peculiarities of his character which led him to think "better of the wisdom and power of legislation than in truth it deserves;" to believe "regulation to be commerce, and taxes to be revenue." The Navigation Act was Grenville's idol. The commerce of America "had filled all its proper channels to the brim." He "turned his eye somewhat less than was just toward the incredible increase of the fair trade, and looked with something of too exquisite a jealousy toward the contraband." The result was that "the bonds of the Act of Navigation were straitened so much that America was on the point of having no trade, either contraband or legitimate." The Americans, Burke says, "thought themselves proceeded against as delinquents, or at best as people under suspicion of delinquency." They were irritated enough before the Stamp Act came. They adopted such counter measures as appeared efficient to a people that had not yet begun to feel their own strength and understand their own resources. They agreed among themselves to wear no English manufactured cloth, and to encourage the breed of sheep that they might manufacture cloth from their own wool. They protested against the English monopoly, and they devised, feebly enough, such measures as they thought might overcome it. At last what Burke calls "the scheme of a regular plantation parliamentary revenue" was established—"a revenue not substituted in the place of, but superadded to, a monopoly; which monopoly was enforced at the same time with additional strictness, and the execution put into military hands." It was one of the misfortunes of Mr. Grenville's scheme that his Stamp Act was popular. "Great was the applause of this measure here. In England we cried out for new taxes on America, while they cried out that they were nearly crushed with those which the war, and their own grants, had brought upon them." Such was the commencement of a struggle which ended in the independence of the American colonies, and thenceforward in the establishment of an empire which has shown how quickly, in one vast region, might be realized the probable future contemplated by Adam Smith—when "the inhabitants of all the different quarters of the world may arrive at that equality of courage and force which, by inspiring mutual fear, can alone overawe the injustice of independent nations into some sort of respect for the rights of one another."†

* "Grenville Papers," vol. ii. p. 374.
† "George III.," vol. ii. p. 68.
‡ Tucker, "Life of Jefferson," vol. i. p. 40.

CHAPTER CLXV.

Illness of the king—The Regency Bill—Overtures to Pitt—He declines office—Grenville and Bedford—The Rockingham administration—Disturbances in America—Parliament—Debates on the Stamp Act—Pitt contends for its repeal—Examination of Dr. Franklin—Declaratory bill as to rights over the colonies—Repeal of the Stamp Act—Weakness of the Rockingham administration—They quit office—Pitt created Earl of Chatham—His loss of popularity—His plans for great measures—Embargo on corn—Chatham's illness—Disorganization of his ministry—Parliament dissolved.

During the progress of the bill for the taxation of the American colonies the king was attacked by a serious indisposition. On the

* "George III.," vol. ii. p. 68 and p. 70.
† "Wealth of Nations," book iv. chap. vii.

nature of that illness the greatest secrecy was maintained. "The king's illness," says Walpole, "had occasioned a general alarm; but, though he escaped the danger, his health was so precarious, and he had such frequent disorders in his breast on taking the least cold, that all sober men wished to see a regency settled by parliament in case of his death." * The real nature of the king's malady was not suspected by the politicians of that day, or by the general public. "His majesty had a serious illness—its peculiar character was then unknown, but we have the best authority for believing that it was of the nature of those which thrice after afflicted his majesty, and finally incapacitated him for the duties of government." This is the statement of a gentleman whose means of information, and whose diligence in penetrating into the secret passages of the past, were of more permanent value than his adroitness in the use of the facts he ascertained for the advancement of his own party views.† The family of George III. at that time consisted of George, Prince of Wales, born on the 12th of August, 1762; and of Frederick, Duke of York, born on the 16th of August, 1763. The differences of opinion between the king and his ministers upon the Regency Bill are of minor importance in a view of public affairs at this distance of time, and require no elaborate detail. The king wished that the power of nominating a regent should be vested in himself. The ministry thought it desirable that a regency during the minority of the successor to the throne should be distinctly named. On the 24th of April his majesty, in a speech from the throne, proposed, whether, under the present circumstances, it would not be expedient to vest in him the power of appointing, from time to time, by instrument in writing, under his sign-manual, either the queen, or any other person of his royal family, usually residing in Great Britain, as guardian of the person of his successor and as regent of these kingdoms. When a bill to this effect had passed the Commons, a doubt arose in the Lords whether the Princess Dowager of Wales was included in the term "My Royal Family." Lord Halifax, one of the secretaries of state, went to the king, and said that the matter ought to be cleared up; but that if the name of his majesty's mother appeared in the bill, the House of Commons would probably strike it out. The king reluctantly acquiesced, and then the royal family was defined as "all the descendants of the late king." Grenville refused to introduce the name of the princess dowager, as he was urged to do by her friends; and upon this, a member, unconnected with the ministry, made a proposition to that effect. The name of the king's mother was decided to be introduced into the bill, by the vote of a large majority. The king was now indignant at the conduct of his ministers; sent for his uncle, the Duke of Cumberland, and commissioned him to negotiate with Mr. Pitt for a return to power. It was an embarrassing time in which to contemplate a change of ministry. America was getting into a flame of anger at the Stamp Act. London was terrified by riots of Spitalfields weavers, upon the rejection of a bill which would have prohibited the importation of foreign silks. What Burke calls "the vertigo of the Regency Bill" produced changes which an untoward aspect of national affairs might have failed to effect.

The rumors that the king contemplated a change of ministers produced an opinion in one then unconnected with official life, but who looked upon political affairs and public men from a higher elevation than most observers of the shifting scenes of that time. Edmund Burke announced to a friend, with reference to Pitt, that "this crisis will show whether pride or patriotism be predominant in his character." To him, wrote Burke, is open "to come into the service of his country upon any plan of politics he chooses to dictate. . . . A few days will show whether he will take this part, or continue on his back at Hayes, talking fustian." The Duke of Cumberland went to Hayes, and there learned the "plan of politics" which Pitt chose "to dictate." There was no "fustian" in his sensible propositions—that general warrants should be repudiated; that dismissed officers should be restored; that Protestant alliances should be formed, to balance the family compact of the Bourbons. There was some difference of opinion about appointments, but these might have been removed. Earl Temple was sent for; and although he was intended for the office of first lord of the treasury, he persuaded his brother-in-law to give up the negotiation. He was seeking a ministerial alliance with his brother, George Grenville, to whom he had become reconciled, and he conceived the plan of inducing Pitt to join them; in which union he fancied he saw a power that would enable them to stand alone without the support of ducal Whigs or courtly Tories. The king was obliged to call back his ministers, Grenville and Bedford. They dictated terms to the king; and Bedford appears to have deported himself in a spirit which may have been grossly exaggerated by Junius, but which is not wholly removed from truth. "The Duke of Bedford demanded an audience of the king; reproached him, in plain terms, with duplicity, baseness, falsehood, treachery, and hypocrisy; repeatedly gave him the lie; and left him in strong convulsions." A paper was read, according to Walpole, in which the king was told "that he must smile on his ministers, and frown on their adversaries, whom he was reproached, in no light terms, with having countenanced, contrary to his promise. Invectives against the princess were not spared, nor threats of bringing Lord Bute to the block." The king bowed to the ministers to retire, and said, "If he had not broken out into the most profuse sweat he should have been suffocated with indignation." * Pitt was again applied to; and he again declined to take office without Lord Temple, who persevered in his resolution, at an audience which both had of the king. The Whig families were again resorted to. The Duke of Newcastle again obtained a post of honor in receiving the privy seal; the Duke of Grafton became one of the secretaries of state, with General Conway as the other secretary; and the Marquis of Rockingham was named first lord of the treasury. Untried colts and worn-out hacks were harnessed together, to drag the state-coach through the sloughs in which it was travelling. They pulled honestly side by side for a brief journey, and then came to a dead stop. This ministry had the lasting credit of bringing one man of extraordinary genius into public life, though in a subordinate situation. The eloquent gratitude of Edmund Burke to the Marquis of Rockingham has made us think favorably of the head of this ministry, for "sound principles, enlargement of mind, clear and sagacious sense, and unshaken fortitude." † Such qualities were needed at such a crisis.

The Rockingham administration came into office on the 10th of July. Parliament had been prorogued previous to their appointment; and a few months passed on without any disturbing events. At last came intelligence which demanded grave and anxious consideration. In the autumn of 1765 various letters were received by Mr. Secretary Conway, from official persons in America, relating the particulars of riots at Boston and in the colony of Rhode Island. At Boston the effigy of the gentleman who had accepted the office of stamp-distributor was hung upon a tree, which was subsequently called "Liberty Tree;" his house was sacked, and he was compelled to promise to resign his office. These riots went on for a fortnight, with much wanton destruction of property. A letter from New York, of the 25th of September, to Conway, says, "The general scheme concerted throughout seems to have been, first, by menace or force, to oblige the stamp-officers to resign their employments, in which they have generally succeeded; and next, to destroy the stamped papers upon their arrival—that, having no stamps, necessity might be an excuse for the dispatch of business without them." ‡ But more important than the outrages of mobs were the solemn proceedings of a congress at New York, comprising delegates from nine assemblies. They continued their sittings for three weeks; and then passed fourteen resolutions, in which they maintained the right of every British subject to be taxed only by his own consent, or that of his legal representatives; and that their only legal representatives were those annually chosen to serve as members of the assembly of each province.

The administration was in a position of extreme difficulty. The strong opposition of the colonial assemblies was a reason for ministers reconsidering the measures of their predecessors; but a submission to the violent resistance to the authority of the imperial legislature would be to manifest an unworthy fear, which might have the effect of encouraging other resistance to the law. But there were

* "George III.," vol. ii. p. 95.
† Mr. Croker, in "Quarterly Review," vol. lxvi. p. 240.

* "George III.," vol. ii. p. 183.
† Speech on American Taxation.
‡ Papers laid before Parliament, in "Parliamentary History," vol. xvi.

consequences arising out of the discontent and resentment of the colonists which were productive of immediate evils at home, and threatened greater dangers for the future. A petition of the merchants of London trading to North America set forth that this commerce, so necessary for the support of multitudes, was under such difficulties that its utter ruin was apprehended; and that several millions sterling, due to the merchants of Great Britain, were withheld by the colonists, on the plea that the taxes and restrictions laid upon them had rendered them unable to meet their engagements. Scarcely seeing a way out of the difficulties that surrounded them, the ministers, on the meeting of parliament on the 14th of January, after the Christmas recess, laid the papers before the two houses which "give any light into the origin, the progress, or the tendency of the disturbances which have of late prevailed in some of the northern colonies." Such were the terms of the king's speech. His majesty said that he had issued orders for the exertion of all the powers of government for the suppression of riots and tumults, and added, "Whatever remains to be done on this occasion I commit to your wisdom." A debate ensued in the Commons, which was reported by two members, and printed in Paris—the houses still strictly forbidding the publication of their proceedings. On that night Burke made his first speech in parliament; and Pitt, whose voice had not been heard for a year, delivered one of those orations which, however imperfectly recorded, give us a notion of that supremacy that, broken as he was in health, wrapped in flannels, and giving effect to his action with a crutch, he still, above all men, exercised over his contemporaries. In a letter which he wrote from Bath on the 9th he said, "If I can crawl or be carried, I will deliver my mind and heart upon the state of America." What he then spoke was remembered and repeated as the great contest went on; and by none more diligently than by the colonists. He went with them to the full extent of denying the right of the British legislature to impose taxes without representation. He touched upon great principles that extended beyond this question of taxing the American colonies: "There is an idea in some that the colonies are virtually represented in this house. I would fain know by whom an American is represented here? Is he represented by any knight of the shire, in any county in this kingdom? Would to God that respectable representation was augmented to a greater number! Or will you tell him that he is represented by any representative of a borough—a borough which, perhaps, its own representative never saw. This is what is called 'the rotten part of the constitution.' It cannot continue the century; if it does not drop it must be amputated. The idea of a virtual representation of America in this house is the most contemptible idea that ever entered into the head of a man; it does not deserve a serious refutation. The commons of America, represented in their several assemblies, have ever been in possession of the exercise of this, their constitutional right, of giving and granting their own money. They would have been slaves if they had not enjoyed it." Grenville replied to Pitt, and defended his Stamp Act: "When I proposed to tax America, I asked the house if any gentleman would object to the right. I repeatedly asked it, and no man would attempt to deny it. Protection and obedience are reciprocal. Great Britain protects America; America is bound to yield obedience. If not, tell me when the Americans were emancipated? When they want the protection of this kingdom, they are always very ready to ask it. That protection has always been afforded them in the most full and ample manner. The nation has run itself into an immense debt to give them their protection; and now they are called upon to contribute a small share toward the public expense, an expense arising from themselves, they renounce your authority, insult your officers, and break out, I might almost say, into open rebellion. The seditious spirit of the colonies owes its birth to the factions in this house." Pitt was permitted again to speak, the house being clamorous to hear him. There are passages in his second speech which show how much the house gained in this departure from its ordinary rules. We may give the concluding summary of the orator's opinions: "A great deal has been said without doors, of the power, of the strength, of America. It is a topic that ought to be cautiously meddled with. In a good cause, on a sound bottom, the force of this country can crush America to atoms. . . . In such a cause your success would be hazardous. America, if she fell, would fall like a strong man. She would embrace the pillars of the state, and pull down the constitution along with her. Is this your boasted peace? Not to sheath the sword in its scabbard, but to sheath it in the bowels of your countrymen? . . . The Americans have not acted in all things with prudence and temper. They have been wronged. They have been driven to madness by injustice. Will you punish them for the madness you have occasioned? Rather let prudence and temper come first from this side. I will undertake for America that she will follow the example. There are two lines in a ballad of Prior's, of a man's behavior to his wife, so applicable to you and your colonies, that I cannot help repeating them:

'Be to her faults a little blind:
Be to her virtues very kind.'

Upon the whole, I will beg leave to tell the house what is really my opinion. It is, that the Stamp Act be repealed absolutely, totally, and immediately. That the reason for the repeal be assigned, because it was founded on an erroneous principle. At the same time let the sovereign authority of this country over the colonies be asserted in as strong terms as can be devised, and be made to extend to every point of legislation whatsoever. That we may bind their trade, confine their manufactures, and exercise every power whatsoever, except that of taking their money out of their pockets without their consent."

The petitions against the American Stamp Act, and the papers laid before parliament, occupied in the Commons the attention of a committee of the whole house for three weeks. Several persons were also examined, among whom was Dr. Benjamin Franklin. The examination of this eminent man afforded much practical information as to the condition of the North American colonies. He considered that there were about 300,000 white men in North America from sixteen to sixty years of age; that the inhabitants of all the provinces, taken at a medium, double in about twenty-five years; that the colonists raised, clothed, and paid, during the recent war, near twenty-five thousand men, and spent many millions; that they paid many and heavy taxes among themselves for the support of the civil and military establishments of the country, and to discharge the debt contracted in the war. His answer to the question, "What was the temper of America toward Great Britain before the year 1763?" is very remarkable: "The best in the world. They submitted willingly to the government of the crown, and paid in all their courts obedience to acts of parliament. Numerous as the people are in the several old provinces, they cost you nothing in forts, citadels, garrisons, or armies, to keep them in subjection. They were governed by this country at the expense only of a little pen, ink, and paper. They were led by a thread. They had not only a respect, but an affection, for Great Britain; for its laws, its customs and manners, and even a fondness for its fashions, that greatly increased the commerce. Natives of Britain were always treated with particular regard. To be an Old England man was, of itself, a character of some respect, and gave a kind of rank among us." To the question, Whether he thought the people of America would submit to pay the stamp duty if it was moderated, he boldly answered, "No; never; unless compelled by force of arms." He said it was a prevailing opinion among the people in America that they could not be taxed in a parliament where they were not represented; but the payment of duties laid by act of parliament, as regulations of commerce, was never disputed. They distinguished between external and internal taxes. An external tax was a duty on commodities imported, and it enhanced their price; but the people were not obliged to pay the duty; they might refuse the article. An internal tax is forced from the people without their consent. The Americans could do without British manufactures. They could do without cloth from England. "I am of opinion," said Franklin, "that before their old clothes are worn out they will have new ones of their own making." But "can they possibly find wool enough in North America?" he was asked. The answer showed the mettle of the people that he represented: "They have taken steps to increase the wool. They entered into general combination to eat no more lamb, and very few lambs were killed last year. This course, persisted in, will soon make a prodigious difference in the quantity of wool. The establishing of great manufactories, like those in the clothing towns, is not necessary, as it is where the business is to be carried on for the purposes of trade. The people will all spin and

work for themselves, in their own houses." To the question, "If the Stamp Act should be repealed, would it induce the assemblies of America to acknowledge the right of parliament to tax them, and would they erase their resolutions?" the answer was, "No, never."

After this examination of papers and witnesses the repeal of the Stamp Act was recommended by the committee of the whole house, and a declaratory resolution was adopted: "That the king's majesty, by and with the consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons of Great Britain, in parliament assembled, had, hath, and of right ought to have, full power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the colonies and people of America, subjects of the crown of Great Britain, in all cases whatsoever." The distinction which Pitt had maintained, that parliament was not competent to pass a law for taxing the colonies, was set at nought by this resolution. But it was contended that though the right existed, it was impolitic to exercise it, and therefore the Stamp Act ought to be repealed. Pitt adhered to his opinion, but did not attempt to divide the house. A Declaratory Bill was passed, embodying the principle of the power of parliament to bind the colonies "in all cases whatsoever." In the upper house this bill was supported by the Lord Chancellor Northington, but was opposed by Lord Camden in a very remarkable speech, in which he explicitly declared that "the British Parliament have no right to tax the Americans. . . . Taxation and representation are inseparably united. . . . Taxation and representation are coeval with and essential to this constitution." He alluded to Carte's History of England, and to another history "much read and admired" [Hume's], which mischievously endeavored "to fix the era when the House of Commons began in this kingdom. . . . When did the House of Commons first begin? When, my lords? It began with the constitution, it grew up with the constitution. There is not a blade of grass growing in the most obscure corner of the kingdom which is not, which was not ever represented since the constitution began; there is not a blade of grass which, when taxed, was not taxed by the consent of the proprietor." Lord Camden divided the house, but only four peers voted with him against the Declaratory Bill. While this bill was passing into law, a strong opposition was getting up against the bill for the repeal of the Stamp Act, which was about to be proposed by the government. It is painful to look back upon one of the most miserable exhibitions which history can present of "a house divided against itself"—those called the friends of the king intriguing against the king's ministers. Lord Bute, whose honor was never doubted, whatever might have been his political indiscretions, distinctly gave his solemn word that he had never offered an opinion upon measures, or the disposition of offices, directly or indirectly, since the time when the Duke of Cumberland was consulted on the arrangement of a ministry. We may therefore dismiss from our minds the popular belief that Lord Bute was the instigator of all the double-dealing that was characteristic of the early years of the reign of George III. Burke has been charged with exaggeration in denouncing the system pursued, "in the idea of weakening the state in order to strengthen the court;" a system effected by those he calls "the new court corporation."* But there were too many proofs of the evidence of "a reptile species of politicians, never before and never since known in our country."† They worked underground to prevent this repeal of the Stamp Act. Their operations were evinced in a singular misunderstanding between the king and his ministers, in the crisis of the Stamp Act. The most dispassionate relation of the circumstances is in a letter of General Conway to Lord Hertford, on the 13th of February: "His majesty had told Lord Rockingham and the Duke of Grafton that he was for the repeal; but he on Tuesday told Lord Strange that he was not so now—that he wished his opinion to be known, and his lordship might declare it. This ran through the House of Commons and the town, and has had an odd effect. Our ministerial lives were not thought worth three days' purchase. His majesty has been pleased to explain himself to us, that he always was for the repeal, when contrasted with enforcing the whole act, but not as compared with modification. We told his majesty this distinction was unfortunately not explained to us; and that in consequence we had (as he had allowed Lord Rockingham particularly to do) declared his majesty to be for the repeal; and that on all accounts we were engaged and obliged to push that measure. It was very mortifying to us, and very unhappy, that it now appeared to be against his majesty's sentiments, which put us into an odd predicament, being under a necessity of carrying on a great public measure against his majesty's declared sentiments, and with great numbers of his servants acting against us. He was not displeased, he said, with our freedom—thought we acted like honest men—had no design of parting us—always foresaw the difficulties which might attend his business—but that, once over, he hoped all things would go smoothly again. You see that this might branch out into very long details, had I time for them; but this is the substance. 'Tis a whimsical situation, and what will be the event I don't know. I think the Bill of Repeal will probably pass, because our disposition for it is too strong in the House of Commons for anything now to conquer; and the Lords, I think, with submission, dare not resist it."*

The House of Commons came to a decisive vote on the 21st of February, on the resolution that leave should be given to bring in a bill for the repeal of the Stamp Act. The resolution was moved by Conway. He drew a strong picture of the mischiefs that had already ensued. The trade of England was not only stopped, but in danger of being lost. The conflict would ruin both countries. "If we did not repeal the act, he had no doubt but France and Spain would declare war, and protect the Americans." Grenville exposed the futility of maintaining a right in the Declaratory Bill which the government would not dare to assert. Pitt demanded the repeal as due to the liberty of unrepresented subjects. The scene after the termination of the debate on that February morning has been described by Burke in glowing words, but words not too lofty for the great occasion: "I remember, sir, with a melancholy pleasure, the situation of the honorable gentleman who made the motion for the repeal; in that crisis, when the whole trading interest of this empire, crammed into your lobbies, with a trembling and anxious expectation, waited, almost to a winter's return of light, their fate from your resolutions. When, at length, you had determined in their favor, and your doors, thrown open, showed them the figure of their deliverer in the well-earned triumph of his important victory, from the whole of that grave multitude there arose an involuntary burst of gratitude and transport. They jumped upon him like children on a long absent father. They clung about him as captives about their redeemer. All England, all America, joined to his applause. Nor did he seem insensible to the best of all earthly rewards, the love and admiration of his fellow-citizens. Hope elevated and joy brightened his crest."† Such was the enthusiasm toward Conway, the mover of the resolution. Walpole has described the difference in the reception of Pitt and Grenville. When Pitt appeared, the crowd pulled off their hats, huzzaed, and many followed his chair home with shouts and benedictions. Grenville was hissed; and, in a rage, seized the nearest man to him by the collar. "Providentially the fellow had more humor than spleen 'Well, if I may not hiss,' said he, 'at least I may laugh,' and laughed in his face. The jest caught; had the fellow been surly and resisted, a tragedy had probably ensued."‡ The bill for the repeal finally passed the Commons by a large majority, and the Lords by a majority of more than thirty.

When Mr. Pitt made his memorable appearance in the House of Commons, on the 14th of January, 1766, to deliver his opinion against the resolution of the house to tax America, which had passed "when he was ill in bed," he said, "If I could have endured to be carried in my bed—so great was my agitation for the consequences—I would have had some kind hand to have laid me down on this floor to have borne my testimony against it. It is now an act that has passed." But he knew that a ministry had meanwhile come into power who were disposed to repair the evil consequences which he had apprehended. To that ministry he took the earliest opportunity of declaring that he did not give his strenuous support. He had advised some of them, he said, "to engage, but notwithstanding, I cannot give them my confidence. Pardon me, gentlemen, confidence is a plant of slow growth in an aged bosom." He plainly dis-

* "Present Discontents."
† Macaulay, in "Edinburgh Review," vol. lxxx. p. 516.

* MS. Collection of "Conway's Letters."
† Speech on American Taxation, 1774.
‡ "George III.," vol. ii. p. 299.

covered, he affirmed, "the traces of an overruling influence." He distinctly pointed to the supposed influence of Lord Bute. The great Commoner was probably mistaken, but he was undoubtedly sincere.

Conway distinctly repelled the charge that the ministry had been subjected to that particular influence. Pitt has been greatly blamed for not allying himself with the Rockingham administration. He was invited by them with an earnestness that approached to obsequiousness. He turned a deaf ear to their overtures. They fell, from their inability to stand against the unwilling support of the sovereign, and the intrigues of those who arrogated to themselves the exclusive title of the king's friends. This ministry did popular things. They gave in to the clamor of the weavers by passing an act for restraining the importation of foreign silks. They repealed the cider tax. They passed resolutions declaring the illegality of general warrants, and condemning the seizure of private papers to discover the authors of libels. Their concessions in some degree indicated their weakness. Several of their minor supporters deserted them. The Duke of Grafton left them, resigning his office of secretary of state, on the ground that they wanted "authority, dignity, and extension;" that he knew but one man who could give them strength and solidity; and that were that person to give his assistance, "he should with pleasure take up the spade and the pickaxe and dig in the trenches."* A disagreement ensued in the cabinet; the king was told that the ministry could not go on as they were; and his majesty, in July, resolved to send for Mr. Pitt, and so told his servants. The king wrote him a letter, expressing his desire to have his thoughts "how an able and dignified ministry may be formed." Pitt answered the king—"penetrated with the deepest sense of your majesty's boundless goodness to me, and with a heart overflowing with duty and zeal for the honor and happiness of the most gracious and benign sovereign." Lord Temple was sent for by the king; and his majesty wrote to Mr. Pitt, who was ill, that he had opened a desire to see his lordship in the treasury; but that "he seems to incline to quarters very heterogeneous to my and your ideas, and almost a total exclusion of the present men." Temple was ambitious. He was indignant at the idea of being "stuck into a ministry as a great cipher at the head of the treasury, surrounded with other ciphers all named by Mr. Pitt."† The ministry was at length formed. The Duke of Grafton became head of the treasury; General Conway and Lord Shelburne, secretaries of state; Lord Camden, lord chancellor; Charles Townshend, chancellor of the exchequer. Mr. Pitt, to the great surprise of the world, on taking the office of lord privy seal went to the House of Peers as Earl of Chatham.

The transformation of Pitt into Chatham is held to have destroyed his popularity. "That fatal title blasted all the affection which his country had borne to him, and which he had deserved so well. . . . The people, though he had done no act to occasion reproach, thought he had sold them for a title."‡ The city of London declined to present an address on the appointment to office of the man they had idolized. The objectors seem to have forgotten the bodily infirmities which necessarily prevented him taking the post in the House of Commons which a prime minister was expected to take, and they scarcely gave him credit for the power which remained to him, of influencing his colleagues by the vigor of his plans, when he could not command a popular assembly by the splendor of his eloquence. He had large projects of statesmanship. He was anxious to cement an alliance with the Protestant states of Europe, to counterbalance the Family Compact of France and Spain, which was leading those powers again to meditate attacks upon England. He sent an ambassador to confer with the Czarina of Russia and Frederick of Prussia; but Frederick was indignant at the treatment he had received at the peace, and could place no reliance on a policy so subject to the consequences of ministerial change. There is a strong testimony to the rare powers of Lord Chatham's mind at an early period of his administration. Charles Townshend for the first time attended the cabinet as chancellor of the exchequer, when the great statesman developed his views of the position of Europe. "Mr. Townshend," says the Duke of Grafton in his Memoirs, "was particularly astonished; and owned to me, as I was carrying him home in my carriage, that Lord Chatham had just shown us what inferior animals we were, and that, much as we had seen of him before, he did not conceive till that night his superiority to be so very transcendent." The minister contemplated important changes in the government of Ireland. "To enable himself to contend with the powerful connections there, he proposed to establish himself upon the basis of a just popularity, by shortening the duration of parliament, and granting other measures which the Irish appeared to have most at heart."* Lord Chatham also had in view organic changes in the constitution of the East India Company—their astonishing dominion having now become an anomaly in the absence of government control, and their vast revenues the means of administering to private rapacity and injustice.

The administration entered upon its duties at a period of domestic trouble. The season was one of extreme wetness. The harvest failed, and riots attended the rising price of corn. But the price had not quite reached the point at which exportation was forbidden. By an order in council an embargo was laid on exportation. The parliament had not been called together, as it might have been, to sanction the measure, which came into operation on the 24th of September. Parliament met, according to the date of its prorogation, on the 11th of November. The first appearance of Chatham in the House of Lords was to defend the order in council on the ground of public necessity. Camden and others in both houses maintained its legality. Fierce debates ensued, in which this exercise of the prerogative was compared to former unconstitutional attempts to set up a dispensing power. It was thought essential to mark that such an exertion of the prerogative was not constitutional. An Act of Indemnity was therefore passed to exonerate those who had advised and acted upon the order in council. A parliamentary inquiry into the affairs of the East India Company was now forced on by Chatham, in opposition to the wishes of several of his colleagues. He refused to impart to them the nature and extent of his plans. Several of the Rockingham party resolved to secede from him. He had to form new combinations of public men, and to quiet the apprehensions of those who were accused of being despotically governed by him. During the Christmas recess Chatham went to Bath, where he became seriously ill. Parliament assembled, and the prime minister was not in his place. His cabinet fell into disorder. The fatal effects of the absence of the chief, and his unwillingness to intrust responsibility to his colleagues, were signally manifested, when the chancellor of the exchequer commended the Stamp Act, and again proposed to tax the colonies. Burke has described in his speech upon American taxation this strange disorganization of Lord Chatham's ministry. "When his face was hid but for a moment, his whole system was on a wide sea, without chart or compass. . . . As if it were to insult as well as betray him, even long before the close of the first session of his administration, when everything was publicly transacted, and with great parade, in his name, they made an act declaring it highly just and expedient to raise a revenue in America. For even then, sir, even before this splendid orb was entirely set, and while the western horizon was in a blaze with his descending glory, on the opposite quarter of the heavens arose another luminary, and, for his hour, became lord of the ascendant. You understand, to be sure, that I speak of Charles Townshend, officially the reproducer of this fatal scheme."

That portion of the life of Chatham when he was nominally the head of the administration, but wholly incapable of directing the national affairs, and altogether shrinking from that direction, is as difficult to understand as it is melancholy to contemplate. In the beginning of 1767, when the parliament met, he was ill at Bath. In the middle of February the gout had returned so severely upon him as to confine him to his bed at the inn at Marlborough, as he writes to Lord Shelburne by the hands of his secretary. In that inn he is described by Walpole as "inaccessible and invisible, though surrounded by a train of domestics that occupied the whole inn, and wore the appearance of a little court."† Here he remained a fort-

* "Chatham Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 422.
† Ibid., p. 436 and p. 438.
‡ Walpole, "George III.," vol. ii. p. 358.

* Letter from Lord Camden; quoted from the MS. by Sir Denis le Marchant, in note to Walpole's "George III.," vol. iii. p. 111.
† "George III.," vol. iii. p. 416. The statement in the "Edinburgh Review," vol. lxxx., that Chatham insisted that during his stay all the waiters and stable boys of the inn should wear his livery, is contradicted by Lord Mahon, on the authority of the late Mr. Thomas Grenville.

night. The Duke of Grafton earnestly entreats to be allowed to come to the Earl of Chatham. The answer is, that "until he is able to move toward London, it is by no means practicable to him to enter into discussions of business." On the 2d of March he came to town, but unable to stir hand or foot. At this time the ministry had been in a minority upon the question whether the land tax should be reduced in amount. The king writes to Chatham expressing his reliance upon him "to withstand that evil called connection," to which his majesty attributes the defeat of the ministry. Chatham responds reverentially. Meanwhile the public business falls into confusion; a violent opposition, a divided ministry. From the beginning of April the prime minister had not been allowed to see any one, nor to receive letters. It was in vain that his colleagues desired to visit him. Business, said Chatham, was impossible for him. Again and again the king wrote affectionately to his minister; and at last said, "If you cannot come to me to-morrow, I am ready to call on you." As an interview less to be dreaded, Chatham consented to receive the Duke of Grafton. The duke records in his Memoirs that he found him in a different state from what he expected. "His nerves and spirits were affected in a dreadful degree, and the sight of his great mind bowed down and thus weakened by disorder would have filled me with grief and concern, even if I had not long borne a sincere attachment to his person and character." The session closed on the 2d of July. The Duke of Grafton was now the real minister, although the name of Chatham in some degree upheld the government.

A theory has been proposed, in a review of the Chatham Correspondence, that the illness of the great minister was a long series of pretences—"that the gout, whatever may have been its real severity, was exaggerated in order to excuse a line of conduct for which, even if true, it would have furnished no excuse;" that the gout was a frequent pretext; that the desire of Lord Chatham to have a power of attorney prepared in order to enable his lady to transact his private business was "a blind;" that his disappointment at his loss of popularity, and his regret at having descended from his proud position of the great Commoner, made him reluctant to appear in his new character, and that he clung to office till he could find some striking and popular occasion for his resignation.* Never was ingenuity more absurdly exercised for the purpose of damaging a great man's character. The true solution of this mystery is that the intellect of Chatham was temporarily enfeebled, almost destroyed; that he did not resign office, although incapable of performing its duties, because the ordinary perceptions of his mind were clouded to an extent that left him no power of judgment; and that when he did resign, in October, 1768, on account of "the deplorable state of his health," his mind had to some extent resumed its vigor, though his bodily infirmities were as great as ever. His condition during the continuance of his mental prostration is thus described: "Lord Chatham's state of health is certainly the lowest dejection and debility that mind or body can be in. He sits all the day leaning on his hands, which he supports on the table; does not permit any person to remain in the room; knocks when he wants anything; and having made his wants known, gives a signal, without speaking, to the person who answered his call, to retire."† He had sold his property at Hayes, and was removed to Burton-Pynsent, a valuable estate he had acquired under the will of Sir William Pynsent. With the intense eagerness of a mind verging on insanity, his one idea was to repurchase Hayes. Difficulties were naturally raised; and he resigned himself to his disappointment, saying, "That might have saved me." But the repurchase was effected, and for many months he dwelt there secluded from all mankind. Lord Chatham, according to Walpole, under an attack of the gout, had put himself into the hands of Dr. Addington—"innovating enough in his practice to be justly deemed a quack. . . . If all was not a farce, I should think the physician rather caused the disease; Addington having kept off the gout, and possibly dispersed it through his nerves, or even driven it up to his head."‡ If all was a farce, it was a long farce to occupy more than a year in playing out.

The ministry struggled on with considerable difficulty through the session of 1768. There had been many changes in its composition. Charles Townshend had died of fever. His brilliant talents were neutralized by his levity; and it was clear that if his ambition had placed him at the head of the government, he would have done some rash things—perhaps precipitated a war with America earlier than the nobleman, Lord North, who succeeded Townshend as the chancellor of the exchequer. The parliament, now approaching the end of its septennial term, was dissolved on the 11th of March, 1768.

* "Quarterly Review," vol. lxvi. p. 251.
† Letter in Lord Lyttleton's "Memoirs."
‡ "George III.," vol. ii. p. 451.

CHAPTER CLXVI.

New parliament—Non-publication of debates—Wilkes returned for Middlesex—Riots—Sentence upon Wilkes—His expulsions from parliament and re-elections—Debates on the privileges of the Commons—The letters of Junius—Personalities of Junius—His attacks on the Duke of Grafton—Private letters of Junius—His attack on the Duke of Bedford—Address of Junius to the king—Opening of parliament—Lord Chatham—Chatham's speech on the address—Schism in the ministry—Lord Camden disclaims their measures—Resignation of the Duke of Grafton.

The new parliament was opened on the 10th of May, 1768. In this most important session the non-publication of debates was enforced with almost unequalled strictness. Horace Walpole has, for some years, been to us the almost only authority for forming any notion of the debating power in an age of real oratory, if we may judge of its rhetorical excellence from the testimony of contemporaries. He is not now a member of "the thirteenth parliament of Great Britain." He says, "What traces of debates shall appear hereafter must be mutilated and imperfect, as being received by hearsay from others, or taken from notes communicated to me."* The rigid enforcement of the standing order for the exclusion of strangers went on from 1768 to 1774—the whole term of the duration of this parliament, thus known as the "Unreported Parliament." But the debates of the House of Commons in this stirring period were not "unreported." Mr. Cavendish (afterward Sir Henry Cavendish), member for Lostwithiel, not only devoted himself to the task of taking down the heads of speeches, but, after some practice, attempted to report them "more at large." These most valuable notes have been the foundation of the collection edited by Mr. J. Wright, as "Sir Henry Cavendish's debates;" but, probably from inadequate public encouragement, these reports, in their printed form, do not extend beyond March 27th, 1771.†

At the opening of parliament the ministry comprised Lord Camden, lord chancellor; the Duke of Grafton, first lord of the treasury; Lord Shelburne, secretary of state; Lord North, chancellor of the exchequer. Lord Chatham still held the privy seal, but continued unable to discharge any official duties. It was the Duke of Grafton's ministry. The new parliament commenced in a tempest of popular violence, such as had been unwitnessed in England for many years. John Wilkes, an outlaw, suddenly returned from France, at the time when the writs had been issued for a general election, and he declared himself a candidate for the city of London. He was lowest on the poll, there being four aldermen in nomination, who had the suffrages of most decent citizens. Wilkes then proposed himself as a candidate for the county of Middlesex. The ministry were unwilling to proceed against him on his outlawry; and the Whigs, generally, could not well forget that he had been their tool. The demagogue was returned as member for Middlesex; and his triumph was celebrated by illuminations and riots. On the 20th of April, being the first day of term, Wilkes, according to a promise he had given, surrendered to his outlawry, and was committed to custody. A violent mob rescued their favorite from the officers of the court, but he had the prudence to get away from them, and surrender himself at the King's Bench Prison. Riots daily took place in the neighborhood of Wilkes' place of confinement. On the 10th of May a vast concourse of people assembled in St. George's Fields to convey the member for Middlesex to his seat in the house, which it was thought he would then take in virtue of his privilege. The Riot Act was read when the mob assailed the prison-gates; and the mili-

* "Memoirs of George III.," vol. iii. p. 180.
† Published in parts, in 1843, and forming two volumes, the second of which is incomplete.

tary being called in, five or six persons lost their lives, and many were wounded. The magistrate who gave the order to fire was tried and acquitted. On the 11th of May a royal proclamation was issued "for suppressing riots, tumults, and other unlawful assemblies." There were other causes of tumult than the political agitations connected with Wilkes. Seamen from vessels in the Thames were parading the streets demanding increase of wages, and having interfered with the unloading of colliers, the coal-heavers took part against the sailors, and were fighting with them in the public thoroughfares. The coal-heavers had their own especial grievance, having by act of parliament been subjected to the jurisdiction of the alderman of the ward. An alehouse-keeper of the name of Green had given offence to the coal-heavers, who were chiefly Irish, and they vowed his destruction. Walpole relates their proceedings as "the fiercest and most memorable of all the tumults." His narrative shows the lawlessness of the metropolis ninety years ago. Green, Walpole says, "every night removed his wife and children out of his house. One evening he received notice that the coal-heavers were coming to attack him. He had nobody with him but a maid-servant and a sailor, who by accident was drinking in the house. Green asked the sailor if he would assist him. 'Yes,' answered the generous tar, 'I will defend any man in distress.' At eight the rioters appeared, and fired on the house, lodging in one room above two hundred bullets; and when their ammunition was spent they bought pewter pots, cut them to pieces, and fired them as ball. At length with an axe they broke out the bottom of the door; but that breach the sailor defended singly, while Green and his maid kept up a constant fire, and killed eighteen of the besiegers. Their powder and ball being at last wasted, Green said he must make his escape; 'for you,' said he to the friendly sailor, 'they will not hurt you.' Green, retiring from the back room of his house, got into a carpenter's yard, and was concealed in a saw-pit, over which the mob passed in their pursuit of him, being told he was gone forward." During nine hours, while this tumult was going on, no police or military interfered. Green was tried for murder and was acquitted. Seven of the coal-heavers were executed; but the revenge of their associates did not cease, for they murdered Green's sister. The brave sailor "never owned himself; never claimed honor or recompense for his generous gallantry." *

The only real business in the first short session of the new parliament was to continue the act prohibiting the exportation of corn and flour. The houses adjourned after sitting only ten days, and the parliament was afterward prorogued. Colonel Luttrell, on the 10th of May, had moved "that the proper officer of the crown do inform the house why the laws were not immediately put in force against John Wilkes, Esq., an outlaw;" but the speaker held that the motion could not be entertained. The parliament did not reassemble till the 8th of November; but the case of John Wilkes had been kept alive in the public mind by the legal proceedings against him. Lord Mansfield, in June, delivered judgment in the Court of King's Bench, that the outlawry of Mr. Wilkes was null and void through a defect in the pleadings; but the original judgment against him for libels was sufficient, and he was sentenced to two years' imprisonment and to two fines of 500*l*. There were illuminations in the Strand on the 27th of October in honor of Wilkes' birthday. On the 2d of January, 1769, he was elected alderman of the ward of Farringdon Without; and subsequently, some informality having been found in the proceedings, he was re-elected. He was to be raised to the highest pinnacle of popularity by the contest in which the government, acting through the House of Commons, now became engaged with the prisoner in the King's Bench, who had been elected member for Middlesex. On the 14th of November a petition to the Commons was presented from Mr. Wilkes "for redress of his grievances." The proceedings upon this petition occupied much time, and the House of Commons appeared eager to raise another issue, upon a complaint in the House of Peers of Lord Weymouth, the secretary of state, that Wilkes had published a libel against himself. The Commons, after a conference with the Lords, took this matter in hand, summoned Wilkes to their bar in custody, and received his defiance in the assertion that he was the author of the paper complained of, and that he gloried in it. The house decided that this was an insolent, scandalous, and seditious libel. On the 3d of February Lord Barrington moved that John Wilkes, having confessed himself the author of what the house had deemed to be a libel, and being also under sentence for other seditious, obscene, and impious libels, be expelled. The motion was carried by a majority of eighty-two, and a new writ was moved for Middlesex. The sentence of expulsion was resisted by the minority upon constitutional grounds; and upon the same principle Wilkes was re-elected unanimously. The election was declared null and void by a majority in the Commons of a hundred and forty-six. Again the freeholders of Middlesex resolved to set at nought the decision of parliament. The rights of electors were considered to be violated. Large sums were subscribed to carry on this dangerous battle between the people and their representatives. The whole kingdom was in agitation. Wilkes was a third time elected; and it was voted that, having been expelled the house, he was incapacitated for election. The government now provided a candidate who would not shrink from opposing the popular favorite. Colonel Luttrell vacated his seat, and stood for the metropolitan county. On the 13th of April, without any tumult, Wilkes was a fourth time returned by a very large majority. The House of Commons now decided by a majority of fifty-four that Luttrell should have been returned, and not Wilkes, and that Luttrell should take his seat. The king, in April, 1768, had urged upon Lord North the necessity for the expulsion of Wilkes; and on this last decision of the house he congratulated the chancellor of the exchequer upon "the very honorable issue of the debate." His majesty added, "The house has, with becoming dignity, supported their own privileges, without which they cannot subsist, and it is now my duty to see the laws obeyed."

King, Lords, and Commons were now committed to what was deemed a warfare against the people, and a violation of constitutional rights. Sober statesmen were alarmed. Granby and Conway stayed away from parliament on the motion for the expulsion of Wilkes. "Having declared against violent measures, they would not concur in it; and disapproving Wilkes' attacks on the government, they would not defend him." * Dunning took the same course. When Lord Barrington moved the expulsion, George Grenville, during whose administration Wilkes had been first arrested for the libel in the "North Briton," delivered a speech which may even now be read with admiration for its grave wisdom. He denied, in the strongest terms, the legality and the prudence of the proposed measure.† Burke brought all the force of his eloquence to contend against the manifest disposition of the house. One sentence would not be readily forgotten: "The late hour of the night—the candles—all put me in mind of the representation of the last act of a tragi-comedy, performed by his majesty's servants, by desire of several persons of distinction, for the benefit of Mr. Wilkes, and at the expense of the constitution."‡ The conclusion of his speech pointed to the impending danger: "I dread the consequences of this violent struggle between the two tides of power and popularity." The house went on debating, with more or less energy, on every occasion when the re-election of Wilkes was the subject of controversy. On the 15th of April, upon the motion for declaring Colonel Luttrell member for Middlesex, instead of Mr. Wilkes, the discussion was conducted with a heat that manifested how the passions even of temperate men had become committed to this unhappy contest. Alderman Beckford having been interrupted by Mr. Onslow in saying that "he apprehended a resolution of the House of Commons was not the law of the land," George Grenville rose to the point of order, and with great animation exclaimed, "Sir, the man who will contend that a resolution of the House of Commons is the law of the land is a most violent enemy of his country, be he who or what he will." His emotion was so great that on the conclusion of his short speech "Mr. Grenville spat blood." § On the same evening Charles Fox, who had not then attained his majority, made his first speech in favor of the government. The debut of the "man of the people" of after times was not promising. He said that "the contest was between the House of Commons and the lowest scum of the people." Burke replied, in terms which probably sank deep into the mind of the young man, who was then renowned only for his extravagance: "Sir, if

* "Memoirs of George III.," vol. iii. p. 219.

* Walpole, "George III.," vol. iii. p. 317.
† Reported in full in the "Cavendish Debates," vol. i. pp. 159 to 176.
‡ "Cavendish Debates," vol. i. p. 180.
§ Ibid., p. 371.

party distinction is to be raised up in this country between the gentlemen and those who have this evening been called beggarly—if such a party should ever arise—woe betide the gentlemen! If, dabbling in intrigues, they make themselves contemptible and useless, they will never be respected: the active, the industrious, those who labor, will get before them." * On the 8th of May there was a debate on the petition against the return of Colonel Luttrell, when the question that he was duly elected was affirmed by a majority of sixty-nine. On that occasion Mr. Henry Cavendish said, "I lay it down as a principle that no order of the House of Commons can make a minority a majority; that no resolution of the House of Commons can ever make Mr. Luttrell the legal representative of the county of Middlesex: for I do, from my soul, abhor, detest, and abjure, as unconstitutional and illegal, that damnable doctrine and position, that a resolution of the House of Commons can make, alter, suspend, abrogate, or annihilate the law of the land." † The next day seventy members dined together at the Thatched House Tavern, when one of the toasts was "Mr. Cavendish's creed." Another toast was, "The first edition of Dr. Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England." ‡ The allusion was to the debate of the previous night. Blackstone, then solicitor-general to the queen, had declared that the legal incapacity of Wilkes to sit in that house was established by the common law; and Grenville said, "I greatly prefer the opinion given by the learned gentleman in his work on the laws of England, to what fell from him this evening;" and then quoted a passage from the "Commentaries" as to the qualifications of persons to be elected. §

While this contest was going on in parliament, the attention of the town, and very soon of the whole nation, was turned to an anonymous writer in the "Public Advertiser," who, under the signature of "Junius," commenced a series of attacks upon persons of high station, that formed, by their fearlessness as well as their ability, a striking contrast to the ordinary communications to newspapers. There had been many previous letters in the same paper, printed and conducted by Mr. Henry Sampson Woodfall, which, from their personalities, had made some noise. Many of these, signed Poplicola, Anti-Sejanus, jun., Correggio, Mnemon, Lucius, Atticus, have been ascribed to the same writer; but it has been maintained very convincingly, in successive articles in the "Athenæum," that, although included in the edition of Junius of 1812, the theory of their coming from one and the same pen is not to be accepted without large qualification. Nevertheless, careful inquirers, among whom is Lord Mahon, think they would not have appeared in Woodfall's edition without some good authority. These letters abound with very choice figures of speech, which have a remarkable resemblance to the undoubted writings of Junius. Lord Chatham, in the spring of 1767, is "a man purely and perfectly bad"—"a grand vizier"—one who had accepted "a share of power under a pernicious court minion." In the autumn Chatham is "a lunatic brandishing a crutch." Camden is a judge, with the laws of England under his feet, and "before his distorted vision a dagger which marshals him the way to the murder of the constitution." Beastliness and brutality characterize these productions in many instances, Profaneness is common enough. So far these letters agree with those of Junius. They agree also in the few political principles which we find amid their scurrility. Those who contended against the justice and policy of taxing the North American colonies were "a particular set of men base and treacherous enough to have enlisted under the banners of a lunatic, to whom they sacrificed their honor, their conscience, and their country—the wretched ministers who served at the altar, while the high priest himself, with more than frantic fury, offered up his bleeding country a victim to America." On the 5th of April, 1768, the return of Wilkes to England offered a favorable occasion for a new attack to be opened against the ministry of the Duke of Grafton, under the signature of C., which Junius adopted in his private correspondence with his printer. Wilkes was now the object of his most rancorous abuse—"a most infamous character in private life." The ministry were responsible for this outlaw being at large. "We are still strong enough to defend our lives and properties against Mr. Wilkes and his banditti." Within a year there was no man more zealous than Junius in an endeavor to stimulate this banditti into those acts of violence which are the natural consequence of writings which rouse the passions by unmeasured personalities. He made no attempts to sustain the people in a temperate assertion of their rights, or to bring the powers of argument to deter those who were invading those rights. His mode of proceeding has its admirers, as we learn from his last idolater: "Junius had a busier mission than that of writing panegyrics on principles, or didactic essays on axiomatic politics. . . . Principle, in those days, if not practised, being at least understood, Junius was, in my judgment, right in applying his vast powers rather to the chastisement of wrong-doers than to theoretical disquisitions on wrongs done." *

It is more than forty years ago since the author of this history was induced diligently to read the "Letters of Junius." The elaborate edition by Woodfall was then recently published; but to a youth it was more important that, as a "British classic," Junius could be carried about as a pocket volume. Little more than forty years had passed since the victims of "Junius" were guiding the destinies of the nation. The "great personage" whom he had assailed with unexampled boldness was still alive, although utterly insensible to what opinions might be held of the honesty of his arch-enemy. Probably the study of Junius as a master of invective was seriously damaging to our capacity for forming a correct judgment of the public men of a very remarkable period. Certainly it required a much more intimate acquaintance with the real materials for an impartial view of national affairs than were then open to us, to divest ourselves of a lingering confidence that these brilliant epigrams of an anonymous assailant of the great had not only a broad foundation of truth to rest upon, but were substantially true. Unquestionably it demanded a strong exercise of the reasoning faculty not to be seduced by the fascination of the mystery which had so long defied an absolute solution. It was more than difficult not to believe that this man in the mask was some grand and awful magician, endued with all-penetrating knowledge, wondrous ability, and irresistible power. The tardy conviction at length arrived that, whether of high rank or of humble, a senator or a garreteer, a minister of state or an eavesdropper, a noble lord in a blue ribbon or an office clerk, he was, taken all in all, one of the most abandoned of anonymous literary assassins; that no writer ever more abused the power of the press for the gratification of his "envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness." Again we read Junius, now that we have to write of Grafton, Mansfield, Bedford, whom he made his quarry. When we now see that his elaborately pointed periods are rarely the vehicle of anything higher than temporary personalities of the dirtiest character, such as a gentleman would scorn, and of dastardly insinuations, such as none but a coward could utter in disguise, we care not to trouble ourselves about the solution of the riddle which has engaged so many acute minds—*Who* was Junius? We are content with asking, *What* was Junius? If that question be answered in accordance with our opinion of his character, we may arrive at one safe conclusion—*Who* Junius was *not*.

Horace Walpole has a remark upon the author of Junius, which appears to have been overlooked by some who think that the literary merit of these letters will keep their moral turpitude in the background. "Men," he says, "wondered how any one possessed of such talents could have the forbearance to write in a manner so desperate as to prevent his ever receiving personal applause for his writings: the venom was too black not to disgrace even his ashes." † The representatives of Sir Philip Francis have paraded his claims to be Junius, as if he, in that belief, were to be honored in the dust. The letter of Lady Francis to Lord Campbell is an earnest pleading that the renown of being the author of Junius shall be allotted to her deceased husband. ‡ When the able editor of the "Grenville Papers," then librarian to the late Duke of Buckingham, suggested to his grace "the possibility that Lord Temple might have been the author of Junius," although the duke had not heard it as a family tradition, he "did not discourage the supposition." The librarian at

* "Cavendish Debates," vol. i. p. 382. † Ibid., p. 428.
‡ "Chatham Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 360.
§ "Cavendish Debates," vol. i. p. 430.

* "William Burke the author of Junius." By J. C. Symons. 1859. † "Memoirs of George III.," vol. iii. p. 402.
‡ Printed in Campbell's "Chancellors," vol. iv.; and given also in Bohn's edition of Junius, vol. ii. p. lxii.

Stowe, with whom the honor of the Grenvilles must have had some weight, thus encouraged, writes upward of two hundred pages of "Notes on the Authorship of Junius," which he thus concludes: "It is my firm and deliberate conviction, that if Lord Temple were not the author of Junius, then the author has never yet been publicly named."* The writer of a very interesting article in the "Quarterly Review" seeks to identify Junius with Thomas Lord Lyttelton—the "profligate Lord Lyttelton," as he was called—not more by the remarkable talents of this young nobleman than by his unquestionable familiarity with the gross excesses and base insinuations in which Junius delighted to indulge; by the love of Junius for private scandal, picked up in "the haunts of refined blackguardism" which Thomas Lyttelton frequented.† If "the venom of Junius was too black not to disgrace his ashes;" if that vanity which led Junius to hold that his Letters would descend to posterity in company with the Bible had some counterpart in the intense vanity of Sir Philip Francis; if one of the resemblances between Junius and Temple was, that the most scurrilous pamphlets were written under the direction of this malignant friend of Wilkes; if to be plunged in the grossest sensuality was one proof that Lyttelton was Junius, how will these attributes support the theory of some of his contemporaries that Burke was the real Junius, or the modified hypothesis now put forward, that "Edmund Burke in all probability aided William in writing Junius."‡

In noticing, perhaps more fully than they intrinsically deserve, the Letters of Junius, it is our chief duty to regard them as bearing upon, and in connection with, the history of their time. There can be no doubt that they had some influence upon the movements of party; terrified a few persons of high station; made others more obstinate in their contempt even of the truths uttered by a systematic libeller. That they produced any real and permanent benefit to the country can scarcely be pretended, even by those who shut their eyes to the monstrous evil of that system of personality which they carried to its utmost limit—a system which was the disgrace of the literature of that period, and which only died out when anonymous writers accepted their position of secrecy as one that imposed as heavy, perhaps heavier, responsibilities than belonged to acknowledged authorship. Junius waged no chivalric war. In "complete steel" he was fighting with naked men. Sir Nathaniel Wraxall, among his gossiping anecdotes, says that Mr. Bradshaw, the secretary of the treasury, made no secret "of the agony into which the Duke of Grafton was thrown by these productions. Such was their effect and operation on his mind as sometimes utterly to incapacitate him during whole days for the ministerial duties of his office."§ It was "the venom of the shaft rather than the vigor of the bow"‖ which made the prime minister sink, "as a sick girl," under these skin-deep wounds from a foe in ambush.

The first especial attack of Junius on the Duke of Grafton was in connection with an event which was associated with the Wilkite agitation. Mr. Cooke, the member who had been returned for Middlesex at the same time with Wilkes, having died, Sergeant Glynn had been elected in December, with the recommendation to popular favor of having been counsel for Wilkes. The court had also put a candidate in nomination. The "roughs" at this period were mostly chairmen, of whom the greater number were Irish. The mob, whether hirelings or volunteers, engaged in a fierce battle, which ended in the death of Mr. Clarke, one of the friends of the popular candidate. Two chairmen, whose names were Macquirk and Balfe, had a verdict of wilful murder returned against them on a coroner's inquest; and they were tried at the Old Bailey, and found guilty, in January. The feeling of the populace was manifested by the shouts and clapping of hands which arose in the gallery when the verdict was given. They were left for execution, although one had been recommended to mercy by the jury, and there were circumstances which invalidated the proof that these men, however engaged in the riot, had struck the deceased. Walpole relates that two members of the House of Commons, who saw "the glaring cruelty of putting two men to death who had neither counselled the deed nor meditated it," expressed their opinion in the House of Commons; that there was not a dissenting voice on the recommendation that they should be pardoned; and that consequently the criminals were respited during pleasure. At the desire of the secretary of state, the College of Surgeons entered upon an examination of witnesses, and gave as their unanimous opinion that the blow which was described on the trial was not the cause of Clarke's death. The men accordingly received the king's free pardon. Burke, on the 15th of April, spoke strongly against this proceeding: "After a jury, upon legal evidence, have given their verdict—the court of judicature has determined, the judges have approved, and the party is under sentence—the mercy of the crown interposes: 'No, no,' say the government, 'we must get a jury of surgeons; of that kind of judicature we must avail ourselves;' and the man receives the royal pardon."* The orator complains of this mode of setting aside a solemn verdict by an irregular inquiry; but he does not make his complaint the vehicle for a personal attack upon the prime minister or any member of the government. Junius, on the contrary, writes thus to the Duke of Grafton: "When the laws have given you the means of making an example, in every sense unexceptionable, and by far the most likely to awe the multitude, you pardon the offence, and are not ashamed to give the sanction of government to the riots your complain of, and even to future murders. You are partial, perhaps, to the military mode of execution; and had rather see a score of these wretches butchered by the guards, than one of them suffer death by regular course of law." The object of Burke is to complain of an irregular ministerial act: the purpose of Junius is to damage an individual.

The one paramount desire of Junius was to destroy the administration of the Duke of Grafton. He had no large conception of a general policy that should unite a great party in the conduct of affairs if that administration were destroyed. The two questions which absorbed the thoughts and divided the opinions of all public men, were the contest between parliamentary privilege and Wilkes, and the more perplexing quarrel between the mother country and the North American colonies. It was known that the king held the most decided opinions on both these questions—that he would have pursued Wilkes to the utmost reach of power, whatever might be the unpopularity; and that he would assert the right of taxation over the colonies, whatever might be the danger of rebellion and war. The ministry of the Duke of Grafton was committed, in a great degree, to an agreement with the will of the sovereign, less perhaps from conviction than from an imperfect view of the consequences of persisting in a doubtful career. At this juncture Lord Chatham, having ceased to be at the head of affairs, was free to pursue his own declared sentiments on the subject of American taxation, and to form an independent judgment on the case of Wilkes. He had become reconciled to his brother-in-law, Lord Temple, and was looked upon as having joined the Grenville party. But though he agreed with George Grenville on the unconstitutional proceedings of the House of Commons in the matter of the Middlesex election, he was totally opposed to him on the subject of America. The Rockingham party, of whose policy Burke was now the great parliamentary expositor, held fast to the popular principles in the dispute with the freeholders of Middlesex, but repudiated any such assertion of authority over the colonies as George Grenville had maintained. Junius not only supported but prompted Wilkes in every act that could damage the ministry. But he also spoke in the most contemptuous terms of any individual or any party that deemed the colonists anything but rebels, to be trodden down as troublesome vermin. Ostensibly he was an adherent of George Grenville. Had he any real principles? He was not a politician, in the higher sense of the word. He had some selfish ambition to gratify; he had some private grievances to revenge. He might be a writing puppet, moved by some one of higher mark—a Francis or a Dyer prompted by a Temple. He might be a man of noble birth, mining like a mole, whose vanity was gratified by the notoriety which he commanded—pleased with acquiring another self-consciousness than that which belonged to his proper person. Whoever he was, he had essentially a paltry mind. He had not the mind of any man that had won or was winning a great name—a Chatham or a Burke, even a Barré or a Shelburne. He was "a good hater;" but his dislikes

* "Grenville Papers," vol. iii. p. ccxxxviii.
† "Quarterly Review," vol. xc.
‡ "William Burke, the Author of Junius," p. 6.
§ "Historical Memoirs," vol. i. p. 454.
‖ Johnson, "Falkland Islands."

* "Cavendish Debates," vol. i. p. 382.

had more of the real meanness than of the false grandeur of hatred. His true nature was disclosed in his private letters to his printer. Of Mansfield, the lord-chief justice, he says, "I will never rest till I have destroyed or expelled that wretch." Mr. Chamier, a member of the club which Johnson, Reynolds, Burke, and Goldsmith made illustrious, is "to be run down," to annoy Lord Barrington, the secretary at war, who had appointed him his deputy. With the airs of an aristocrat he writes to Garrick, "Mark me, vagabond. Keep to your pantomimes, or be assured you shall hear of it." With the determination of an assassin, he says of the Duke of Bedford, "I am sure I can threaten him privately with such a storm as would make him tremble even in his grave." In consonance with his whole system, he recommends Woodfall to deny the authenticity of one of his letters which had been printed: "Suppose you were to say, We have some reason to suspect that the last letter signed Junius in this paper was not written by the real Junius." To show how the coward trembled even in his triple armor of concealment, we have only to quote from one letter to his publisher: "I must be more cautious than ever. I am sure I should not survive a discovery three days; or, if I did, they would attaint me by bill. I am persuaded you are too honest a man to contribute in any way to my destruction." Attaint him by bill! as if he were a Bolingbroke or an Ormonde. He was a man of rank, and had their penalties of forfeiture in his mind, according to the belief of one who has looked carefully into the subject.* In our view the fear of attainder was only one of the many pretences by which an inordinately vain man sought to raise his personal importance in the eyes of the humble friend to whom he left all the real peril consequent upon his own audacity. "I hope these papers have reimbursed you. I never will send you anything that *I* think dangerous; but the risk is yours, and you must determine for yourself."

The Duke of Grafton, in 1769, was thirty-four years of age. He had the misfortune to be divorced from his wife by no fault of his own; and he subsequently made no secret of keeping a mistress—the great of that day not having been shamed into decency by the decorum of the court. These circumstances are paraded by Junius without reserve. His descent from Charles II. was objected to him as a crime. But there was a greater sin which Grafton had just committed. He had quitted Nancy Parsons, and married a niece of the Duchess of Bedford. The family union was the symptom of political union, and the hatred of Junius to the two ducal houses strengthened with their strength. His letter to the Duke of Bedford appeared immediately after outrages committed upon the Duke at Exeter and at Honiton. Bull-dogs were set upon him, as he rode through the latter town, and he was pelted with stones by an outrageous mob, who cried "Wilkes and Liberty;" "the peacemaker."† Junius took up the hint. The duke was assaulted on the 30th of July. On the 19th of September appeared a letter in which "the peacemaker," who as ambassador to France negotiated the peace of Paris, was accused of having made disadvantageous terms for his country upon the receipt of pecuniary compensations. With reference to the Devonshire outrages we have this passage: "Your friends will ask, perhaps, whither shall this unhappy old man retire? Can he remain in the metropolis, where his life has been often threatened, and his palace so often attacked? If he returns to Woburn, scorn and mockery await him. He must create a solitude round his estate, if he would avoid the face of reproach and derision. At Plymouth his destruction would be more than probable: at Exeter, inevitable." Lord Brougham has devoted a paper to the vindication of the character of John, fourth Duke of Bedford—"to rescue the memory of an able, an amiable, and an honorable man, long engaged in the public service, both as a minister, a negotiator, and a viceroy—long filling, like all his illustrious house, in every age of our history, an exalted place among the champions of our free constitution—from the obloquy with which a licentious press loaded him when living." Lord Brougham makes the complete refutation which he gives to the falsehoods of Junius, a test of "the claims of a noted slanderer to public confidence."‡

The celebrated address of Junius to the king may properly close our notice of this overestimated writer. Of that depth of political information which it has been the fashion to attribute to Junius, this address exhibits no trace. It is a tedious homily, displaying no accurate perception of the character of George III., and touching none of the points on which he was really open to animadversion. He is blamed for his encouragement of "the natives of Scotland;" for removing on his accession the ablest servants of the crown for "a little personal motive of pique and resentment"—not alluding to the design of governing by "the king's friends;" of hastily concluding a peace with "the natural enemies of this country." The contest with Wilkes is gone over, without any stronger argument than very dull sarcasm upon the king's ministers. Allusion is made to Charles I., but only to point to the treachery of his Scotch subjects. The peroration is like the bounce at the end of a squib: "The name of Stuart, of itself, is only contemptible; armed with the sovereign authority, their principles are formidable. The prince who imitates their conduct should be warned by examples; and, while he plumes himself upon the security of his title to the crown, should remember that, as it was acquired by one revolution, it may be lost by another." Mr. Woodfall was prosecuted for this address, and was tried before Lord Mansfield, in June, 1770. The jury had been charged to consider, first, the printing and publishing the paper; secondly, the sense and meaning of it. But the chief justice told them that as to the charge of its being malicious, seditious, etc., these were inferences in law about which no evidence need be given. The jury returned a verdict of "Guilty of printing and publishing only." The Court of King's Bench decided that a new trial should be granted, but the original newspaper not being produced, the proceedings fell to the ground. Out of this trial grew a material alleviation of the libel law.

On the 9th of May the parliament was prorogued. It was the day after the final decision on the Middlesex election. In the speech from the throne the members were exhorted, "with more than ordinary earnestness," to exert their utmost efforts for the maintenance of the public peace. The excitement throughout the country was considerable, but it rarely took the form of tumult. It was manifest, however, that the supposed victory of the government would not give the nation that quiet which sanguine courtiers anticipated. Lord Chatham came forth from his long retirement, and attended the king's levée on the 7th of July—"he himself, *in propriâ personâ*, and not in a strait-waistcoat," as Walpole writes. From the MS. memoirs of the Duke of Grafton we find that Chatham, when called by the king into his closet, objected to the course which had been pursued in the case of Wilkes, and stated "that he doubted whether his health would ever again allow him to attend parliament, but if it did, and if he should give his dissent to any measure, that his majesty would be indulgent enough to believe that it would not arise from any personal consideration."

On the 9th of January, 1770, the parliament was opened by the king. With a singular want of perception of the ridiculous, the first words of the royal speech were these: "My Lords and Gentlemen. It is with much concern that I find myself obliged to open the session of parliament with acquainting you that the distemper among the horned cattle has lately broke out in this kingdom." The petitions which had been presented from corporations and counties received no notice in this speech. Junius, with some justice, said to the Duke of Grafton, "While the whole kingdom was agitated with anxious expectation upon one great point, you meanly evaded the question; and instead of the firmness and decision of a king, gave us nothing but the misery of a ruined grazier." But a voice more terrible than that of Junius was to rouse the government from its seeming unconcern. In the House of Lords Chatham moved an amendment to the address, pledging the peers that they would take into their most serious consideration the causes of the discontents which so generally prevailed, and particularly the late proceedings in the House of Commons touching the incapacity of John Wilkes, Esq., to be elected a member of the present parliament. The scene in the upper house on this occasion must have been as exciting as any in the history of our country. The speech by which Chatham introduced the amendment, as well as the speech of Lord Mansfield, and Lord Chatham's reply, were first published in 1792, from a report of Mr. Francis, afterward Sir Philip Francis, upon whom rests the prevailing opinion that he was Junius. We may judge by the follow-

* "Quarterly Review," vol. xc. p. 101.
† Journal of the Duke, in "Cavendish Debates," p. 620.
‡ "Sketches of Statesmen who flourished in the time of George III."

ing passage of the tendency of Chatham's speech: "The liberty of the subject is invaded, not only in the provinces but here at home! The English people are loud in their complaints; they demand redress; and, depend upon it, my lords, that, one way or another, they will have redress. They will never return to a state of tranquillity till they are redressed. Nor ought they. For in my judgment, my lords, and I speak it boldly, it were better for them to perish in a glorious contention for their rights, than to purchase a slavish tranquillity at the expense of a single iota of the constitution." Lord Mansfield spoke, contending that the proposed amendment was an attack upon the privileges of the other house of parliament. This produced a reply from Lord Chatham. When men speak of the eloquence of this wondrous orator, they quote such passages of this speech as the following.

On the usurpation of power by the House of Commons: "The constitution of this country has been openly invaded in fact; and I have heard, with horror and astonishment, that very invasion defended upon principle. What is this mysterious power, undefined by law, unknown to the subject, which we must not approach without awe, nor speak of without reverence—which no man may question, and to which all men must submit? My lords, I thought the slavish doctrine of passive obedience had long since been exploded; and, when our kings were obliged to confess that their title to the crown, and the rule of their government, had no other foundation than the known laws of the land, I never expected to hear a divine right, or a divine infallibility, attributed to any other branch of the legislature. My lords, I beg to be understood. No man respects the House of Commons more than I do, or would contend more strenuously than I would, to preserve to them their just and legal authority. Within the bounds prescribed by the constitution, that authority is necessary for the well-being of the people. Beyond that line every exertion of power is arbitrary, is illegal; it threatens tyranny to the people and destruction to the state. Power without right is the most odious and detestable object that can be offered to the human imagination. It is not only pernicious to those who are subject to it, but tends to its own destruction. . . . The House of Commons, we are told, have a supreme jurisdiction, and there is no appeal from their sentence; and that wherever they are competent judges, their decision must be received and submitted to, as, *ipso facto*, the law of the land. My lords, I am a plain man, and have been brought up in a religious reverence for the original simplicity of the laws of England. By what sophistry they have been perverted, by what artifices they have been involved in obscurity, is not for me to explain. The principles, however, of the English laws are still sufficiently clear; they are founded in reason, and are the masterpiece of the human understanding; but it is in the text that I would look for a direction to my judgment, not in the commentaries of modern professors. The noble lord assures us that he knows not in what code the law of parliament is to be found; that the House of Commons, when they act as judges, have no law to direct them but their own wisdom; that their decision is law; and if they determine wrong, the subject has no appeal but to Heaven. What then, my lords? Are all the generous efforts of our ancestors, are all those glorious contentions, by which they meant to secure to themselves, and to transmit to their posterity, a known law, a certain rule of living, reduced to this conclusion, that instead of the arbitrary power of a king, we must submit to the arbitrary power of the House of Commons? If this be true, what benefit do we derive from the exchange? Tyranny, my lords, is detestable in every shape, but in none so formidable as when it is assumed and exercised by a number of tyrants. But, my lords, this is not the fact; this is not the constitution. We *have* a law of parliament. We have a code in which every honest man may find it. We have Magna Charta. We have the statute-book, and the Bill of Rights." . . .

Could the mischief of the decision of the House of Commons not be redressed: "If we are to believe the noble lord, this great grievance, this manifest violation of the first principles of the constitution, will not admit of a remedy. It is not even capable of redress, unless we appeal at once to Heaven! My lords, I have better hopes of the constitution, and a firmer confidence in the wisdom and constitutional authority of this house. It is to *your* ancestors, my lords, it is to the English barons, that we are indebted for the laws and constitution we possess. Their virtues were rude and uncultivated, but they were great and sincere. Their understandings were as little polished as their manners, but they had hearts to distinguish right from wrong; they had heads to distinguish truth from falsehood; they understood the rights of humanity, and they had spirit to maintain them. My lords, I think that history has not done justice to their conduct, when they obtained from their sovereign that great acknowledgment of national rights contained in Magna Charta: they did not confine it to themselves alone, but delivered it as a common blessing to the whole people. They did not say, these are the rights of the great barons, or these are the rights of the great prelates. No, my lords, they said, in the simple Latin of the times, 'nullus liber homo' [no free man], and provided as carefully for the meanest subject as for the greatest. These are uncouth words, and sound but poorly in the ears of scholars, neither are they addressed to the criticism of scholars, but to the hearts of free men. These three words, 'nullus liber homo,' have a meaning which interests us all. They deserve to be remembered—they deserve to be inculcated in our minds—they are worth all the classics. Let us not, then, degenerate from the glorious example of our ancestors. Those iron barons (for so I may call them when compared with silken barons of modern days) were the guardians of the people; yet their virtues, my lords, were never engaged in a question of such importance as the present. A breach has been made in the constitution—the battlements are dismantled—the citadel is open to the first invader—the walls totter—the constitution is not tenable. What remains, then, but for us to stand forward in the breach, and repair it, or perish in it?"

That memorable debate of the Peers on the 9th of January was closed by an event which was not unexpected, but which formed a striking exception to the ordinary course of the actions of great statesmen. It is clear from the Chatham Correspondence that the Lord Chancellor Camden and the Marquis of Granby were to a certain extent under the influence of Chatham. His confidential correspondent, Mr. John Calcraft, writes to him, on the 28th of November, to beg "that they may be put on their guard" not to attend a particular council. "Fearing neither of our friends are the best politicians, I cannot help harboring doubts but they may get entangled at this council, for no pains will be spared." Camden, Granby, and Conway, as well as Grafton, in the spring of 1769, held to the necessity of not attempting any taxation of America by import duties. They were overruled. Grafton remained in power, and Camden and Granby did not quit their employments. The schism in the cabinet was made more serious by the question of Wilkes. After Chatham's speech, on the 9th of January, Camden rose from the woolsack, and thus threw off all restraint: "I accepted the great seal without conditions; I meant not, therefore, to be trammelled by his majesty—I beg pardon, by his ministers—but I have suffered myself to be so too long. For some time I have beheld with silent indignation the arbitrary measures of the minister. I have often drooped and hung down my head in council, and disapproved by my looks those steps which I knew my avowed opposition could not prevent. I will do so no longer, but openly and boldly speak my sentiments. I now proclaim to the world that I entirely coincide in the opinion expressed by my noble friend—whose presence again reanimates us—respecting this unconstitutional vote of the House of Commons. If, in giving my opinion as a judge, I were to pay any respect to that vote, I should look upon myself as a traitor to my trust, and an enemy to my country. By their violent and tyrannical conduct, ministers have alienated the minds of the people from his majesty's government—I had almost said from his majesty's person—insomuch that if some measures are not devised to appease the clamors so universally prevalent, I know not, my lords, whether the people, in despair, may not become their own avengers, and take the redress of grievances into their own hands."

In the House of Commons the Marquis of Granby voted for the amendment which had been proposed in opposition to the government. The lord chancellor and the commander-in-chief were thus in open hostility with the other members of the cabinet. Such an anomalous state could not long endure. Chatham, Temple, and their friends were waiting the issue with extreme solicitude. Granby had been earnestly entreated to retain his command of the army in spite of his vote. "The king, it seems, and the Duke of Grafton are upon their knees to Lord Granby not to resign," writes Temple to Chatham.*

* "Chatham Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 391.

Chatham grieves that twenty-four hours' respite has been granted to a minister's entreaties.* He was at last set at rest by Granby's resignation. But he regrets that the chancellor had dragged the great seal for an hour at the heels of a desperate minister.† His high office had been offered to Mr. Charles Yorke, the son of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke. It was a prize he had long coveted; but to accept it would be to desert his party. He declined. Three days after he went to the levée at St. James's, and, at the earnest entreaties of the king, he kissed the royal hand as chancellor. Camden was dismissed. Yorke, borne down by agitation of mind, died, as was supposed by his own hand, on the 20th of January. On the 22d there came on another great debate in the House of Lords on the state of the nation, in which Chatham announced his cordial union with the party of Rockingham. It was on this occasion that Chatham recommended a specific plan of parliamentary reform. "The boroughs of this country have properly enough been called 'the rotten parts' of the constitution. But in my judgment, my lords, these boroughs, corrupt as they are, must be considered as the natural infirmity of the constitution. Like the infirmities of the body, we must bear them with patience, and submit to carry them about with us. The limb is mortified, but the amputation might be death. Let us try, my lords, whether some gentler remedies may not be discovered. Since we cannot cure the disorder, let us endeavor to infuse such a portion of new health into the constitution as may enable it to support its most inveterate diseases. The representation of the counties is, I think, still preserved pure and uncorrupted. That of the greatest cities is upon a footing equally respectable; and there are many of the larger trading towns which still preserve their independence. The infusion of health which I now allude to would be to permit every county to elect one member more, in addition to their present representation. The knights of the shires approach nearest to the constitutional representation of the country, because they represent the soil. It is not in the little dependent boroughs, it is in the great cities and counties, that the strength and vigor of the constitution resides; and by them alone, if an unhappy question should ever arise, will the constitution be honestly and firmly defended. It would increase that strength, because I think it is the only security we have against the profligacy of the times, the corruption of the people, and the ambition of the crown."

The continued debate on the state of the nation was deferred till the 2d of February. On the 28th of January the Duke of Grafton resigned. The king was not unprepared for this event. On the 23d of January he thus wrote to Lord North: "Lord Weymouth and Lord Gower will wait upon you this morning to press you in the strongest manner to accept the office of first lord commissioner of the treasury. My mind is more and more strengthened in the rightness of the measure, which would prevent every other desertion. You must easily see that if you do not accept I have no peer at present that I would consent to place in the Duke of Grafton's employment." "The rightness of the measure" was to be tested by twelve years of national calamity.

CHAPTER CLXVII.

Lord North's administration—Retrospect of colonial affairs—Opposition to the Revenue Act—Debates in parliament on American proceedings—Measures of coercion proposed—Lord Hillsborough—Virginia—Outrages in Boston—Repeal of duties, except that on teas—Encounter with the military at Boston—Renewal of the conflict regarding Wilkes—Remonstrance of the city of London—Beckford's address to the king—Printers arrested for publishing debates—Released by the city authorities—Riots—The lord mayor and an alderman committed—Officers of state.

The domestic agitations during the period of the Duke of Grafton's ministry required to be given in an unbroken narrative. We now take up the more truly important relation of those events in the North American colonies, and of the mode in which they were dealt with by the imperial government. These facts form the prologue to the tragedy of the American Revolution.

In 1768 a third secretary of state was appointed. The office of secretary of state for Scotland had been abolished; but now a new place was created for the Earl of Hillsborough—the secretaryship of the colonies. It was a position of authority which demanded a rare union of firmness and moderation. But the secretary was a member of a cabinet divided in judgment on the great question of American taxation; and Lord Hillsborough was of the party of the Duke of Bedford, who held opinions on that subject not exactly in consonance with that championship of our free constitution which has been claimed for him.* Hillsborough had to deal with colonial subjects of the British crown whose indignation at the Stamp Act had been revived by Charles Townshend's fatal measures for granting duties in America on glass, red and white lead, painters' colors, paper, and tea. These duties were not to be collected until the 20th of November, 1767. That day passed over in quiet in Boston; but the inhabitants had previously assembled, and had entered into resolutions to forbear the use of many articles of British produce or manufacture. The principle of resistance to the Revenue Act of 1767 was declared in a work largely circulated, entitled "Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania." The author was John Dickinson. Franklin republished these letters in London, although they were opposed to his earlier opinion that external taxation—import duties—were essentially less obnoxious than internal taxation—a Stamp Act. In February, 1768, the Assembly of Massachusetts, between which body and the governor, Francis Bernard, there had been serious disputes, addressed a circular letter to the other provinces, inviting them to unite in opposing the act for raising a revenue in the colonies. When the intelligence of this circular reached London, Hillsborough wrote to Bernard directing him to require, in the king's name, the House of Representatives in Massachusetts to rescind the resolution which produced the circular letter from their speaker; and if they refused, immediately to dissolve them. The governors of the other colonies were ordered to pursue a similar course, if the assemblies gave any countenance to the "seditious paper" of Massachusetts. The dissolution of the assembly of that State took place on the 1st of July, 1768, on its refusal, by a very large majority, to rescind the resolution. At that time there was a great ferment in Boston, occasioned by the seizure of a sloop laden with wine from Madeira, which had been attempted to be landed without paying duty. The new commissioners of customs directed the seizure; but a riot ensuing, they fled in terror to a fortress at the mouth of the harbor. It was now ascertained, from a letter written by Hillsborough to Bernard at the very time that this riot was taking place, that troops were ordered to be sent from Halifax to Boston. Some of the more violent inhabitants proposed to arm; others requested the governor to call together another assembly. He refused to do so. The bold step was then taken by the popular leaders of summoning a convention to meet at Boston. Elections took place; and committee-men, as they were termed, from ninety-five towns or districts held sittings in a building belonging to the people of Boston, known as Faneuil Hall. The convention sat only six days. The governor had remonstrated against this body of delegates attempting to transact the public business, and warned them of the penal consequences which they might incur if they did not separate. They protested, however, against taxation of the colonies by the British parliament, and against a standing army. They addressed a petition to the king. They recommended to all the preservation of good order. On the 28th of September a squadron arrived from Halifax, conveying a large body troops with artillery. Other troops continued to arrive; and four regiments were encamped near the city, or found their lodging in any public building. It was illegal to quarter them on the inhabitants. There was quiet; but the spirit of resistance was not thus to be extinguished. That spirit was not confined to Massachusetts, although the determination to counteract the operation of the Revenue Act took only the form of associations who agreed not to consume the produce or manufactures of the mother country. The "Sons of Liberty," as they were called, would wear no English broadcloth, and the "Daughters of Liberty" would drink no tea if a duty were to be paid of threepence a pound. The consumers of tea in England paid four times as much duty; but the colonists denied the right of the imperial parliament to levy any duty at all upon those who were unrepresented.

The king, on opening the parliament on the 8th of November, 1768, spoke in severe terms of the proceedings in North America. The

* "Chatham Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 392. † Ibid., p. 398.

* See *ante*.

spirit of faction had broken out afresh; one of the colonies had proceeded to acts of violence and of resistance to the execution of the law; the capital town of that colony was in a state of disobedience to all law and government—had adopted measures subversive of the constitution, and attended with circumstances that might manifest a disposition to throw off their dependence on Great Britain. Not a word was uttered of the cause of this disobedience. Turbulent and seditious persons were to be defeated. On the 15th of December, in the House of Lords, the Duke of Bedford moved an address to the king, recommending that the chief authors and instigators of the late disorders in Massachusetts should be brought to condign punishment; and beseeching his majesty that he would direct the governor of that colony "to take the most effectual methods for procuring the fullest information that can be obtained touching all treasons or misprision of treason committed within this government since the 30th day of December last, and to transmit the same, together with the names of the persons who were most active in the commission of such offences, to one of your majesty's principal secretaries of state, in order that your majesty may issue a special commission for inquiring of, hearing, and determining the said offences within this realm, pursuant to the provisions of the statute of the 35th year of the reign of King Henry VIII., in case your majesty shall, upon receiving the said information, see sufficient ground for such a proceeding." This most arbitrary proposal was carried without a division. In the House of Commons, at the opening of the session, Mr. Stanley, the seconder of the address, said that the people of the insolent town of Boston "must be treated as aliens." "It is not arms that govern a people," exclaimed Burke. Beckford spoke with plain English honesty: "At the time of passing the American Stamp Act I openly declared it to be my opinion that taxing America for the sake of raising a revenue would never do. Why would you stir these waters? Let the nation return to its old good-nature and its old good-humor." The resolutions and address of the Lords had been sent down to the Commons. On the 26th of January, 1769, the proposal of the Duke of Bedford was strenuously resisted and feebly defended. Burke said, with regard to this dangerous remedy for disaffection, "You fire a cannon upon your enemy which will react upon yourselves." Why, he said, do you call for this act of Henry VIII. to be put in force? "Because you cannot trust a jury of that country. If you have not a party among two millions of people, you must either change your plan of government or renounce the colonies forever." George Grenville said the resolution was "so much waste paper. . . . Your conduct reminds me of the story of the sailor who climbed up to the top of the mainmast: on being asked what he was doing, he said he was doing nothing, and that the lad was helping him." * The most practical advice was offered to the house by Mr. Pownall, who had been governor of Massachusetts: "Let the matter of right rest upon the declaratory law, and say no more about it." †

The minority, whether in parliament or among the nation generally, who opposed the principle of American taxation, little knew in the spring of 1769 how near they were to a triumph. On the 19th of April Governor Pownall moved that the house should go into committee to consider the act passed for granting certain duties on the American colonies. There was a short debate, but the motion was rejected, by what Lord North called "a mannerly way of putting aside the present question"—namely, by moving the orders of the day. On the 9th of May the parliament was prorogued. But on the 1st of May a cabinet council was held, in which the result of a deliberation on the question of America is thus described by the Duke of Grafton in his MS. memoirs: "The internal state of the country was really alarming; and from my situation I had more cause to feel it than any other man. But a measure at this time adopted by a majority of the king's servants gave me still more apprehension, considering it to be big with more mischief; for, contrary to my proposal of including the article of teas, together with all the other trifling objects of taxation, to be repealed on the opening of the next session, it was decided that the teas were still to remain taxed as before, though contrary to the declared opinions of Lord Camden, Lord Granby, General Conway, and myself. Sir Edward Hawke was absent through illness; otherwise I think he would have agreed with those who voted for including the teas in the repeal." The Duke of Grafton then proceeds distinctly to accuse Lord Hillsborough of having suppressed in the minute of the council, which was to be communicated to the colonial governors, "words as kind and lenient as could be proposed by some of us, and not without encouraging expressions which were too evidently displeasing to his lordship." Camden charged Hillsborough with this suppression, which he denied. The presumptuous secretary, who evidently acted with some authority from a higher quarter, not only garbled the minute, but accompanied it with a circular letter, which Grafton terms "unfortunate and unwarrantable—calculated to do all mischief, when our real minute might have paved the way to some good." Grafton and Camden felt that their power was gone. They ought to have resigned and denounced their dangerous colleague. The tea duties were to be retained upon the principle maintained by the king, that "there must always be one tax to keep up the right."

While the king's ministers were thus divided upon the question of which few men saw the real importance, a demonstration of opinion was taking place in one of the colonies, of far more significance than the riots at Boston and the meeting of its convention. Lord Hillsborough had removed Sir Jeffrey Amherst from the post of Governor of Virginia, and had appointed in his place Lord Boutetort, who, in a lucrative American office, could repair the consequences of his extravagance at home. In 1758 America had been called "the hospital of England;" the places in the gift of the crown being filled "with broken members of parliament, of bad if any principle; valets de chambre, electioneering scoundrels, and even livery servants." * Lord Boutetort was a faded courtier, whose rank would be acceptable to the aristocratic families of Virginia, and whose parade might dazzle the eyes of discontented politicians. Boutetort, the only governor who had appeared in Virginia within memory, opened the session of the Legislature of Virginia, at Williamsburg, with royal pomp. He went to the House of Representatives in a state carriage drawn by six white horses. He gave splendid entertainments. A dutiful address was presented to him, which he answered with the most perfect courtesy.† But there were men in that assembly of a character not to be propitiated by cream-colored horses or sumptuous feasts. George Washington, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, Peyton Randolph, were members of that assembly. The House of Burgesses followed up its dutiful address by unanimous resolutions, in which they asserted that the right of laying taxes on Virginia was exclusively vested in its own legislature; and pronounced that the mode of trial recommended in parliament upon charges of high treason was illegal and unconstitutional. The governor, without waiting for an official communication, dissolved the assembly. On the next day the members assembled at the Raleigh tavern; and in a room called "The Apollo"—probably in memory of the famous Apollo Room, where Ben Jonson prescribed his "*Leges Conviviales*"—eighty-eight pledged themselves not to import or purchase certain articles of British merchandise while the Revenue Act was unrepealed, and signed resolutions to that effect. The example spread. Pennsylvania approved the resolutions. Delaware adopted them.

The Assembly of Massachusetts was at last legally convened in May, 1769. The members complained that they could not discuss the public affairs with freedom, being surrounded with an armed force. The governor told them he had no authority over the ships in the port or the troops in the town. The place of assembling was removed to the town of Cambridge. The two authorities continued hostile, and the assembly was prorogued. Sir Francis Bernard was recalled to England, and a lieutenant-governor, Hutchinson, an American, remained in authority. Then commenced a series of outrages on the part of the leaders of the non-importation agreement, which was disgraceful to the cause which would have had far better argument in moderation. Obnoxious persons were tarred and feathered. At a public dinner, "Strong halters, firm blocks, and sharp axes, to such as deserve them," was one of the toasts.‡ These excesses, which are slightly passed over by the historian of the American Revolution, elicited the following remarks from Lord Chatham, strenuous as he was in contending for the right of America to be untaxed by Great Britain. His words are not reported in the "Parlia-

* "Cavendish Debates," vol. i. p. 203. † Ibid., p. 225.

* Letter of General Huske in Phillimore's "Memoirs of Lord Lyttelton." † Bancroft, "American Revolution," vol. iii. p. 309. ‡ Ibid., p. 342.

mentary History," but they are given in a letter from Mr. Johnson, agent for Connecticut. * "I have been thought to be, perhaps, too much the friend of America. I own I am a friend to that country. I love the Americans because they love liberty, and I love them for the noble efforts they made in the last war. But I must own I find fault with them in many things; I think they carry matters too far; they have been wrong in many respects. I think the idea of drawing money from them by taxes as ill-judged. Trade is your object with them, and they should be encouraged. But (I wish every sensible American, both here and in that country, heard what I say), if they carry their notions of liberty too far, as I fear they do, if they will not be subject to the laws of this country, especially if they would disengage themselves from the laws of trade and navigation, of which I see too many symptoms, as much of an American as I am, they have not a more determined opposer than they will find in me."

We have now reached the period of Lord North's administration. On the 5th of March, 1770, on the House of Commons proceeding to take into consideration the petition of the merchants of London trading to North America, the first lord of the treasury, in a temperate speech, moved the repeal of such portions of the act of 1767 as laid duties upon glass and other articles, omitting any mention of tea. "I cannot propose," he said, "any further repeal than what it was my intention to promise them. The Americans, by their subsequent behavior, have not deserved any particular indulgence from this country." Upon this principle many a mistaken policy has been persisted in, out of pure defiance of the excesses which that policy has provoked. "We will not be driven to repeal, by any threats held out to us," said the minister. He anticipated no larger revenue than 12,000*l.* a year from the tea duties, but he would not give up the right to tax America which was asserted in the preamble of the act imposing the duties. There was much discussion upon the particular point in dispute; but Colonel Barré took a broad view of the whole question: "For three years we have seen nothing but the folly and absurdity of succeeding administrations. If the former erred, they had the sense of the nation with them; they acted upon a system. We are now proceeding upon no system at all: what we do carries nothing with it but monuments of our tyranny and folly. . . . Why suffer these discontents to rankle in the minds of your American subjects? I suspect we are not safe behind this peace. With your colonies discontented, what would be your condition if a war should break out? Could you depend upon receiving their support? With their minds soured, they might, perhaps, go further: they might take you at an unlucky moment, and compel you to come into their terms." The proposition of Lord North was carried by a majority of sixty-two. Franklin, writing to a friend in America, says of this result, "I think the repeal would have been carried, but that the ministry were persuaded by Governor Bernard, and some lying letters, said to be from Boston, that the associations not to import were all breaking to pieces; that America was in the greatest distress for the want of the goods; that we could not possibly subsist any longer without them, and must, of course, submit to any terms parliament should think fit to impose upon us. The ministerial people gave out that certain advices were received of our beginning to break our agreements; of our attempts to manufacture proving all abortive, and ruining the undertakers; of our distress for want of goods, and dissensions among ourselves, which promised the total defeat of all such kind of combinations, and the prevention of them for the future, if the government were not urged imprudently to repeal the duties. But now that it appears, from late and authentic accounts, that agreements continue in full force, that a ship is actually returned from Boston to Bristol with nails and glass (articles that were thought of the utmost necessity), and that the ships, which were waiting here for the determination of parliament, are actually returning to North America in their ballast, the tone begins to change."

On the same day that the British parliament was voting against the repeal of the tea duties the people of Boston were fighting with British soldiers in their streets. The story of this conflict has been related as if, as is generally the case, there were not egregious faults on both sides. "At the cry of innocent blood shed by the soldiery, the continent heaved like a troubled ocean," writes Mr. Bancroft.* There was a quarrel between a soldier and some workmen at a ropewalk. The soldier challenged one to fight in the good old English fashion of fisticuffs, was beaten, and came back with some of his companions for revenge. A general scuffle ensued, and the troops were driven to their barracks. Sunday intervened; but on Monday, the 5th of March, the troops, who had been stimulating each other, came forth in the evening, and offering some insults to the townsmen, there was a serious tumult. This was at length quieted. The more prudent of the citizens cried "Home, home;" but many boys remained, daring the soldiers, and calling them "lobsters." They at last surrounded a sentinel; and Captain Preston, the captain of the day, ordered the main guard to turn out. The captain, a corporal, and six men marched to the rescue of the sentinel. They began to load; and then a party of the townsmen passed along the front of the soldiers and struck their muskets with sticks. They dared the guard to fire, calling them "lobster scoundrels." One of the soldiers received a blow with a stick thrown at him, and he shot a mulatto. Two other persons were killed, and eight wounded. A warrant was issued against Preston, who surrendered himself, and the soldiers were committed to prison. With great good sense Governor Hutchinson and the colonel in command removed all the troops from the town. The affray was called "a massacre." When Preston was tried for murder, a few months afterward, no counsel dared undertake his defence, till John Adams, a rising advocate, devoted to the popular cause, but more devoted to his duty, accepted a brief, and the jury returned a verdict of not guilty. The high-minded barrister became the President of the United States. Two of the soldiers were found guilty of manslaughter. On the 9th of May Burke brought forward a motion for inquiry into the late disorders in America. On that occasion George Grenville made his last speech in parliament, he dying in the following November. His concluding words, in giving his assent to Burke's motion, were solemn and prophetic: "If, by the neglect of his ministers, our beloved sovereign should leave his crown to his successor diminished and dishonored, then, sir, let those who brought the misery upon us rise up severally and say, 'I was the man who formed those incompetent plans; I was the man who advised this plan and that plan; I was the man to whom all these fatal consequences are owing.'"

When the American colonists came to know that the British parliament had repealed all the duties laid by the act of 1767, except that on tea, the spirit which had prompted the non-importation agreements was somewhat allayed. The citizens of New York determined by a large majority to resume importations from England, and many orders were dispatched in July for every kind of merchandise but tea. Other provinces were indignant with the New Yorkists. Massachusetts maintained a position of sullen defiance. The jurymen of Boston had manifested that in the discharge of their duty, in the trial of Captain Preston and the soldiers, they were not to be influenced by popular clamor. The conduct of John Adams showed how high-minded were many of those opponents of an obstinate policy who, in parliamentary language, were usually called rebels. "The language we hold," said Colonel Barré, "is little short of calling the Americans rebels: the language they hold is little short of calling us tyrants—rebels on one side, tyrants on the other." It was thus that the men of England and the men of America were mutually inflamed. Although, for two or three years, there was in America an apparent calm—a deceptive absence of violence which looked like peace—the time was rapidly approaching when the exhortation of Mr. Wedderburn, in 1770, before he became Lord North's solicitor-general, would be looked upon as a prophecy: "How, sir, will it hereafter sound in the annals of the present reign, that all America—the fruit of so many years' settlement, nurtured by this country at the price of so much blood and treasure—was lost to the crown of Great Britain in the reign of George III.?" † While there is a lull in this transatlantic tempest, let us revert to our domestic affairs—petty in their details, but very significant in their tendencies.

The parliamentary conflict on the question of the Middlesex election was not likely to drop after the great debates on the address at the opening of the session of 1770. Mr. Sheriff Townsend, in his

* Note of Mr. Jared Sparks, in his edition of Franklin's Works.

* "American Revolution," vol. iii. p. 386.

† "Cavendish Debates," vol. ii. p. 30.

place in the House of Commons on the 7th of February, declared, upon going into a committee of ways and means, that it was not his intention to pay the land tax. He would state the case as on the part of the freeholders of Middlesex. Their lawful representative, Mr. Wilkes, was kept out of the house by force and violence. Mr. Luttrell was not their representative. Lord North told the worthy sheriff that if any demand upon him was illegal, the law would relieve him. He refused to pay the tax; his goods were distrained; he brought an action against the collector; and Lord Mansfield having charged the jury that the question was no other than whether there was a legislative power in this country, the jury found for the defendant. The declaration of Mr. Townsend was an indication of the prevailing temper of the citizens of London. On the 14th of March the lord mayor and sheriffs, a few aldermen, and a great number of the common council, exercising the ancient right of the city to present addresses to the king in person, arrived, with an immense concourse of people, at St. James's. The address, remonstrance, and petition offered on this occasion prayed for the dissolution of parliament and the removal of evil ministers; spoke of "secret and malign influence" which had deprived the people of their dearest rights, and declared that the present House of Commons did not represent the people. The king's answer was "deemed by some to have been uncommonly harsh."* His majesty said, "I shall always be ready to receive the requests, and to listen to the complaints, of my subjects: but it gives me great concern to find that any of them should have been so far misled as to offer me an address and remonstrance, the contents of which I cannot but consider as disrespectful to me, injurious to my parliament, and irreconcilable to the principles of the constitution." A debate took place the next day in the House of Commons, upon a motion for an address to his majesty that he would direct a copy of this paper and his answer to be laid before them. The lord mayor (Beckford), Alderman Trecothick, and Sheriffs Townsend and Sawbridge boldly defended the language of the remonstrance. Lord North told them that they would be remembered as the John Lilburns and Dr. Sacheverels of their day. Burke called to the memory of the house the words of Lord Falkland, "Peace! peace!" The Commons, by a large majority, agreed upon an address to the king; having resolved that "to deny the legality of the present parliament, and to assert that the proceedings thereof are not valid, is highly unwarrantable." The general opinion was that the lord mayor and sheriffs courted commitment.† On the 23d of May the lord mayor, aldermen, and common council presented a second remonstrance to the king at St. James's. Walpole says, "It had been drawn up by Lord Chatham, or formed on one of his late speeches." They lamented that his majesty had been advised to lay the weight of his displeasure upon the citizens of London. "We are deeply concerned that what the law allows, and the constitution teaches, hath been misconstrued by ministers, instruments of that influence which shakes the realm into disrespect for your majesty." They demanded "a full, free, and unmutilated parliament." They concluded by saying, "We offer our constant prayers to Heaven that your majesty may reign, as kings only can reign, in and by the hearts of a loyal, dutiful, and free people." The king's answer conveyed no change of opinion on the proceedings of the city: "I should have been wanting to the public as well as to myself if I had not expressed my dissatisfaction at the late address. My sentiments on that subject continue the same." The king had no sooner spoken his answer, writes Walpole, "than, to the astonishment of the whole court, Beckford, the lord mayor, desired leave to say a few words. This was totally unprecedented. Copies of all intended harangues to the sovereign are first transmitted privately to court, that the king may be prepared with an answer. On this occasion the king was totally at a loss how to act. He was sitting in ceremony on his throne, and had no means to consult, no time to consider, what to do. Remaining silent and confounded, Beckford proceeded."‡ The words said to be uttered by the lord mayor are engraved in letters of gold under his monument in the Guildhall of London. Having this distinguished record, it may be proper here to give them:

"Most gracious Sovereign: Will your majesty be pleased so far to condescend as to permit the mayor of your loyal city of London to declare in your royal presence, in behalf of his fellow-citizens, how much the bare apprehension of your majesty's displeasure would at all times affect their minds. The declaration of that displeasure has already filled them with inexpressible anxiety and with the deepest affliction. Permit me, sire, to assure your majesty, that your majesty has not in all your dominions any subjects more faithful, more dutiful, or more affectionate to your majesty's person and family, or more ready to sacrifice their lives and fortunes in the maintenance of the true honor and dignity of your crown. We do therefore, with the greatest humility and submission, most earnestly supplicate your majesty that you will not dismiss us from your presence, without expressing a more favorable opinion of your faithful citizens, and without some comfort, without some prospect at least of redress. Permit me, sire, further to observe, that whoever has already dared, or shall hereafter endeavor, by false insinuations and suggestions, to alienate your majesty's affections from your loyal subjects in general, and from the city of London in particular, and to withdraw your confidence in and regard for your people, is an enemy to your majesty's person and family, a violator of the public peace, and a betrayer of our happy constitution, as it was established at the glorious revolution."

Chatham was in raptures. Two days after he wrote to Beckford, "The spirit of Old England spoke, that never-to-be-forgotten day. . . . Your lordship's mayoralty will be revered till the constitution is destroyed and forgotten." Beckford replied, "What I spoke in the king's presence was uttered in the language of truth, and with that humility and submission which becomes a subject speaking to his lawful king."* Certainly the constitution was somewhat outraged when a subject forgot that ministerial responsibility ought to have sheltered his lawful king from a personal reproof.† Beckford died within a month after this remarkable impulse of an honest but over-zealous partisanshp. The agitations connected with the Middlesex election soon subsided. The term of Wilkes' imprisonment had expired in April; and, in his position of alderman, he became more a city agitator than a demagogue to stir a nation.

In the ensuing session of parliament, in 1771, there was a contest between the House of Commons and the corporation of London which was eventually productive of the highest public benefit. Although both houses held strenuously to the principle that it was the highest offence to publish their debates, the speeches of particular members were frequently printed. Sometimes the privileges of parliament were strictly enforced. At other times little notice was taken of reports, with stars and initials in newspapers and magazines. The thirteenth parliament of Great Britain was one in which the majorities of both houses were on the anti-popular side; and thus the nation had only occasional glimpses of the proceedings of those who presided over their destinies. On the 8th of February, 1771, Colonel Onslow complained to the House of Commons that two newspapers had printed a motion he had made, and a speech against it; and moreover had called him "little Cocking George." Upon his motion the papers were delivered in and read; and the printer of the "Gazetteer," R. Thompson, and the printer of the "Middlesex Chronicle," J. Wheble, were ordered to attend the house. The printers could not be found to serve the orders upon them, and then the house addressed the king that he would issue his royal proclamation for their apprehension. On the 12th of March Colonel Onslow said he was determined to bring this matter to an issue. "To-day I shall only bring before the house three brace, for printing the debates." This wholesale proceeding was resisted by motions for adjournment and amendments, which protracted the debates till five o'clock in the morning, during which the house divided twenty-three times.‡ One member moved an amendment to the motion for summoning one of the printers, by adding, "Together with all his compositors, pressmen, correctors, blackers, and devils;" and Burke said, "It would be as irregular for the printer to come to your bar without them as it would be for you, sir, to come to the house without your mace, or a marshal of the King's Bench without his tipstaff, or a first lord of

* "Annual Register," 1770, p. 79.
† "Chatham Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 429.
‡ "Memoirs of George III.," vol. iv. p. 154.

* "Chatham Correspondence," vol. iii. pp. 462–3.
† See *ante*, p. 842.
‡ "Annual Register," 1771.

the treasury without his majority." * Four of the printers obeyed the orders of the house, made their submission, and were discharged. But the affair now took a more serious turn. The sergeant-at-arms had been ordered to take J. Miller, of the "London Evening Post," into custody. Wheble and Thompson had been previously arrested collusively, by some friends or servants; and, being taken before Alderman Wilkes and Alderman Oliver, were discharged. Miller was apprehended by the officer of the House of Commons, at his house in the city; but the officer was immediately himself taken into custody by a city constable. The parties went before the lord mayor, Crosby, who was attended by Wilkes and Oliver. The lord mayor decided that the arrest of a citizen without the authority of one of the city magistrates was a violation of its charters, and ordered Miller to be released, and the officer of the Commons to give bail to answer a charge of assault. The king, always impatient of resistance to authority, wrote on the 17th of March to Lord North, "If lord mayor and Oliver be not committed, the authority of the House of Commons is annihilated." On the first complaint of Colonel Onslow he had written to his minister, "Is not the House of Lords the best court to bring such miscreants before, as it can fine as well as imprison, and has broader shoulders to support the odium of so salutary a measure?"

On the 18th of March the deputy sergeant-at-arms was desired by the speaker to give an account of the transactions in the city. It was then moved that Brass Crosby, Esq., lord mayor, and a member of parliament, should attend in his place the next day. The lord mayor, although he was ill, came amid the huzzas of a crowd that echoed through the house. He was permitted to sit while defending his conduct, and then he desired to go home, having been in his bedchamber sixteen or seventeen days. The lord mayor was allowed to retire. Charles Fox said, "There are two other criminals, Alderman Oliver and Alderman Wilkes," for which expression "criminals" he was gently reproved by Wedderburn, who had become solicitor-general. Alderman Oliver was then ordered to attend in his place. Wilkes had written a letter to declare that he was the lawful member for Middlesex, and would only appear in the house as a member. Mr. Calcraft writes to Lord Chatham, "The ministers avow Wilkes too dangerous to meddle with. He is to do what he pleases; we are to submit. So his majesty orders; he will have 'nothing more to do with that devil Wilkes.'" † On the 25th of March the lord mayor and Alderman Oliver were in their places. In the course of the debate upon a proposal to commit them to the Tower, members came in, and reported that they had been insulted on their way to the house. The magistrates of Westminster were called, and were ordered to disperse the mob. The debate proceeded. The lord mayor, being again permitted to withdraw, said he should submit himself to whatever the house should do. The populace took the horses from his coach, and drew him in triumph to the Mansion House. After a sitting of nine hours, a motion for adjournment was rejected. When the speaker asked Alderman Oliver what he had to say in his defence, he replied, "I know the punishment I am to receive is determined upon. I have nothing to say, neither in my own defence nor in defence of the city of London. Do what you please. I defy you." ‡

Before the motion for committing Alderman Oliver to the Tower was carried, Colonel Barré left the house, followed by Dunning and about a dozen other members. He wrote to Chatham, "I spoke to this question about five minutes only, but I believe with great violence." To the Tower was Oliver conducted quietly at seven o'clock on the morning of the 27th. On that day the lord mayor again came to the house to attend in his place. A tremendous riot ensued. Mr. Calcraft described the scene to Lord Chatham: "The concourse of people who attended the lord mayor is incredible. They seized Lord North, broke his chariot, had got him among them, and but for Sir William Meredith's interfering would probably have demolished him. This, with the insults to other members, caused an adjournment of business for some hours. The justices came to the bar to declare they could not read the Riot Act, and that their constables were overpowered. The sheriffs were then called upon: they went into the crowd, attended by many members, and quieted them by five o'clock; when we proceeded on business." Upon the resumption of the debate Lord North displayed his anxiety by his tears, and his courage by his words: "I certainly did not come into office at my own desire. Had I my own wish I would have quitted it a hundred times. My love of ease and retirement urged me to it; but as to my resignation now, look at the situation of the country; look at the transactions of this day, and then say whether it would be possible for any man with a grain of spirit, with a grain of sense, with the least love for his country, to think of withdrawing from the service of his king and his country. . . . There are but two ways in which I can go out now—by the will of my sovereign, which I shall be ready to obey; or the pleasure of the gentlemen now at our doors, when they shall be able to do a little more than they have done this day." *

The lord mayor and alderman Oliver remained prisoners in the Tower till the parliament was prorogued on the 8th of May. A prorogation suspends the power under which the privilege of committal is exercised. The house wisely resolved not to renew the perilous dispute with the city in the ensuing session. With equal wisdom the printers of the debates were no more threatened or arrested. On the 1st of May Chatham told the peers some wholesome truths, on the subject of the publication of parliamentary proceedings. The dissatisfaction of the people "had made them uncommonly attentive to the proceedings of parliament. Hence the publication of the parliamentary debates. And where was the injury, if the members acted upon honest principles? For a public assembly to be afraid of having their deliberations published is monstrous, and speaks for itself." It was some years before these principles were completely recognized, in the conviction that a full and impartial report of the debates in parliament is one of the best securities for freedom, for a respect for the laws, and for raising up a national tribunal of public opinion in the place of the passions of demagogues and the violence of mobs. The triumph of the "miscreants" of 1771 led the way to the complete establishment of that wonderful system of reporting which has rendered the newspaper press of this country the clearest mirror of the aggregate thought of a reflecting people.

CHAPTER CLXVIII.

Foreign affairs — Cession of Corsica to France — The Falkland Islands—First partition of Poland—War between Turkey and Russia—Acquisitions of Russia—Suppression of the Jesuits—Home politics—Subscription to Thirty-nine Articles—Test Act—Thirtieth of January—Repeal of laws against forestalling—The Queen of Denmark—Death of the Princess Dowager—The Royal Marriage Act—Retrospect of Indian affairs—East India Company's Regulation Act—Teas duty free to the colonies.

THE turbulence of home politics and the threatening aspect of the colonies left little inclination in the people to think much of foreign affairs. The cession by Genoa, in 1768, of Corsica to France, and the resistance by the Corsican patriot, Paoli, to the occupation of the island by French troops excited interest in a few who could sympathize with heroic actions. Boswell wrote an account of Corsica. The cold Walpole advises Gray to read it: "What relates to Paoli will amuse you much." † The impressible Gray replies, "It has moved me strangely; all, I mean, that relates to Paoli. He is a man born two thousand years after his time." Corsica was subjugated in 1769, and Paoli became an exile from his country, seeking refuge in England. A month after Corsica was annexed to France, Napoleon Bonaparte was born at Ajaccio. In 1768 England was within a hair's-breadth of making war with France in the matter of Corsica. "Corsica a province of France is terrible to me," said Burke. The Duke of Grafton did not go to war, but he sent secret supplies of arms and ammunition to Paoli, who said he could hold out eighteen months. Insurrections continued through 1770 and 1771. The French minister, the Duke de Choiseul, who had annexed Corsica, and was anxious for a rupture with England, was dismissed from power in 1770. "My minister wishes for war," said Louis XV., "but I do not." If war had come, Corsica would most prob-

* "Cavendish Debates," vol. ii. p. 391.
† "Chatham Correspondence," vol. iv. p. 143.
‡ "Cavendish Debates," vol. ii. p. 461.

* "Cavendish Debates." † February 18, 1768.

ably have been a British possession, Napoleon Bonaparte a subject of the British crown. He might have chosen England for the theatre of his rising ambition, have commanded a company of British grenadiers in the war of the French Revolution, and have won a green ribbon instead of an empire.

In 1770, while the influence of the Duke de Choiseul was paramount, Great Britain became involved in a dispute with Spain, which very nearly led to a war in which France would most probably have joined. The Falkland Islands—who cares now to enter into the details of a quarrel about a possession which Johnson calls "tempest-beaten barrenness?" These two islands in the South Atlantic were known by English navigators at the end of the sixteenth century. They were not colonized till the French, in 1764, formed a settlement in East Falkland. The British settled in West Falkland in 1767. The French at that time ceded their colony to the Spaniards; and the Spaniards, at a period of profound peace, in 1770, sent a force of five frigates, with sixteen hundred men, from Buenos Ayres, and drove the British from their fort at Port Egmont. Preparations for war were instantly made. The aggression of Spain was the chief topic of the speech with which the king opened the session of parliament on the 13th of November. There were violent debates in both houses, the opposition accusing the ministry of supineness and pusillanimity. Johnson wrote a pamphlet in defence of the government, which may be read, now the particular points of the quarrel have ceased to interest, for his forcible descriptions of the calamities of war, and his declamation against the folly of plunging two countries into hostilities upon a question of doubtful right. The Spanish government gave way to remonstrance. Mr. Harris, afterward Lord Malmesbury, was the British chargé des affaires at Madrid; and, although at one time war appeared inevitable, the Spanish court finally made restitution. Mr. Harris had been recalled from Spain, in consequence of the language of the Spanish ambassador in London. He was twenty leagues from Madrid on his way home when he met the messenger from St. James's who was sent to say that the Spanish envoy had conceded the demands of the British government.* The sudden change was in consequence of the fall from power of the Duke de Choiseul. England and Spain left the naked rocks and bogs of the Falkland Islands to their wild cattle, till in 1840, after an attempt at occupation by the republic of Buenos Ayres, they were again colonized by the English.

The first partition of Poland by Russia, Prussia, and Austria was made in 1772. On the 5th of August definitive treaties were signed between these powers, by which nearly a third of the Polish territory was divided among them. To Russia was assigned great part of Lithuania; to Austria, Galicia and portions of Podolia and Cracow; to Prussia, Pomerania and the country of the Vistula. Prussia acquired by far the smallest share of the spoil in extent of territory, but incomparably the most valuable, when she obtained Dantzic and the best trading towns of the dismembered country. The events which led to this partition, or rather which were the excuses for it, were connected with the religious and political dissensions of the Polish nobles, priests, and commonalty. An elective monarchy was necessarily subject to the intrusive control of a powerful neighbor. After the death of John Sobieski, at the end of the seventeenth century, his successors, Augustus II. and Augustus III., were little more than the representatives of the court of Russia. The influence of the czarina, Catherine, procured the election of Stanislaus Poniatowski. The favorite of the profligate empress was lifted into a throne by the intrigues of one party of the nobles, supported by a Russian army. From 1764 to 1772 two factions were struggling about civil and religious privileges, while their country was more and more exposed to the danger of an entire loss of its independence. Poland could scarcely be called a nation, if by a nation we mean a community of various classes, with a large intermediate class between the highest and the lowest. Poland was a country of nobles and of serfs. When Russia was about to seize the territories which she coveted, Prussia demanded a share; and to prevent the opposition of the other great neighbor, Austria was propitiated with another share. Maria Theresa, personally, was opposed to the scheme; but her opposition was not of that nature which was likely to interfere with its completion. "I let things go their own way," she said, "but not without the greatest grief."

The indifference of the English government to what was considered by impartial observers "as the first very great breach in the modern political system of Europe,"* was manifested in the diplomatic communications of our court. Mr. Harris, now minister at Berlin, kept Lord Suffolk well informed of the negotiations between Prussia and Russia. The secretary for foreign affairs receives the intelligence very coolly: "I have some reason to apprehend the terms and quantum of this curious transaction are not positively settled, though there is no doubt of the general plan and intention."† Again: "His majesty does not consider the affair of such present importance as to justify acting to prevent it."‡ Mr. Murray, ambassador at Constantinople, who had given some advice to the Porte on the subject, received a very severe admonition from the British government not to meddle with matters on which he had no instructions. Lord Rochford calls the partition of Poland an "extraordinary and unexpected event;" but says, "I am to inform you that, although such a change suggests not improbable apprehensions that *the trade* of Europe may hereafter be affected by it, neither his majesty nor the other commercial powers have thought it of such present importance as to make a direct opposition to it."§ The language of the British government only reflected the temper of the country. Burke describes this apathy: "We behold the destruction of a great kingdom, with the consequent disarrangement of power, dominion, and commerce, with as total an indifference and unconcern as we would read an account of the extermination of one horde of Tartars by another, in the days of Gengis Khan and Tamerlane."‖ Mr. Harris, writing to Lord Suffolk in 1774, upon the completion of the partition by fresh usurpations of territory, indulges a hope which was not to be fulfilled: "There is reason to believe that this affair once settled, that unfortunate republic, after an uninterrupted series of discord, troubles, and disgraces for nearly ten years, in which it has lost its liberty, its finest provinces, and all its consideration in the affairs of Europe, will be left quietly to reflect on its misfortunes, and from its insignificance be unmolested."¶ Twenty-one years afterward Kosciusko fell, and what remained of Poland was divided among the first spoliators.

Intimately connected with the affairs of unhappy Poland was the war between Turkey and Russia. It commenced in October, 1768, under the avowed desire of the sultan, Mustapha III., to save Poland from the calamity of Russian interference in her domestic troubles. The sultan, however, lies under the charge of having proposed a partition of Poland between Turkey and Austria. The war was a serious calamity for the Porte. Its details have become more interesting for us, as the scenes of that conflict present us with the names so familiar in 1855. The war was for some time chiefly between the Polish confederates and their allies the Turks against the Russian troops in Poland. But it soon assumed the more decisive character of a war for an extension of Russian dominion. The generals of each power, in the judgment of the King of Prussia, had no military skill. The battles were terrible sacrifices of life, without intelligent direction, though the Russians had more pretension to tactics. "To have a proper notion of the contest," said Frederick, "we must figure to ourselves a party of one-eyed people thoroughly beating a party of blind men." Eventually the whole country between the Danube and the Dneiper fell into the hands of the Russians. The Crimea was overrun by them. They became masters of Kertsch, Yenikale, and Kaffa. The Turkish fleet was destroyed in the bay of Chesme by a Russian squadron which had sailed from Cronstadt to the Mediterranean. The Russian admiral was assisted by English officers, every indirect aid having been given by the British government to Russia; which power, wrote Lord Rochford, in 1772, "his majesty cannot but look upon as the natural ally of his crown, and with which he is likely, sooner or later, to be closely connected." There was an armistice after the Russian fleet returned to the Baltic, having been very efficiently resisted by Gazi Hassan, an adventurer who raised

* "Diaries and Correspondence of the Earl of Malmesbury," vol. i. p. 61.

* "Annual Register," 1772, p. 2.
† "Malmesbury Diaries," etc., vol. i. p. 70.
‡ Ibid., p. 73.
§ Appendix to Mahon, vol. v.
‖ "Annual Register," 1772, p. 2.
¶ "Diaries," etc., vol. i. p. 99.

imself by his genius and daring to be capitan pasha.* Peace was concluded in 1774. The acquisitions of Russia by the peace of Kuchuk-Kainarji may be thus summed up: Russia obtained the Great and the Little Kabarda, the fortresses of Azof, Kilbarun, Kertsch, and Yenikale; the country between the Bog and the Dneiper; the free navigation of the Black Sea, and a free passage through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles; the co-protectorship over Moldavia and Wallachia; and the protectorship over all the Greek churches within the Turkish empire. The Khanat of the Crimea was declared independent, but it soon became a prey to Russia.

The suppression of the Jesuits, in 1773, "though it has been so long expected," writes Burke, "is so remarkable an event that it will stamp the present year as a distinguished era."† The event was expected, because the abolition of the society by Pope Ganganelli, Clement XIV., was a final measure of the proscription which had been carried on against them, for some years, by the Roman Catholic powers of Europe. They had been expelled from Portugal, in 1759, with many odious circumstances of severity. In 1764 the society was suppressed in France, and their property confiscated. In 1767 the members of the order were driven out of Spain. Clement XIII. strenuously defended the Jesuits. He believed that they were among the firmest supporters of the papacy, and the most faithful champions of religion. He would consent to no change in their constitution; and he was supported by the obstinacy of their chief, Lorenzo Ricci.‡ The Bourbon courts had real or supposed injuries of the Jesuits to revenge. Madame de Pompadour, it is said, had been affronted by her confessor, a Jesuit, who exhorted her wholly to amend her life. The King of Spain believed that they were plotting to put his brother upon the throne. Clement XIII. died in 1769. His successor had been raised to the papal throne by the Bourbon influence. But he was a man of liberal and moderate opinions, and he saw that the institution had outlived its uses as an instrument of papal supremacy, and was out of harmony with the prevailing opinions of his time. However predisposed against the Jesuits, he took several years for inquiry and counsel. On the 31st of July, 1773, he thus pronounced his decision: "Inspired, as we humbly trust, by the Divine Spirit, urged by the duty of restoring the unanimity of the Church, convinced that the Company of Jesus can no longer render those services, to the end of which it was instituted, and moved by other reasons of prudence and state policy which we hold locked in our own breast, we abolish and annul the Society of Jesus, their functions, houses, and institutions." When Ganganelli said "the Company of Jesus can no longer render those services to the end of which it was instituted," he expressed a truth of larger comprehension than their services to the papacy. They had, in spite of their political intrigues, rendered essential aid to the progress of knowledge. Their missions had done more for the spread of information as to the geography of distant countries than for the conversion of the peoples among whom they went. Their success as educators had done more for the freedom of the human mind than their notions of papal authority for its enslavement. They had advanced literature and science amid their incessant efforts to hold society in thraldom. They had waged unceasing war against Protestantism, and during that conflict the prevailing thoughts of Europe had been advancing, and had left them behind. "The general course of events, the development of modern civilization, the liberty of the human mind, all these forces against which the Jesuits were called to contest, were arrayed against them, and conquered them."§ A recent writer has expressed this more tersely: "They stood in the way of the age, and the age swept them from its path."‖ The same acute thinker says: "They were the last defenders of authority and tradition; and it was natural that they should fall in an age when statesmen were sceptics, and theologians were Calvinists." Johnson, while most men exulted in their destruction, "condemned it loudly as a blow to the general power of the Church, and likely to be followed with many dangerous innovations, which might at length become fatal to religion itself."* He was addressing a French abbé, and was perhaps right with regard to France.

There are subjects of home politics which ought to be fully treated in a special history of a particular era, but which must be slightly noticed in a work embracing the whole field of British progress. Thus, in the year 1772, when Wilkes was contending for the shrievalty of London instead of battling with a House of Commons; when the country was no longer agitated with remonstrances and addresses; when Woodfall was reporting the debates of parliament without the terror of the sergeant-at-arms before his eyes—there were interesting discussions in both houses on petitions of some of the clergy and laity that subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles might not be enforced at the universities. But we cannot enter upon any detail of these proceedings. Nor can we do more than notice that the dissenters then obtained a majority in the House of Commons for a repeal of the Test Acts, but were defeated in the upper house. Time gradually matures into practical measures the theories, sometimes crude and undigested, by which social reforms are advanced. There has been, since 1772, a partial concession to the spirit of religious liberty on the subject of subscription. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was among the earliest of those vast improvements which have made the age of Queen Victoria so essentially different from the age of George IV. The constant agitation of questions like these gradually determines public opinion, and reforms are accomplished without violence or ill-will. Thus, in March, 1772, Mr. Montague moved for leave to bring in a bill to repeal so much of the act of the 12th of Charles II. as directs that every 30th of January should be forever kept as a day of fasting and humiliation. When the debates were very meagrely reported, a joke was sometimes carefully preserved; and we learn from the "Parliamentary History" that Mr. Stephen Fox said he thought the ceremony of the day did no harm, unless—addressing the speaker—"it obliges you, sir, to go to church once a year." In 1859 the fast of the 30th of January passed out of the calendar by act of parliament, and the form of prayer, which was called "impious" in the debate of 1772, has vanished from our Liturgy. The motion was rejected. The strongest prejudice must, however, yield at last, and the most prejudiced know that time will settle these conflicts of principle. "I am against abolishing the fast for the 30th of January," said Johnson. "But I should have no objection to make an act continuing it for another century and then letting it expire."† The time he had contemplated had nearly run out when this solemn mockery could no longer be endured.

Upon a question of political economy the parliament of 1772 was in advance of public opinion. It was a period of scarcity. The price of wheat was 35 per cent above the average. Harvests were deficient throughout Europe. Adam Smith represents the feeling of his time in saying, "In years of scarcity the inferior ranks of people impute their distress to the avarice of the corn merchant." The statute of Edward VI. enacted that whoever should buy any corn or grain with intent to sell it again should be reputed an unlawful engrosser, and be subject to various penalties. The statute of Charles II. permitted the engrossing of corn when it was cheap, but the buyer was not to sell again in the same market within three months. The statute of 1772, "for repealing several laws therein mentioned against badgers, engrossers, forestallers, and regrators," boldly declares that these laws are "detrimental to the supply of the laboring and manufacturing poor of this kingdom." The preamble to the statute says that "it hath been found by experience that the restraints laid by several statutes upon dealing in corn, meal, flour, cattle, and sundry other sorts of victuals, by preventing a free trade in the said commodities, have a tendency to discourage the growth and to enhance the price of the same." Nevertheless, the common law was not yet rendered inoperative by public enlightenment. In 1800 the clamors against corn dealers were as violent as in the days of the Tudors; and a merchant was convicted, before Lord Kenyon, for regrating, that is, for selling thirty quarters of oats at an advanced price in the same market on the same day on which he had bought them.

The commencement of the year 1772 brought to George III. an accumulation of family anxieties. On the 29th of January a

* The sketch of this remarkable man in "Anastasius" is held to be perfectly accurate.—Note by Lord Mahon, vol. v. p. 473.
† "Annual Register," 1773, p. 3.
‡ Ranke, "History of the Popes," vol. iii. p. 209.
§ Guizot, "Civilisation en Europe," Douzième Leçon.
‖ Buckle, "Civilization in England," vol. i. p. 783.

* Mrs. Piozzi's "Anecdotes."—Note in Boswell.
† Boswell, March 21st, 1772.

courier arrived from Denmark with the intelligence that the Queen of Denmark, sister of the King of England, had been sent as a prisoner to the castle of Kronberg. Caroline Matilda, the youngest of the numerous family of Frederick, Prince of Wales, was born in 1751, and was married in 1766 to Christian VII., King of Denmark. She is described as very beautiful, of a sweet nature; one whose life would have been happy had she been united to a worthy husband. The King of Denmark was as debased in morals as he was low in intellect—a spiritless wretch, who had given up all care of his subjects to his favorite, Struensee. Verging toward idiocy, the king left his consort to transact state affairs in council with Struensee. The minister was rash and presumptuous, and provoked the hostility of a strong party of the court, who were led by the dowager queen, Juliana Maria, the step-mother of Christian VII. A formidable conspiracy was organized against Struensee, and Caroline Matilda was destined to be the victim with him, upon an accusation against her of conjugal infidelity. She had borne the king a son and a daughter, and had been recently confined with a second daughter. At midnight the king's chamber was suddenly entered, and he was required to sign an order for the arrest of his queen, of Struensee, and of his colleague in the ministry, Brandt. The king was told that they had entered into a plot to depose him; and in terror for his own personal safety he hesitated not to resign his queen and his ministers into the hands of their enemies. Caroline Matilda was dragged from her chamber, refused access to her husband, and with her infant carried off to the castle of Kronberg. Struensee and Brandt were beheaded, after a pretended trial. Proceedings against the queen were suspended by the interposition of the government of George III., and, after a captivity of four months, she was received on board a British man-of-war, but was not permitted to take her child with her. In the castle of Zell, in Hanover, she passed the remaining three years of her unhappy life. There is a record of M. Roques, the pastor of the French Protestant Church at Zell, who was frequently consulted by the queen on the distribution of her charities, that on her death-bed she made a solemn declaration that she had never been unfaithful to her husband.

When this distressing news arrived in England the mother of George III. was dangerously ill. The king, as Walpole relates, was advised to conceal this new misfortune from the princess dowager; but he replied, "My mother *will* know everything, and therefore it is better that I should break it to her by degrees." * On the 8th of February the king wrote this short note to Lord North: "My mother is no more." Of the five sons of the Princess of Wales, two had died—Edward, Duke of York, and Frederick, the youngest son. William, Duke of Gloucester, and Henry, Duke of Cumberland, were at this time under the serious displeasure of their brother the king.

The Marriage Act of 1753 especially excepted members of the royal family from its operation. George II. is represented to have said, "I will not have my family laid under these restraints." In 1771 the Duke of Cumberland, then in his twenty-sixth year, became deeply enamored of Mrs. Horton, the daughter of an Irish peer, Simon Luttrell, Lord Irnham. The duke had been previously notorious for his intrigues, and a jury had awarded damages of ten thousand pounds against him in an action for criminal conversation brought by Lord Grosvenor. The letters of this very silly prince of the blood, produced on this occasion, were the public scorn. In October, 1771, the Duke of Cumberland induced Mrs. Horton to accompany him to Calais, where they were married according to the forms of the English Church. The pair were forbidden the court. What was the mortification of the king, what was the triumph of Wilkes, exclaims Walpole, "when it was known that this new princess of the blood was own sister of the famous Colonel Luttrell, the tool thrust by the court into Wilkes' seat for Middlesex?" † The Duke of Gloucester, in September, 1766—he then being in his twenty-third year—had married the widow of the Earl of Waldegrave. This lady was a natural daughter of Sir Edward Walpole, and as the wife of the nobleman who had been governor to Prince George, had been distinguished for her exemplary character. Walpole says, "The Duke of Cumberland's marriage was a heavy blow on Lady Waldegrave, and seemed to cut off all hopes of the king's permitting the Duke of Gloucester to acknowledge her for his wife." * The Duke of Gloucester's marriage was kept secret.

On the 20th of February the following royal message was brought down to both houses of parliament: "George R. his majesty being desirous, from paternal affection for his own family, and anxious concern for the future welfare of his people, and the honor and dignity of his crown, that the right of approving all marriages in the royal family (which ever has belonged to the kings of this realm as a matter of public concern) may be made effectual, recommends to both houses of parliament to take into their serious consideration whether it may not be wise and expedient to supply the defect of the laws now in being; and, by some new provision, more effectually to guard the descendants of his late majesty King George the Second (other than the issue of princesses who have married or may hereafter marry into foreign families) from marrying without the approbation of his majesty, his heirs, or successors, first had and obtained." The Royal Marriage Bill was presented next day to the House of Lords. It made provision that no prince or princess, descended from George II.—with the exception of the issue of princesses married abroad—should be capable of contracting matrimony without the previous consent of the king, his heirs, or successors. But it also provided that if any such descendant of George II., being above the age of twenty-five, should persist in a resolution to marry, the king's consent being refused, he or she might give notice to the privy council and might at any time within twelve months after such notice contract marriage, unless both houses of parliament, before the expiration of twelve months, should expressly declare their disapprobation of such intended marriage. After continued and vehement debates in both houses the bill became law; and it still continues in force. Its provisions appear to be imperfectly understood. It is called "an encroachment upon the law of nature"—"an impious and cruel measure." † There is a constitutional appeal against an unjust exercise of the prerogative. Such an appeal has never been made; but it would most probably not be made in vain, if any case should arise which would justify parliament in not supporting the sovereign in the assertion of an arbitrary power. However we may deplore the alleged necessity of excepting the highest in the land from the enjoyment of that individual liberty which belongs to the meanest subject, we cannot help repeating a question very pertinently asked, "What turn would English history have taken if this act had never been passed?" ‡ During the progress of the bill the Duke of Gloucester's marriage was avowed. There is a very interesting letter of the Duchess of Gloucester to her father, Sir Edward Walpole, dated the 19th of May; the last debate on the Marriage Act having been on the 24th of March. The following is an extract: "When the Duke of Gloucester married me (which was in September, 1766) I promised him upon no consideration in the world to own it even to you without his permission; which permission I never had till yesterday, when he arrived here in much better health and looks than ever I saw him; yet, as you may suppose, much hurt at all that has passed in his absence: so much so that I have had great difficulty to prevail upon him to let things as much as possible remain as they are. To secure *my* character without injuring his is the utmost of my wishes; and I dare say that you and all my relations will agree with me that I shall be much happier to be called Lady Waldegrave, and respected as Duchess of Gloucester, than to feel myself the cause of his leading such a life as his brother does, in order for me to be called your Royal Highness. . . . If ever I am unfortunate enough to be called Duchess of Gloucester, there is an end of almost all the comforts which I now enjoy, which, if things can go on as they are now, are many." § The domestic miseries of one generation are, happily, frequently put an end to in another generation. The son of William, Duke of Gloucester, the brother of George III., married the Princess Mary, the daughter of George III. ‖

* "Last Journals of Horace Walpole," edited by Dr. Doran, vol. i. p. 4.

† "Memoirs of George III.," vol. iv. p. 356.

* "Memoirs of George III.," vol. iv. p. 360.
† Massey, "George III.," vol. ii. p. 145.
‡ "Quarterly Review," vol. cv. p. 479.
§ "Last Journals of H. Walpole," p. 100.
‖ "On the death of the late Duke of Sussex, the fifth son of King George III., who had been married at Rome in 1792, by a minister of the Church of England, and shortly afterward again in England, according to the rites of the Church of England, it was held that his peerage did not pass to the only son of that marriage, Sir Augustus

In 1773 the parliament turned from its long course of anti-popular contests to look seriously at a matter of paramount national importance. The pecuniary affairs of the East India Company had fallen into great disorder. On the 2d of March a petition was presented from the company to the House of Commons praying for the assistance of a loan of a million and a half sterling. In the previous session a select committee of the house had been appointed to inquire into the affairs of the company. The necessity for such an inquiry was strongly urged, upon financial and moral grounds. The net revenues of Bengal had decreased; the natives were distressed and discontented; the company's servants were arbitrary and oppressive. General Burgoyne, the mover of the resolution for a committee, made an eloquent appeal to the feelings of the house: "The fate of a great portion of the globe; the fate of great states, in which your own is involved; the distresses of fifteen millions of people; the rights of humanity, are involved in this question." To understand the necessity for such an inquiry we must take a rapid glance at the affairs of India, from the period when the French supremacy was utterly destroyed by the energies of Clive. *

In 1760, when the strong hand that had made the English masters of Bengal was withdrawn, the agents of the company, regarding their own enrichment as the immediate business of their lives, and permitting their native factors to pursue a similar course of extortion, Meer Cossein, for whose elevation they had removed the Subahdar whom Clive had raised to power, displayed an inclination to be freed from his English friends. The differences at last came to an open rupture, and Meer Cossein's troops murdered the members of a deputation sent from Calcutta to negotiate with him. In 1763 war was commenced, for the purpose of deposing Meer Cossein and restoring Meer Jaffier. The Subahdar was finally overthrown, but not before he had taken a horrible vengeance upon the English by murdering a hundred and fifty prisoners in the fortress of Patna. The tyrant fled to the Nabob of Oude. Their joint forces were subsequently defeated by the English under Major Munro. Shah Alum, the Great Mogul, who had been driven from his capital of Delhi by the Mahrattas, now sought the British protection. But in spite of victories, the rule of the stranger was one of oppression for the Bengalees, and the undoubted misgovernment of this period justified General Burgoyne to call upon the parliament to redress their wrongs: "Good God! what a call! the native of Hindostan, born a slave; his neck bent from the very cradle to the yoke; by birth, by education, by climate, by religion, a patient, submissive, willing subject to Eastern despotism, first begins to feel, first shakes his chains, for the first time complains, under the pre-eminence of British tyranny."

The misrule of the company's servants in India was unchecked by an united central authority in England. The king's government had as yet no efficient control over Indian affairs. The directors were quarrelling among themselves, and divided into knots contending for supremacy. To establish a just rule over the vast empire that was subject to their power and influence formed a small portion of their deliberations. In India there was no supreme authority, and the three presidencies had rival interests to uphold. The whole dominion of the English would have probably gone to ruin if Clive had not procured an ascendency in the court of directors, and once more sailed for Calcutta with extensive powers, as Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Bengal. His very name soon operated upon the native princes. His judicious measures set some bounds to the rapacity of the company's servants. He made them give pledges to accept no future presents from natives. He debarred high officers from carrying on private trade. He deprived military officers of that extra allowance in the field known as "double batta." For himself, he now cautiously abstained from adding anything to his large fortune by accepting such gratuities as he had received in the early portion of his career. He returned to England in the beginning of 1767, having laid the foundation of that better government which eventually made the British dominion a blessing instead of a curse to India. His biographer has said, "From Clive's second visit to India dates the political ascendency of the English in that country. . . . From Clive's third visit to India dates the purity of the administration of our Eastern empire." *

The successes of the company in Bengal were now to be counterbalanced by defeats in Madras. Hyder Ali, a man of ability and daring, who had deposed the rajah of Mysore in 1761, was extending his dominions by conquests and seizures, and was securing his ascendency by an energy which formed a striking contrast to the supineness of the greater number of native princes. He became engaged in a contest with the English, and by his rapid movements and his sudden attacks was a most formidable enemy by land and sea. Having plundered and wasted the Carnatic, he appeared with five thousand horsemen before Madras, in 1769, and there concluded a treaty with the terrified council, in the absence of their troops. The terms of the alliance which was then concluded were not onerous. Their moderation evinced the sagacity of this extraordinary ruler.

An arrangement was, in 1769, made between the administration and the East India directors. The company were to hold the territorial revenues of India for five years, they paying £400,000 annually into the exchequer. But in 1770 the resources of India materially failed. There was a terrible famine in Bengal, in which it is supposed that one third of the inhabitants perished. In 1772 the company declared a deficiency of above a million, obtained loans from the Bank of England to a large amount, and at last went to parliament for aid, with the undoubted risk of provoking a more stringent inquiry into their affairs than had ever before been instituted. In 1773 an act was passed by which £1,400,000 was lent to the company, the payment of £400,000 per annum was postponed, and the dividend of the proprietors was restricted to 6 per cent until the loan should be repaid. By another act the annual elections of directors were to be subject to regulations, such as prevailed till the very recent changes. A governor-general was to reside in Bengal, to which presidency the other two were made subordinate. The first governor-general, Warren Hastings, was named in this act, as were the new council. The appointments of parliament were to continue for five years, and then the nomination was to revert to the court of directors, subject to the approbation of the crown. One of the new council was Philip Francis; and this appointment has given birth to the theory that Junius ceased to write when he was propitiated by so great a bounty upon his silence.

The transactions of the government with the East India Company were completed by what was meant as a concession to the directors. They had in their warehouses seventeen million pounds of tea, for which they wanted a market. Permission was given by act of parliament to export teas belonging to the company to any of the British plantations in America, with a drawback of the duty payable in England. The colonial tax of threepence in the pound was to be paid in the American ports. Ships were freighted, and consignees appointed to sell their cargoes. Fatal boon, whose consequences no one saw.

CHAPTER CLXIX.

Destruction of tea in Boston harbor—Franklin before the council—Boston Port Bill—Burke's speech against taxing America—Chatham's speech—Sentiments of the Americans—State of parties in America—Leaders of the House of Commons—Reception of the Boston Port Bill—Military preparations—Chatham's and Burke's efforts for conciliation—Rapid growth of America—English feelings on the American question—Hostilities commenced at Lexington—Ticonderoga and Crown Point taken—Washington's view of civil war—Principles involved in the struggle.

It was Sunday, the 28th of November, 1773, when there sailed into Boston harbor the English merchant-ship Dartmouth, laden with chests of tea belonging to the East India Company. The act of parliament which allowed the treasury to license vessels to export the teas of the company to the American colonies free of duty was the signal for popular gatherings in Boston. Samuel Adams, in the "Boston Gazette," roused again that feeling of resistance which had partially subsided. The Governor of Massachusetts, in October, wrote to Lord Dartmouth, who had succeeded Lord Hillsborough as colonial

d'Este; but that the statute extended to prohibit contracts for, and to annul, any marriage in violation of its provisions, wherever the same might be contracted or solemnized."—*Blackstone's Commentaries*, Kerr's edit., vol. i. p. 215.

* See *ante*, p. 835.

* Macaulay, "Essays."

secretary, that Samuel Adams, "who was the first person that openly, and in any public assembly, declared for a total independence," had "obtained such an ascendency as to direct the town of Boston and the House of Representatives, and consequently the council, just as he pleases." The East India Company had appointed its consignees in Boston. On the night of the 2d of November summonses were left at the houses of each of these persons, requiring them to appear on a certain day at Liberty Tree, to resign their commission; and notices were issued desiring the freemen of Boston and of the neighboring towns to assemble at the same place. The consignees did not appear; but a committee of the assembly traced them to a warehouse, where they were met to consult. They were required not to sell the teas, but to return them to London by the vessels which might bring them. They refused to comply, and were denounced as enemies to their country. Philadelphia had previously compelled the agents of the company to resign their appointments. Town meetings were held at Boston, when strong resolutions were adopted. In this state of things, on that Sunday, the 28th of November, the first tea-ship arrived. The New England colonists preserved that strict observance of the Sabbath which their Puritan fathers felt the highest of duties. But it was a work of necessity to impede the landing of the tea, and a committee met twice on that Sunday to concert measures. They obtained a promise from Rotch, the commander of the ship Dartmouth, that his vessel should not be entered till the following Tuesday. On Monday the committees of all the neighboring towns assembled at Boston, and five thousand persons agreed that the tea should be sent back to the place whence it came. "Throw it overboard," cried one. The consignees, alarmed at this demonstration, declared that they would not send back the teas, but that they would store them. This proposal was received with scorn; and then the consignees agreed that the teas should not be landed. But there was a legal difficulty. If the rest of the cargo were landed, and the tea not landed, the vessel could not be cleared in Boston, and after twenty days was liable to seizure. Two or more ships arrived, and anchored by the side of the Dartmouth. The people kept watch night and day to prevent any attempt at landing the teas. Thirteen days after the arrival of the Dartmouth the owner was summoned before the Boston committee, and told that his vessel and his tea must be taken back to London. It was out of his power to do so, he said. He certainly had not the power, for the passages out of the harbor were guarded by two king's ships, to prevent any vessel going to sea without a license. On the 16th the revenue officers would have a legal authority to take possession of the Dartmouth. For three days previous there had been meetings of the Boston committee; but their journal had only this entry, "No business transacted matter of record."

On the 16th of December there was a meeting in Boston of seven thousand persons, who resolved that the tea should not be landed. The master of the Dartmouth was ordered to apply to the governor for a pass, for his vessel to proceed on her return voyage to London. The governor was at his country house. Many of the leaders had adjourned to a church, to wait his answer. The night had come on when Rotch returned and announced that the governor had refused him a pass, because his ship had not cleared. There was no more hesitation. Forty or fifty men, disguised as Mohawks, raised the war-whoop at the porch of the church, went on to the wharf where the three ships lay alongside, took possession of them, and deliberately emptied three hundred and forty chests of tea into the waters of the bay. It was the work of three hours. Not a sound was heard but that of breaking open the chests. The people of Boston went to their rest as if no extraordinary event had occurred.

On the 27th of January, 1774, the news of this decisive act reached the English government. On the 29th there was a great meeting of the lords of the council to consider a petition from Massachusetts, for the dismissal of Hutchinson, the governor, and Oliver, the lieutenant-governor. Dr. Franklin appeared before the council as agent for Massachusetts. He had rendered himself obnoxious to the English government by a proceeding which even his patriotism could not wholly justify. He had obtained possession of some private letters written confidentially several years before, in which Hutchinson and Oliver avowed sentiments opposed to what they considered the licentiousness of the colonists. These letters Franklin transmitted to the assembly at Boston, who voted, by a large majority, that the opinions expressed contemplated the establishment of arbitrary power, and they accordingly petitioned for the removal of the governor and lieutenant-governor. The intelligence from Boston of the destruction of the teas was not likely to propitiate the council. Franklin was treated with little respect, and Wedderburn, the solicitor-general, assailed him with a torrent of invective, at which the lords cheered and laughed. Franklin bore the assaults with perfect equanimity, but from that hour he ceased to be a mediator between Great Britain and the colonists. The council reported that the petition from Massachusetts was "groundless, vexatious, and scandalous." Two days after Franklin was dismissed from his office of deputy postmaster-general. He said to Priestley, who was present at the council, that he considered the thing for which he had been so insulted as one of the best actions of his life.

The parliament had met on the 13th of January. It was the 7th of March when Lord North delivered the king's message relating to "the violent and outrageous proceedings at the town and port of Boston, in the province of Massachusetts Bay, with a view to obstructing the commerce of this kingdom, and upon grounds and pretences immediately subversive of the constitution thereof." There was a debate, of which the most remarkable part was, that when Lord North stated that the proper papers should be ready on the following Friday, Thurlow, the attorney-general, said, loud enough to reach the ear of the minister, "I never heard anything so impudent; he has no plan yet ready." * The one plan which first presented itself—the most unfortunate of all plans—is exhibited in a note of the king to Lord North, dated the 4th of February: "General Gage, though just returned from Boston, expresses his willingness to go back at a day's notice if convenient measures are adopted. He says, They will be lions while we are lambs; but if we take the resolute part they will undoubtedly prove very meek. Four regiments sent to Boston will, he thinks, be sufficient to prevent any disturbance. All men now feel that the fatal compliance in 1766 has increased the pretensions of the Americans to thorough independence." On the 14th of March Lord North brought in a bill for removing the custom-house from Boston, and declaring it unlawful, after the 1st of June, to lade or unlade, ship or unship, any goods from any landing-place within the harbor of Boston. There was little opposition to this measure, which was passed in a fortnight, and when sent to the Lords was as quickly adopted. Chatham suggested, in a letter to Shelburne, that reparation ought first to be demanded and refused before such a bill could be called just. The letter of Chatham, in which he makes this suggestion, is that of a great statesman, exhibiting the sound qualities of his mind perhaps even more clearly than his impassioned oratory: "The whole of this unhappy business is beset with dangers of the most complicated and lasting nature; and the point of true wisdom for the mother country seems to be in such nice and exact limits (accurately distinguished, and embraced, with a large and generous moderation of spirit) as narrow, short-sighted counsels of state, or overheated popular debates, are not likely to hit. Perhaps a fatal desire to take advantage of this guilty tumult of the Bostonians, in order to crush the spirit of liberty among the Americans in general, has taken possession of the heart of government." †

In the "heart of government" there was no place for conciliation. The Boston Port Bill, backed up by military force, was to be followed by other measures of coercion. On the 28th of March Lord North brought in a bill for regulating the government of Massachusetts Bay. "I propose," he said, "in this bill to take the executive power from the hands of the democratic part of government." The proposition went, in many important particulars, to annul the charter granted to the province by William III. The council was to be appointed by the crown; the magistrates were to be nominated by the governor. This bill also passed, after ineffectual debate. A third bill enacted that, during the next three years, the Governor of Massachusetts might, if it was thought that an impartial trial of any person could not be secured in that colony, send him for trial in another colony; or to Great Britain, if it were thought that no fair trial could be obtained in the colonies. The object of the bill was distinctly stated by Lord North: "Unless such a bill should pass into a law the executive power will be unwilling to act, thinking they

* Walpole, "Last Journals," vol. i. p. 329.
† "Chatham Correspondence," vol. iv. p. 337.

will not have a fair trial without it." Colonel Barré strongly remonstrated against such a measure. The bill was to protect the military power in any future encounters with the people.* The king rejoices "in the feebleness and futility of opposition." † Mr. Bancroft says, without perhaps any very accurate means of judging, that "the passions of the British ministry were encouraged by the British people, who resented the denial of their supremacy, and made the cause of parliament their own." ‡ The British people were not allowed to be free judges of the great question at issue. On the discussion of the Bostonian bills Walpole says, "The doors of both houses were carefully locked—a symptom of the spirit with which they were dictated." § Perhaps if the words of Edmund Burke had gone forth to the world, hot from his lips, instead of oozing out in a pamphlet, the people might have thought seriously of the crisis which called forth his eloquent philosophy. His speech of the 19th of April, on American taxation, has passages that have an interest for all time. It had been urged that the tax upon tea was trifling. This is his reply: "Could anything be a subject of more just alarm to America than to see you go out of the plain high-road of finance, and give up your most certain revenues and your dearest interest, merely for the sake of insulting your colonies? No man ever doubted that the commodity of tea could bear an imposition of threepence. But no commodity will bear threepence, or will bear a penny, when the general feelings of men are irritated, and two millions of people are resolved not to pay. The feelings of the colonies were probably the feelings of Great Britain. Theirs were formerly the feelings of Mr. Hampden when called upon for the payment of twenty shillings. Would twenty shillings have ruined Mr. Hampden's fortune? No! but the payment of half twenty shillings, on the principle it was demanded, would have made him a slave." Lord Carmarthen, as Walpole records, produced a sensation on his first appearance in the House of Commons. The young lord's speech prompted one of the most splendid manifestations of Burke's genius: "A noble lord, who spoke some time ago, is full of the fire of ingenuous youth; and when he has modelled the ideas of a lively imagination by further experience he will be an ornament to his country in either house. He has said that the Americans are our children, and how can they revolt against their parent? He says that if they are not free in their present state, England is not free; because Manchester, and other considerable places, are not represented. So then, because some towns in England are not represented, America is to have no representative at all. They are 'our children'; but when children ask for bread we are not to give a stone. Is it because the natural resistance of things, and the various mutations of time, hinder our government, or any scheme of government, from being any more than a sort of approximation to the right, is it therefore that the colonies are to recede from it infinitely? When this child of ours wishes to assimilate to its parent, and to reflect with a true filial resemblance the beauteous countenance of British liberty, are we to turn to them the shameful parts of our constitution? are we to give them our weakness for their strength, our opprobrium for their glory, and the slough of slavery, which we are not able to work off, to serve them for their freedom?"

The dangers of the country called forth Chatham from his retirement. Walpole describes him making his appearance in the House of Lords on the 26th of May: "Lord Chatham, who was a comedian even to his dress, to excuse his late absence by visible tokens of the gout, had his legs wrapped in black velvet boots, and, as if in mourning for the King of France, he leaned on a crutch covered with black likewise." ‖ Walpole says, "He made a long feeble harangue." There are portions of the harangue which throw a doubt upon the taste or candor of the journalist—the opening passage, for example:

"If we take a transient view of those motives which induced the ancestors of our fellow-subjects in America to leave their native country to encounter the innumerable difficulties of the unexplored regions of the western world, our astonishment at the present conduct of their descendants will naturally subside. There was no corner of the world into which men of their free and enterprising spirit would not fly with alacrity rather than submit to the slavish and tyrannical principles which prevailed at that period in their native country. And shall we wonder, my lords, if the descendants of such illustrious characters spurn with contempt the hand of unconstitutional power, that would snatch from them such dear-bought privileges as they now contend for? Had the British colonies been planted by any other kingdom than our own, the inhabitants would have carried with them the chains of slavery and spirit of despotism; but as they are, they ought to be remembered as great instances to instruct the world what great exertions mankind will naturally make, when they are left to the free exercise of their own powers."

The spirit of the New Englanders took the same course of thought as that of the first orator of the mother country. In proposing a general congress of the several houses of assembly, John Hancock exclaimed, "Remember from whom you sprang." * This was said on the 5th of March, two days before Lord North had delivered to parliament the royal message which was the prelude to the measures which the British government believed would insure the submission of the colonists. The people of Massachusetts, in their proceedings of the 16th of December, "had passed the river and cut away the bridge." † Lord Mansfield called upon the Peers to delay not in carrying the Boston Port Bill: "Pass this act, and you will have crossed the Rubicon." Before the men of Massachusetts knew of the severities that were hanging over them, the most violent of their leaders, Samuel Adams, had officially drawn up instructions for Franklin, the agent for the colony, which concluded with these words: "Their old good-will and affection for the parent country are not totally lost. If she returns to her former moderation and good-humor, their affection will revive. They wish for nothing more than a permanent union with her upon the condition of equal liberty. This is all they have been contending for; and nothing short of this will or ought to satisfy them." ‡ The same language was held in 1774 by George Washington. He wrote in October of that year, to a friend who held the rank of captain in the English army, "You are taught to believe that the people of Massachusetts are rebellious, setting up for independency and what not. Give me leave to tell you, you are grossly abused. . . . I can announce it as a fact, that it is not the wish or interest of that government, or any other upon this continent, separately or collectively, to set up for independence. But this you may at the same time rely on, that none of them will ever submit to the loss of those valuable rights and privileges which are essential to the happiness of every free state, and without which life, liberty, and property are rendered totally insecure."

Such were the sentiments, even of the moderate, in the American colonies. But it must not be assumed that the universal opinion of the colonial communities was represented by Samuel Adams or John Hancock, even by George Washington or Thomas Jefferson. There was a large party in every province who were avowed Royalists, and who gradually acquired the name of Tories. They were not wanting in encouragement from England. They had the support of a preponderating majority in parliament, which sanguine persons thought would overawe the malcontents. "Nothing can be more calculated," writes the king to Lord North, "to bring the Americans to a due submission than the very handsome majority that at the outset appears in both houses." This was written on the 22d of January, 1775, a new parliament having met on the previous 29th of November. The American Royalists would not lack private instigations from individuals of eminence in England, to oppose their rebellious countrymen. The conversational opinions of the famous Dr. Johnson might reach them, even before they read his pamphlet, "Taxation no Tyranny." They might be told that Edward Gibbon, of rising literary reputation, held that the right was on the side of the mother country. § The future great historian was returned to parliament in 1774, and was prepared to speak on the American question, if he could have overcome "timidity fortified by pride." Whatever may

* Lord Mahon has not looked at this measure with his usual care. He says, "It was imagined that no fair trial could be had within the limits of that province of any persons concerned in the late disturbances."—History, vol. vi. p. 8.

† Note to Lord North, 23d March.

‡ "American Revolution," vol. iii. p. 556.

§ "Last Journals," p. 363.

‖ "Last Journals," vol. i. p. 369. (Louis XV. died on the 10th of May.)

* Bancroft, vol. iii. p. 561. † J. Adams, quoted by Bancroft.

‡ Bancroft, p. 563.

§ See his letter to Holroyd, 31st January, 1775.

be now the prevailing sentiment upon the colonial quarrel, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the controversy was one that involved great principles, and called forth the highest energies of great intellects. On either side of the Atlantic was manifested the grandeur of the Anglo-Saxon mind. Chatham, in 1775, paid a deserved tribute to the qualities displayed in the first American congress: "When your lordships look at the papers transmitted us from America—when you consider their decency, firmness, and wisdom, you cannot but respect their cause, and wish to make it your own. For myself I must declare and avow, that in all my reading and observation—(I have read Thucydides, and have studied and admired the master-states of the world)—that for solidity of reasoning, force of sagacity, and wisdom of conclusion, under such a complication of difficult circumstances, no nation or body of men can stand in preference to the General Congress at Philadelphia. I trust it is obvious to your lordships that all attempts to impose servitude upon such men, to establish despotism over such a mighty continental nation, must be vain, must be fatal." Gibbon has described the striking scene he witnessed in the British House of Commons. "I assisted at the debates of a free assembly; I listened to the attack and defence of eloquence and reason; I had a near prospect of the character, views, and passions of the first men of the age. The cause of government was ably vindicated by Lord North, a statesman of spotless integrity, a consummate master of debate, who could wield, with equal dexterity, the arms of reason and of ridicule. He was seated on the treasury bench between his attorney and solicitor-general, the two pillars of the law and state, *magis pares quam similes;* and the minister might indulge in a short slumber, while he was upholden on either hand by the majestic sense of Thurlow and the skilful eloquence of Wedderburn. From the adverse side of the house an ardent and powerful opposition was supported by the lively declamation of Barré, the legal acuteness of Dunning, the profuse and philosophical fancy of Burke, and the argumentative vehemence of Fox, who, in the conduct of a party, approved himself equal to the conduct of an empire. By such men every operation of peace and war, every principle of justice and policy, every question of authority and freedom, was attacked and defended; and the subject of the momentous contest was the union or separation of Great Britain and America. The eight sessions that I sat in parliament were a school of civil prudence, the first and most essential virtue of an historian." *

The differences of opinion in America ought to have retarded the terrible issue that was approaching. The fears of the timid, the hopes of the loyal, were opposed to the advocates of resistance, and might have prevailed to avert the notion of independence. In an unhappy hour blood was shed, and conciliation then became a word that was uttered to deaf ears in England as in America. We must in this chapter rapidly trace the course of events till we reach that crisis.

The ministry after passing their coercive bills had determined to send out General Gage to supersede Hutchinson as Governor of Massachusetts, and to be commander-in-chief in the colonies. He would have to act upon a system distinctly opposed to the old chartered system of free local government. He undervalued, as we have seen, the resistance which was to be brought against him, and relied too absolutely upon "four regiments." His appointment was not disagreeable to the New Englanders. He had lived among them, and had honorably executed the military authority with which he had been previously intrusted. In an unhappy hour he arrived at Boston, on the 13th of May, 1774. A vessel which came there before him brought a copy of the Boston Port Bill. When Gage came into the harbor the people were holding a meeting to discuss that act of the British legislature which deprived them of their old position in the commerce of the world—which doomed their merchants and all dependent upon them to absolute ruin. There was but one feeling. The meeting entered into resolutions, to which they invited the co-operation of the other colonies, for the purpose of suspending all commercial intercourse with Great Britain and the West Indies until the act was repealed. Copies of the act were everywhere circulated, printed with a black border. But there was no violence. The new governor was received with decorum, but without the accustomed honors. General Gage gave the assembly notice that on the 1st of June, according to the provisions of the act, their place of meeting would be removed to the town of Salem. When the spirit of opposition to his dictates was getting up, the governor suddenly adjourned the assembly. He was asked to appoint the 1st of June as a day of general prayer and fasting. He refused. In Virginia the House of Burgesses appointed the 1st of June as a day of humiliation, to avert the calamity of their loss of rights, or the miseries of civil war. They were immediately dissolved. The assembly of Virginia did not separate without recommending a general congress. The idea universally spread. Meanwhile General Gage had an encampment of six regiments on a common near Boston, and had begun to fortify the isthmus which connects the town with the adjacent country. The 1st of June came. There was no tumult. Business was at an end; Boston had become a city of the dead.

The first congress, consisting of fifty-five members, met at Philadelphia on the 4th of September. The place of their meeting was Carpenter's Hall. Peyton Randolph was chosen as their president. Their proceedings were conducted with closed doors. The more earnest party gradually obtained the ascendency over the more timid. They drew up a Declaration of Rights. They passed resolutions to suspend all imports from Great Britain or Ireland after the 1st of December, and to discontinue all exports after the 10th of September in the ensuing year, unless the grievances of America should be redressed. They published addresses to the people of Great Britain and of Canada, and they decided upon a petition to the king. These were the papers that called forth the eulogium of Chatham. The congress dissolved themselves on the 26th of October, and resolved that another congress should be convened on the 10th of May, 1775.

After the 1st of June the irremediable conflict between the governor and representatives of the people soon put an end to the legal course of government. General Gage was so wholly deserted by the council that the meeting of the assembly, which was proposed to take place at Salem in October, could not be regularly convened. Writs for the election of members had been issued, but were afterward annulled by proclamation. The elections took place. The persons chosen assembled, and styled themselves a local congress. A committee of safety was appointed. They enrolled militia, called "minute-men," whose engagement was that they should appear in arms at a minute's notice. They appointed commanders. They provided ammunition. The knowledge of the two acts of parliament which had followed that for shutting up the port of Boston not only provoked this undisguised resolve to resist to the death among the people of Massachusetts, but called up the same growing determination throughout the vast continent of America.

The new parliament met on the 29th of November, 1774. There was an end of the agitations about Wilkes; for, having been elected for Middlesex, he took his seat without opposition. The king's speech asserted his determination "to withstand every attempt to weaken or impair the supreme authority of this legislature over all the dominions of my crown." Corresponding addresses were voted in both houses with a large majority. In January Lord Chatham brought forward a motion to withdraw the troops from Boston. "I wish, my lords," he said, "not to lose a day in this urgent, pressing crisis. An hour now lost in allaying ferments in America may produce years of calamity. For my own part, I will not desert for a moment the conduct of this weighty business, from first to last. Unless nailed to my bed by the extremity of sickness, I will give it unremitted attention. I will knock at the door of this sleeping and confounded ministry, and will rouse them to a sense of their important danger." Chatham knocked in vain to awaken these sleepers. His voice, whose noble utterance cannot now be read without stirring the heart, was called by George III. "a trumpet of sedition." Again, on the 1st of February, that voice was heard, when Chatham presented "a provisional bill for settling the troubles in America." On the first occasion he had only eighteen peers to vote with him against sixty-eight; on the second occasion he had thirty-two against sixty-one. Franklin heard the great speech of the 20th of January, having been conducted into the house by Chatham himself, who said to him, "I am sure your presence at this day's debate will be of more service to America than mine." This was some compensation to that eminent man for the insults of Wedderburn. Chatham's second son, the child of his hopes, then only sixteen, wrote to his mother an account of that memorable debate. It is touching to observe the young William Pitt's deep sympathy with his father's efforts:

* "Autobiography."

"Nothing prevented his speech from being the most forcible that can be imagined; and administration fully felt it. . . . He is lame in one ankle, near the instep, from standing so long. No wonder he is lame; his first speech lasted above an hour, and the second half an hour—surely the two finest speeches that were ever made before, unless by himself. . . . I wish I had time and memory to give an account of all I heard, and all I felt." * Chatham's oratory was in vain. The ministry that night declared they would send out more troops, instead of recalling any. Chatham's conciliatory bill made some impression upon Lord North, who proposed a very weak measure, as a resolution of the House of Commons, that if any of the American provinces, by their legislature, should make some provision for the defence and government of that province, which should be approved by the king and parliament, then it might be proper to forbear imposing any tax. This was to attempt to put out a conflagration with a bucket of water.

If the highest efforts of argument could have been availing, the speech of Edmund Burke, on the 22d of March, would have arrested the headlong course of the government. At this moment a bill was passing both houses which Burke called "the great penal bill by which we had passed sentence on the trade and sustenance of America." It was a bill to prohibit certain colonies from fishing on the banks of Newfoundland. Great Britain was not ashamed to resort to this petty measure of retaliation against the American non-importation agreements. Burke proposed a series of conciliatory resolutions, of a less sweeping nature than those of Chatham, and therefore more likely to be acceptable to men of temperate opinions. They were rejected on a division of two hundred and seventy against seventy-eight. The speech of the great statesman presented a masterly review of the wonderful growth of the American colonies—their successful industry—their commercial importance to Great Britain. The whole export trade of England, including the colonial trade, was six millions and a half in 1704. The export trade to the colonies alone was six millions in 1772. These statistical facts were suddenly illumined by a burst of oratory, perhaps unrivalled. Allen, Lord Bathurst, to whom Pope addressed his "Epistle on the Use of Riches"—Bathurst "unspoiled by wealth," the father of the lord chancellor of 1775—was cited by Burke as one that might remember all the stages of the growth of our national prosperity. He was in 1704 "of an age at least to be made to comprehend such things." "Suppose that the angel of that auspicious youth" had opened to him in vision the fortunes of his house in the twelfth year of the third prince of the line of Brunswick: "If amid these bright and happy scenes of domestic honor and prosperity, that angel should have drawn up the curtain, and unfolded the rising glories of his country, and while he was gazing with admiration on the then commercial grandeur of England, the genius should point out to him a little speck, scarce visible in the mass of the national interest, a small seminal principle rather than a formed body, and should tell him, 'Young man, there is America—which at this day serves for little more than to amuse you with stories of savage men and uncouth manners; yet shall, before you taste of death, show itself equal to the whole of that commerce which now attracts the envy of the world. Whatever England has been growing to by a progressive increase of improvement, brought in by varieties of people, by a succession of civilizing conquests and civilizing settlements in a series of seventeen hundred years, you shall see as much added to her by America in the course of a single life.' If this state of his country had been foretold to him, would it not require all the sanguine credulity of youth, and all the fervid glow of enthusiasm, to make him believe it? Fortunate man, he has lived to see it! Fortunate indeed, if he lives to see nothing that shall vary the prospect, and cloud the setting of his day!"

Allen, Earl Bathurst, lived long enough to see the prospect clouded over, but not to behold that sun set which was predicted to follow the separation of Great Britain from her North American colonies. It was for later times to behold the cloud passing away from the old monarchy and the young republic. In that year of 1775, when Burke was thus pointing to the remembrances of an eminent living man, to contrast "the little speck scarce visible in the mass of the national interest," with the continent which contained two millions of prosperous colonists—in that year there came to England an American painter, with a son who would gradually comprehend the mighty changes which were then going on in the country of his birth. If the angel of this auspicious boy should have drawn up the curtain, and unfolded the glories of America when he was to be Lord Chancellor of England, would it not have required all the sanguine credulity of youth, and all the fervid glow of enthusiasm, to have made John Singleton Copley believe that the woods in which his father taught himself to paint should be covered with mighty cities, that the republic of the United States should contain a population of twenty-three millions, and that the commerce of those States should, next to that of Great Britain, be the largest in the world?

The contrarieties of public opinion in Great Britain and Ireland upon the American question were exhibited in petitions from various corporate bodies. Many manufacturing towns petitioned against the coercion acts, as destructive of the commerce of the country. Other petitions called for an enforcement of the legislative supremacy of Great Britain, as the only means of preserving a trade with the colonies. There were war petitions and peace petitions. Those who signed the war petitions were held to be mere party men known as Tories. Those who signed the peace petitions were discontented Whigs, or something worse. The Quakers, while they exhorted to peace, maintained the loyalty of all religious denominations in America to the king's person, family, and government. The citizens of London, with Wilkes at their head as lord mayor, presented an address and remonstrance to the king on the throne, in which they denounced the measures of the government as deliberately intended to establish arbitrary power all over America. The king answered, that it was with the utmost astonishment that he found any of his subjects capable of encouraging the rebellious disposition which existed in some of his colonies in America. From such different points of view did men regard this great argument. As usual in England, the most serious questions had their ludicrous aspect. Caricatures were numerous. One represented America as a struggling female, held down by Lord Mansfield, while Lord North was drenching her with "a strong dose of tea." In another, Britannia is thrown down upon her child America, while Lord North is pumping upon both of them, looking exultingly through his eye-glass.* The partisans of the minister struck a medal in his honor.

The close of 1774 was, in Massachusetts, the silence before the storm. The people were arming. The Provincial Congress had formed an arsenal at Concord, an inland town. The British troops made no movements during the winter to interfere with these hostile demonstrations. In his speech of the 27th of January Chatham alluded to the position of the royal forces: "Their situation is truly unworthy; penned up; pining in inglorious inactivity. . . . I find a report creeping abroad that ministers censure General Gage's inactivity. . . . It is a prudent and necessary inaction. . . . This tameness, however contemptible, cannot be censured; for the first drop of blood shed in civil and unnatural war might be *immedicabile vulnus.*" That incurable wound was too soon to be inflicted.

On the evening of the 18th of April Lieutenant-Colonel Smith, of the 10th foot, marched, by order of Governor Gage, with a body of grenadiers and light infantry, for Concord, with the purpose of destroying all military stores collected there. "Notwithstanding," writes Lieutenant-Colonel Smith in his dispatch, "we marched with the utmost expedition and secrecy, we found the country had intelligence or strong suspicion of our coming, and fired many signal guns, and rung the alarm-bells repeatedly; and we were informed, when at Concord, that some cannon had been taken out of the town that day; that others, with some stores, had been carried away three days before, which prevented our having an opportunity of destroying so much as might have been expected at our first setting off." Six light infantry companies were dispatched to seize two bridges on different roads beyond Concord. They found country people drawn up on a green, with arms and accoutrements. The troops advanced, according to the lieutenant-colonel, without any intention of injuring the people; but, nevertheless, they were fired upon, and the soldiers fired again. When the detachment reached Concord there was a more serious skirmish with a very considerable body of countrymen. "At Concord," the narrative continues, "we found very few inhabitants in the town; those we met with, both Major Pitcairn and myself

* "Chatham Correspondence," vol. iv. p. 376.

* See Wright's "House of Hanover," vol. ii. p. 22.

took all possible pains to convince that we meant them no injury, and that if they opened their doors when required to search for military stores, not the slightest mischief would be done. We had opportunities of convincing them of our good intentions, but they were sulky, and one of them even struck Major Pitcairn. On our leaving Concord to return to Boston, they began to fire on us from behind the walls, ditches, trees, etc., which, as we marched, increased to a very great degree, and continued without the intermission of five minutes altogether, for, I believe, upward of eighteen miles; so that I can't think but it must have been a preconcerted scheme in them to attack the king's troops the first favorable opportunity that offered, otherwise I think they could not, in so short a time as from our marching out, have raised such a numerous body, and for so great a space of ground." * The destruction of the detachment under Lieutenant-Colonel Smith by a large body of infuriated men was averted by the arrival at Lexington of a reinforcement sent out by General Gage, The British continued to retreat before their resolute opponents. They did not reach their quarters till night had fallen—worn out with fatigue, and with a loss of two or three hundred in killed, wounded, and prisoners. There was no open fight, for the minutemen were in ambush, and picked off the officers and men of the detachment from their secure hiding among trees and behind stone walls.

The news of the affair of Lexington arrived in England at the end of May. The Provincial Congress of Massachusetts knew the effect that would be produced upon public opinion in the mother country when it should be learned that the king's troops had been defeated. The day after the skirmish this congress dispatched a vessel to England without freight, for the sole purpose of carrying letters detailing this triumph. Walpole has described the impression produced by the receipt of this intelligence in London: "May 28th. Arrived a light sloop, sent by the Americans from Salem, with an account of their having defeated the king's troops." He then gives details of the news received, which seems to have been free from exaggeration. "The advice was immediately dispersed, while the government remained without any intelligence. Stocks immediately fell. The provincials had behaved with the greatest conduct, coolness, and resolution. One circumstance spoke a thorough determination of resistance: the provincials had sent over affidavits of all that had passed, and a colonel of the militia had sworn in an affidavit that he had given his men orders to fire on the king's troops if the latter attacked them. It was firmness, indeed, to swear to having been the first to begin what the parliament had named rebellion. Thus was the civil war begun, and a victory the first fruits of it on the side of the Americans, whom Lord Sandwich had had the folly and rashness to proclaim cowards."

While the provincials of Massachusetts and the troops of General Gage had thus been brought into a collision, which had more the character of accident than of preconcerted hostilities, a bold and successful attempt was made in another quarter, which could only be interpreted as a deliberate act of warfare. Forty volunteers, well armed, had set out, at the instigation of some leading men of Connecticut, to form part of an expedition which was to attack Ticonderoga, a fort on Lake George, and Crown Point, a fort on Lake Champlain. If these were taken, the invasion of Canada by the American militia would be greatly facilitated. The Connecticut volunteers were joined on their march by Ethan Allen, who had many volunteers under his command, and by Benedict Arnold, who subsequently obtained a celebrity not the most honorable. Ticonderoga was garrisoned by only forty-four soldiers, under the command of Captain de la Place. On the morning of the 10th of May the commander was roused in his bed; saw his fort surrounded by several hundred men in arms; and was required to surrender "in the name of the Great Jehovah and the Continental Congress." The demand was not resisted. Crown Point was also surprised by the same body of adventurers.

The affair of Lexington was the commencement of the American war. More decisive encounters very speedily followed between the king's troops and many thousand Americans in arms. How this first contest was regarded by the noblest of the men who built up the independence of their country we find in a letter from Washington to a friend in England: "General Gage acknowledges that the detachment under Lieutenant-Colonel Smith was sent out to destroy private property; or, in other words, to destroy a magazine, which self-preservation obliged the inhabitants to establish. And he also confesses, in effect at least, that his men made a very precipitate retreat from Concord, notwithstanding the reinforcement under Lord Percy; the last of which may serve to convince Lord Sandwich, and others of the same sentiment, that the Americans will fight for their liberties and property, however pusillanimous in his lordship's eye they may appear in other respects. . . . Unhappy it is, though, to reflect that a brother's sword has been sheathed in a brother's breast, and that the once happy and peaceful plains of America are either to be drenched with blood or inhabited by slaves. Sad alternative! But can a virtuous man hesitate in his choice?"

On the day that Ticonderoga fell into the hands of these American partisans the General Congress assembled for the second time at Philadelphia.

We have dealt somewhat fully with the circumstances which preceded the unfortunate contest between Great Britain and her North American colonies. We have endeavored to exhibit the general agreement which existed between the principles maintained by the colonists and those of the English statesmen who are now regarded as the true representatives of the national mind in its highest sense—the mind of the dispassionate and enlightened few of those times, and that of the more general enlightenment of our own time. Happily the day has long since past when either the citizen of the republic of the United States or the subject of the monarchy of the United Kingdom can read a narrative of the great struggle which resulted in American independence with any sentiment of vindictiveness. In the circumstances which preceded the actual war, and during the continuance of the war, there were noble feelings called forth in the parent country and in the revolted provinces, which showed how truly that spirit of liberty was upheld which was common to both—which had descended from the time of Alfred; which had never been lost under Plantagenet or Tudor; which had gone forth to colonize New England when a Stuart made Old England unsafe for free men to dwell in; which, having expelled the oppressors, drew new breath under a bill of rights. It was that spirit which spoke in the eloquence of Chatham, which asserted itself in the sagacity and moderation of Washington. Looking at the other side in the great contest, whether the majority of the legislature and people of Great Britain, or the American royalists, it would not be just to view them as assertors of arbitrary doctrines, intent upon reducing their fellow-men to slavery. They acted upon a mistaken principle which they believed to be a constitutional right. Their errors have not been without their use if they have led to that better understanding of the relations between a state and its colonies which prevails in our own day.

CHAPTER CLXX.

Franklin's return to America—Meeting of congress at Philadelphia—Washington elected commander-in-chief—Events at Boston—Battle of Bunker's Hill—Washington blockades Boston. Public opinion in England—Petition from congress to the king—Mr. Penn, the bearer of the petition, examined in the House of Lords—Lord North's Prohibitory Bill—Invasion of Canada—Silas Deane sent to Paris—Declaration of Independence adopted by congress—Note: The Declaration.

At the end of March, 1775, that remarkable man, Benjamin Franklin, who fifty years before had been working in London as a journeyman printer turned his back upon that England where he had received all honor as a philosopher, to become one of her most strenuous opponents in the struggle of his native country for independence. He left England—as we learn from a letter written a short time before his departure—with a firm conviction that her system of government was conducting her to ruin and disgrace. He deprecated any further attempt to restore united interests between the mother country and her colonies: "When I consider," he writes, "the extreme corruption prevalent among all orders of men in the old rotten state, and the glorious public virtue so predominant

* From dispatch in the State Paper Office, given by Mahon, Appendix to vol. vi.

in our rising country, I cannot but apprehend more mischief than benefit from a closer union. . . . Here numberless and needless places, enormous salaries, pensions, perquisites, bribes, groundless quarrels, foolish expeditions, false accounts or no accounts, contracts and jobs, devour all revenue, and produce continual necessity in the midst of natural plenty."* Making every allowance for one whose endeavors to promote peace had been met with neglect and insult, much of this severe description is undoubtedly true. But Franklin still shrunk from war. "I would try anything, and bear anything that can be borne with safety to our just liberties, rather than engage in a war with such relations, unless compelled to it by dire necessity in our own defence." On the 5th of May he arrived in Philadelphia. On the 6th he was elected by the assembly of Pennsylvania one of the deputies to the Continental Congress appointed to meet on the 10th. In a few days came the news of the first fatal contest at Lexington; and then Franklin writes to Priestley in England: "All America is exasperated. The breach between the two countries is grown wider, and in danger of becoming irreparable."†

The congress assembled at Philadelphia, composed of deputies from thirteen States, held at first a common agreement only upon one principle—the determination to resist the claim of the British government to tax the American colonies without their consent. But the mode of resistance, and the probable consequences of resistance, involved great differences of opinion. The provincial assemblies which had elected these deputies were composed of members who, in their aggregate character, represented various interests—the agricultural and the commercial; who had varieties of national origin—Dutch, German, Swedish, as well as English; who professed various forms of religion. In the State where the congress assembled the majority were Quakers, who would cleave, as long as possible, to peaceful counsels. The deputies from Massachusetts, on the contrary, irritated in their continual struggle with the authority of England, deprived of their charter, ruined in their commerce, would see no solution of their difficulties but in open war. There were several weeks of indecision; but, gradually, the more timid counsels yielded to the bolder. The moderate—who clung to union with England, from the thought of a common ancestry, from respect to the state which had given them the model of free institutions, from commercial interests—were alienated by the obstinate refusal of the British legislature to adopt reasonable measures of conciliation. The local assemblies were using more determined language, and were organizing their provincial forces, as if there were to be a foreign enemy to be resisted. At Boston the military authority of the crown and the armed resistance of the colonists stood face to face; and no one could doubt that a more deadly trial of strength than that of the 19th of April would speedily be the result. On the news of that day numerous bodies of militiamen were on the march toward Boston, under bold leaders, who left their ordinary occupations to place themselves at the head of their neighbors. Such was Israel Putnam, a farmer and tavern-keeper, who became one of the generals of the revolutionary war. For a month the British troops, who had exclusive possession of Boston, were harassed by the incessant activity of partisans who cut off supplies from the interior. General Gage was blockaded in his stronghold, having only communication by sea. Many of the inhabitants had been permitted to leave the city with their effects. Others remained, not being allowed to consider their merchandise as effects. On the 25th of May reinforcements arrived from England, under the command of Generals Burgoyne, Howe, and Clinton, and the force under General Gage now reached ten thousand men. Such an army, it might well be imagined, would be powerful to crush the irregular troops which were surrounding Boston. Martial law was proclaimed by the British commander, and a pardon offered to all who would lay down their arms, except John Hancock and Samuel Adams. The two proscribed men were naturally the boldest advocates for warlike measures in the congress at Philadelphia. That body had resolved to petition the king, still clinging to hopes of pacification. But the course of events rendered such a policy hopeless. The olive branch had been sent to England; the sword had been drawn in America. The congress passed from a deliberative assembly into an executive power. The deputies had agreed upon articles of confederation and perpetual union, under the name of "The United Colonies of North America," with authority to determine on war and peace, and on reconciliation with Great Britain; to raise troops; to appoint all officers civil and military. They resolved to provide for munitions of war by the issue of a paper currency. They appointed a commander-in-chief of the confederate forces, now to be called the Continental Army. That commander was George Washington.

The early military career of Washington has been briefly traced in a former chapter.* Twenty years before he was thus selected for the greatest trust that could be reposed in a man, he was fighting in the British ranks against the French on the Ohio. He had no subsequent military experience. Possessing ample means, he resided upon his estate in Virginia, called Mount Vernon, a plain country gentleman, managing his property with a skilful economy; engaging in those field sports which were agreeable to his vigorous constitution; reading and meditating upon the past and the present with intelligent curiosity; giving a month or two of the year to his public duties as a member of the House of Burgesses. He was neither learned nor eloquent; he was modest and retiring. But by the undeviating exercise of his sound judgment and his rigid integrity he had acquired a reputation in his own colony which had extended to other States. His strongest recommendations as commander-in-chief came from Massachusetts. The consistent force of his character procured for him a confidence that the noisy demagogue or the dashing partisan could not obtain. On the 16th of June his appointment was officially announced to him when he took his seat in the congress. He would enter, he said, upon the momentous duty, although he did not think himself equal to the command he was honored with. He added, that as no pecuniary consideration could have tempted him to accept this arduous employment at the expense of his domestic ease and happiness, he had no desire to make a profit by it. He would take no pay. He would keep an exact account of his expenses, and those, he doubted not, would be discharged. To his wife he wrote that it was utterly out of his power to refuse the appointment, although he had used every endeavor to avoid it. "But as it has been a kind of destiny that has thrown me upon this service, I shall hope that my undertaking it is designed to answer some good purpose."

The congress, upon the acceptance by Washington of his appointment, resolved that it was necessary that he should immediately proceed to Boston to take upon himself the command of the army round that town. That army has been described as a mixed multitude, under very little discipline or order. They wanted many of the necessaries of war, especially ammunition. The men were brave—far braver than some of the insolent dependants upon the British ministry were willing to believe. "It was romantic to think they would fight," said Rigby, one of the parliamentary jobbers who lived upon corruption. "There was more military prowess in a militia drummer."† Before Washington arrived at the camp near Boston, on the 3d of July, the provincials had shown how "they would fight."

Boston is built upon a peninsula. An isthmus on the south connected the peninsula with the mainland. A promontory, then called Dorchester Neck, now South Boston, had heights which commanded the town, and which are now fortified. On the east was the harbor; on the west the Charles River. Divided from Boston on the north by this river was Charlestown, also a peninsula. At the northern extremity, bounded by the Mystic River, is the height of Bunker's Hill, and lower down, near Charlestown, is Breed's Hill. An army having possession of these two hills on the north and of Dorchester Heights on the south, would have Boston at its mercy.‡ The British generals had seen the importance of the acclivities of Charlestown, and had determined to land a force to take possession of them on the 18th of June. This became known to the Massachusetts Committee of Safety, and it was resolved to anticipate the movement of the British by establishing a post on Bunker's Hill. After sunset on the 16th of June a brigade of a thousand men, under the command of William Prescott, assembled on Cambridge Common, armed mostly with fowling-pieces, and carrying their powder and ball in horns and pouches. A proclamation had been issued from the British head-

* "Franklin's Works," by Sparks, vol. viii. p. 146—Letter to Galloway, February 25th, 1775. † Ibid., p. 154.

* *Ante*, p. 828. † Walpole, "Last Journals," vol. i. p. 481.
‡ See plan of Boston, in Maps of Useful Knowledge Society.

quarters that all persons taken in arms should be hanged as rebels. The rebels marched on with a determination never to be taken alive. They crossed Charlestown Neck, and took up their position, not on Bunker's Hill, as the Committee of Safety had proposed, but on Breed's Hill. They had an engineer with them, and abundance of intrenching tools. The lines of a redoubt were drawn; and the troops who in their occupations of husbandmen had useful familiarity with spades and pickaxes, worked through the night, while their commander anxiously listened for any extraordinary movement that would indicate they were discovered by the ships of war in the harbor. The defences were nearly completed as day dawned. Then the redoubt, which had arisen in the night as if by magic, was visible to the British naval and land officers, with throngs of men still laboring at their intrenchments. The cannon of the Lively sloop commenced a fire upon the earth-works, and a battery was mounted on the Boston side, on a mound called Copp's Hill. The Americans continued to extend their lines while shot and shell were dropping around them. The cannonade was the prelude to something more serious. Two thousand soldiers, with field artillery, embarked in boats, and landed under cover of the shipping on a north-eastern point of the Charlestown peninsula. They were under the command of Major-General Howe. Prescott and his band waited for their approach. The British halted for some time, expecting additional force. The Americans had their rear protected by a low stone wall surmounted with posts and rails. The ground was covered with mown grass, browning under a hot midsummer sun, and there was time to interweave the hay between the rails and form a temporary shelter. When the British troops went forth in their boats from Boston, numbers also hurried from the American camp at Cambridge to share the dangers of their comrades. Howe's reinforcements at length arrived. Before they advanced to attack the irregular force that had made such a bold show of defiance, Charlestown, a mass of wooden buildings, was set on fire by a bombardment from Copp's Hill, and from the ships of war. Between two and three o'clock the British, under the command of General Pigot, advanced up the hill steadily in line, to attack the redoubt. Prescott had commanded his men not to fire till the British were within eight or ten rods. When he gave the word there was one simultaneous discharge from the muskets and fowling-pieces of the skilful marksmen. The front rank of the British was swept away. The rear ranks advanced to meet another discharge equally fatal. The whole line staggered, and retreated down the hill. From another point Howe led up his men to attack the fence. They were met by a volley, and fell back in confusion. Their officers rallied those who had retreated, and again the columns advanced upon the redoubt and the grass-woven rails. There was the same carnage as before. Officers had fallen in unusual numbers. It was a terrible scene. The town below Breed's Hill was furiously burning. The hill was covered with the dead, "as thick as sheep in a fold." The colonists were ready to meet a third attack when it was discovered that their ammunition was nearly spent. This final assault of the British was conducted with a better estimate of the courage of their enemy. Cannon were brought up so as to rake the breastwork of the redoubt, against which all the available force was concentrated. The fire from the breastwork gradually ceased. The redoubt was scaled. Resistance was no longer possible, and the Americans gave way, some retiring in order, but most escaping as they best might. There was little pursuit. The British lost above a thousand killed and wounded, of whom more than eighty were officers. The American loss was represented as less than half that of the royal forces. General Gage wrote home to Lord Dartmouth: "The success, which was very necessary in our present condition, cost us dear. . . . The trials we have had show the rebels are not the despicable rabble too many have supposed them to be."

Within a week after the arrival of Washington at the camp at Cambridge he had employed all his energies to place his troops in a position of security. The British were now intrenching Bunker's Hill, where the bulk of their army, commanded by General Howe, were encamped. Within half a mile of the British camp the Americans had thrown up intrenchments on Winter Hill and Prospect Hill, and there were other strong works at weak points. In his letter to Congress detailing these circumstances, Washington says, "Considering the great extent of line, and the nature of the ground, we are as well secured as could be expected in so short a time, and with the disadvantages we labor under. These consist in a want of engineers to construct proper works and direct the men, a want of tools, and a sufficient number of men to man the works in case of attack." Nevertheless, the council of war had determined to hold and defend these works as long as possible. Under such difficulties it is easy to conceive the arduous task that was imposed upon the commander of a body of undisciplined men, imperfectly armed, and wanting ammunition. He had to contend also against the constant solicitations of the Assembly of Massachusetts to send portions of his force upon detached services. These he steadily resisted, and, concentrating his army, was enabled to continue the blockade of Boston through the autumn and winter.

Public opinion in Great Britain, on what had now become a war with America, found its expression in the usual form of addresses to the throne. The majority of these addresses went to urge a vigorous prosecution of coercive measures against rebellious subjects. On the 23d of August the king issued a proclamation for the suppression of rebellion and sedition in America, and forbidding assistance and traitorous correspondence with the rebels. In the city, Wilkes being lord mayor, the corporate authorities did not join the procession of heralds when the proclamation was read at the Royal Exchange. On the other hand, Manchester and many trading towns sent up loyal addresses for the prosecution of the war. "The addresses must have been dearly bought," says Walpole.* The king appears to have made a very sensible estimate of the value of these productions. He writes to Lord North, on the 10th of September, "Address from Manchester most dutiful and affectionate. As you wish the spirit to be encouraged, I have no objection; though I know from fatal experience that they will produce counter petitions." Parliament met on the 26th of October. The encouragement which the ministry had given to "the spirit" of hostility was now to exhibit its fruits in the royal speech. Conciliation was to be cast to the winds. The strongest words in the vocabulary were selected to terrify the men to whom the British bayonet brought no terror. "Desperate conspiracy," "rebellious war," were to be put an end to by "decisive exertions." The "unhappy and deluded multitude" were not only to be subdued by the naval and military armaments of their mother country, but his majesty did not hesitate to inform his parliament that he had condescended to implore the aid of other countries in this work: "I have the satisfaction to inform you that I have received the most friendly offers of foreign assistance." Hessians were indeed levied; and Hanoverians received British pay. But the king was disappointed in some of his overtures to great powers. He writes to Lord North, only ten days after this boast of foreign aid: "The answer of the Empress of Russia to my letter is a clever refusal, not in so genteel a manner as I should have thought might have been expected from her. She has not had the civility to answer me in her own hand." As might be expected, the parliamentary majorities in support of the views of the court were very large. An amendment to the address on the first night of the session was rejected by a majority of forty in the House of Lords; by a majority of a hundred and seventy in the House of Commons. The Duke of Grafton, after voting with the minority, resigned his office of privy seal. Two months before the meeting of parliament he had pressed upon Lord North the necessity of conciliation, but had received no reply, except a draft of the king's speech. When the duke waited upon the king to resign, his majesty entered upon a discussion of this most grave subject: "He informed me that a large body of German troops were to join our forces; and appeared astonished when I answered earnestly that his majesty would find too late that twice that number would only increase the disgrace and never effect his purpose."† Lord Dartmouth succeeded the Duke of Grafton as privy seal, and Lord George Germaine (Sackville) became secretary of state. In spite of the disgrace of Minden, the military experience of the clever secretary was now to conduct the war with the colonies. General Gage had been previously called home, and the chief command left with General Howe.

The king, before the opening of the session, said to Lord North, "I am fighting the battle of the legislature, therefore have a right to expect an almost unanimous support." After a ministerial triumph

* "Last Journals," vol. i. p. 502.

† MS. Memoirs.

on the 1st of November, his majesty wrote to express his hope that the "very handsome majority would have the effect of shortening the debates. The house cannot possibly hear the same speeches frequently repeated, or the House of Commons must be composed of more politeness than formerly." It was difficult to treat this great question with any novelty of argument. The controversy had gone out of the region of argument into that of brute force. Nevertheless, in spite of the sanguinary conflict of the 17th of June, the Congress assembled at Philadelphia had on the 8th of July confided to Richard Penn, Governor of Pennsylvania, a petition to the king, to be presented on his arrival in England. The petition, according to Mr. Jefferson, was adopted merely to please its mover, Mr. Dickinson; but "the disgust against its humility was general." This document, denominated the Olive Branch, was delivered to Lord Dartmouth on the 1st of September, and in three days Penn and his companion, Arthur Lee, were informed by letter that no answer would be given to it. This contemptuous rejection of the humble petition of Congress went upon the ground that the body petitioning had no legal existence. The Americans—who knew that the deputies of thirteen States, who signed the petition, were real representatives of the opinions of the majority of the people—from the time of that rejection of their last humble effort at pacification held that to British councils, and not to American, all the bloodshed and guilt of the war were to be ascribed. The British government considered, or professed to consider, that with "vague expressions of attachment to the parent state," the rebellious war was "manifestly carried on for the purpose of establishing an independent empire."* The Americans maintained, up to that period, that they entertained no such purpose. In the House of Lords, on the 7th of November, the petition of the Congress to the king was to be taken into consideration, and having been read, the Duke of Richmond moved that Mr. Penn be examined. That examination, which took place on the 10th, was a very important testimony to the state of opinion in the colonies.

The questions proposed to Mr. Penn, as he stood at the bar of the House of Lords, were chiefly those of the Duke of Richmond and other supporters of the opposition; but he was subjected to a cross-examination by the Earl of Sandwich and others of the ministry. He had resided four years in America; he was two years in the government of Pennsylvania. He thought the members of Congress were men of character, and capable of conveying the sense of America; they undoubtedly convey the sense of the provinces they represent, and he firmly believed the provinces would be governed by their decisions. He was acquainted with almost all the members of the Congress. "Do you think," he was asked, that "they levy and carry on this war for the purpose of establishing an independent empire?" His answer was, "I think they do not carry on the war for independency; I never heard them breathe sentiments of that nature." He was asked, "For what purpose do you believe they have taken up arms?" Brief and emphatic was his answer: "For the defence of their liberties." At the close of his examination Mr. Penn distinctly stated that the most opulent inhabitants of the American provinces would prefer freedom under this country to any other state of freedom; and that while supporting the measures of the Congress they wished at the same time a reconciliation with Great Britain.† The opinions of Mr. Penn on the subject of independence have been confirmed by those held by Washington, Madison, Franklin, and Jefferson, before the commencement of hostilities. Even after that commencement Jefferson affirms that the possibility of separation was "contemplated with affliction by all." Mr. Jay marks more distinctly the period when the notion of separation began to be received: "Until after the second petition of Congress in 1775, I never did hear an American of any class, or of any description, express a wish for the independence of the colonies. . . . Our country was prompted and impelled to independence by necessity, and not by choice."

A motion that the petition of Congress brought by Mr. Penn afforded grounds for conciliation was rejected by an overwhelming majority. In vain Shelburne and Grafton in the Lords—in vain Burke, Fox, and Barré in the Commons—supported propositions "for composing the present troubles in America." The government carried its measures with a high hand. Chatham was again incapable through sickness of taking part in the debates of this solemn period. Lord North's prohibitory bill, forbidding any commerce with the thirteen American colonies, was carried, in all its severe enactments, without Chatham's voice being heard to reprove Mansfield for hounding on the people to the extremities of war. But Chatham emphatically manifested the consistency of his opinions. General Carleton, the commander in Canada, had sent home Lord Pitt, Chatham's eldest son, with dispatches, and in a letter to the father had expressed the most favorable opinion of his aide-de-camp. The Countess of Chatham writes to General Carleton to convey the gratitude of her husband, who, from ill health, was unable fully to testify his sense of obligation: "Feeling all this, sir, as Lord Chatham does, you will tell yourself with what concern he communicates to you a step that, from his fixed opinion with regard to the continuance of the unhappy war with our fellow-subjects of America, he has found it necessary to take. It is that of withdrawing his son from such a service."*

General Carleton, in his letter to Chatham from Montreal, in September, says, of Lord Pitt, "I would it had been in my power to send him with more agreeable news for the public." The Congress had sanctioned an invasion of Canada, under the command of General Montgomery. Benedict Arnold had received a detachment of a thousand men from Washington's army in Massachusetts; and Ethan Allen was ready for a repetition of some such dashing exploit as his capture of Ticonderoga. Allen was marching to attack Montreal when he fell in with the British troops, was made prisoner, and was sent to England. Arnold, having surmounted great difficulties in penetrating through a country of woods and rocks—his men sometimes wading through rapid rivers, and sometimes carrying their boats over barren heights—appeared suddenly before Quebec. Arnold was repulsed by Colonel Maclean, who came in time to save the capital of Canada. But Montgomery was approaching with a larger force. Carleton, with energetic resolution, set off from Montreal disguised as a fisherman; and, passing in a whale-boat through the American flotilla on the St. Lawrence, got into Quebec and took the command. On the 31st of December the united forces of Montgomery and Arnold climbed the heights of Abraham and attacked the city. They were met by a formidable resistance. Montgomery was killed, and Arnold severely wounded. But the Americans blockaded Quebec throughout the winter.

From July, 1775, to February, 1776, Washington had continued the blockade of Boston. He was tired of what he describes as the irksomeness of his situation. The frost had formed some pretty strong ice over the river Charles, and he contemplated an assault upon the town.† He was overruled by a council of war. Meanwhile the British army, in camp round Boston, was suffering great privations and miseries. The small-pox had broken out among the troops. The want of fresh provisions and of fuel made sickness and cold more fatal. In March Washington had taken possession of Dorchester Heights, and was about to secure other strong points, from which measures he hoped it would be in his power "to force the ministerial troops to an attack, or to dispose of them in some way that will be of advantage to us."‡ No attack was made by the British; and on the 19th of March Washington wrote to the president of Congress, "It is with the greatest pleasure I inform you that on Sunday last, the 17th instant, about nine o'clock in the forenoon, the ministerial army evacuated the town of Boston, and that the forces of the United Colonies are now in possession thereof." General Howe sailed for Halifax to wait for reinforcements. Washington and his army marched for New York, against which city he felt assured that the British arms would be next directed. The Congress ordered a gold medal to be struck to commemorate the evacuation of Boston.

On the 20th of February, 1776, Lord North presented copies of treaties between Great Britain and the Duke of Brunswick, the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, and the Count of Hanau, for the hire of troops. The prime minister said, "that the force which this measure would enable us to send to America would be such as, in all human probability, must compel that country to agree to terms of submission, perhaps without any further effusion of blood." The petty

* King's Speech, October 26.
† "Parliamentary Debates," vol. xviii. cols. 911 to 916.

* "Chatham Correspondence," vol. iv. p. 420.
† "Dispatch to Congress," February 18. ‡ Ibid., February 26.

German princes made a hard bargain with the British government. Mr. Hartley, the friend of Franklin, said, with a clear prospect of the future, "When foreign powers are once introduced in this dispute, all possibility of reconciliation and return to our former connection is totally cut off. You have given a justification to the Americans by your example, if they call in the assistance of foreign powers." The measure was supported by a majority of a hundred and fifty-four. On the 3d of March Silas Deane was dispatched by the Congress to Paris, with instructions to inform the French minister for foreign affairs that in the event of the probable separation from Great Britain, France would be regarded as the power whose friendship it would be fittest for the United Provinces of America to obtain and cultivate.

At the beginning of 1776 the Americans had been defeated by General Carleton, and had retired from Quebec. In other engagements they had been equally unsuccessful; and Canada, in the summer of that year, was in the unmolested possession of the king's troops. In June General Howe had left Halifax, and had landed his forces on Staten Island. In July Admiral Lord Howe arrived with reinforcements from England. The two brothers had been authorized, as commissioners, to receive the submission of insurgent colonists, to grant pardons, and inquire into grievances. At an earlier period the appointment of these commissioners, who were men of sense and moderation, might have had beneficial results. But the state of feeling among the colonists was hurrying onward that measure of separation, which the most sagacious saw would be the inevitable result of an obstinate assertion of authority opposed to an ardent desire for independence—a desire at first timidly avowed by a few, dreaded by most, and at last matured into a sentiment which it would have been dangerous in the minority to oppose.

While the British forces under Howe were taking a position on Staten Island, and the Americans, under Washington, were collecting on Long Island and in the city of New York, each preparing for hostilities, the Congress at Philadelphia took a decisive resolution which gave to the war a character somewhat different from an insurrection. In the convention of Virginia the delegates to Congress had been instructed to propose that the colonies should declare themselves independent of Great Britain. The proposal was submitted to the Congress at the beginning of June, and was debated for some days with slight prospect of unanimity. Six of the colonies were opposed to the immediate adoption of such a measure. Nevertheless, a committee of five was appointed to prepare a manifesto embodying this principle. Jefferson was selected to make the draught of a Declaration of Independence. It was submitted and discussed on the 1st of July, when the delegates of Pennsylvania and South Carolina voted against it. Those of Delaware were divided in opinion, and those of New York withdrew. On the next day, by a compromise and a change of delegates, three of the dissentient provinces gave their adhesion to the majority. The draught prepared by Jefferson was discussed during sittings of three days; and it was finally agreed to by the members present of the twelve States, with the exception of one. The delegates from New York were subsequently empowered to give their assent. Thus, on the 4th of July, was completed what has been not unjustly termed "the most memorable public document which history records." * We give the document in a note to this chapter. The long catalogue of "injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny," must be regarded, in many particulars, rather as overstrained inferences from impolitic acts than as evidences of deliberate oppression. Like most of the manifestoes in any great conflict of principles, these charges must be viewed rather as a demonstration of temporary feeling than as incontrovertible truths. But the opening paragraphs of the Declaration are very remarkable as an exposition of doctrines which had a different origin than the Anglo-Saxon institutions upon which the American colonies were founded. The deputies of Congress say, "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and their happiness." These were not American ideas. They were based upon the "Social Contract" of Rousseau, and reflected the popular philosophy which was destined to produce a far mightier revolution than that of the separation of America from the British crown. In France, where inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—were too frequently trampled upon by the governing classes, the American Declaration of Independence was hailed as a beautiful illustration of that theory of liberty and equality which was delightful to speculate upon in the Parisian *salons*—a theory calling forth a delicious enthusiasm, provided it could be kept at a safe distance. If we look back with wonder and pity upon the obstinacy of the British government in the attempt to coerce the Americans into submission, we may regard as a stronger manifestation of political blindness the support which the French government gave to that practical assertion of republican freedom, which was to convert the ideal democracy of which courtly aristocrats delighted to talk, into the terrible reality in which a long-suffering people roused themselves to act, in a fearful revenge of centuries of misrule.

* Tucker, "Life of Jefferson," vol. i. p. 90.

A DECLARATION BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, IN GENERAL CONGRESS ASSEMBLED.

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes: and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his assent should be obtained; and, when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the legislature, a right inestimable to them, and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time after such dissolutions to cause others to be elected, whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large for their exercise, the State remaining, in the mean time, exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

He has made judges dependent on his will alone for the tenure of their offices and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of new officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us in times of peace standing armies without the consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitutions and unacknowledged by our laws, giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation for quartering large bodies of armed troops among us; for protecting them by a mock trial from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States; for cutting off our trade with all parts of the world; for imposing taxes on us without our consent; for depriving us in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury; for transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offences; for abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries, so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these colonies; for taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our governments; for suspending our own legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated government here by declaring us out of his protection and waging war against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burned our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation, and tyranny already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow-citizens taken captive on the high seas to bear arms against their country, to become the executioners of their friends and brethren, or to fall themselves by their hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections among us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions.

In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms: our repeated addresses have been answered only by repeated injuries.

A prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have we been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here, we have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations which would inevitably interrupt our connection and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must therefore acquiesce in the necessity which denounces our separation, and hold them as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace friends.

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America in general Congress assembled, appealing to the supreme judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do in the name and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved; and that as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do.

And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

CHAPTER CLXXI.

Lord Howe, as the British commissioner, addresses a letter to Washington—The letter refused—The British on Long Island—Battle of Brooklyn—Washington retreats—His exploit at Trenton—His success at Princeton—Franklin dispatched by the Congress to Paris—Underhand proceedings of France—John the Painter, the incendiary—Manning the navy—Defences of the country—Chatham appears again in parliament—Steuben—La Fayette—Kosciusko—Battle of the Brandywine—The British in Philadelphia—Burgoyne's army enters the United States from Canada—The convention of Saratoga—Parliament meets—Chatham's speech on the address—On the employment of Indians—Washington in winter quarters at Valley Forge—Steuben reorganizes the army.

The first measures of Lord Howe, upon his arrival off New York, were of a conciliatory nature. He arrived on the 12th of July. On the 14th he sent a flag on shore with a letter, addressed "George Washington, Esquire." One of Washington's colonels told the officer who brought the letter that there was no such person in the American army. The officer expressed great concern, and finally went back, receiving as his answer that a proper direction would obviate all difficulties. Washington wrote to Congress, "I deemed it a duty to my country and my appointment to insist upon that respect which, in any other than a public view, I would willingly have waived." A letter of the 16th, from General Howe, similarly addressed, was similarly refused. The British adjutant-general, Lieutenant-Colonel Paterson, then came to Washington's quarters to explain the matter. He laid the letter on the table, and Washington refused to open it. The conversation on both sides was that of two high-minded gentlemen, but Washington was firm in declining to accept the direction of "George Washington, Esquire, etc., etc., etc.," as a proper address to himself in his public station. Colonel Paterson wished his visit to be considered as the first advance toward that accommodation of the unhappy dispute which was the object of the appointment of commissioners, who, he said, had great powers. Washington replied that he was not invested with any powers on this subject, from those from whom he derived his authority; but from what had transpired, it appeared that Lord Howe and General Howe were only to grant pardons—those who had committed no fault wanted no pardon. Paterson departed, having declined Washington's invitation to a collation. He had expressed his apprehension that an adherence to forms was likely to obstruct business of great moment. Washington had signified to Congress his unwillingness to sacrifice essentials to punctilio; but it is clear that he thought the maintenance of his own dignity was an essential. No further attempt was made at negotiation with Washington.

A large division of the British troops, on the 22d of August, landed on Long Island. A portion of Washington's army was stationed near Brooklyn, a small town at the western angle of the island. Washington, with the greater number of his troops, remained in New York an attack upon which city was not improbable. The Americans were under the command of General Putnam; the British, and their Hessian auxiliaries, were under Sir William Howe. On the 27th was fought the battle of Brooklyn, in which the Americans were defeated with great loss, and were driven back to their lines. But Howe did not follow up his advantage, and Washington, hurrying from New York, rallied his troops, and waited for two days an attack upon his position, which the British commander did not care to risk. Washington then determined to make no further attempt to hold Long Island; and, with consummate prudence and ability, favored by a dense fog, embarked his troops in boats, and landed them with the military stores and artillery in safety at New York. Lord Cornwallis, who had sailed from Cork in February with seven regiments of infantry, was in the action of Brooklyn. Two of the American generals, Sullivan and Stirling, were taken prisoners. On the 15th of September Washington evacuated New York. The reverses in the field were not so dangerous to the cause of independence as the want of discipline in the American troops. Their general was half-despairing, and exclaimed, "Are these the men I am to defend America with?" When the British entered New York they were received by a large number of the inhabitants as deliverers from the plunder and oppression of the troops of the Congress. From the heights of Harlem, about nine miles from New York, where Washington was some time encamped, he moved further up the country to White Plains. There was a serious skirmish between the two armies on the 28th of October; but Howe was deterred from following up the retiring enemy by the apparent strength of their lines. Washington was astonished that the British general did not attempt something. His own army was so disorganized and weakened by desertions that a vigorous attack might have annihilated his remnant of effective men. Fort Washington and Fort Lee, each situated on the bank of the Hudson, were captured by the British in the middle of November. They followed up their success by overruning Jersey. Washington continued to retreat before Cornwallis. Lee, the general who had been directed to join him, was taken prisoner, through his own imprudence in lodging out of his camp.

The British generals now thought they had done enough for one campaign. They had an enemy to deal with who had the old English spirit of not knowing when he was beaten. There appeared no obstacle to the advance of the royal army to Philadelphia; and in

that apprehension the Congress had dispersed to meet at Baltimore. But the passage of the Delaware had been rendered impracticable to the detachment under Cornwallis, for Washington had destroyed the boats on the river. Howe had directed that the men should go into winter cantonments, "the weather having become too severe to keep the field," as he wrote home on the 20th of December, expressing his confidence that, from the general submission of the country and the strength of the advanced posts, the troops would be in perfect security.* Washington had destroyed the boats by which the British might pass the Delaware, but the frost was setting in, and in a few days the British might pursue their way to Philadelphia over the frozen river. He had about five thousand men. On the evening of Christmas day he embarked about half his forces on the Delaware; and continuing his passage through the night, impeded by floating ice, and struggling with snow-storms, he landed his men at Trenton at eight o'clock in the morning, surprised the outposts of the Hessians, and made the main body prisoners, with very slight loss on his own side. Washington went back to secure his prisoners, and again crossed the river, the outposts of the British being abandoned without a struggle by panic-stricken fugitives. Cornwallis, who had gone to New York with the purpose of returning to England, hurried back with fresh troops, and collected those who had been posted on the Delaware. Washington, on the approach of Cornwallis, abandoned Trenton, and established himself in a strong position beyond the river Assanpink. It was not his purpose to hazard a general engagement. By a rapid and secret night march, while Cornwallis judged by the burning of the watch-fires that the enemy was before him, Washington was far away in the rear of the British, and reached Princeton on his road to Brunswick. Here he encountered three British regiments and three troops of light-horse marching to join Cornwallis. The 17th regiment cut its way through the American columns; the 40th and 55th were driven back to Brunswick with the loss of three hundred prisoners. Washington was unable to follow up his advantage, for his men were exhausted by fatigue and hunger. He took up a position on the hills; and his well-timed success brought him large reinforcements, with which he held Jersey, which a month before was in the possession of the British. Washington's second campaign, although marked by great reverses—some of which the candid soldier attributed to his own inexperience—must have shown the British commanders that they were opposed by no common man; that in courage, endurance, and vigilance, this gentleman of Virginia was equalled by few whose military training had been more regular and complete. It was clear that Congress had found the right man for command. It was more than probable that if there had been no such man the event of the war would have been very different.

When Lord Howe arrived off New York in July he addressed a kind letter to Dr. Franklin as "his worthy friend," to inform him that he was sent on a mission which would be explained by the official dispatches that he forwarded at the same time. Franklin replied in a like spirit of former friendship; but said, as the dispatches only showed that Lord Howe was to offer pardon upon submission, he was sure it must give his lordship pain to be sent so far upon so hopeless a business.† In September Lord Howe arranged with General Sullivan, a prisoner of war, to proceed to Congress, upon his parole, to inform them that although he could not treat with that assembly as a body, he was desirous of having a conference with some of the members. Franklin, with John Adams and Edward Rutledge, had accordingly a meeting with Lord Howe; but the conference was quickly broken off when the British commissioner was informed that the United Colonies could only treat for peace as free and independent States. Franklin was now dispatched upon a more hopeful negotiation. He was to join Silas Deane in Paris; and these two, with Arthur Lee, were appointed as commissioners to take charge of the American affairs in Europe, and to endeavor to procure a treaty of alliance with the court of France. At the beginning of November Franklin left America. On the 8th of December he had landed in France, and wrote from Nantes to the president of Congress. He says, "I understand that Mr. Lee has lately been at Paris, that Mr. Deane is still there, and that an underhand supply is obtained from the government of two hundred brass field-pieces, thirty thousand firelocks, and some other military stores, which are now shipping for America, and will be conveyed by a ship of war."* From this period the French government is to be traced in many other "underhand" proceedings hostile to England. On the 31st of October, in the debate on the address at the opening of the session, Lord North and Lord George Germaine expressed their reliance on the assurances of the pacific intentions of France. Franklin and Lee, early in January, saw the Count de Vergennes, the French minister for foreign affairs, who received their memorial, and told them that the French and Spanish courts would act in perfect concert. "Their fleets," Franklin writes, "are said to be in fine order, manned and fitted for sea. The cry of this nation is for us; but the court, it is thought, views an approaching war with reluctance." Franklin, in Paris, was in a singular position to form a just estimate of "the cry of this nation." He writes to a lady in England, "Figure to yourself an old man, with gray hair appearing under a martin-fur cap, among the powdered heads of Paris." He looked with wonder upon the ladies at a ball in Nantes, with head-dresses five lengths of the face above the top of the forehead. At court the mode was less extravagant: "We dined at the Duke de Rochefoucauld's, where there were three duchesses and a countess, and no heads higher than a face and a half."† Schlosser, a German historian, has described Franklin's appearance in the Paris salons: "The admiration of Franklin, carried to a degree approaching folly, produced a remarkable effect on the fashionable circles of Paris. His dress, the simplicity of his external appearance, the friendly meekness of the old man, and the apparent humility of the Quaker, procured for freedom a mass of votaries among the court circles, who used to be alarmed at its coarseness and unsophisticated truths"‡ During several years, when he resided at Passy, a village about three miles from Paris, the shrewd old man in the fur cap was a constant visitor in the highest society. To his exertions is to be chiefly attributed the eagerness with which the aristocracy embraced those vague notions of freedom which, misunderstood and exaggerated, were to become their own destruction.

In the letters of Franklin there is no allusion to a very remarkable series of occurrences in England in which his coadjutor, Mr. Silas Deane, was asserted to have been mixed up in a manner disgraceful to his character. On the 7th of December, 1776, the rope-house of the dockyard at Portsmouth was burned down. With difficulty the flames were prevented from reaching other buildings. The fire was considered accidental, until, on the 15th of January, 1777, a quantity of combustibles were found in the hemp-house of the same yard. About this period an incendiary attempt was also made upon the docks at Plymouth, and then some warehouses were set on fire upon the quay at Bristol, with an evident design to burn the shipping lying alongside. Suspicion at length fell upon a man who had been seen lurking about the dockyard at Portsmouth on the day of the fire, who was known to some persons as John the Painter. He was apprehended at Odiham early in February; and having been induced to confide in another painter, who was permitted to visit him, he at length revealed to his supposed friend the transactions in which he had been engaged. The incendiary's real name was Aitken: his native place Edinburgh; he had been in America three years, and had returned from France a short time before these fires broke out. In March he was brought to trial at the Winchester Assizes, and then, to his surprise, his confidential friend came forward as evidence against him. This suspicious testimony was, however, confirmed by a variety of circumstances proved by other witnesses; and John the Painter paid the penalty of his crimes. His own confession, of which the following is the substance, removed every possible doubt of his guilt. After his return from America he followed the trade of a painter at Birmingham, and also at Titchfield, in Hampshire. Here he conceived the first idea of setting fire to the dockyards. He went to France, and applied to Mr. Silas Deane, who told him when the work was done he should be rewarded. On his return to England, and after setting fire to the rope-yard at Portsmouth, he went to London, and waited on Dr. Bancroft, to whom he had a verbal recommendation from Mr. Deane; but the doctor gave him no coun-

* "Correspondence of Cornwallis," vol. i. p. 25.
† These letters are in the "Annual Register" for 1777.

* Franklin's Works, vol. viii. p. 191. † Ibid., pp. 195 and 197.
‡ Quoted in "Life of Steuben," p. 89. New York. 1859.

venance. He afterward wrote to Bancroft, and the day following met him at the Salopian coffee-house, and told him he would do all the prejudice he could to this kingdom; but the doctor not approving of his conduct, he took his leave, hoping that the doctor would not inform against him, to which the doctor said he did not like to inform against any man. At Plymouth he twice attempted to set fire to the dockyard, and twice reached the top of the wall for that purpose; but the watchman being within hearing, he desisted. He then went to Bristol, where he attempted to set fire to the shipping in the harbor, and afterward set fire to a warehouse in Quay Lane. These details are given in the "Annual Reigster" for 1777, so that Silas Deane had ample opportunity to deny the charges under which he labored. Dr. Bancroft, an American by birth, was settled as a physician in London, and was favorably known as a man of science and an author. Silas Deane was instructed by the Committee of Secret Correspondence of Congress to communicate with Dr. Bancroft, who could give him a good deal of information about what was going on in England. He saw Deane in Paris, where he remained several months. "He then returned to London," says Mr. Jared Sparks, "and being attached to the interests of the United States, he rendered some valuable assistance to the American agents and ministers in Europe." *

Great Britain, at this period, was ill-prepared for a naval war. Her system of manning the navy was as inefficient as it was disgraceful to a country calling itself free. And yet, like many other evil things, it was long held essential to the safety of the nation. On the 11th of March Mr. Temple Luttrell proposed to the House of Commons a measure for the more easy and effectual manning of the navy. In describing the horrors of impressment he showed the tumults, fear, and confusion which arose in every town and village within ten or twelve miles of a press-gang. In Yorkshire the laborers were so terrified by a press-gang at Tadcaster that they fled from their work like a covey of partridges. In the west of England the fishermen had deserted the coasts, and their families were reduced to poverty. Seamen had been drowned in attempting to swim from their ships to the shore, or were shot by the sentinels. Some committed suicide; some mutilated themselves. In the impress-tenders, where captive seamen were thrust together, fevers and other contagious diseases broke out. The guard-ship at the Nore was a seminary of contagion to the whole fleet. The inefficiency of the system was shown to be as palpable as its cruelty. In 1770, during five months when press warrants were in execution through the kingdom, only eight thousand persons could be added to the navy, although the refuse of the jails and the outcasts of every town and hamlet were of the number. The motion was of course negatived by a large majority. Any system of rational expenditure for the defence of the country was constantly opposed by the jobbers in parliament. A plan of registry for seamen, and of bounties for enlistment, was rejected for that plan of brute force which was far more costly, and made the naval service so hateful that not a ship of the line in commission was properly manned. "You have a goodly show of pendants and streamers waving at Spithead," said Mr. Luttrell, "but so far are they from being formidable, as their appearance bespeaks, that your ships hardly ride secure against the equinoctial gales of the present season, much less are they in any condition to put to sea and bid defiance to an enemy." † The coast defences were so neglected as to leave England equally exposed to attack. Marshal Conway writes, in 1774: "The most important places in the English dominions are either left quite defenceless, or such scanty provision made, from the horror of expense, as will neither give security to the objects concerned nor do honor to those who have the conduct of the works. I speak feelingly, when I consider that even Portsmouth is in this case." ‡ Looking back upon many such instances of the neglect of the commonest means of national preservation, we can scarcely regard our country in any other light than as an energetic man, who, by the inherent vigor of his constitution, has survived the cruelty and folly of the silly nurses of his childhood, of the ignorant quacks who were the torment of his youth, and of the venal guardians who starved him in his adult age.

* Franklin's Works, vol. viii. Note on p. 266.
† "Parliamentary Debates," vol. xix. col. 89.
‡ Unpublished Collection of Letters.

On the 28th of May Lord Camden acquainted the House of Lords that the Earl of Chatham intended to move the consideration of the American war on the 30th. Two years had elapsed since Chatham had made his appearance in public. These were days of suffering and solitude. On the 17th of November, 1776, Lady Chatham transmitted to Dr. Addington "a memorandum of that declaration concerning America which, from his confidence in your experienced friendship, he reposed, last July, in your breast." * The memorandum, "expressed with due precision, and in the exact terms," in the handwriting of Lady Chatham, is a document of singular interest. It set forth, "That he continued in the same sentiments, with regard to America, which he had always professed, and which stand so fully explained in the Provisional Act offered by him to the House of Lords. Confiding in the friendship of Dr. Addington, he requested of him to preserve this in memory; that in case he should not recover from the long illness under which he labored, the doctor might be enabled to do him justice by bearing testimony that he persevered unshaken in the same opinions. To this he added, that unless effectual measures were speedily taken for reconciliation with the colonies, he was fully persuaded that, in a very few years, France will set her foot on English ground. That, in the present moment, her policy may probably be to wait some time, in order to see England more deeply engaged in this ruinous war against herself in America, as well as to prove how far the Americans, abetted by France, indirectly only, may be able to make a stand, before she takes an open part by declaring war upon England." The great statesman did recover for a short period. The sensation his appearance produced is forcibly described in the speech of the Duke of Grafton on that occasion. After Chatham had spoken, the duke congratulated the house and the nation upon the evidence that the people retained a grateful sense of the high obligation they owed to the great man who had returned to his duty in parliament. The space before the bar, he said, was filled by gentlemen of all parties; the avenues of the house were so crowded as not to leave room for the peers to come to their seats. Swathed in flannel, and tottering on his crutch, Chatham had passed through this admiring crowd, and not a sound was heard as that melodious voice, a little enfeebled, again charmed every listener. His speech is imperfectly reported, but a few passages show how the pristine vigor of his intellect survived his bodily infirmities: "America has carried you through four wars, and will now carry you to your death, if you don't take things in time. In the sportsman's phrase, when you have found yourselves at fault you must try back. You have ransacked every corner of Lower Saxony; but forty thousand German boors never can conquer ten times the number of British freemen. You many ravage—you cannot conquer; it is impossible: you cannot conquer the Americans. You talk, my lords, of your numerous friends among them to annihilate the Congress, and of your powerful forces to disperse their army. I might as well talk of driving them before me with this crutch! . . . You have been three years teaching them the art of war; they are apt scholars; and I will venture to tell your lordships that the American gentry will make officers enough, fit to command the troops of all the European powers. What you have sent there are too many to make peace—too few to make war. If you conquer them, what then? You cannot make them respect you; you cannot make them wear your cloth; you will plant an invincible hatred in their breasts against you. Coming from the stock they do, they can never respect you." The motion of Chatham was for an humble address to the king, to advise his majesty to take the most speedy and effectual measures for putting a stop to such fatal hostilities. The motion was lost by a majority of 76 against 26. The king wrote this note the next day to Lord North: "Lord Chatham's motion can have no other use but to convey some fresh fuel to the rebels. Like most of the other productions of that most extraordinary brain, it contains nothing but specious words and malevolence."

Lord Chatham, in his declaration to his physician, conjectured rightly that France would abet the Americans indirectly only till they were able to make a stand; after which she would declare open war against England. In May, 1777, Von Steuben, who had been aide-de-camp to Frederick of Prussia, went to Paris, and had various interviews with the Count de St. Germain, secretary at war, and

* "Chatham Correspondence," vol. iv. p. 423.

with the Count de Vergennes, the minister of foreign affairs. The German was sent for by St. Germain, who, spreading a map upon the table and pointing to America, said, "Here is your field of battle; here is a republic which you must serve." Steuben was told that the Congress and the commander-in-chief wanted an officer of military experience, who would bring their army into a regular and permanent formation. He was referred to Beaumarchais, the author of "Figaro," who made him acquainted with Silas Deane, and Deane introduced him to Franklin. The wary American would make no promises about money payments, but talked about presenting him with two thousand acres of land. Steuben did not relish the prospect of these distant advantages, and went away to Germany. But he was persuaded to return to Paris, and finally determined to cross the Atlantic as a volunteer. Vergennes said to him, "You know very well it is impossible for us to make conditions with you. I can only say, go, succeed, and you will never regret the step you have taken." The French ministers suggested to him that he should pretend to the Americans that he had been a major-general in the service of the Margrave of Baden, which imposing title, says his biographer, "secured to Steuben the right place in the American army." With letters to Franklin, the self-created major-general sailed to America in September, in a ship freighted with materials of war by Beaumarchais, who lent the volunteer money to start with. Two remarkable men engaged the same year in the American cause—La Fayette and Kosciusko. La Fayette, one of the noble subalterns of the French army, was secured before he became of age, by the promise given to him, by Silas Deane, that he should have the commission of a major-general in the army of the United States. Franklin gave Kosciusko a letter to Washington, describing him as "a man of experience in military affairs and of tried bravery; who had lost his family and estate in Poland by fighting there in the cause of liberty, and wishes, by engaging in the same cause, to find a new country and new friends in America." * But the old man of Passy was harassed out of his wonted equanimity by incessant applications to recommend officers for the American service. He says, in answer to an application of his nature, "I am afraid to accept an invitation to dine abroad, being almost sure of meeting with some officer or officer's friend, who, as soon as I am put in good-humor by a glass or two of champagne, begins his attack upon me."

The British, under the command of Howe, and the Americans, under Washington, were engaged till the middle of June in watching and checking the movements of each other. After several indecisive encounters, Howe, at the beginning of July, evacuated Jersey, and leaving a part of his force at New York embarked with a large body of infantry and two battalions of cavalry with the intent to reach Philadelphia by sea. Washington was at first perplexed by this sudden change of plan, and thought Howe's conduct "puzzling and embarrassing beyond measure." His first notion was that Howe would endeavor to form a junction with Burgoyne, who was preparing to enter the States from Canada; but he was at last convinced that the British general's object was Philadelphia. To reach this city Howe had employed many weeks in sailing round a great extent of coast before he entered the Chesapeake. When he had landed his troops at the head of the Elk River he was as far from Philadelphia as if he had remained in his position on the Delaware. Washington marched to oppose him. On the 11th of September Lord Cornwallis, with a strong detachment, was sent forward, and on the 13th encountered the American army on the Brandywine, a stream which flows into the Delaware. The Americans were routed with considerable loss, and on the 27th Cornwallis was in the occupation of Philadelphia. There were several smaller actions, especially that of Germantown, before the winter set in; but Washington could not be brought to a general engagement. He went into winter quarters at Valley Forge, a strong position on the banks of the Schuylkill, with an army not exceeding four thousand men, who were wretchedly lodged. In the comfortable quarters of Philadelphia the British indulged in excesses by which all discipline was relaxed, and the sober inhabitants so disgusted that the feelings of loyalty which many cherished were quickly destroyed. The success at the battle of Brandywine and the possession of Philadelphia were advantages that offered no compensation for a terrible blow to the royal cause in another quarter. It had been determined to invade the United States from Canada, with an army of seven thousand troops, British and German, under General Burgoyne. Indians were engaged as auxiliaries; and a co-operation with General Clinton's forces from New York was expected. At the end of June Burgoyne marched. His first exploit was the recapture of Ticonderoga. He next secured Fort Edward, which the Americans abandoned on his approach. Before he accomplished this last success he had to encounter the most formidable interruptions to his march, from the nature of the country and the artificial obstacles which the enemy had created. There were no adequate supplies to be obtained as they proceeded, and the army depended upon salt provisions brought by the lakes from Canada. The Indians who had joined Burgoyne committed atrocities without rendering any effectual aid, and their employment by the British provoked a determined resistance in the New England States. To encounter invaders whose cruelties were proclaimed with violent exaggerations throughout every town and hamlet, a large irregular army was speedily collected. The command was given to General Gates and to General Arnold. Burgoyne too soon found the enormous difficulties of his enterprise. "In all parts," he wrote home, "the industry and management in driving cattle and removing corn are indefatigable and certain." He could obtain no intelligence of General Howe. With stores for thirty days, which he had collected during a month, he crossed the Hudson to Saratoga. The army of Gates was encamped on a range of hills called Bemus's Heights. On the 19th of September a battle was fought, in which the victory of the British secured no real advantage, for the Americans retired to their lines. The two armies continued in front of each other till the 7th of October. The stores of Burgoyne were rapidly diminishing, and on that day he sent out a detachment of fifteen hundred men for the purpose of covering a foraging party. Arnold attacked them, and compelled a retreat with a loss of six cannon. He then assaulted Burgoyne's lines, and was repulsed where the British occupied them, but succeeded in forcing the intrenchments defended by a German reserve. The royal army quitted their encampment in the night, and sought a safer position on some higher ground. The next day Burgoyne saw the necessity of retreating to Saratoga, leaving his sick and wounded behind him. He was now encompassed with enemies on every side, and, worst of all, his provisions were nearly exhausted, though for some days the troops had been upon short rations. Three thousand five hundred men were all that remained. The general called a council of war, and it was determined to treat with the enemy. A message was sent to the American headquarters with a flag of truce. The answer of General Gates was that as the army of General Burgoyne was reduced in force, their provisions exhausted, their horses and baggage taken or destroyed, their retreat cut off, their camp invested, they could only be allowed to surrender as prisoners of war, and were required to ground their arms within their lines. The unanimous resolve in the British camp was to reject the terms. It was finally agreed that the army should march out of the camp with the honors of war, and pile their arms at the command of their own officers; that a free passage should be granted to Great Britain, upon the condition that the troops should not serve again in North America during the war. On the 17th of October the convention was signed, and the small and disheartened army received a supply of fresh provisions, and commenced their march to Massachusetts. The conduct of the American army toward the vanquished was marked by the utmost delicacy and consideration. The conduct of the Congress was very different. They refused to permit the embarkation of Burgoyne and his men from Boston till the court of Great Britain had ratified the convention; and under various pretences the British were detained for so long a period as to justify the indignation of contemporary statesmen and of future historians against this signal instance of bad faith on the part of the American government.

The session of parliament was opened on the 18th of November. There was no change in the tone of the royal speech. The "obstinacy of the rebels—a deluded and unhappy multitude—called for a steady pursuit of measures for the re-establishment of constitutional subordination." It was known that Chatham, greatly restored in health, intended to move an amendment upon the address. By general consent, the great orator, in all the fire of his youth, and all the

* "Works," vol. viii. p. 221.

majesty of his maturity, never exceeded this almost last effort of his genius. The Duke of Grafton says, "In this debate he exceeded all that I had ever admired in his speaking." This speech was admirably reported by Hugh Boyd, and thus, taken altogether, gives the most correct idea of Chatham's peculiar powers. He set forth the encouragement which France was giving to the ministers and ambassadors of those who are called rebels. "Can there be a more mortifying insult? Can even our ministers sustain a more humiliating disgrace? Do they dare to resent it?" He foreshadowed the fatal event of Saratoga. "My lords, you cannot conquer America. What is your present situation there? We do not know the worst; but we know that in three campaigns we have done nothing and suffered much. Besides the sufferings, perhaps total loss of the northern force, the best appointed army that ever took the field, commanded by Sir William Howe, has retired from the American lines. . . . As to conquest, therefore, my lords, I, repeat, it is impossible. You may swell every expense and every effort still more extravagantly; pile and accumulate every assistance you can buy or borrow; traffic and barter with every pitiful little German prince that sells and sends his subjects to the shambles of a foreign prince; your efforts are forever vain and impotent—doubly so from this mercenary aid on which you rely; for it irritates, to an incurable resentment, the minds of your enemies, to overrun them with the mercenary sons of rapine and plunder, devoting them and their possessions to the rapacity of hireling cruelty. If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country I never would lay down my arms—never—never—never." He then exclaimed, Who is the man who has dared to authorize and associate to our arms the tomahawk and scalping-knife of the savage? and dwelt on this stain on the national character. Though the orator was indignant at the manner in which the war was carried on, the statesman did not give his approval to the object which the Americans now proposed to themselves. "The independent views of America have been stated and asserted as the foundation of this address. My lords, no man wishes for the due dependence of America on this country more than I do. To preserve it, and not confirm that state of independence into which your measures hitherto have driven them, is the object which we ought to unite in attaining. The Americans, contending for their rights against arbitrary exactions, I love and admire. It is the struggle of free and virtuous patriots. But, contending for independency and total disconnection from England, as an Englishman, I cannot wish them success; for in a due constitutional dependency, including the ancient supremacy of this country in regulating their commerce and navigation, consists the mutual happiness and prosperity both of England and America."

Chatham having moved his amendment to the address, Lord Sandwich replied, and was succeeded by Lord Suffolk, one of the secretaries of state. One passage of his lordship's speech was as follows: "The noble earl, with all that force of oratory for which he is so conspicuous, has charged administration as if guilty of the most heinous crimes, in employing Indians in General Burgoyne's army; for my part, whether foreigners or Indians, which the noble lord has described by the appellation of savages, I shall ever think it justifiable to exert every means in our power to repel the attempts of our rebellious subjects. The Congress endeavored to bring the Indians over to their side, and if we had not employed them they would most certainly have acted against us; and I do freely confess I think it was both a wise and necessary measure, as I am clearly of opinion that we are fully justified in using every means which God and Nature has put into our hands." The Duke of Grafton thus describes the reply of Chatham to this position: "He stood up with a degree of indignation that added to the force of the sudden and unexampled burst of eloquence which must have affected any audience, and which appeared to me to surpass all that we have ever heard of the celebrated orators of Greece or Rome." Having denounced the horrible notion of attributing the sanction of God and Nature to the massacres of the Indian scalping-knife, he thus proceeded: "These abominable principles, and this more abominable avowal of them, demand the most decisive indignation. I call upon that right reverend bench, those holy ministers of the Gospel, and pious pastors of our Church—I conjure them to join in the holy work, and vindicate the religion of their God. I appeal to the wisdom and the law of this learned bench, to defend and support the justice of their country. I call upon the bishops to interpose the unsullied sanctity of their lawn; upon the learned judges to interpose the purity of their ermine, to save us from this pollution. I call upon the honor of your lordships, to reverence the dignity of your ancestors, and to maintain your own. I call upon the spirit and humanity of my country, to vindicate the national character. I invoke the genius of the constitution. From the tapestry that adorns these walls, the immortal ancestor of this noble lord frowns with indignation at the disgrace of his country. In vain he led your victorious fleets against the boasted armada of Spain; in vain he defended and established the honor, the liberties, the religion—the Protestant religion—of this country, against the arbitrary cruelties of popery and the inquisition, if these more than popish cruelties and inquisitorial practices are let loose among us—to turn forth into our settlements, among our ancient connections, friends, and relations, the merciless cannibal, thirsting for the blood of man, woman, and child! to send forth the infidel savage—against whom? against your Protestant brethren; to lay waste their country, to desolate their dwellings, and extirpate their race and name with these horrible hell-hounds of savage war—hell-hounds, I say, of savage war! Spain armed herself with bloodhounds to extirpate the wretched natives of America, and we improve on the inhuman example even of Spanish cruelty; we turn loose these savage hell-hounds against our brethren and countrymen in America, of the same language, laws, liberties, and religion, endeared to us by every tie that should sanctify humanity." . . . "My lords, I am old and weak, and at present unable to say more; but my feelings and indignation were too strong to have said less. I could not have slept this night in my bed, nor reposed my head on my pillow, without giving this vent to my eternal abhorrence of such preposterous and enormous principles."

On the 3d of December Colonel Barré, having called upon Lord George Germaine "to declare, upon his honor, what was become of General Burgoyne and his brave troops," he admitted that he had received a piece of very disastrous intelligence from Quebec. Furious was the indignation against the ministry. Charles Fox declared that an army of ten thousand men, destroyed through the obstinate, wilful ignorance and incapacity of the noble lord, called loudly for vengeance. A gallant general was sent like a victim to be slaughtered. He was ordered to make his way to Albany, to wait the orders of Sir William Howe; but General Howe knew nothing of the matter, for he was gone to a different country, and left the unhappy Burgoyne and his troops to make the best terms for themselves. Fox moved for copies of instructions to Burgoyne, which motion was negatived.

Washington's position in his winter quarters of Valley Forge was such as to demand the utmost exercise of his energy and fortitude. His commissariat department was in a frightful state of incapacity. He wrote to Congress on the 23d of December, "Unless some great and capital change suddenly takes place in that line, this army must inevitably be reduced to one or other of these three things—starve, dissolve, or disperse, in order to obtain subsistence in the best manner they can." In answer to some presumptuous remarks of members of Congress, reprobating his going into winter quarters, he says, "I can assure these gentlemen that it is a much easier and less distressing thing to draw remonstrances in a comfortable room by a good fireside, than to occupy a cold bleak hill, and sleep under frost and snow, without clothes or blankets." Steuben arrived in Washington's camp at this period of suffering. He found the military administration intrusted to departments having separate powers—quartermaster-general, war-commissary, provisions-commissary, commissary of the treasury, paymaster of forage—"bad copies of a bad original—that is to say, they had imitated the English administration, which is certainly the most imperfect in Europe. . . . The English system, bad as it is, had already taken root. Each company and quartermaster had a commission of so much per cent on all the money he expended. It was natural, therefore, that expense was not spared."* In the condition of the troops he found disorder and confusion supreme. The men were only engaged for three, six, or nine months, so that it was impossible to have a regiment or a

* "Steuben's Life," p. 114.—Extracts from his MS. papers.

company complete. "I have seen a regiment consisting of thirty men, and a company of one corporal." A general would have thought himself lucky to find a third of the men ready for action whom he found upon paper. "The arms at Valley Forge were in a horrible condition, covered with rust, half of them without bayonets, many from which a single shot could not be fired." The men were literally naked. Officers mounted guard in a sort of dressing-gown made of an old blanket. The formation of the regiments was as varied as their mode of drill, which only consisted of the manual exercise, each colonel having a system of his own. They could only march in flies, after the manner of the Indians. Such, according to Steuben, was the condition of an army that was to resist the regularly disciplined troops of England, provided with necessaries of war at an unbounded expense. It may be instructive to see how the Prussian officer set about bringing this irregular force into something like military order, with the sanction of Washington. He drafted a hundred and twenty men from the line, as a guard for the chief in command. He drilled them himself twice a day. "In a fortnight my company knew perfectly how to bear arms, had a military air, knew how to march, deploy, and execute some little manœuvres with excellent precision." In the course of instruction he departed altogether from the general rule. "In our European armies a man who has been drilled for three months is called a recruit; here, in two months, I must have a soldier. In Europe we had a number of evolutions very pretty to look at when well executed, but in my opinion absolutely useless so far as essential objects are concerned." He reversed the whole system of eternal manual and platoon exercises, and commenced with manœuvres. He soon taught them something better than the pedantic routine which was taught in manuals of tactics. To the objectors against Steuben's system it was answered, "that in fact there was no time to spare in learning the minutiæ—the troops must be prepared for instant combat." The sagacious German had his men at drill every morning at sunrise; and he soon made the colonels of regiments not ashamed of instructing their recruits.

CHAPTER CLXXII.

Public opinion on the American War—Measures of conciliation proposed by Lord North—France concludes a treaty of amity with America—Chatham's last speech in parliament—His sudden illness in the House of Lords—His death—Propositions of Lord North rejected by Congress—French fleet under D'Estaing arrives in America—Attack on Rhode Island impeded by fleet under Lord Howe—Admiral Keppel takes the command of the Channel fleet—Engagement off Ushant—Court-martial on Keppel—Burgoyne's defence of himself in parliament—Destruction of Wyoming—Spain declares war against Great Britain—Apprehensions of invasion—The national spirit roused—Enterprises of Paul Jones—Military operations in America in 1779.

The voice of Edmund Burke was rarely heard in parliament on the subject of America during the two sessions of 1777. In his remarkable "Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol," he says: "It is some time since I have been clearly convinced, that in the present state of things, all opposition to any measures proposed by ministers, where the name of America appears, is vain and frivolous. . . . Everything proposed against America is supposed, of course, to be in favor of Great Britain. Good and ill success are equally admitted as reasons for persevering in the present method. Several very prudent and very well-intentioned persons were of opinion that, during the prevalence of such dispositions, all struggle rather inflamed than lessened the distemper of the public counsels. Finding such resistance to be considered as factious by most within doors, and by very many without, I cannot conscientiously support what is against my opinion, nor prudently contend with what I know is irresistible." The tone of this letter sufficiently indicates the conviction of one who sagaciously watched the course of public opinion, that the contest with America had reached such a stage that those who continued to advocate principles of conciliation were not supported by the majority of the British nation. Burke saw the injury that the prevailing sentiment was producing upon the national character: "Liberty is in danger of being made unpopular to Englishmen. Contending for an imaginary power, we begin to acquire the spirit of domination, and to lose the relish of honest equality. The principles of our forefathers become suspected to us, because we see them animating the present opposition of our children." At the commencement of the war this state of public opinion was wholly irrational and almost base. In 1776 the American Declaration of Independence turned aside many friends of pacific measures, to regard the conflict as one which it became the dignity of Great Britain to carry on to a successful assertion of national rights. But in 1778, when France was ostensibly preparing to support the cause of the revolted colonies, there could be little doubt that the advocates for recognizing the claim to independence, thus enforced by a power systematically hostile to British interests, would form a very inconsiderable portion of the people—that continued opposition to the government upon this question would be "considered factious by most within doors and by very many without."

At the beginning of 1778 Manchester and Liverpool came forward in a marked display of loyalty. Each community offered to raise a regiment of a thousand men at their own expense. Edinburgh, Glasgow, and parts of the Highlands exhibited a similar spirit. Large subscriptions were provided in London for raising men for his majesty's service. These proceedings took place during the recess; and when the houses met in January, strong objections were taken to what was held to be the unconstitutional measure of levying troops by private subscription without the consent of parliament. Lord North rejoiced in the manifestation of public spirit, which he regarded as a tribute to the conduct of the administration. But the prime minister, while thus exulting that "a very loyal part of his majesty's subjects had expressed their abhorrence of an unnatural rebellion," was about to depart very widely from the principle on which the contest had been hitherto conducted. On the 17th of February Lord North brought in two bills, the first of which was entitled, "For removing all doubts and apprehensions concerning taxation by the parliament of Great Britain in any of the colonies." This was a complete and utter renunciation of the right of Great Britain to impose any tax upon the American colonies, except only such duties as it might be expedient to impose for the regulation of commerce, the net produce of which was always to be applied to the use of the colony in which the duties were levied. The second bill was to enable the king to appoint commissioners with ample powers to treat upon the means of quieting the disorders in America; and they were authorized to treat and agree with any body or bodies politic, or any person or persons whatsoever. The commissioners were thus empowered to treat with the Congress as if it were a legal body, and as if its acts and concessions would bind all America. The Congress, said Lord North, had raised a difficulty with the former commission, on pretence of the non-admission of their title to independent states. "As the Americans might claim their independence in the outset, he would not insist on their renouncing it till the treaty should receive its final ratification by the king and parliament of Great Britain." The minister, in recapitulating the circumstances of this unhappy contest, from the period of the Stamp Act, maintained that from the beginning he had been uniformly disposed to peace. In the historical part of the Annual Register, written no doubt by Burke, the temper of the house is thus recorded: "A dull melancholy silence for some time succeeded to this speech. It had been heard with profound attention, but without a single mark of approbation to any part, from any description of men, or any particular man, in the house. Astonishment, dejection, and fear overclouded the whole assembly. Although the minister had declared that the sentiments he expressed that day had been those which he always entertained, it is certain that few or none had understood him in that manner; and he had been represented to the nation at large as the person in it most tenacious of those parliamentary rights which he now proposed to resign, and the most remote from the submissions which he now proposed to make. It was generally therefore concluded that something more extraordinary and alarming had happened than yet appeared, which was of force to produce such an apparent change in measures, principles, and arguments."

The "something more extraordinary and alarming than yet appeared" was soon to be manifested. On the 17th of March a royal message was presented to both houses, stating that his majesty had been informed, by order of the French king, "that a treaty of amity and commerce had been signed between the court of France and cer-

tain persons employed by his majesty's revolted subjects in North America;" and that in consequence of this offensive communication the king had sent orders to his ambassador to withdraw from the French court. The communication was made to the British secretary of state, by the French ambassador in London, on the 13th of March. On the 14th Lord North earnestly pressed the king to accept his resignation, and to send for Lord Chatham. The letters of the king sufficiently manifest the strong aversion which his majesty had taken to the statesman who, in this crisis of his country's fate, was looked up to as the only Englishman who was likely to conciliate America while he alarmed France. The king, on the 15th of March, declared that he did not object to Lord North applying to Lord Chatham to support his administration; but adding, "that no advantage to my country, nor personal danger to myself, can make me address myself to Lord Chatham or to any other branch of opposition. Honestly, I would rather lose the crown I now wear than bear the ignominy of possessing it under their shackles." In another letter of the same day he says, "I don't expect that Lord Chatham and his crew will come to your assistance." Lord North continuing to press for a more complete change of ministers than the king contemplated, the correspondence continued for several days in the same determined exhibition of the sovereign's implacability. Chatham he terms "that perfidious man." He would not have him, "as dictator, planning a new administration." Lord North at length consented to go on as the head of a ministry till the session of parliament was closed. A few official changes were made, the most important of which was the appointment of the attorney-general, Thurlow, to be lord chancellor. The national feeling, with regard to Chatham was expressed in a letter to Lady Chatham, by Thomas Coutts, the eminent banker. He said that Lord Chatham's health "becomes every day more interesting, in the present desponding state of the people. Every rank looks up to him, with the only gleam of hope that remains." In a few weeks a higher power than courts or senates decided that Chatham should be at rest—indifferent to the hatred of a king or the veneration of a people.

The Duke of Richmond had given notice in the House of Lords of a motion which he intended to make on the 7th of April, "for an address to the king upon the state of the nation." On the 5th the duke sent to Lord Chatham the draft of his proposed address; which Chatham returned the next day, expressing his concern "to find himself under so wide a difference with the Duke of Richmond, as between the sovereignty and allegiance of America."* Chatham was slowly recovering from a fit of the gout; but he determined to go to town from Hayes, and take his place in parliament. Lord Camden, in a letter to the Duke of Grafton, describing the closing scene of the great earl's public life, says, "He was not in a condition to go abroad: and he was earnestly requested not to make the attempt." Camden saw him in the Prince's Chamber before he went into the house, and remarked "the feeble state of his body and the distempered agitation of his mind." An eye-witness has recorded his appearance. "Lord Chatham came into the House of Lords, leaning upon two friends, lapped up in flannel, pale and emaciated. Within his large wig, little more was to be seen than his aquiline nose and his penetrating eye. He looked like a dying man; yet never was seen a figure of more dignity."† The two friends were his son, William Pitt, and Lord Mahon, his son-in-law. The Duke of Richmond had made his motion for an address. Viscount Weymouth had opposed the motion. The Earl of Chatham, continues the narrative of the eye-witness, "rose from his seat with slowness and difficulty, leaning on his crutches, and supported under each arm by his two friends. He took one hand from his crutch, and raised it, casting his eyes toward heaven, and said, 'I thank God that I have been enabled to come here this day, to perform my duty, and to speak on a subject which has so deeply impressed my mind. I am old and infirm—have one foot, more than one foot, in the grave—I am risen from my bed, to stand up in the cause of my country, perhaps never again to speak in this house.'" He rejoiced that he was still able to lift up his voice against the dismemberment of this ancient and most noble monarchy. "My lords, his majesty succeeded to an empire as great in extent as its reputation was unsullied. Shall we tarnish the lustre of this nation by an ignominious surrender of its rights and fairest possessions? Shall this great kingdom, which has survived whole and entire the Danish depredations, the Scottish inroads, and the Norman conquest—that has stood the threatened invasion of the Spanish armada—now fall prostrate before the house of Bourbon? Surely, my lords, this nation is no longer what it was. Shall a people that, fifteen years ago, was the terror of the world, now stoop so low as to tell its ancient inveterate enemy, Take all we have, only give us peace?" Lord Camden describes the words of Chatham as "shreds of unconnected eloquence, and flashes of the same fire which he, Prometheus-like, had stolen from heaven; and were then returning to the place from whence they were taken." That withering sarcasm which occasionally found its place in his impassioned harangues was not absent in this last effort. Speaking of the probability of invasion, he said, "Of a Spanish invasion, of a French invasion, of a Dutch invasion, many noble lords may have read in history; and some lords may perhaps remember a Scotch invasion." He looked at Lord Mansfield. The Duke of Richmond replied; and then Chatham made an effort again to address the house. "He fell back upon his seat," writes Camden, "and was to all appearance in the agonies of death. This threw the whole house into confusion. Every person was upon his legs in a moment, hurrying from one place to another, some sending for assistance, others producing salts, and others reviving spirits; many crowding about the earl to observe his countenance; all affected; most part really concerned; and even those who might have felt a secret pleasure at the accident yet put on the appearance of distress, except only the earl of M., who sat still, almost as much unmoved as the senseless body itself." There was one who, though "born and bred a Briton," felt no regret that one of the noblest vindicators of Britain's honor had, in all human probability, concluded his eventful career. The king the next day wrote to Lord North, "May not the political exit of Lord Chatham incline you to continue at the head of affairs?" The political exit was quickly followed by the close of the "last scene of all." Chatham died at Hayes on the 11th of May. On the day after his decease the House of Commons unanimously resolved to honor his memory by a public funeral and a public monument. The king was "rather surprised," he said, in a note to Lord North, at such a testimony; but trusted it would be merely an expression of gratitude for Chatham's having roused the nation at the beginning of the late war, and his conduct as secretary of state. "This compliment, if paid to his general conduct," added his majesty, "is rather an offensive measure to me personally." The funeral in Westminster Abbey was attended by few of the party in power. The monument, by Banks, "erected by the king and parliament as a testimony to the virtues and abilities of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham," records that during his administration "Divine Providence exalted Great Britain to an height of prosperity and glory unknown to any former age." The cenotaph erected by the corporation of London has an inscription of higher import. The monument to William Pitt is placed in the Guildhall of the city of London, "that her citizens may never meet for the transaction of their affairs without being reminded that the means by which Providence raises a nation to greatness are the virtues infused into great men; and that to withhold from those virtues, either of the living or the dead, the tribute of esteem and veneration, is to deny to themselves the means of happiness and honor."

The news of the French alliance being concluded reached Washington's camp at Valley Forge on the 4th of May. The biographer of Steuben records that "suddenly the public distress seemed to be forgotten amid universal joy." Many supposed that immediate peace would be the natural consequence of this change of circumstances. Steuben wrote to Henry Laurens, then president of Congress, to offer his congratulations "in seeing the independence of America established on so solid a basis." The cautious president replies, "It is my opinion that we are not to roll down a green bank and toy away the ensuing summer. There is blood, much blood, in our prospect. Britain will not be hummed by a stroke of policy. She will be very angry, and if she is to fall, her fall will be glorious. We, who know her, ought to be prepared."*

The pacific measures of the British government produced not the

* "Chatham Correspondence," vol. iv. p. 518.
† "Seward's Anecdotes," vol. ii. p. 383. Fifth edit.

* "Life of Steuben," p. 138.

slightest change in the policy of the leaders of the American Revolution. Washington held that the propositions and the speech of Lord North must have proceeded from despair of the nation's succeeding against the United States. When the commissioners under Lord North's bill arrived at Philadelphia, they found the army about to evacuate the town; having received positive orders to that effect from home. Howe had resigned his command, which had been transfered to Sir Henry Clinton. The abandonment of Philadelphia, the certainty of the French alliance, the contempt which was felt at the vacillating policy of the ministry, emboldened the Congress to treat the royal commissioners with little ceremony. That body refused to hold a conference with them, unless they should withdraw the naval and military power of Great Britain, or acknowledge the independence of America in direct terms. No reply was given to the explanatory offers of the commissioners—offers which, if made in the early days of the contest, would have commanded not only willing obedience but fervent gratitude. The commissioners determined to return to England; but they first took the somewhat dangerous step of addressing a manifesto to the American people, remonstrating against the decision of the Congress, and holding out the threat that if peace and union were refused the war would in future be conducted upon different principles. "The policy, as well as the benevolence, of Great Britain, have thus far checked the extremes of war, when they tended to distress a people still considered as our fellow subjects, and to desolate a country shortly to become again a source of mutual advantage; but when that country professes the unnatural design, not only of estranging herself from us, but of mortgaging herself and her resources to our enemies, the whole contest is changed." Upon this plea it was affirmed that the laws of self-preservation called upon Great Britain, if her colonies were to become an accession to France, "to render that accession of as little avail as possible to her enemy." When this manifesto was brought before parliament at the end of the year, there were different opinions as to the meaning to be attached to such a threat; but most men, not wholly subservient to the ministry, agreed with Burke, that "if the war was to be changed—if the lenity, the humanity, the toleration, which had been hitherto observed, was to be foregone, and we had forbore nothing that the rights of war could authorize—then the plan now to be prosecuted was different from lenity and toleration, and was different from the laws of war; for war was constantly to be limited by necessity, and its calamities and ravages to be bound in by that plea alone. . . . The extremes of war, and the desolation of a country, were sweet sounding mutes and liquids, but their meaning was terrible; they meant the killing of man, woman, and child, burning their houses and ravaging their lands, annihilating humanity from the face of the earth, or rendering it so wretched that death would be preferable." *

The war of Great Britain against France and America at once became a fierce struggle by land and sea. When Sir Henry Clinton had marched through Jersey with Washington following him, and a partial battle had been fought on the 28th of June, the British army was at last established at New York, with a large garrison at Rhode Island. A French fleet from Toulon, under the Count d'Estaing, had appeared off New York on the 5th of July. It consisted of twelve sail of the line and six frigates, with a large number of troops on board. It was determined to attack the British in Rhode Island, by a combined army of four thousand French and ten thousand Americans. The garrison of five thousand retired wthin their lines at Newport. The Americans had crossed the narrow strait called the Seaconnet Channel, and d'Estaing was about to land his troops on the west side of the island when the fleet under Lord Howe appeared in sight, and the French admiral put to sea to offer battle, leaving his allies to pursue the siege of Newport alone. The fleets were prevented engaging by a violent storm, by which they were both dismantled. Each went into port to refit; the British to New York, the French to Boston. The abandonment of the Americans by d'Estaing compelled them to relinquish their enterprise upon Rhode Island; and bitter was their indignation against their allies. The French admiral finally sailed to pursue his own plans of attacking the British West Indian Islands, or defending those of France. The island of St. Lucia was taken by the British, and Dominica by the French.

* "Parliamentary Debates," vol. xix. col. 1400.

In the House of Commons on the 5th of May Thomas Townshe noticed the sailing of the French fleet from Toulon, while o was merely exhibited as a pageant at Portsmouth—a "puppet-sho as Walpole terms it. Lord North said the utmost exertions had be made. Though no fleet had sailed, the ministers were not to l accused of incapacity; for the French at all times, by their mode c supply of seamen from their registers, could man a fleet sooner than England. Admiral Keppel, an experienced officer, and highly popular with the navy, had been appointed to the command of the Channel fleet. This appointment was creditable to the ministry, for Keppel was, as a member of parliament, strongly opposed to their policy. When he first accepted the command he found only six ships of the line fit for service; but before the middle of June the number was increased to twenty. He sailed from St. Helen's on the 17th of June. Two French frigates, reconnoitring, were attacked by his squadron, one of which was captured and the other driven on shore on the coast of France. Among the papers of the Lecorne thus captured, he discovered that anchorage was ordered at Brest for an immense fleet, with which he thought his own unable to contend. He sailed back to Portsmouth. The public feeling is expressed in a letter of Gibbon: "Keppel's return has occasioned infinite and inexpressible consternation, which gradually changed into discontent against him." The admiralty made great exertions; and Keppel, on the 9th of July, again put to sea with a reinforcement of ten ships. The French fleet, consisting of thirty-two sail of the line and a considerable number of frigates, had come out from Brest, under the command of Count d'Orvilliers. After four days' manœuvring an engagement took place off Ushant, which had no decisive result. Night was coming on with a heavy squall. Keppel signalled to the second in command, Sir Hugh Palliser, to come up to renew the fight; but that admiral was unable to obey the order, from the damage which his ship had sustained. The French admiral got back to Brest, and Keppel sailed to Plymouth. The conduct of the two admirals became the subject of warm debates when the parliament met in November. Attacks and recriminations were conducted with all the heat of party; Keppel being upon terms of friendship with the leading members of the opposition; Palliser a supporter of the ministry and a lord of the admiralty. Each admiral blamed the other; and, finally, upon charges made by Palliser against Keppel for misconduct and incapacity, a court-martial was ordered. The trial lasted thirty-two days, and ended in a unanimous verdict of the court, that Keppel had acted with bravery and judgment, and that the charges were ill-founded and malicious. This court-martial has been rendered illustrious by a passage of Burke, in which he describes "with what zeal and anxious affection I attended him through that his agony of glory. . . . If to the eternal disgrace of this nation, and to the total annihilation of every trace of honor and virtue in it, things had taken a different turn from what they did, I should have attended him to the quarter-deck with no less good-will, and more pride, than I partook of the general flow of national joy that attended the justice that was done to his virtue." * The popular enthusiasm in favor of Keppel was indeed remarkable. It may be attributed, in part, to a conviction that the government was unequal to the conduct of the war. The people could not be supposed to feel with Burke that Keppel was "one of the greatest and best men of his age;" but they illuminated and rioted for his acquittal; and his portrait became a favorite sign in town and country. Palliser demanded a court-martial upon himself, and received an acquittal of a very qualified character. The extravagant admiration of Keppel and the proportionate depreciation of Palliser may suggest the opinion that admirals and generals may receive a more impartial judgment from their contemporaries by withholding their support from extreme parties in politics.

General Burgoyne returned to England in the spring of 1778, Congress having consented to give him passports, upon the condition that he would go back to America, and abide the fate of the rest of the army, should their embarkation continue to be prevented. He was treated coldly by our government, and refused admission to the royal presence. A court of inquiry into his conduct was refused, upon the ground that he was a prisoner on parole to the Congress. As a member of parliament he had an opportunity of vindicating the

* "Letter to the Duke of Bedford."

ta. ntion of Saratoga. The blame that had been attached to him Ar e employment of Indians in his campaign appears to have ti unded him very deeply. He stated that he always believed the l dian alliances to be at best a necessary evil. He had declined heir offers and solicitations to be employed separately. He had pre-ided at one of the greatest councils with the Indians that had been hel l at Montreal. It was their custom to offer the pipe of war to the representative of the power they meant to serve. It was pressed upon him by the chiefs present; and it was at his option, by a single whiff of tobacco, to have given flame and commotion to a dozen nations. He had acted in this matter under the instructions of Sir Guy Carleton in 1776; and when he came to England in that year he found the system of restraining the impetuous passions of these people unpopular with those official persons who had adopted the reasoning, in their zeal against the colonists, that partial severity was general mercy. He returned to Canada, determined to be the soldier not the executioner, of the state. The eloquent invective of Chatham, we thus see, had in view the ministerial directors of the war rather than the commander who succumbed to unavoidable difficulties.

Connected with the subject of the barbarities of the Indians, there is an event of the year 1778 which has been rescued from the possible oblivion of history by the more enduring associations of poetry.* Wyoming, on the Susquehanna, consisting of eight townships, was a new settlement. The soil was fertile, the climate genial, the inhabitants unusually prosperous. Happy they were not, for a minority among them was bitterly opposed to those who resisted the British government. The people were removed from the scene of hostilities; yet the greater number took a deep interest in the contest for independence, and had sent a large proportion of their adult male population to the army of the Congress. The infant settlement was comparatively defenceless, although four forts had been constructed to resist the inroads of the savages. The right to the soil was a disputed point between the States of Connecticut and Pennsylvania; and in the absence of a central control those who were loyalists, or Tories, were exposed to rigorous treatment. The mutual hatred between the two parties of Americans was too often marked by persecution, and political differences became the justification for rapine and revenge. Many of the Tories of Wyoming had abandoned the settlement. Some strangers had come among the inhabitants of the townships under suspicious circumstances, and had been arrested and sent to Connecticut. At the beginning of July a body of armed men, amounting to sixteen hundred, appeared on the Susquehanna. One fourth of these were Indians. The whole force was commanded by a partisan known as Colonel Butler, and according to the accounts of the time, by one Brandt, half Indian by blood, ferocious and cruel beyond example—"The monster Brandt."† One of the smaller forts was first taken by storm, and all the men were massacred. The commander of another fort was induced to march out with four hundred men to hold a parley, and after a murderous struggle only seventy escaped. In a third fort the men were slaughtered or burned alive. In a fourth the same indiscriminate havoc was pursued, with similar cruelty. Then commenced such a wholesale destruction of houses, corn-ricks, standing corn as the terrible devastations of what some have called regular warfare could scarcely parallel. The sufferings of those who fled from the scenes of devastation, to endure all the miseries of inhospitable woods, were almost as great as those of the victims of the Indian tomahawk. Other such scenes of havoc took place in back settlements.

The Annual Register of 1779 opens with a sentence that can scarcely be held as founded merely upon vain apprehensions: "The year of which we treat presented the most awful appearances of public affairs, which this country had perhaps beheld for many ages. . . . Mankind seemed to wait, with an aspect which at best bespoke indifference, for the event of that ruin which was expected to burst upon us." The writer proceeds to say, that "the expected evil and danger were less dreadful in the encounter than in the distant appearance." In that year Spain joined France in the alliance against Great Britain. On the 16th of June the king sent a message to parliament announcing that the Spanish minister had delivered a state-paper which amounted to a declaration of war. Invasion was expected; and a proclamation was issued, charging all civil and military authorities to remove horses, cattle, and provisions from the coast in case of a descent. An extraordinary measure was carried through parliament, by a suspension of the standing orders, to do away with all exemptions from impressment into the royal navy. Ships of the line were rotting in the harbor for want of sailors, it was affirmed: "Will you trust the existence of this country to the fate of a battle on shore?" An encampment of large bodies of militia was formed on Cox Heath. The spirit of the country was again roused, as when Spain threatened England in days of yore. Her fleet, combined with that of France, rode in the Channel, with as mighty a display as when Drake went out from Plymouth to encounter the galleons. The united fleet consisted of sixty-six sail of the line, with a large number of frigates and smaller vessels. Sir Charles Hardy left Portsmouth with thirty-eight ships; and although the combined armament was insulting the coast, he could not venture on an action with a force so superior. But in avoiding an engagement he did good service by leading the enemy to pursue him, and thus diverting their object of landing an invading army. The stormy season was approaching, while time was thus gained. The ships of both the hostile nations were in bad condition. A malignant disease had broken out among their crowded sailors and troops. The Spanish admiral declared to the French admiral that he must return to his own ports. The French admiral chose the same prudent course. When the king opened the parliament in November, he exulted that the designs and attempts at invasion had, by the blessing of Providence, been frustrated. Lord North, in the debate on the address, spoke with a British spirit that found a response in the national feelings. The combined powers of France and Spain "had fitted out a powerful armament; they appeared upon our coasts, it is true; they talked big, threatened a great deal, did nothing, and retired. It should be remembered that the enemy professed themselves to be acting on the offensive; we were as professedly acting on the defensive. They came with a declared intention to invade, we to resist such an attempt; they were therefore foiled, for they had not dared even to make the attempt. Their immense armaments paraded to no purpose; and their millions were spent in vain. Had they landed, and indeed he almost wished they had, their reception, he was confident, would have been such as would have added to their disgrace; and would have convinced them that a British militia had spirit enough to defend their country and repel invaders."

In May, 1779, Benjamin Franklin was accredited by the Congress as the sole representative of the United States at the court of France—their minister plenipotentiary. In a letter from Passy he describes his gracious reception by Louis XVI. at Versailles, and his constant weekly attendance at the royal levée. To a friend in America he says, "Perhaps few strangers in France have had the good fortune to be so universally popular."* The society and conversation of the French ladies he describes as extremely agreeable. But the energetic old man was occupied in more serious affairs than the enjoyment of a brilliant society, in which his brown cloth coat was a remarkable contrast to the velvet and embroidery of all around him. His abilities were constantly directed to the difficult task of raising money upon American credit, and of employing it to organize attacks upon the coasts of Britain. Franklin's correspondence shows that he was the active agent in the employ and direction of John Paul Jones, who, with a little squadron in the American service, did considerable damage to British commerce, and produced no small amount of alarm, in 1779. The first notion was to fit out an expedition, in which the sea forces should be commanded by Jones, and the land forces by La Fayette. Franklin's instructions to his American captain refer to this expedition "as an introduction only to greater trusts and more extensive commands." The French government hesitated about this joint adventure, and finally Paul Jones sailed with three ships and a brigantine, and did surprising feats which justified his selection as a bold captain and a skilful seaman. What he was encouraged to do may be collected from Franklin's letters. "It was intended to send him with some transports and troops to make descents in England. Had not the scheme been altered by a general one of a grand invasion, I know

* Campbell's "Gertrude of Wyoming."

† "Gertrude of Wyoming." Mr. Campbell, in a note to the later editions of his poem, says he was misled by popular accounts, and that Brandt was not present at Wyoming.

* "Correspondence," vol. viii. p. 401.

he would have endeavored to put some considerable towns to a high ransom, or have burned them. He sailed without the troops, but he nevertheless would have attempted Leith, and went into the Firth of Edinburgh with that intention, but a sudden hard gale of wind forced him out again." Franklin adds that the burning of Fairfield and other towns by the British in America had demolished all his moderation. We may consider that Leith and perhaps Edinburgh were providentially saved by the "sudden hard gale of wind" from the fate which this unscrupulous rover had prepared for them. Sir Walter Scott, when a boy, was in Edinburgh when Jones came into the Firth; and "the capital of Scotland was menaced by three trifling sloops or brigs, scarce fit to have sacked a fishing-village." An old Highland chief, Stuart of Invernahyle, was the only man who thought of a feasible plan of resistance. "A steady and powerful west wind settled the matter." But Paul Jones had better work before him than sack and plunder. "Going north about," writes Franklin, "he fell in with a number of ships from the Baltic, convoyed by a fifty-gun ship and a twenty-four-gun frigate, both of which he took." These vessels were the Serapis and the Scarborough. The engagement was a desperate one; and the largest vessel of the American squadron, the Bonhomme Richard, sank two days after the action. "The three trifling sloops, or brigs," described by Scott, were in truth large vessels, formidably armed and well-manned. His two prizes were carried by Jones into a neutral port in Holland. The English captains, Pearson and Piercy, fought their vessels with the most desperate courage. The colors of the Serapis were not struck till two thirds of her men were killed or wounded. Paul Jones, a native of Scotland, had been bred to the sea, had settled in Virginia, and had received a commission from Congress on the breaking out of the war.

The military operations in the Northern States of America, during 1779, were not of much importance with reference to the superiority of either army. There were successes on either side which are scarcely necessary to be detailed in our brief general history. Washington was doing everything that a prudent commander could accomplish in the face of great difficulties. He was more apprehensive of the consequences of corrupt and evil management than of any struggle in the field. He writes in March to General Warren, "Our conflict is not likely to cease so soon as every good man could wish. The measure of iniquity is not yet filled; and, unless we can return a little more to first principles, and act a little more upon patriotic ground, I do not know when it will, or what may be the issue of the contest." He complains of speculation, peculation, engrossing, which afford too glaring instances of its being the interest and desire of some to continue the war. He laments the depreciation of the currency. This depreciation had now gone beyond any example of European history in which the promises to pay of a government were treated as little better than waste-paper. "A wagon-load of money," wrote Washington, "will now scarcely purchase a wagon-load of provisions." He held that this depreciation, with the manifest proofs of speculation, stock-jobbing, and party dissensions, kept the arms of Britain in America, and led the British government and their friends to believe that the Americans would be their own conquerors.

The inactivity of the British army in the Northern States was compensated by successes in the South. Toward the end of 1778 Sir Henry Clinton dispatched an expedition by sea to Georgia. Savannah was taken, and the province was reduced to submission. Georgia and South Carolina were occupied through the winter by British troops, the fertility of these countries affording a plentiful supply of stores. This occupation materially facilitated the success of the Southern campaign of 1780.

CHAPTER CLXXIII.

Associations for redress of grievances—Meetings in Yorkshire and other counties—Burke's proposals for economical reform—Dunning's motion on the influence of the crown—Decreasing strength of the opposition—Protestant associations in Scotland—They extend to England—Lord George Gordon—Procession to parliament—Roman Catholic chapels burned—Newgate set on fire—Lord Mansfield's house sacked—The library burned—Continued riots—A council called—Wedderburn's opinion on the employment of military—The riots stopped by military force—Naval affairs—The war in America—Charleston taken by the British—Lord Cornwallis—His severities—French armament under Rochambeau—Treachery of Benedict Arnold—Major André seized—Verdict of a council of officers—His execution.

THE internal affairs of the country in the year 1780 are, in many respects, as interesting and instructive as those of any year in our annals. England was, unquestionably, distinctly threatened with some great political convulsion. The obstinate persistence in the war with America had brought upon the country its natural consequences—excessive taxation, and interruption to the usual course of profitable industry. Twenty years only had elapsed since the nation looked back upon a period of unexampled prosperity, and of signal triumph; of victory abroad and of tranquillity at home. The nation had then confidence in the directors of its affairs; regarded the parliament as the true representative of public opinion; and viewed the sovereign power, according to the principles of the revolution, as the especial guardian of the freedom and happiness of the people. A young prince had come to the crown, with every apparent disposition to rule righteously and constitutionally; and yet, from the first year of his accession a system of favoritism had surrounded the throne with a host of placemen, who were chosen to assert an invidious distinction between the interests of the king and the measures of the responsible servants of the state. During these twenty years a great change had come over the popular convictions. The parliament had become opposed to the people; and the executive power had grown out of harmony with the theory of the constitution, through the tendency to govern by the corruption of the parliament. The preponderating influence of a great aristocratic party had indeed been weakened, and in many essentials destroyed; but with that weakness had come a proportionate weakness of the democratic element of the constitution. The time had arrived when the minority in parliament, whether peers or commoners, saw that, to renew their strength as a governing power, they must identify themselves more distinctly with the people. The abuses consequent upon the excessive number of sinecure offices, and of large pensions unsanctioned by parliamentary authority, called for economical reform. The scandalous proportion of members of the House of Commons returned for rotten boroughs demanded reform in parliament. A vast amount of public opinion was brought to bear upon these two points, in the form of associations for the redress of grievances. During the Christmas recess a spirit burst forth in many of the most influential counties of England, to which there had probably been no parallel since the days of Hampden. Had the gross ignorance of large masses of the populace not taken the form of brutal riot, in a direction opposed to the progress of tolerant opinions, this spirit might have produced some great change in our representative system—a change dangerous, because premature; unsubstantial, because an extended suffrage required a solid foundation of popular intelligence. Burke, in vindicating the scheme of economical reform which he advocated at that time, as a moderate concession to a just public demand, says of "the portentous crisis from 1780 to 1782," that "it was one of the most critical periods in our annals. . . . Such was the distemper of the public mind that there was no madman, in his maddest ideas and maddest projects, who might not count upon numbers to support his principles and execute his designs." *

On the 8th of February Sir George Savile, the respected member for Yorkshire, presented to the House of Commons the petition of a great meeting of the gentlemen, clergy, and freeholders of his county, which was signed by eight thousand persons. "It was first moved," said Sir George, "in a meeting of six hundred gentlemen and upward. In the hall where this petition was conceived there was more property than within the walls of this house." He said that there was a committee appointed to correspond on the subject of the petition with the committees of other counties. The Yorkshire petition set forth, as the consequences of a most expensive and unfortunate war, a large addition to the national debt, heavy accumulation of taxes, a rapid decline of the trade, manufactures, and landrents of the kingdom. It then came to the chief grievance: "Alarmed at the diminished resources and growing burdens of this country, and convinced that rigid frugality is now indispensably necessary in every department of the state, your petitioners observe

* "Letter to a Noble Lord."

with grief, that notwithstanding the calamitous and impoverished condition of the nation, much public money has been improvidently squandered, and that many individuals enjoy sinecure places, efficient places with exorbitant emoluments, and pensions unmerited by public service, to a large and still increasing amount; whence the crown has acquired a great and unconstitutional influence, which, if not checked, may soon prove fatal to the liberties of this country."

The great meeting in Yorkshire gave an example to the rest of England. Twenty-three counties adopted similar petitions, and appointed their corresponding committees. Motions for economical reform had been brought forward in the House of Lords before the recess; and Burke had given notice of the measure which he intended to propose. On the 11th of February he accomplished this intention, in the delivery of a speech which is among the masterpieces of English composition—unsurpassed in lucidness of detail, force of reasoning, historical research, and gleams of wit and poetry, by any example of parliamentary rhetoric. The perusal of this speech will show how many gross abuses have been corrected during the eighty years that have elapsed; and, what is better, how much wiser and honester a spirit has arisen to govern the public expenditure in every department—making it shame to fill an office without its duties, or to receive a pension without desert. Many of the details of reform treated of in this speech are now, happily, things of a past time. The royal household, whose manifold offices were derived from the feudal principle and the system of purveyance, is now conducted upon the same plan as that of a nobleman's establishment. The turnspit in the royal kitchen is no longer a member of parliament. The number of covers on the royal table is no longer determined by a board of green cloth. Offices, whose very names sound strange to us, were then kept up for parliamentary influence alone. They are gone. Some great officers are attached to the royal person, as of old; though they are not perhaps retained upon the principle laid down by Burke, that because "kings are fond of low company," it is of importance to provide such an establishment as will bring about the royal person a great number of the first nobility. General principles too often fall short in their practical application. Burke proposed to abolish the offices of master of the buckhounds and harriers, as they answered no purpose of utility or of splendor. "It is not proper that great noblemen should be keepers of dogs, though they were the king's dogs." Many other courtly appointments are vanished. The master of the buckhounds remains; and if the office is filled by a courteous gentleman and a bold rider, its utility is not too curiously investigated. Though some of the details of Burke's bill present evils no longer unreformed, his general principles of reform will always remain as a guide to honest administrators. Out of seven fundamental rules which he lays down, three, especially, will apply to all time; and, it may be feared, will never cease to require a vigilant application.

"That all jurisdictions which furnish more matter of expense, more temptation to oppression, or more means and instruments of corrupt influence, than advantage to justice or political administration, ought to be abolished.

"That all offices which bring more charge than proportional advantage to the state; that all offices which may be engrafted on others, uniting and simplifying their duties, ought, in the first case, to be taken away; and in the second, to be consolidated.

"That it is right to reduce every establishment, and every part of an establishment (as nearly as possible), to certainty, the life of all order and good management."

Burke, in his truly statesmanlike speech upon economical reform, argued that a temperate reform is permanent, because it has a principle of growth. "Whenever we improve, it is right to leave room for a further improvement." It is the recognition of this principle which has enabled us gradually to effect many improvements which Burke did not think ripe for advocating in his own day. He proposed to reform the crying abuses of the offices of paymaster of the forces, and treasurer of the navy, each of which officers had a separate treasury, and derived large profits from the use of the money which they retained in their hands. The first William Pitt, as we have seen, disdained such an irregular addition to the profits of place. His rival, Fox, and his successors, were not so scrupulous. Burke proposed to reduce the enormous profits of the auditors of the exchequer. In our own times such profits of patent places were made odious by the disinterested renunciation of Lord Camden. Public opinion in our country is ultimately potential in effecting what corrupt influences resist. The philosophical reformer did not suggest depriving the crown of its constitutional right of granting pensions. He proposed to limit the amount to a sum which would now be considered extravagant. He abstained from attempting even the reduction of exorbitant emoluments to efficient offices. He did not think the great efficient offices of the state overpaid. They were paid at a much higher rate than in our own time; and the question may now sometimes present itself to dispassionate minds, whether they are not underpaid. The reasons which Burke then gave for not putting the service of the public to auction, and knocking it down to those who will execute it cheapest, is of wider application now, when larger expenses are attached to the holders of office with comparatively small salaries, than in days when statesmen in power might accumulate fortunes out of the profits of place. It is an honorable characteristic of public service in England that ambition and the lucre of gain have ceased to go together in rendering power attractive. An honorable and fair payment for service is grudged by none but the wildest self-styled reformers. Burke did not go too far when he said that "if men were willing to serve in such situations without salary, they ought not to be permitted to do it. Ordinary service must be secured by the motives to ordinary integrity."

Burke's proposals were so temperate and so incapable of being refuted by argument that Lord North offered no opposition to the reception of the first bill which was founded upon them. Other members were ready to go further than Burke. Sir George Savile, on the 15th of February, moved for an account of all places for life or lives, whether held by patent or otherwise, and also for an account of all subsisting pensions, granted by the crown, during pleasure or otherwise. The motion was opposed by Lord Nugent, upon the ground that many reduced gentry enjoyed his majesty's private bounty, and would not like their names to be made public—"many Lady Bridgets, Lady Marys, and Lady Jennys." Lord North proposed an amendment, limiting the account to pensions payable at the exchequer. The whole amount payable under the name of pensions, he said, did not exceed 50,000*l*. To publish a list would "prepare a feast for party-writers, and furnish materials for magazines and newspapers." Happy is the government that does not shrink from the eye of magazines and newspapers! Lord North carried his amendment only by a majority of two in a full house. The session was a series of parliamentary conflicts, some conducted with personal acrimony which involved the ridiculous arbitrament of duelling. A bill was carried in the House of Commons against contractors sitting in parliament, which was rejected in the House of Lords. Burke's own bill encountered every obstruction in its progress through committee; and the session was concluded without any practical result of the great statesman's incontrovertible exposition of abuses which agitated the minds of a whole people.

The 6th of April is described as a day which "was to distinguish the present session from every other since the revolution."* It was a day that might have brought back to some persons, whether of those who dreaded or those who hoped for change, recollections of the Long Parliament. Another and perhaps a fiercer conflict between prerogative and the people might have appeared at hand. Charles Fox harangued the petitioners of Westminster in the Hall; and resolutions were carried for annual parliaments and an addition of a hundred knights of the shire to the representation. Tumults were expected, and bodies of guards were in readiness in the neighborhood of the houses. Tumult there was none. The order of the day was for taking into consideration the petitions of the people of England—petitions which were so numerously signed as to occupy "such an immense quantity of parchment as seemed rather calculated to bury than to cover the speaker's table."† In a committee of the whole house Mr. Dunning rose. The general prayer of the petitions was for a reform in the public expenditure, and for limiting and restraining the increasing influence of the crown. He passed a splendid eulogium upon Mr. Burke's bill, which, when first proposed, received the approbation of every individual in that house. A different feeling was soon indicated—a temper and disposition which originated out of the house, and not within those walls. Ministers

* "Annual Register," 1780, p. 164. † Ibid.

have now said that the influence of the crown is not too much; that it is not competent for the house to inquire into the expenditure of the civil list. He would bring both these points fairly to issue. He first moved, "That it is the opinion of this committee that the influence of the crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished." The resistance offered to the motion was feeble and indirect. One of its immediate consequences was to disturb Lord North from his usual placidity. He accused the opposition of pursuing measures likely to overturn the constitution. There was immense confusion, amid the cry of "Take down the words." The motion was carried by 233 against 215. Another motion, that it is competent to the house to examine into and correct abuses in the expenditure of the civil list, as well as in every other branch of the public revenue, was agreed to without a division. A third motion, that it was the duty of the house to provide a remedy for the abuses complained of in the petitions, was also agreed to. Contrary to the ordinary usage, the resolutions were reported before the house adjourned. Only nine county members voted with the government. "The exultation and triumph on one side of the house was only equalled by the evident depression and dismay which prevailed on the side of administration. . . . The system of the court was shaken to its foundations."* The king the next day expressed his belief to Lord North that the resolutions could not be regarded as personal to the minister, and adds, "I wish I did not feel at whom they were personally levelled." On the 18th of April Dunning made another motion, that it is incompatible with the independence of parliament that persons holding certain offices about the court should sit in parliament. This was carried only by a majority of 215 to 213. The king exults that "things begin to wear a better aspect. Lord North shall see that there is at least one person willing to preserve unspoiled the most beautiful constitution that ever was framed." The minority rapidly gained strength, and soon became a large majority. Abstract propositions had been carried. The practical measures which were to render them of effect were rejected. On the 18th of May the most important clauses in Burke's bill were lost in committee. The king has triumphed. "You cannot doubt," he writes to Lord North, "that I received with pleasure the account of Mr. Burke's bill having been defeated." His majesty was looking to a new parliament to continue the abuses that were odious to the nation, or, as it appeared to the royal mind, "to keep the present constitution of the country in its pristine lustre."

According to the theory of a narrow-minded king, the pristine lustre of the constitution would have been shorn of its beams if fifty useless places had not been held by members of parliament, to do the bidding of the court without the slightest reference to the interests of the nation. According to the theory of a large section of a somewhat intolerant public, the Protestant succession would have lost the best part of its value if English Roman Catholics were allowed to hold property in land; if their spiritual instructors were not subject to the penalties of treason or felony; if a Protestant son could no longer eject his Papist father from his estate. These severities of the statutes of the tenth and eleventh of William III. had ceased to be applied; but they existed as a temptation to informers to extort money from the timid, and as a stigma upon the loyal and peaceful. In 1778, upon the motion of Savile, seconded by Dunning, these obsolete penalties were repealed, with the approbation of men of all parties. The acts of William III., dating before the union with Scotland, did not affect the position of Roman Catholics there; and it was subsequently contemplated to repeal a statute of the Scottish parliament, which was as odious to right-thinking persons as the enactments of the days when popery was the great terror of England. The proceedings of the parliament in 1778 stirred up the fanaticism of Edinburgh and Glasgow at the beginning of 1779. Riots took place in Edinburgh. Houses of reputed Roman Catholics were assailed and damaged. A house where Catholics assembled for worship was set on fire. Those who by speech or writing advocated freedom of opinion were threatened with vengeance, the brutal zealots selecting as one of the objects of their hostility their distinguished countryman, the historian Robertson. A Protestant association and committee was set up in Scotland, and a silly nobleman, Lord George Gordon, was chosen as its president. This fanatic had sat in parliament for several years, raving and gesticulating when any debate excited his monomania. Contemptible as he was in intellect, he acquired some consideration from the position he had obtained as the leader of a body of people, large in numbers and dangerous in their enthusiasm. The Protestant associations of Scotland had multiplied in England. On the first day of the session in November, 1779, Lord George Gordon declared that the indulgences given to Papists had alarmed the whole country. He did not speak his own sentiments only. Government should find a hundred and twenty thousand men at his back, who would avow and support them, and whose warmth of spirit was still greater than his own.

The contempt in which the public character of Lord George Gordon was regarded appears to have shut the eyes of the government to the danger of his proceedings. In the House of Commons he was viewed as a silly bore. He was complimented as being "a stanch Whig, an enemy to the American war, and a friend to the liberties of the people;" but the same laudatory member said, "He could not bear to see the noble lord render himself a laughing-stock and a make-game to the whole house. He had got a twist in his head."* He was endured, probably from his high connection, being the brother of the Duke of Gordon; and for this, we must presume, the king had patience to hear him indoctrinate his majesty with a pamphlet, the reading of which went on till night put an end to the audience. The twist in Lord George's head did not the less fit him to be a demagogue. He calculated that a display of physical force would serve his cause better than argument in parliament. On the 29th of May he called a public meeting at Coachmakers' Hall, where he harangued a great audience about the dangers of popery, and proposed a resolution that the whole body of the Protestant Association should meet in St. George's Fields on the following Friday, to accompany him to the House of Commons to deliver their petition. If less than twenty thousand persons should attend him he would not present it. He proposed that they should assemble in four divisions—the Protestants of London the first, of Westminster the second, of Southwark the third, and the Scots resident in the metropolis the fourth; and that every real Protestant should come with a blue cockade on his hat. On Friday, the 2d of June, a vast assemblage was gathered together in St. George's Fields—fifty or sixty thousand persons, according to most accounts. Their leader marshalled them in three columns—one to march over London Bridge, another over Blackfriars Bridge, and a third over Westminster Bridge, headed by himself. At half-past two this formidable body was assembled in Palace Yard, and intercepted all the avenues of parliament. The quiet which had distinguished their march now took a more congenial attitude of insult to every obnoxious peer or commoner. They filled the lobbies, and twice attempted to force the doors of each house. The fanatic rose in his place and presented the petition, praying for a repeal of the act passed in favor of Roman Catholics. He moved that the petition be referred to a committee of the whole house. This necessarily produced a debate. For several hours the members were unable to go out, the lobby being filled with a furious mob. Lord George went several times to the top of the gallery stairs, harangued the people, telling them that their petition was likely to meet with ill success, and pointed out to their vengeance such members as had spoken against its consideration. Expostulation was in vain. At last Colonel Gordon, a near relative, went up to him, and said, "My Lord George, do you intend to bring your rascally adherents into the House of Commons? If you do, the first man of them that enters, I will plunge my sword, not into him, but into your body." A party of horse-guards at length arrived, with a magistrate at their head, and eventually the lobby was cleared, and the rabble went home. The house then divided, six for the petition and a hundred and ninety-two against it. During this scene the terror in the House of Lords was kept up by the constant arrival of peers announcing the insults to which some of their body were exposed in the streets, and exhibiting the outrages which had been inflicted upon themselves. Dishevelled hair, clothes covered with mud, proclaimed that the hootings in Palace Yard were not those of a good-tempered English mob. The disgusting excesses of that day had an influence, and not altogether an unnatural influence, upon the

* "Annual Register," p. 172.

* Mr. Turner—April 11—"Parliamentary Debates," vol. xxi. col. 387.

political condition of the British people for many years. Most inopportunely, while the strongest evidence of popular ignorance was before the eyes of parliament, the Duke of Richmond, according to notice, rose to introduce a bill for declaring and restoring the natural, inalienable, and equal right of all the commons of Great Britain (infants, persons of insane mind, and criminals incapacitated by law, only excepted) to vote in the election of their representatives in parliament; for regulating the mode and manner of such elections; and for restoring annual parliaments. The duke said that he found himself exceedingly unhappy that he should have to trouble their lordships with a motion in the situation in which they were at present. He made a speech, necessarily under great embarrassment; for the practical answer to his proposition was the tumult in Palace Yard. The men who were to exercise the natural, inalienable, and equal right of voting in the election of their representatives were interrupting the freedom of debate, demanding the re-enactment of barbarous laws, at the bidding of a madman. The houses adjourned without further violence, on that night, in the neighborhood of parliament. But the spirit of bigotry took another direction. The ministers of Sardinia and Bavaria had their chapels sanctioned by law and the custom of nations. These were set on fire, and their fittings plundered and destroyed. Thirteen of the rioters were apprehended, upon the arrival of the military, and were taken to Newgate.

Saturday, the 3d, was a day of comparative tranquillity. But busy agents of mischief were at work; and on Sunday afternoon Catholic chapels in Moorfields were beset, and their altars and pulpits were torn down and burned. On the Monday the supineness of the magistrates and the want of any efficient system of police encouraged the No Popery fanatics—joined by the idlers, the drunkards, and the thieves that congregate in a great city—to renewed attacks upon religious edifices and private houses. The indifference of men high in office to these continued outrages was incomprehensible. Dr. Johnson writes to Mrs. Thrale: "On Monday Mr. Strahan, who had been insulted, spoke to Lord Mansfield, who had, I think, been insulted too, of the licentiousness of the populace; and his lordship treated it as a very slight irregularity." * On that Monday the house of Sir George Savile was gutted. The king writes to Lord North that he had given directions to the two secretaries of state to take measures for preventing riot on the morrow. His majesty does not appear to have contemplated any immediate danger; for he says, "This tumult must be got the better of, or it will encourage designing men to use it as a precedent for assembling the people on other occasions." On Tuesday the two houses again met. Detachments of guards prevented any great outbreak in the neighborhood of parliament, though one of the ministers, Lord Stormont, was injured by the mob. Burke got into their hands; but his courageous remonstrances produced the effect by which a high spirit generally secures its ascendency over an English multitude, ignorant but not bloodthirsty. The House of Commons agreed in a resolution that they would take the petitions into consideration as soon as the tumults should subside. There was no appearance that they would subside quickly. The more lawless and desperate now came forth in greater numbers, and began to regard London as a city to be sacked. About six o'clock on that summer evening a fierce multitude appeared in front of Newgate, and demanded of Mr. Akerman, the keeper of the prison, the release of the rioters who had been committed for the destruction of the chapels of the foreign ambassadors. Their demand was firmly refused, and then Mr. Akerman's private house was set on fire. The present building of Newgate was then only partially completed. The greater number of the prisoners were confined in the wretched cells of the old prison, which had existed in the time of Charles II. It was, therefore, easily assailed by a furious mob, who thundered at the entrances with sledge-hammers and pickaxes, and then dragged out the furniture of the keeper's house, to pile the tables and chairs against the prison-doors and set them on fire. A way was thus soon forced. The whole building was quickly in a blaze. The felons without rushed through the flames to release the felons within; and that night there were three hundred criminals loose in the streets. The prison of Clerkenwell was also broken open, and the prisoners released. The character of the riots was now altered. The objects of attack were the administrators of the law. The houses of three metropolitan magistrates were sacked. Midnight came, when a yell of havoc was raised before the house of the chief justice in Bloomsbury Square; and, leaving scarcely time for Lord and Lady Mansfield to escape, the frantic miscreants broke in, threw furniture, pictures, books, manuscripts, into the street, where they made a fire which they fed with these valuables, many of them too precious for any money estimate of their value. There perished the law library of the greatest lawyer of his age, enriched with his own notes; and with that library was destroyed the correspondence of half a century. The mansion itself became a ruin in this fiery havoc. A detachment of guards was at hand, but the officer did not dare to act without the orders of a magistrate; and the magistrates, it was given in evidence, had all run away.

"Wednesday, the 7th, was the fatal day." * Walpole writes to a friend, "You may like to know one is alive, after a massacre, and the conflagration of a capital—the most horrible sight I ever beheld, and which, for six hours together, I expected to end in half the town being reduced to ashes." † The first great operation of the morning was to attack the Bank of England. Two attempts were made to force an entrance, but the building was well guarded by parties of soldiers, and the assailants retreated upon the first volley. The shops were shut. The terrified inhabitants of the great thoroughfares chalked "No Popery" on their shutters. The mob appeared to have the lives and property of a population of a million wholly in their power. Yet their numbers were not everywhere formidable, in comparison with the mischief they effected. Johnson observed not more than a hundred men plundering the sessions-house in the Old Bailey—leisurely, in full security, as men lawfully employed. This "full security," which Johnson imputes to "the cowardice of a commercial city," was really to be ascribed to the extraordinary timidity of the king's responsible advisers. London and the neighborhood were full of soldiers, who had been sent for from distant parts. But there was hesitation about their employment. There was a prevailing notion—a very proper scruple under ordinary circumstances—that the military could not act except under the direction of a magistrate; and there was a mistaken belief that they could not fire until an hour had expired after the reading of the Riot Act. The king himself called a council on Wednesday, and submitted the question to them as to the construction of the Riot Act. In 1768 verdicts had been found by juries against officers and soldiers who had put down riots with the loss of life. The council would not decide upon a doubtful point of law. The king turned to Wedderburn, the attorney-general, and desired his opinion. He immediately declared that military force might be exercised, if no other means of restraint are effectual, when a tumultuous assemblage are engaged in committing a felony, such as setting fire to a house. This opinion was subsequently confirmed by Lord Mansfield in the House of Lords, upon a debate as to the employment of that military power which had saved the capital: "The military have been called in, and very wisely called in, not as soldiers but as citizens; no matter whether their coats be red or brown, they have been called in aid of the law." The opinion of Wedderburn satisfied the doubts of the council. The king declared that to have been his own opinion; and a proclamation was immediately issued, commanding all householders to keep within doors, with their servants and apprentices, and announcing that the king's officers were now authorized to repress the riots by an immediate exercise of force. The decision did not come an hour too soon. On that evening, when every decent citizen was hurrying home to obey the proclamation, London was on fire in thirty-six different places. "One might see," says Johnson, "the glare of conflagration fill the sky from many parts. The sight was dreadful." The most terrible scene was in Holborn, where the distillery of Mr. Langdale, a Roman Catholic, was set on fire; and the unrectified spirits pouring into the streets were lapped up by the wretched crowds of men, women, and children, who perished in helpless drunkenness amid liquid fire or falling timbers. The military poured into every street where there was tumult. If the command of the officer to disperse was not obeyed, they fired at once. Through that terrible night sleep was banished from a metropolis wholly unused to scenes of anarchy. The next morning all were

* Boswell's "Life," ed. 1848, p. 648.

* Walpole's "Last Journals." † Letter to Cole.

quiet. Nothing remained to do but to bury the dead, to attend the wounded, and to fill the remaining jails with miserable prisoners.

It is unnecessary for us to pursue the painful history of these disgraceful riots into the subsequent details, which afforded abundant matter for the meagre newspapers of the time. Lord George Gordon was committed to the Tower on a charge of high treason; and, being tried early in the following year, was so successfully defended by Erskine, then rising into high reputation, that the jury returned a verdict of acquittal. Of the miserable rioters, a hundred and thirty-five were tried in Middlesex and Surrey, of whom about half were convicted, and twenty-one were executed. The session of parliament was approaching to a close. Matters of the greatest importance had been agitated without any practical results. Proposals for economical reform, which had been welcomed at the beginning of the session, were rejected or frittered away during its progress. Parliamentary reform came to be regarded as an impossible theory. The contemporary historian describes this period with a calm judgment: "It may be said with confidence, that so great a number of important affairs were never agitated in any one session. The riot, in the close, threw a general damp upon all endeavors whatever for reformation, however unconnected with its particular object. Popular fury seemed, for that time at least, the greatest of all possible evils. Administration then gathered, and afterward procured, no small degree of power, from a tumult which appeared to threaten the subversion of all government."* The parliament was prorogued on the 8th of July, and on the 1st of September it was dissolved.

During the domestic excitement that had lasted through the session of parliament, the external affairs of the country were regarded with comparative indifference. The dread of invasion had passed away. The war with America appeared to drag on without any decisive results. Gibraltar was invested by the Spaniards; but the siege had not as yet assumed the interesting character which the resolute defence of the key of the Mediterranean subsequently commanded. The naval ascendency of Great Britain was, however, manifested in a way that gave the nation confidence that its ships could be well manned and bravely led to battle. Sir George Rodney, on the 16th of January, engaged the Spanish admiral off Cape St. Vincent, and obtained a complete victory, having captured four ships of the line and destroyed four others. He then proceeded to the relief of Gibraltar. Sailing to the West Indies, he there encountered a combined French and Spanish fleet, but was unable to bring them to a general engagement. But the vigilance of the Spanish government inflicted a severe blow upon our mercantile marine. Knowing when the East India and West India fleets would be off the Azores, with a convoy of only two ships of war, a powerful squadron intercepted them, and carried sixty sail, laden with valuable merchandise, as prizes into Cadiz. The Dutch and English governments were beginning to squabble about violations of neutrality, which the next year gave occasion to a war with Holland. The maritime claims of England produced also an "armed neutrality" between Russia, Sweden, and Denmark, which threatened danger. At this period it would have been difficult to affirm that the government of George III. had a friend in Europe.

We have now to return to the events of the war in America. At the end of December, 1779, General Clinton, with a force of five thousand men, sailed from New York in the fleet of Admiral Arbuthnot, for the purpose of investing Charleston, in South Carolina. The American forces within this important place were under the command of General Lincoln, who, with the assistance of French engineers, had constructed some formidable defences. The progress of the expedition was delayed by bad weather. It was the first of April before the British army broke ground before Charleston. The siege was pursued with great vigor and ability, under the direction of Clinton, who had detached Lord Cornwallis, with a large force, to cut off the communication between the garrison and the interior. An assault was contemplated, but on the 12th of May Lincoln capitulated. The surrender of six thousand men, with four hundred pieces of cannon and large magazines, was an important triumph for the British commanders, and gave a renewed spirit to the war. General Clinton in June returned to New York, leaving Lord Cornwallis in command. He had only four thousand regular troops to defend Charleston, to contend against a probable invasion of the province, and to repress a spirit of disaffection among the inhabitants. It is to be regretted that he considered it within the line of his duty to make severe examples of those Americans who, from those shifting influences of fear and hope which mark such contests, deserted the royal cause for which they had engaged their services. The laws of war certainly justified the punishment of desertion; but the peculiar circumstances of this war called for the exercise of great forbearance, except in cases of signal treachery. The American army which was approaching Charleston was under the command of General Gates. The vanguards of the two armies became engaged at Camden on the 16th of August, when the Americans sustained a complete defeat. Some of the prisoners taken in this battle were hanged, they having manifested their change of opinion by having British protections on their persons. Death was denounced against all militiamen who, having served in the British armies, had joined the revolutionists. Estates were threatened to be sequestered of those who had opposed the British interests in the province. American citizens of Charleston were forcibly removed on board ship to St. Augustine, in Florida. Complaint was made of this proceeding, and Cornwallis thus defends it: "I have only to say that the insolence of their behavior, the threats with which they, in the most daring manner, endeavored to intimidate our friends, the infamous falsehoods which they propagated through the town and country, and the correspondence which they constantly kept up with the enemy, rendered it indispensably necessary that they should be either closely confined or sent out of the province."* In a letter to Clinton, of the 29th of August, Cornwallis details how he had ordered militiamen, who had been enrolled and then revolted, to be hung up.† He makes constant complaints to American generals of their severities. Washington writes a letter of remonstrance against the severities of Cornwallis, which he addresses to Clinton; and Clinton replies, that it has been his invariable desire to soften the horrors of war, as it was the desire of every officer in his majesty's service; "but proper punishments upon guilty persons may become sometimes necessary."‡ Sir Henry takes rather a high tone at the notion of any remonstrance being addressed to him: "I desire to conclude this subject by informing you, sir, that I esteem myself accountable for my public conduct to his majesty the king, to my country, and my own conscience." Lord Rawdon, afterward Lord Moira, who commanded a post in connection with the main army, appears to have gone somewhat beyond the proper bounds of punishment for guilty persons. He offered a reward of ten guineas to the inhabitants of the country if they would bring in the head of any deserter, and five guineas if they would bring him in alive. He justifies his measure as being merely intended to terrify. During the war in the Southern States the severities practised by both parties were a proof that embittered feelings on both sides would endure far too long for the restoration of a cordial amity, whatever might be the issue of the war. The word "retaliation" was of too frequent use by those in command; and Cornwallis himself saw that the contest was assuming a character in which it would "become truly savage." After various encounters, each of the Southern armies went into winter quarters.

Until the summer of 1780 the British and American armies in the Central States were comparatively inactive. Washington had to encounter the greatest difficulties in the maintenance of his troops. During the absence of Clinton the royalist forces were not strong enough to attempt any important movement. The prospect was changed by the arrival, in July, off Rhode Island, of a French armament of six thousand men, under the command of the Comte de Rochambeau. A commission of lieutenant-general in the French service had been sent to Washington, and the French troops were to be under his orders. This great reinforcement of the Americans landed in Rhode Island. There were various delays, which prevented Clinton attacking them. But a considerable addition to the fleet under Admiral Arbuthnot having arrived from England, the French troops were effectually blockaded in their position at Newport, and their purpose of combined operations with Washington was prevented. The two generals, however, arranged a meeting at Hartford, in Connecti-

* "Annual Register," 1780, p. 280.

* "Correspondence of Cornwallis," vol. i. p. 72.
† Ibid., p. 61.
‡ Ibid., p. 58.

cut, Greene having the command of the American army during the temporary absence of Washington.

Benedict Arnold, who had done such signal service against the British in Canada, had, in his capacity of chief in Philadelphia, after that city had been evacuated by Clinton, been guilty of some irregularity for which he had been reprimanded by a court-martial. He was dissatisfied with Congress, and the French alliance was distasteful to him. Washington recommended his appointment to the charge of West Point and other important posts commanding the Hudson, and at West Point he was stationed in August. He had, long previously, opened a secret correspondence with Sir Henry Clinton, in which he proposed to join the royal army, and give possession of the forts and their garrisons under his orders. The treacherous overture was accepted, and all honor and advantage promised to the traitor. The correspondence was conducted on the part of Clinton by Major John André, the adjutant-general of the army, who signed his letters "John Anderson." Arnold adopted the signature of "Gustavus." A meeting between the correspondents was proposed to take place during the time when Washington had gone to confer with Rochambeau. Clinton consented, warning the ardent young officer against entering the American lines carrying papers or assuming any disguise.

On the night of the 21st of September André went up the Hudson in the Vulture sloop of war, and was conveyed in a boat to the place appointed for his rendezvous with Arnold. It was on the western bank, on the neutral ground. The conference lasted till the dawn; when, to complete their arrangements, André was persuaded to accompany Arnold to a house within the American lines. When his business was finished, and he went to the river to be conveyed on board the sloop, he found that it had been compelled to drop down the Hudson nearer New York. He returned; received a pass from Arnold, under his assumed name of John Anderson; changed his uniform for plain clothes; and did the other dangerous thing against which he was expressly cautioned—he received papers from Arnold, explaining the state of the fort at West Point. Having crossed the river, with the intention of proceeding on horseback to New York, he had passed securely through the American lines, and was again on neutral ground, when he was seized by three men of the American militia. He was conducted to their commander, Colonel Jameson. The mode in which Arnold was informed of the capture of André does not very clearly appear, the narratives being somewhat conflicting; but, upon learning the event, Arnold saw the immediate necessity of his own escape, and getting on board the sloop which was to have secured safety to André, he reached the British quarters at New York. Two days after Washington arrived at Arnold's house, and learned the news of his absence and his defection.

On the return of Washington to his camp on the 28th he found André there under arrest. He had previously received a letter from the prisoner, avowing his name and rank. The case was immediately referred to a court of general officers, fourteen in number. Twelve of these were Americans, with whom La Fayette and Steuben were associated. The deportment of the prisoner was altogether consistent with the manliness of a British officer and his own sense of honor. He would commit no other person. He would resort to no subterfuge to defend himself. Steuben, it is reported, was exceedingly afflicted at what he considered the inevitable result. "It was impossible," said the old German, "to save him. He put us to no proof; but in an open, manly manner confessed everything but a premeditated design to deceive." * The verdict of the council of officers was that Major André ought to be considered as a spy from the enemy, and that, agreeably to the law and usage of nations, it was their opinion he ought to suffer death. Before the inquiry took place, Clinton had addressed a letter to Washington demanding André's release, on the ground that he had gone ashore with a flag of truce sent by Arnold, and when arrested was under the protection of a pass which Arnold had authority to give. Washington informed Sir Henry of the decision to which the court had come. A deputation was then sent to the American headquarters, who were received by Greene, the president of the court; but their arguments, and offers to exchange any prisoner that might be selected, were unavailing. Washington confirmed the sentence that the brave, enthusiastic, accomplished officer should die the death of a felon. André requested to die as a soldier. To that request no answer was given. He made up his mind, as expressed in a touching letter to Sir Henry Clinton, for any fate to which an honest zeal for the king's service might have devoted him. On the 2d of October that execution took place under the warrant of Washington, which is held by a very just and right-minded historian as "by far the greatest, and, perhaps, the only blot in his most noble career." * We are constrained to dissent from this opinion; but we prefer to rest our judgment upon another authority than our own. We extract the following passage from a brief memoir of André, published in one of the earliest miscellanies that was addressed to the growing power to read among the humbler classes:

"At the period when the event took place a torrent of indignation burst forth against Washington, who was charged with cold malignity, in thus sacrificing a meritorious officer, in a manner so unworthy of his character. This is the tone of feeling which dictated Anna Seward's monody to his memory, and filled the newspapers of the day with every violent epithet. It is to be regretted that some of our historians have adopted this view of the transaction. But highly as we estimate the claims of our lamented countryman to the gratitude of this nation, we must acquit Washington of all injustice toward him. Major André fell a sacrifice to that ardent zeal which animated his whole conduct, and to the ill-advice which he received from Arnold. Against his own better judgment and intentions, he assumed a disguise in name and dress, and took charge of secret papers within the enemy's lines, which distinctly fixed upon him the character of a spy, and subjected him to all the perils of discovery. His letter to Sir Henry Clinton bears witness to the personal kindness he received from Washington, who doubtless gave no reply to his last request, in order to save his feelings the pain of a refusal. Had that general consented to change the mode of his death, he would have abandoned the principle upon which his fate was determined. The critical posture of affairs at that moment compelled the American chief to avail himself of an event so important to his future success. The strong measure he adopted was designed to show that the contest must be decided by force of arms—that he had thrown away the scabbard—and that he was resolved to extinguish at a blow those intrigues by which his former operations had been betrayed. As the success of Major André's confederacy with Arnold would probably have destroyed the last hope of the revolutionists, so the terror produced by his execution and the timely discovery of Arnold's defection ultimately led to the independence of the United States." †

* "Life of Steuben," p. 290.

CHAPTER CLXXIV.

Elections of 1780—Burke rejected for Bristol—War with Holland—French attack upon Jersey—Capture of St. Eustatius by Rodney—Privateering—Action off the Dogger Bank—Difficulties of Washington's army—Mutinies—Cornwallis in the Carolinas—He is defeated at Cowpens—His victory at Guilford—Cornwallis marches into Virginia—Fleet of De Grasse arrives in the Chesapeake—Washington's march to Virginia—Cornwallis fortifies Yorktown—He is besieged, and his supplies cut off—He capitulates—Surrender of the British army—The disastrous news received in London.

THE new parliament assembled on the 1st of November, 1780. The elections had, in some degree, furnished a test of the popular feeling, in the choice of their members by large communities. They had certainly not manifested that the opinion of commercial cities, represented by that very ill-compounded body of voters called freemen, was favorable to the growth of a just and liberal policy. Edmund Burke was rejected by Bristol, after having served that flourishing

* Lord Mahon's "History," vol. vii. p. 106.

† "Plain Englishman," vol. ii. 1821. This periodical was jointly conducted by Mr. Locker, the secretary of Greenwich Hospital, and by the author of the "Popular History." Mr Locker was selected, as the friend of the three sisters of Major André, to attend on the 28th of November, 1821, as their representative, when the remains of their brother, disinterred in America, were placed in a vault in Westminster Abbey, near the cenotaph which had been erected to his memory by command of George III. The memoir of André, containing the passage we quote, was written by Mr. Locker immediately after the ceremony which he had attended.

emporium of trade for six years. The sentiment against him was so decided that he could not even venture to go to the poll. What were the public crimes imputed to him? First, that he had voted for bills which removed some of the barbarous restrictions upon the trade of Ireland. It was in vain that he had told his constituents, while this measure of relief was depending in 1778, that "trade is not a limited thing; as if the objects of mutual demand and consumption could not stretch beyond the bounds of our jealousies;" * that England and Ireland might flourish together; that everything that is got by another is not taken from ourselves. Secondly, it was charged against the member for Bristol that he had supported a bill for reforming the law process concerning imprisonment for debt, and thus had endeavored to mitigate some of the frightful evils of a system under which a debtor might be imprisoned for life at the bidding of an inexorable creditor, unless relieved by those occasional acts of grace "which turned loose upon the public three or four thousand naked wretches, corrupted by the habits, debased by the ignominy of a prison." † It was in his speech to the electors, in defending his maintenance of the principle that "the counting-house has no alliance with the jail," that Burke pronounced his splendid eulogy on Howard: "He has visited all Europe—not to survey the sumptuousness of palaces or the stateliness of temples; not to make accurate measurements of the remains of ancient grandeur, nor to form a scale of the curiosity of modern art; not to collect medals or to collate manuscripts; but to dive into the depths of dungeons; to plunge into the infection of hospitals; to survey the mansions of sorrow and pain; to take the gauge and dimensions of misery, depression, and contempt; to remember the forgotten, to attend to the neglected, to visit the forsaken, and to compare and collate the distresses of all men in all countries." The third charge of the citizens of Bristol against their representative was his support of Sir George Savile's bill for the relief of the Roman Catholics from the penal laws—that wise and politic measure which produced the riots of 1780. Burke's manly exposure of the cowardice which argued that the Act of Relief ought not to have been passed, in deference to Protestant prejudices, is an example of the mode in which honest statesmen ought to encounter popular delusions. The spirit which dictated the peroration of his speech to the electors is worthy of the imitation of the highest and the humblest in rank or talent who aspire to be legislators: "I do not here stand before you accused of venality, or of neglect of duty. It is not said that in the long period of my service, I have, in a single instance, sacrificed the slightest of your interests to my ambition, or to my fortune. It is not alleged that, to gratify any anger or revenge of my own, or of my party, I have had a share in wronging or oppressing any description of men or any one man in any description. No! the charges against me are all of one kind, that I have pushed the principles of general justice and benevolence too far; farther than a cautious policy would warrant, and farther than the opinions of many would go along with me. In every accident which may happen through life—in pain, in sorrow, in depression and distress—I will call to mind this accusation, and be comforted."

The elections were generally favorable to the court. The riots of London had spread terror through the country. Opposition to the measures of government, conducted legally and peacefully, was regarded by many of the rich and most of the timid as encouragement to the outrages of ignorant multitudes. Although a hundred and thirteen new members were returned to this parliament, there were few expensive contests, especially for counties. Of the new members there were several young men whose names afterward became famous. Wilberforce was returned for Hull by a corrupt expenditure of eight or nine thousand pounds.‡ Pitt sat for the close borough of Appleby, having unsuccessfully contested the University of Cambridge. Sheridan was elected for Stafford.

The ministry, as might be expected from the result of the elections, had acquired a firmer position. On the 25th of January a royal message announced a rupture with Holland, the reasons of which were set forth in a manifesto. An amendment to the address in support of the war was rejected by large majorities in both houses. Burke, having been returned for the borough of Malton, brought forward his motion for the regulation of the civil list, which had been rejected in the previous session. It again met with the same fate. Pitt made his first speech on this occasion, in support of the bill. Two more efforts put the young orator upon a level with the most influential members of the party that advocated retrenchment and reform, and were opposed to the American war—a war described by the son of Chatham as "a most accursed, wicked, barbarous, cruel, unnatural, unjust, and diabolical war!" Of these displays of his friend, Wilberforce thus prophesied: "He comes out, as his father did, a ready-made orator; and I doubt not but that I shall one day or other see him the first man in the country." *

At the beginning of 1781 the French made a desperate effort to secure the most important of the Channel Islands—the last possession of the Duchy of Normandy which remained to the English crown. During the American war two previous attacks had been made upon Jersey, without success. The Baron de Rullecourt had sailed from Granville, in Normandy, in a season of tempest, with a fleet of small vessels carrying two thousand troops. About half his force was driven back to the coast of France. But on the night of the 5th of January he landed eight hundred men at the Violet Bank, about three miles from St. Helier, and before daybreak was in possession of that town. The lieutenant-governor and the magistrates being seized, Rullecourt terrified them into signing a capitulation. The officers in Elizabeth Castle declared that they were not bound by such an act, and refused to surrender the fortress. Meanwhile a spirited young officer, Major Pierson, of the 99th regiment, had collected the militia of the island, with some other troops, and, in answer to a demand from Rullecourt to capitulate, replied that if the French commander did not himself surrender in twenty minutes he should be attacked. Pierson led his columns into the town, drove the enemy from street to street, and finally compelled the whole body to surrender in the market-place. The gallant Englishman was shot through the heart at the moment of his triumph, and the French invader was mortally wounded.

Great Britain had now to encounter the hazards of a maritime war with France, Spain, and Holland. For two years this somewhat unequal battle was most vigorously fought, wherever there was a hostile flag to be encountered. The ancient supremacy of the seas was again maintained, single-handed, against four allied powers. Whatever were the misfortunes of the British army that terminated the conflict in America, the close of the war was marked by maritime successes which had an important influence upon the conclusion of a peace, and whose example stimulated that heroic spirit in our naval commanders which was the chief safety of our country in another war of even greater peril.

The first signal event of the war with Holland was the capture of St. Eustatius, one of the Leeward Islands. This small possession, which had been colonized by the Dutch for a hundred and eighty years, was especially valuable to them as the seat of a great commerce—"as the grand free port of the West Indies and America, and as a general market and magazine to all nations." † This rock was in itself a natural fortification. Its one landing-place is now so fortified as to be considered impregnable. On the 3d of February, 1781, when Admiral Rodney, having been apprised of the declaration of war, appeared before St. Eustatius with a large fleet and demanded an immediate surrender, the governor deemed all resistance unavailing. The riches in merchandise obtained by this success were beyond all previous conception. The whole island was one vast emporium of sugar and tobacco, and all the richer products of the West Indies. In the bay two hundred and fifty trading vessels were captured. All the valuable property belonging, not only to the Dutch West India Company and the traders of Amsterdam, but to the merchants of Great Britain and the residents of our West Indian Islands, was indiscriminately seized. Rodney, who had the command of the West India station, was beset with remonstrances and applications for redress. The merchants of St. Christopher's had been great sufferers, and the legislature of that island supported their claims to compensation on the ground that they had lodged their property at St. Eustatius under the guarantee of several acts of parliament.

* "Two Letters to Gentlemen in Bristol."
† "Speech at Bristol."
‡ "Life of Wilberforce," by his sons, vol. i. p. 15.

* "Life of Wilberforce," by his sons, vol. i. p. 22.
† "Annual Register," 1781, p. 101.

They were told that the island was Dutch, everything in it was Dutch, was under the protection of the Dutch flag, and as Dutch it should be treated. Jews, Americans, French, and native Dutch were successively transported from the island. Their property was sold by public auction; and merchandise, to the amount of three millions, was disposed of at a terrible depreciation, and found its way chiefly to the French and Danish islands. May we not hope that such a barbarous mode of conducting warfare has passed away; and that, although merchants cannot expect to be wholly exempted from loss and suffering, it will cease to be an object with a great naval power such as Britain, so to time its declaration of hostilities as to rush upon unprepared and unsuspecting commercial communities "like thieves who break through and steal?" Rodney, in his official dispatch, disclaimed any hope of private advantage. Lord North, in a debate in the House of Commons upon the question of the confiscation of the property at St. Eustatius, stated that he had received a letter from the admiral, in which he had said he did not consider the property as belonging to himself, but to the crown; and Rodney, in his place as a member, declared he had no other idea at the time when he seized all the property in the island than that it belonged of right to his country. "He had not received intelligence, till long after the confiscation, of his majesty's gracious intentions of relinquishing his rights in favor of the fleet and army to whom the island was surrendered." Litigation in the courts of law left little to the captors of what had been saved from recapture by the French in its conveyance home. The nation had to endure a great amount of opprobrium in Europe, and the English flag came to be regarded in the West Indies as an ensign almost as much to be dreaded as the black flag of the pirate. The piratical flag was really raised by a squadron of privateers from Bristol, who set sail upon hearing of the rupture with Holland without waiting for those letters of marque and reprisal under which their acts would have been legalized. The Dutch settlements in Guiana offered tempting prizes to these adventurers. To plunder the rich Hollanders appeared to be an object worthy of British enterprise, whether lawful or unlawful. The present age has grown ashamed of the system of privateering, however regularly conducted under the recognized forms. Enlightened men were always averse to this mode of private plunder under the pretence of national advantage. Franklin, in the negotiations for the peace of 1783, proposed that Great Britain and America, as well as the other belligerent powers, should agree not to grant any commissions to private armed vessels, empowering them to take or destroy trading ships. In 1856, after the close of the war with Russia, the conference at Paris recommended the entire abolition of the system of privateering, and the acknowledgment of the rights of neutrals, as desirable and necessary changes for bringing the system of war into harmony with the ideas and principles of modern civilization. There was one dissentient power whose ministers thought it politic to forget the recommendation of their illustrious countryman.

It was made a charge against Sir George Rodney that he lingered at St. Eustatius from February to May, for the purpose of looking after his own interests, when he might during that time have carried on offensive operations at Martinique, where the French had an inferior force to oppose him. He was busy, it was said, about the captured merchandise, while the French fleet was reinforced, and Tobago was taken. Rodney defended himself by alleging that he had sent Sir Samuel Hood, as he believed with an adequate force, to oppose the armament under De Grasse that had sailed from France. The force was not adequate; for five ships came out of Port Royal harbor to join the French admiral; and although there was a partial action, the English operations were wholly inefficient. The next year Rodney nobly vindicated himself from any imputation of want of zeal and daring. It was, indeed, then time that some great effort should be made to assert the maritime eminence of England; for Lord Mulgrave, according to a report of his speech in November, 1781, maintained an opinion very strangely opposed to the prevailing belief: "We are not, nor ever were, equal to France in a naval contest, where France applied all her resources and strength to the raising of a navy."* An engagement off the Dogger Bank between a squadron under Admiral Hyde Parker and a Dutch squadron recalled the memory of "those dreadful sea-fights between England and Holland which the last century witnessed."* Like many of those sea-fights, there was no result but mutual destruction and prolonged animosity. The bravery and endurance of a British garrison were never more signally displayed than in the defence of Gibraltar during this year. Of that memorable siege we shall have to relate the continuous story in a subsequent chapter.

At no period of the contest between Great Britain and the United States were the two principals in the war in a condition in which peace was more necessary to each than at the beginning of the year 1781. Washington, looking at the extensive confederacy against England, thought, toward the end of the campaign of 1780, that it would not be in her power to continue the contest. But he was soon convinced that, however menaced on every side, England was entering upon another campaign without manifesting any sign of exhaustion. The American commander looked at his own resources, and saw little to inspire him with the hope of any decisive success. At this period he writes, "I see nothing before us but accumulating distress. We have been half our time without provisions, and are likely to continue so. We have no magazines, nor money to form them. We have lived upon expedients until we can live no longer."† The Congress, at the end of 1780, transmitted a letter to Franklin, addressed to the King of France, urgently requesting arms, ammunition, clothing, and a loan of money. Franklin writes to the French minister of foreign affairs, to express his opinion "that the present conjuncture is critical; that there is some danger lest the Congress should lose its influence over the people, if it is found unable to procure the aids that are wanted; and that the whole system of the new government in America may therefore be shaken."‡ Franklin, at this crisis, when the immediate prospect was so obscure, predicted of a more remote future, if America should fail in asserting its independence, and "if the English were suffered once to recover that country." He prophesied "that the possession of those fertile and extensive regions, and that vast sea-coast, will afford them so broad a basis for future greatness, by the rapid growth of their commerce and breed of seamen and soldiers, as will enable them to become the terror of Europe, and to exercise with impunity that insolence which is so natural to their nation."§ Franklin, amid the blandishments of Paris, had become half a Frenchman. John Adams, who at this period was the American envoy at Amsterdam, reports how some of the Dutch prophesied after another fashion—"that America has the interest of all Europe against her; that she will become the greatest manufacturing country, and thus ruin Europe; that she will become a great and an ambitious military and naval power, and consequently terrible to Europe."‖ Without regarding the possible effect of the establishment of American independence upon the future stability of the monarchy of France, the government of Louis XVI. resolved to make one more effort in this strange alliance between liberty and despotism. Six millions of livres were granted to America as a free gift. The King of France wanted to borrow money himself to support the war, and could not injure his own credit by being associated with an American loan, for the depreciation of the paper of Congress had closed the pockets of European capitalists.¶ To add to the gloom of the republican leaders, on new year's day thirteen hundred of the troops raised by Pennsylvania mutinied for redress of grievances to which Congress had given no heed. They would serve no longer without pay, without food, without clothing. They marched away from their encampment at Morristown, and were reduced to obedience with great difficulty, but without severities. A similar mutiny in the brigade of New Jersey was quelled by a superior force and by military executions.

The capture of Charleston in May, 1780, and the victory of Camden in the following August, had led the English government to believe that another campaign would produce a favorable termination of the war. Lord George Germaine, in a letter to Lord Cornwallis, takes the same high tone about the restoration of the constitution and the punishment of rebels as in the early stages of the conflict. He approves of the severities of Cornwallis toward traitors: "The most disaffected will now be convinced that we are not afraid to

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxii., col. 711.

* "Annual Register," 1782, p. 120.
† Ramsay, "Life of Washington," p. 162.
‡ "Works," vol. viii. p. 534.
§ Ibid.
‖ Ibid., p. 494, Letter to Franklin, August, 1780.
¶ Ibid., vol. ix. p. 2.

punish, and will no longer venture to repeat their crimes in the hope of impunity, should they be detected; and those who are more moderate will be led to withdraw from a cause which is evidently declining, before it becomes desperate, and they expose themselves to the consequences they may reasonably apprehend will fall upon such as persist in rebellion to the last." * With such an adviser we can well understand how the king could have no other notion of three or four millions of Americans in revolt than that they were mere traitors to be conquered, and then to be wholly dependent upon his royal mercy. The people of England were now, to a certain extent, in unison with the government as to the necessity of continuing the war. Mr. Hartley writes to Franklin, "I verily believe, so great is the jealousy between England and France, that this country would fight for a straw to the last man, and the last shilling, rather than be dictated to by France."† The unfortunate union of common cause between America and France had turned aside the wish of the people of England for peace. This opinion of Mr. Hartley is confirmed—as far as a general sentiment can receive confirmation from the expression of opinion in particular localities—by the tone of public meetings and the words of addresses to the crown.

Lord Cornwallis, in his camp at Wynnesborough, amid the flooded rivers and creeks of South Carolina, was not so sanguine as the secretary at Whitehall. The whole country, he writes to Sir Henry Clinton at the beginning of January, is kept in continual alarm by perpetual risings in different parts of the province, and the invariable success of these parties against the royalist militia.‡ On the 7th of January Cornwallis began his march for North Carolina. He sent forward Lieutenant-Colonel Tarleton, with seven hundred infantry and three hundred and fifty cavalry, "to endeavor to strike a blow at General Morgan." Heavy rains swelled the watercourses, and impeded the progress of the army. On the 17th Tarleton came up with Morgan, and the battle of Cowpens resulted in the total defeat of the British. The American line had given way, and the British were in disorderly pursuit, when Morgan's corps faced about and poured in a heavy fire upon the pursuers. A general panic ensued, in spite of the exertions, entreaties, and example of Colonel Tarleton. More than one half of the royalist forces were killed, wounded, or taken prisoners, by an enemy not superior in numbers. This defeat is described as "the most serious calamity which had occurred since Saratoga—and crippled Lord Cornwallis for the remainder of the war." §

Morgan, after his victory at the Cowpens, was enabled, though closely pursued by Cornwallis, to unite his forces with those of Nathanael Greene, a meritorious officer, who was appointed to succeed Gates as commander of the American army in North and South Carolina. By the judicious arrangements of General Greene he was enabled to avoid a battle with the superior force of Cornwallis, and entered Virginia. Jefferson was the governor of that State. At the beginning of January Arnold, who was now in full activity in the British service, landed about nine hundred men at Jamestown. They burned all the public property at Richmond and other places, and, having marched more than thirty miles into the interior, regained their vessels. This incursion occupied only forty-eight hours. Virginia had at that time a population of more than half a million, and there were fifty thousand enrolled militia. But these were scattered over the country; and Richmond, the capital, was a town, or rather village, of only eighteen hundred inhabitants. The militia was a force upon paper, with few men called into the field; and without money or arms it would have been useless to collect and embody them. This was the defence made by Jefferson, when his enemies accused him of neglect, and threatened impeachment. ‖ Arnold made a second irruption in April, and again destroyed much property. General Greene had been reinforced with all the available militia from Virginia at the beginning of March, and on the 15th he was approaching Guilford, in North Carolina, with an army of seven thousand men. On that day Lord Cornwallis attacked him, and after an action of an hour and a half routed the American army and took their cannon. The British sustained a heavy loss. "The great fatigue of the troops," writes Cornwallis to Rawdon, "the number of wounded, and the want of provisions, prevented our pursuing the enemy." * Greene, who had fled twenty miles from Guilford, soon became the pursuer. By his incessant activity he cut off supplies from the British army, which was compelled to fall back to Wilmington, on the Cape Fear River. He arrived there on the 7th of April. On the 10th he wrote to Major-General Phillips. "I have had a most difficult and dangerous campaign, and was obliged to fight a battle, two hundred miles from any communication, with an enemy seven times my number. The fate of it was long doubtful. We had not a regiment or corps that did not at some time give way." He adds, "I am quite tired of marching about the country in quest of adventures. If we mean an offensive war in America we must abandon New York and bring our whole force into Virginia, we then have a stake to fight for, and a successful battle may give us America." † Cornwallis wrote home to Lord George Germaine to recommend "a serious attempt upon Virginia." On the 23d, without waiting for instructions from the ministry, or receiving orders from Sir Henry Clinton, his superior officer, he resolved, upon his own responsibility, as he expressed in another letter to the secretary of state, "to take advantage of General Greene's having left the back of Virginia open, and march immediately into that province to attempt a junction with General Phillips." He apologizes to Clinton for deciding upon measures so important without his direction or approbation, alleging "the delay and difficulty of conveying letters, and the impossibility of waiting for answers." ‡ The opinions of Clinton and Cornwallis upon the conduct of the war were not in accord. Clinton thought the main object was to defend New York, and merely maintain the posts held in the southern provinces. Cornwallis held that if a defensive war was the plan to be adopted, mixed with desultory expeditions, it would be best to abandon the Carolinas, which could not be held defensively while Virginia could be so easily armed. "Let us quit the Carolinas, and stick to our salt-pork at New York, sending now and then a detachment to steal tobacco." While Cornwallis was setting forth on an undertaking which, he says, "sits heavy on my mind," Rawdon, on the 25th of April, won a battle near Camden. He sallied from that post to attack General Greene, whose force doubled his own. The Americans quitted the field, but the victory had no eventual benefit for the British cause.

Lord Cornwallis crossed James River into Virginia on the 26th of May. General Phillips had died while his friend was on his march to join him. Cornwallis was, however, now strengthened by reinforcements, and proposed to dislodge La Fayette from Richmond. But La Fayette moved to the upper country, and though the English general wrote "the boy cannot escape me," the boy was too alert to be captured. The legislature of Virginia was sitting at Charlottesville, and Colonel Tarleton was very near surprising the whole body. Jefferson himself had a narrow escape, having only quitted his own house at Monticello ten minutes before the British entered it. "His property, books, and papers, were all respected, with the exception of the waste which was committed in his cellars by a few of the men, without the knowledge of their commanding officer." § The Virginians bitterly complained of the mischief committed upon their plantations by the invading army—crops of corn and tobacco destroyed, barns burned, horses carried off. The damage of six months was estimated at three millions sterling. ‖

On the 2d of August Cornwallis was in possession of Yorktown, on the peninsula between the River York and the River James. "The position," he writes to his friend, Brigadier O'Hara, "is bad, and of course we want more troops, and you know that every senior general takes without remorse from a junior, and tells him he has nothing to fear." ¶ Clinton was urging him to send men to New York. During the month of August Cornwallis was busily employed in fortifying Yorktown, and also Gloucester on the opposite side of the York River. On the 29th of August the French West India fleet, under De Grasse, entered the Chesapeake, and landed a large force at Jamestown. Cornwallis wrote to Clinton to apprise him of this event, and to announce that Washington "is said to be

* "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. i. p. 81.
† "Franklin's Works," vol. ix. p. 119.
‡ "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. i. p. 81.
§ Ibid., vol. i. p. 84.
‖ Tucker's "Life of Jefferson," vol. i. p. 150.

* "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. i. p. 86.
† Ibid., p. 88.
‡ Ibid., pp. 94, 95.
§ Tucker, "Life of Jefferson," vol. i. p. 160.
‖ Ibid.
¶ "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. i. p. 112.

shortly expected." Clinton replied that he had no doubt that Washington was "moving with six thousand French and rebel troops" against Cornwallis, and that all the force that could be spared from New York should be sent to him.

At the beginning of August Washington, encamped in the neighborhood of New York, was anxiously expecting the arrival of the fleet under De Grasse. He had conceived hopes, more than usually sanguine, that a combined attack upon New York by land and sea might have given a decisive turn to the war. The dispatches of Clinton to Cornwallis show how anxiously the British general looked to the defence of this important place, which had so long been the scene of hostilities. On the 14th of August Washington received intelligence that De Grasse had sailed to the Chesapeake. He instantly determined to abandon all idea of attacking New York, and to march for Virginia. On the 21st of August the troops destined for the South were in motion, no attempt having been made by Clinton to interrupt their march.

Those qualities of a commander which are, at the least, as important, if not so dazzling, as his ability to "set a squadron in the field," have been rarely displayed more signally than in the provident care of Washington that no disorder should ensue from the sudden change in his whole plan of operations. He had to provide against the chance of attack on his march from New York to Trenton, and he adroitly managed to lead Clinton to believe that the march was a feint, and that he would return to his encampment. From Trenton his army had to be transported to Christiana, and from the head of Elk down the Chesapeake. He had to make arrangements that, upon the instant of his arrival, all the craft fit for the navigation of the Delaware should be ready to embark his troops. He had to insure a supply of salt provisions, flour, and rum, at the head of Elk, to satisfy weary and grumbling men during their long river passage. They were grumblers because for some time they had received no pay. He arranged for "a douceur of a little hard money to put them in proper temper." He regarded the object of his movement as one of the greatest importance, and urged upon the authorities of the various States to provide the means for prosecuting a siege with rapidity. On the 6th of September Washington was at the head of Elk, and had put himself into communication with De Grasse. On the 10th he was for a few hours in his own home at Mount Vernon —"a modest habitation, quite in keeping with the idea that we have of Cincinnatus, and of those of the other great commanders of the Roman republic."* The troops had been embarked at the head of Elk, but their general suddenly commanded them to stop. He had heard that De Grasse had gone to sea on the 5th, and he doubted whether the navigation of the bay would have been secure. De Grasse had set sail to encounter the West India fleet of Sir Samuel Hood, which had effected a junction with six ships under Admiral Graves, who, as senior officer, took the command. On the 5th a general engagement ensued, in which both fleets were damaged, but no vessels on either side were taken or destroyed. The French being reinforced by the squadron from Rhode Island, Graves returned to New York, and De Grasse remained master of the Chesapeake.

On the 17th of September Cornwallis wrote somewhat despairingly to Clinton: "I am just informed that since the Rhode Island squadron has joined, they have thirty-six sail of the line. This place is in no state of defence. If you cannot relieve me very soon you must be prepared to hear the worst."† He was promised relief, and the co-operation of a force of five thousand men, which was to be conveyed by the whole fleet on the 5th of October. On the 8th of September Cornwallis had provisions for six weeks. The French fleet in the Chesapeake entirely cut off any chance of further supplies. On the 14th of October, then, according to this calculation, the British army would be in peril of starvation. But, according to one account, Cornwallis subsequently thought that he might hold out to the middle of November.‡

On the 19th of September Steuben, who had been appointed to a regular command in the siege of Yorktown, writes, "Cornwallis is fortifying himself like a brave general who must fall; but I think he will fall with honor."§ Steuben was the only American officer who had ever taken part in a regular siege, and his assistance in the siege of Yorktown appears to have been especially valuable. On the 30th of September the besieging army broke ground, and constructed redoubts about eleven hundred yards from the British works. On the evening of the 9th they opened their batteries, and, writes Cornwallis on the 11th, "have since continued firing without intermission with about forty pieces of cannon, mostly heavy, and sixteen mortars." On the 12th their second parallel was opened. Cornwallis now began to lose hope: "Nothing," he says, "but a direct move to York River, which includes a successful naval action, can save me." On the 15th he apprised Clinton that his two advanced redoubts had been carried by storm; that his situation was very critical; that his first earthen works could not resist powerful artillery; and, his numbers being weakened, he concludes by saying, "The safety of the place is therefore so precarious that I cannot recommend that the fleet and army should run great risk in endeavoring to save us." The catastrophe was close at hand. On the 20th of October Cornwallis wrote to inform Clinton that on the previous day he had been forced to give up the posts of York and Gloucester, and to surrender the troops under his command, by capitulation, as prisoners of war to the combined forces of America and France. In this letter he describes the difficulties he had encountered, since he withdrew within the works in expectation of the promised relief. He dwells on the diminution of his numbers by the fire of the enemy and by sickness; on the exhaustion of the strength and spirits of those that remained. "Under all these circumstances I thought it would have been wanton and inhuman to the last degree to sacrifice the lives of this small body of gallant soldiers, who had ever behaved with so much fidelity and courage, by exposing them to an assault, which, from the numbers and precautions of the enemy, could not fail to succeed."* The garrison, at the time of the surrender, consisted of 363 officers, of whom some were sick; of 4541 non-commissioned officers and rank and file fit for duty, and of 2089 sick and wounded.

The articles of capitulation did not involve any degrading conditions. The garrisons of York and Gloucester were to march out to an appointed place, with shouldered arms, colors cased, and drums beating a British or German march; then to ground their arms, and return to the place of their encampment. The imagination might fill up a picture from this indistinct outline. But a very graphic representation of an extraordinary scene exists in the diary of an Anspach sergeant who served in the British army.† We necessarily take only the prominent points of a lengthened detail. On the afternoon of the 19th of October, all the troops marched on the road to Williamsburg, in platoons, through the whole American and French army, who were drawn up in regiments. In front of each regiment were their generals and staff-officers. The French generals were attended by richly dressed servants in liveries. Count de Rochambeau, Marquis de La Fayette, Count de Deuxponts, and Prince de Lucerne were there, wearing glittering stars and badges. The French formed the right wing. The left wing of the line was formed of the Americans. In front were their generals, Washington, Gates, Steuben, and Wayne. They were paraded in three lines. The regulars, in front, looked passable; but the militia, from Virginia and Maryland, were ragged and ill-looking. The prisoners were quite astonished at the immense number of their besiegers, whose lines, three ranks deep, extended nearly two miles. They passed through this formidable army to a large plain, where a squadron of French hussars had formed a circle. One regiment after another had to pass into this circle, to lay down their muskets and other arms. The honest narrator says, "When our colonel, Baron Seybothen, had marched his men into the circle, he had us drawn up in a line, stepped in front of it, and commanded first, 'Present arms,' and then, 'Lay down arms—put off swords and cartridge-boxes,' while tears ran down his cheeks. Most of us were weeping like him." All the officers, English and German, were allowed to keep their swords. All marched back in utter silence to the camp. Their courage and their spirit were gone; "the more so," says the

* Steuben, p. 346. † "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. i. p. 120.
‡ Ibid., p. 123. Letter of Brodrick to Townshend.
§ "Life," p. 406.

* "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. i. p. 129.
† First published in the "Life of Steuben," from the manuscript of John Conrad Doehla, in the possession of Friedrich Kaap, the author of that Life, p. 459.

sergeant, "as in this our return march the American part of our conquerors jeered at us very insultingly." Upon their return to their lines and tents they enjoyed full liberty. The French are described as behaving very well toward the conquered—altogether kind and obliging. Cornwallis, in his dispatch, makes no complaint of the Americans, but he clearly draws a distinction that seems expressive of no very cordial feeling toward those of the same race with himself: "The treatment, in general, that we have received from the enemy since our surrender has been perfectly good and proper; but the kindness and attention that has been shown to us by the French officers in particular—their delicate sensibility of our situation, their generous and pressing offer of money, both public and private, to any amount—has really gone beyond what I can possibly describe, and will, I hope, make an impression on the breast of every British officer whenever the fortune of war should put any of them into our power."* The Abbé Robin noticed that there was a much deeper feeling of animosity between the English and Americans than between the English and French. As the English officers passed through the lines they saluted every French officer, but they showed no such courtesy to the American officers.† There was no wisdom or equity in this unmerited contempt of men who were fighting for a far higher cause than their French allies. There was only a paltry display of military pride against irregulars, and a servile imitation of the temper of the English court toward "rebels." An article of capitulation proposed by Cornwallis was rejected by Washington: "Natives or inhabitants of different parts of this country at present in York or Gloucester are not to be punished on account of having joined the British army." It was rejected upon this principle: "The article cannot be assented to, being altogether of civil resort." But Washington did not refuse his consent through any vindictive feeling. He allowed an article to stand, by which the Bonetta sloop of war should be left entirely at the disposal of Lord Cornwallis, and be permitted to sail to New York without examination. The Anspach sergeant records that Tories of the country who were in the British army, and the French and American deserters who had joined during the siege, thus passed unmolested. This fact was probably unknown in England when Cornwallis was bitterly blamed for consenting to the refusal of the tenth article. "He ought," says Walpole, "to have declared he would die rather than sacrifice the poor Americans who had followed him from loyalty against their countrymen." ‡

On the day that Cornwallis signed the capitulation Clinton dispatched the auxiliary force for his relief. When Cornwallis and his superior officer met at New York, their differences of opinion became a matter of serious controversy, which was subsequently taken up in parliamentary debates, and in pamphlets not devoid of personal acrimony. These charges and recriminations were soon forgotten in the more important political events that were a certain consequence of a calamity through which the war would very soon come to an end. There can be no doubt that the government felt the capitulation as an irremediable disaster. Wraxall, in his "Memoirs of his Own Time," has related a conversation which he had with Lord George Germaine, as to the mode in which Lord North received the intelligence. Wraxall, a very slovenly and inaccurate writer, has confounded the official account of the surrender with a French gazette that reached London on Sunday, the 25th of November. Clinton's dispatch did not reach Lord George Germaine till midnight of the 25th, as is shown by a minute on the back of the letter; and therefore Wraxall's statement that Lord George read the dispatch to him and others at dinner, between five and six o'clock, is certainly incorrect.§ But nevertheless we cannot, in common fairness, accuse the gossiping memoir writer of having invented the conversation which he alleges took place at this dinner. He asked the secretary how Lord North took the communication when made to him. The reply was, "As he would have taken a ball in his breast; for he opened his arms, exclaiming wildly, as he paced up and down the apartment during a few minutes, 'Oh, God! it is all over,' words which he repeated many times, under emotions of the deepest consternation and distress."* Lord George Germaine appears to have had very little official reticence, if Wraxall is to be believed, for he read to the same mixed company a letter from the king, in reply to the communication of the disastrous news: "I trust that neither Lord George Germaine nor any member of the cabinet will suppose that it makes the smallest alteration in those principles of my conduct which have directed me in past time, and which will always continue to animate me under every event, in the prosecution of the present contest." †

* "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. i. p. 130.
† Quoted by Lord Mahon, vol. vii. p. 181.
‡ "Last Journals," vol. ii. p. 475.
§ Note by Mr. Ross, in "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. i. p. 135.

CHAPTER CLXXV.

The king announces to parliament the capitulation of Cornwallis—Debates on the address very hostile to the ministry—Strong expressions of Fox—More prudent language of Pitt—Differences in the cabinet—Lord G. Germaine retires—Losses of West India Islands and Minorca—The government in a minority—Lord North announces that his administration is at an end—The Rockingham ministry—Rodney's victory over De Grasse—Breaking the line—Capture of the Ville de Paris—Change of costume in the House of Commons—Burke's bill for economical reform—Bills on revenue officers and contractors—Pitt's motion for parliamentary reform—Arming the people—Retrospect of the state of Ireland—Irish parliament—Grattan—His efforts for legislative independence—The volunteers of Ireland—The king's message to the British and Irish parliaments—The statute of George I., asserting the dependence of Ireland, repealed.

The session of parliament was opened on the 27th of November. The royal speech had been prepared before the news of the capitulation of Cornwallis had reached London on the 25th. The mover of the address had been appointed, and had got by heart the echo of the speech. The ministers had little time to prepare or alter the speech, says Walpole. They were obliged to find another mover of the address; for the young Lord Fielding, originally chosen, "avoided making himself as ridiculous as the royal speech." ‡ The inconsistency of the production is manifest. The beginning and the end declare the king's resolution to persevere in extinguishing the spirit of rebellion among his deluded subjects in America, precisely in the same tone as if Cornwallis had sent Washington a prisoner to London. But one little sentence creeps in, which renders these words of sound and fury of no significance: "It is with great concern I inform you that the events of war have been very unfortunate to my arms in Virginia, having ended in the loss of my forces in that province." It was to be expected that the calamity of Yorktown would give new effect to the efforts of the opposition to put an end to the war; but the temper which was evinced in this royal communication was calculated to raise hostility to a ministry into bitterness against the sovereign. Lord Shelburne talked of the greatness of mind with which his majesty could rise superior to the dreadful situation of his affairs. "He was not surprised that ministers should take advantage of the noble sentiments of their monarch, and contrive and fabricate such a speech as should best flatter his personal feelings; but it was to be remembered that those ministers had never governed long for the people's advantage, in any country, who had not fortitude to withstand the mere impulse of their master's sentiments." § Upon this point it is curious to note the difference of opinion between two eminent statesmen of our own times. Lord Holland laments the weakness, while he enters into the chivalrous feelings, of Lord North, which induced him, in opposition to his better judgment, not to abandon a master who expressed for him such confidence, affection, and regard. Lord John Russell holds that the king's opinion that the independence of America would be tantamount to the ruin of the country, was the opinion of Chatham and others of the most eminent of his subjects; that the king was only blamable for the obstinacy with which he clung to this opinion; but that Lord North, who was disposed to conciliate America, and was quite ready to consent to peace, by remaining in power to carry into effect the personal wishes of the sovereign, which he preferred to the welfare of the state, exhibited a conduct which might be Toryism, but was neither patriotic nor constitutional. ‖

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 103.
† Ibid., p. 108.
‡ "Last Journals," vol. ii. p. 474.
§ "Parliamentary History," vol. xxii. col. 644.
‖ "Memorials of Fox," vol. i. p. 247.

The debates in the House of Commons at this crisis, as developing the characters of the two men who were to become the great leaders of rival parties for twenty years, are singularly interesting. Charles Fox, now in his thirty-third year, by the force of his parliamentary abilities had obtained the highest position in popular estimation. He was the recognized leader of opposition; the most accomplished debater in either house. His notorious contempt for some of the decencies of life, unquestionably of evil example to younger men—and therefore particularly offensive to the king—his reckless spirit of gambling, which involved the ruin of his fortune, and all the humiliating exposures of irretrievable debt—these defects could not abate the love and admiration which he commanded by his frank and generous nature, and by his wonderful powers. But his capacity of winning friends was often neutralized by his rashness in making enemies. Lord North, a man of the most imperturbable good-nature, could readily forgive all the bitter things which Fox could say of him, and even smile at his threats of bringing him to the block. George III. treasured up in his memory the strong expressions of Fox, as he had treasured up those of Chatham; and his hatred of these two among the most influential of his subjects was never subdued, and rarely concealed. Fox might naturally look to take a high place in the government when the administration of Lord North should come to an end, as was clearly inevitable; but he could scarcely expect to propitiate the sovereign by the language which he used on the 27th of November, in moving an amendment to the address. The speech from the throne may be considered as the speech of the ministers. But if men, he said, were unacquainted with the nature of our constitution, what would they pronounce that speech to be? "What! but that it was the speech of some arbitrary, despotic, hard-hearted, and unfeeling monarch, who, having involved the slaves, his subjects, in a ruinous and unnatural war, to glut his enmity, or to satiate his revenge, was determined to persevere in spite of calamity and even of fate—that it was the speech of a monarch incapable of feeling his own misfortunes, or of sympathizing with the sorrows of his people, when the high prerogative of his despotic will was disputed; for despotic monarchs were the most tenacious of their rights, as they called them, and allowed nothing to the feelings or to the comforts of their fellow-creatures." * Burke, on this occasion, used a forcible image, which passed into a proverb. Denouncing the "miserable and infatuated men" who claimed a right of taxing America, without the power of enforcing the claim, he employed this illustration: "Oh! says a silly man, full of his prerogative of dominion over a few beasts of the field, there is excellent wool on the back of a wolf, and therefore he must be sheared. What! shear a wolf? Yes. But will he comply? Have you considered the trouble? How will you get this wool? Oh, I have considered nothing, and I will consider nothing but my right: a wolf is an animal that has wool; all animals that have wool are to be shorn, and therefore I will shear the wolf." † The amendment of Fox was lost.

William Pitt did not speak in support of the amendment; but the next day, on the motion for bringing up the report of the address, he made, according to Walpole, "a most brilliant figure, to the admiration of men of all sides." Fox praised him in the warmest terms. Mr. Courtenay, although he supported the government, said, "No man could be more affected by what fell from Mr. Pitt than he was. His splendid diction, his manly elocution, his brilliant periods, his pointed logic, conveyed in a torrent of rapid and impressive eloquence, brought strongly to his recollection that great and able statesman whose memory every grateful and generous Briton reveres." The son of Chatham, then in his twenty-third year, was a striking contrast to Fox, in the rigid decorum of his life. But he was not an unsocial young man. There was a club known as Goosetree's, where he regularly supped with old university companions. He was the wittiest and most amusing among a party of professed wits who spent an evening in memory of Shakespeare at the Boar's Head in East Cheap. ‡ But his ambition entirely subdued any disposition to surrender himself to such pleasures as those which interfered with the power and influence of Fox. Ambition was his master-passion, and it once betrayed him, in this stage of his career, when North was expected to resign, into a declaration that he would accept no subordinate post in a new administration. Walpole, who held that this arrogance proved that "he was a boy, and a very ambitious and a very vain one," states that the moment that Pitt had sat down he was aware of his folly, and said he could bite his tongue out for what it had uttered.* There was one imprudence from which this ambitious youth carefully refrained. He gave vent to those sentiments of indignation which he found it impossible to repress, against those ministers who were running headlong into measures which could end only in the ruin of the state; but he was especially careful not to say one word that could imply any disrespect to the sovereign. Dundas, the Lord Advocate of Scotland, though a ministerial officer, made a speech on this occasion which practically supported the arguments of the opposition. Did the future follower of William Pitt already recognize his natural and rightful leader?

There were differences in the cabinet on the question of continuing the war with America which soon became manifest. Lord George Germaine had declared in parliament that he would never sign a treaty which should give independence to America. Lord North had felt it necessary to declare that for the future the war in America would be confined to an endeavor to retain certain posts which were necessary even for the conduct of the war against France and Spain. Lord George Germaine retired from office, and was created a peer. The naval management of Lord Sandwich was vigorously assailed; for he had sent Admiral Kempenfeldt to intercept a French fleet sailing from Brest to reinforce their squadrons in the West Indies, and the British admiral was forced to return to England, after taking some transports, finding himself likely to be opposed by a very superior force. In the West Indies the prospect was not encouraging to a falling ministry. St. Eustatius, Demerara, and Essequibo had been retaken by the French and restored to their original possessors. Our own colonies of St. Christopher's, Nevis, and Montserrat had fallen into the hands of our enemies. To complete the sum of national misfortunes, Minorca, that noble harbor of the Mediterranean, which was lost in 1756, and regained at the Peace of Paris, was surrendered to the French on the 5th of February, after a long siege and gallant defence.

Thus, with disasters on every side, the administration of Lord North was in no condition to stand up against the repeated attacks of a powerful opposition, and the manifest defection of alarmed supporters. On the 22d of February General Conway, having expressed an opinion that there was a disposition in America to treat for peace, moved that an address be presented to the king that "he will be pleased to listen to the humble prayer and advice of his faithful Commons, that the war on the continent of North America may no longer be pursued for the impracticable purpose of reducing the inhabitants of that country to obedience by force." Mr. Ellis, the new secretary of state, resisted the motion, which was finally rejected by a majority only of one, in a house of three hundred and eighty-seven members. On the 27th General Conway renewed his motion in another form; and the government was then in a minority of nineteen, in a house of four hundred and forty-nine members. The king's reply to the address then voted was cold and sullen: "You may be assured that, in pursuance of your advice, I shall take such measures as shall appear to me to be most conducive to the restoration of harmony between Great Britain and the revolted colonies." On the 9th of March Lord John Cavendish moved a vote of censure on the ministers for the conduct of the war, which was only rejected by a majority of ten. On the 15th, after another bare majority, the king wrote to Lord North, "I am resolved not to throw myself into the hands of opposition at all events, and shall certainly, if things go as they seem to tend, know what my conscience as well as honor dictates as the only way left for me." In his diary of the 18th of March, Walpole says that the king "not only talked of retiring to Hanover, but it is certain that for a fortnight together the royal yacht was expeditiously preparing for transporting him." This idle threat of the king is properly ascribed by Walpole to "moody peevishness, which had not looked for nor fixed on any system." The king could not retain his old ministers; he threw every difficulty in the way of treating with the formidable leaders who had now the command of the House

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxii. col. 689.
† Ibid., vol. xxii. col. 722.
‡ "Life of Wilberforce," vol. i. p. 18.

* "Last Journals," vol. ii. p. 514.

of Commons. But there was no possibility of escape, except by some course which the king knew would end in that confusion which he had the sense at last not to risk. On the 20th of March Lord North announced in parliament that his ministry was at an end. Lord Holland's relation of the scene on this occasion is a relief to Walpole's tedious narrative of negotiations between Lord Thurlow and Lord Rockingham, which have lost the interest they might once have possessed: "I have heard my Uncle Fitzpatrick give a very diverting account of the scene that passed in the House of Commons on the day of Lord North's resignation, which happened to be a remarkably cold day, with a fall of snow. A motion of Lord Surrey's, for the dismissal of ministers, stood for that day, and the Whigs were anxious that it should come on before the resignation of Lord North was officially announced, that his removal from office might be more manifestly and formally the act of the House of Commons. He and Lord Surrey rose at the same instant. After much clamor, disorder, and some insignificant speeches on order, Mr. Fox, with great quickness and address, moved, as the most regular method of extricating the house from its embarrassment, 'that Lord Surrey be now heard.' But Lord North, with yet more admirable presence of mind, mixed with pleasantry, rose immediately, and said, 'I rise to speak to that motion;' and, as his reason for opposing it, stated his resignation and the dissolution of the ministry. The house, satisfied, became impatient, and after some ineffectual efforts of speakers on both sides to procure a hearing, an adjournment took place. Snow was falling, and the night tremendous. All the members' carriages were dismissed, and Mrs. Bennet's room at the door was crowded. But Lord North's carriage was waiting. He put into it one or two of his friends, whom he had invited to go home with him, and turning to the crowd, chiefly composed of his bitter enemies, in the midst of their triumph, exclaimed in this hour of defeat and supposed mortification, with admirable good-humor and pleasantry, 'I *have* my carriage. You see, gentlemen, the advantage of being in the secret. Good-night.'"* On the 27th of March the king wrote to Lord North, "At length the fatal day is come, which the misfortunes of the times and the sudden change of sentiments in the House of Commons have driven me to, of changing my ministers, and a more general removal of other persons than I believe ever was known before." The king refused to have any personal communication with Lord Rockingham until his administration was completed, and he was admitted to an audience as first lord of the treasury. Thurlow was continued as chancellor. Shelburne and Charles Fox became secretaries of state. Burke, Thomas Townshend, and Sheridan held minor offices. Burke felt somewhat mortified at that exclusiveness in the party that "almost avowedly regarded power as an heirloom in certain houses."† He wrote to an applicant for place, "I make no part of the ministerial arrangement. Something in the official line may possibly be thought fit for my measure."

At the precise period when the successors of Lord North were entering upon their tenure of office, a signal triumph of the British navy was taking place, which, had it occurred earlier, might have somewhat altered the course of party movements and of national feeling. Sir George Rodney, at the beginning of the year, had left England to resume his command on the West India station. He arrived at Barbadoes on the 19th of February with twelve sail of the line. He would learn that the surrender of St. Christopher's had taken place a week before his arrival. He would find that of all the West India possessions of Great Britain, only Jamaica, Barbadoes, and Antigua remained. The united naval force of France and Spain in the West Indies amounted to sixty ships of the line; and it was known that a formidable armament was preparing to attack Jamaica. Fortunately Rodney was enabled to form a junction with the squadron of Sir Samuel Hood, whose efforts had been unavailing to prevent the surrender of St. Christopher's. With a reinforcement of three sail of the line from England, Rodney had now thirty-six sail of the line, although several ships were in bad condition. His cruisers were watching the movements of De Grasse in the harbor of Port Royal, where he was refitting and taking troops on board. On the 8th of April signal was made that the French fleet had put to sea with thirty-three sail of the line. It was the obvious policy of Rodney to engage De Grasse before a junction could be effected with the Spaniards. His fleet, which had been anchored at St. Lucia, was immediately under weigh, and in pursuit of the enemy. In the French fleet there were vessels of very heavy metal, especially the Ville de Paris, the flag-ship, of 110 guns, considered the pride and bulwark of their navy. In the English fleet there were five ninety-gun ships. On the 9th of April the van under Hood became engaged with a superior number of the French ships; but the disproportion was remedied by Rodney coming up with a few ships of his division. The baffling winds prevented a general engagement, which De Grasse was evidently desirous to avoid. But on the evening of the 11th Rodney, after a continued chase, in the endeavor to cut off two of the French ships that had made signals of distress, found himself in face of the main fleet of De Grasse, which had borne down to the assistance of the disabled vessels. It was manifest that a general battle on the next day was inevitable.

The scene of action on the memorable 12th of April has been described "as a moderately large basin of water lying between the islands of Guadaloupe, Dominica, Saintes, and Mariegalante, and bounded both to windward and leeward by very dangerous shores."* At seven in the morning the battle commenced. It was sunset before it was finished. As the British ships came up, having received the signal for close fighting, they ranged closely along the enemy's line—so close that every shot that was given or received told with fatal effect. The slaughter was tremendous in the French ships that were crowded with troops. It was about noon when Rodney, in the Formidable, led the way in the daring manœuvre of breaking the enemy's line. He was followed by the Namur, the Duke, and the Canada. They broke the French line about three ships from the centre, where De Grasse commanded in the Ville de Paris. Rodney was followed by the ships astern of his division; and then wearing round, doubled upon the enemy and completed the separation of their line. It is difficult, if not impossible, to show in words the precise effect of such a manœuvre. Rodney himself, in 1789, wrote some marginal notes in a copy of a book which we shall presently notice, in which he said that it was the duty of an admiral "to bring, if possible, the whole fleet under his command to attack half or part of that of his enemy." He further said that, in the engagement with De Grasse, his own ship, the Formidable, "began a very close action within half musket-shot, and continued such action close along the enemy's lines under an easy sail, till an opening appeared at the third ship astern of the enemy's admiral, which gave an opportunity of breaking their line and putting their rear in the utmost confusion." The French fleet was indeed thrown into confusion by a movement so wholly unknown in maritime warfare. Rodney furnished an example which was gloriously imitated by Duncan at Camperdown, by Howe, and by Nelson. There have been pages of controversy on the question whether Rodney is entitled to the merit of the idea of breaking the line, for the first time carried into effect on this 12th of April. About the period that Rodney left London to take the command in the West Indies was printed "An Essay on Naval Tactics," by Mr. John Clerk, of Eldin. This treatise contained a very able exposition of the different principles of maritime warfare pursued by the English and the French—the one making an attack from windward, the other courting a leeward position; which difference, the author contended, had produced many of our failures in general engagements, where the results were indecisive and totally inadequate to the bravery of our sailors and commanders. He compared the meeting of two fleets, on contrary tacks, to a rencounter of horsemen, where the parties pushed their horses at full speed, in opposite directions, exchanging only a few pistol shots as they passed; and thus two great armaments had often engaged and separated without any serious damage or loss on either side. But Mr. Clerk held that if an enemy's line be cut in twain, that portion which is separated from the rest can more readily be destroyed. He alleged, in a later edition of his book, that before its publication he had communicated his views to Mr. Atkinson, a friend of Rodney; and that the admiral himself, before quitting London in 1782, said he would bear them in mind in engaging an enemy. On the other hand, Sir Charles Douglas maintains, by a comparison of dates, that Rodney could not have acquired this information before he left to take his command at the beginning of

* "Memorials of Fox," vol. i. p. 295.
† Lord Mahon, vol. vii. p. 211.

* "Annual Register," 1782.

1782; and that his father, the captain of the Formidable, made the suggestion to the admiral in the heat of the engagement, when he saw a favorable opportunity of breaking the line.* In these rival claims to what has in some degree the character of an invention, most persons will be inclined to consider that the greater merit rests with the man who first gives a practical value to a theory, and especially so in the case of a naval or land commander, who, in the hurry and tumult of a battle, seizes the right moment for carrying a principle into operation.

The engagement of the 12th of April terminated in the most signal success. The admiral held that it was the severest sea-fight on record. The great triumph of the day was the capture of the Ville de Paris. De Grasse continued the fight in this mighty vessel—mighty as compared with the usual size of seventy-fours, and even ninety-gun ships, in that day—till the victory was decisive over the other portions of his fleet. The last broadside from the Barfleur, commanded by Hood, compelled him to strike. Five large ships were captured, and one sunk. Those that escaped fled to various ports, and were not again united for any continuance of the naval warfare. Jamaica was saved from the joint attack of the French and Spanish, for which vast preparations had been made in the trains of artillery that were found on board the captured vessels. Lord Cranston, an officer who was sent, after the Ville de Paris had struck, to receive De Grasse's sword, described the carnage which he beheld on board the great ship as altogether terrible. Only De Grasse himself, with two or three others, remained on the quarter-deck. The French admiral was only slightly wounded, though the fire of so many hours had swept away most of his officers. De Grasse could scarcely recover from his astonishment at seeing his vessel taken, and himself a prisoner—that vessel which, on the news arriving at Plymouth, provoked an exclamation from some French officers, of "Impossible! Not the whole British fleet could take the Ville de Paris." It was held that Rodney ought to have followed up his success by chasing the ships that escaped. But in those latitudes total darkness comes on immediately after sunset. He attempted a pursuit the next morning, but his fleet was becalmed for three days off Guadaloupe. On the 19th of April Hood came up with five French vessels, in the Mona Passage, and captured two seventy-fours and two frigates. Two of the French ships taken in this action never came as trophies to England. The Ville de Paris and the Glorieux went down in a great storm off the banks of Newfoundland in September, when three English vessels of a fleet from Jamaica also perished, leaving only two remaining of those that had sailed homeward with Admiral Graves.

On the 8th of April the parliament met after a short recess, during which the re-elections had taken place of those members who had accepted office in the new ministry. An eye-witness describes the change of costume which the House of Commons presented, when Lord North and his friends took their seats on the opposition benches, in great coats, frocks, and boots; and their successors, having thrown off the Whig livery of blue and buff, appeared in all the dignity of swords, lace, and hair-powder. One tenacious holder of office, Mr. Welbore Ellis, appeared on that 8th of April, for the first time in his life, in an undress.† The new ministers came from the levée and the drawing-room in their unfamiliar and uncomfortable finery; and Fox and Burke had to hear the whispered joke circulating amid the joke-loving Commons, that Lord Nugent, whose house had been robbed of many articles of dress, fancied that he saw some of his laced ruffles on the hands of the gentlemen who now occupied the treasury bench. The change of measures was far more remarkable than the change of costume. The opportunity for carrying those plans of salutary reform which were once so hateful to the court appeared to have come. George III. did not even look frowningly upon the men whose advent to office was to have been the signal for his abdication. "The king appears more and more good-humored every day," writes Fox on the 12th of April. "I believe he is really pleased with the full levées and drawing-rooms which he sees every day, and which he thinks flattering to him."‡ But the administration had the elements of decay and dissolution in its own bosom. Thurlow, who had continued on the woolsack because "the tiger," as he was called, growled so ominously that the hunters were afraid to disturb him in his lair, began at the very onset to give trouble to his coadjutors. On the 12th a royal message on the subject of Burke's measure for economical reform was discussed in the cabinet. Thurlow was decidedly opposed to the bill, Fox as resolute that it should be carried. The king's counsellors were wrangling till the 15th, when it was arranged that Fox should that day carry a message to the House of Commons, "which looks and points to Burke's bill."*

The royal message was very indefinite. It recommended the consideration of an effectual plan of economy through all the branches of the public expenditure, "toward which important object his majesty has taken into his actual consideration a reform and regulation in his civil establishment, which he will shortly lay before the house." Burke declared to the Commons that the message was the genuine effusion of his majesty's paternal care and tenderness for his subjects. Shelburne pledged himself to the Peers that the present message was the voluntary language of the sovereign himself. Horace Walpole describes Burke and Shelburne as "ridiculously extravagant in panegyrics on his majesty for this magnanimity, which certainly was no measure of his, but an artifice of their own, and but a shallow one, to persuade the people that they meant to adhere to their former principles."† Burke did not desert the principles which he had advocated in the original introduction of his great scheme of reform; but, like most other reformers, he was compelled to a compromise—to tolerate the continuance of some evil for the sake of securing some portion of a comprehensive good. Burke had no seat in the cabinet, and he was thus compelled to adopt the decisions of those who were divided among themselves, and could only hope to hold together by mutual concessions. His bill did not interfere with the mode of supplying the royal household; did not abolish the two ancient offices of treasurer and cofferer—great functionaries who carried white wands, and whose abolition might appear an encroachment upon the splendor and dignity of the crown. He left untouched the principality of Wales and the duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall. The ordnance and the mint were continued in the enjoyment of their own anomalous relations with the other branches of the public service. Nevertheless a great reform was effected. A number of useless and mischievous offices, usually held by members of parliament, were abolished, by which an annual saving of seventy-two thousand pounds was effected, and one of the readiest modes of corruption was taken away from the power of a ministry. The pension-list was limited to an annual amount of a very moderate extent, but not before extravagant pensions had been granted to Barré and Dunning. Burke, who held the office of paymaster of the forces, which had been a fountain of monstrous wealth to rapacious politicians, had the honor of proposing a distinct bill for the regulation of that office, by which no balance could in future accumulate in the hands of the paymaster, enabling him at the public expense to pocket the interest even of a million sterling, while the chancellor of the exchequer was raising new loans, to be followed by increased taxation.

There were two important reforms with reference to the constitution of parliament which the Rockingham ministry lost no time in carrying. The one was to exclude contractors from sitting in the House of Commons; the other to prevent revenue officers from voting at elections for representatives in parliament. These measures for limiting the influence of the crown did not pass without opposition from the lord chancellor and from Lord Mansfield. To indicate how prodigal contracts were obtained through parliamentary influences, Lord Shelburne pointed to the splendid palaces of contractors that stared the people in the face all round the metropolis—the sumptuousness and expense with which they were known to live, which rivalled those of the most successful nabobs. The contractor and the nabob were not without reason the great marks for the finger of scorn to point at. To show the power of revenue officers at elections, Lord Rockingham declared that in seventy boroughs the returns to parliament chiefly depended upon those functionaries. The constitutional principle of these disqualifications has never been con-

* Clerk's claims are advocated in the "Edinburgh Review," vol. vi. p. 301. The pretensions of Clerk and Douglas are minutely examined in the "Quarterly Review," vol. xlii. p. 50.
† Wraxall's "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 172.
‡ Russell, "Memorials of Fox," vol. i. p. 315.

* Russell, "Memorials of Fox," vol. i. p. 315.
† "Last Journals," vol. ii. p. 540.

tested since these measures became law, in spite of that opposition which Thurlow headed and Mansfield supported. A more extensive principle of parliamentary reform was at this time advocated by William Pitt. He held no place in the government; but he was deemed a supporter of more liberal doctrines than some of the most influential holders of office. A large addition to the number of county members, and the repeal of the Septennial Act, had been the constant petition of the associations in Yorkshire and other counties. The livery of London invariably maintained that the inequality of the representation was the main cause of calamitous wars and profligate expenditure. Mr. Pitt was speaking therefore the sentiments of a large body of the people, rather than representing the opinions of a party, when, on the 7th of May, he moved for a committee to inquire into the present state of the representation of the Commons of Great Britain. His motion pledged the house to no definite plan, but his speech sufficiently indicated the necessity for "a calm revision of the principles of the constitution and a moderate reform of such defects as had imperceptibly and gradually stole in to deface, and which threatened at last totally to destroy the most beautiful fabric of government in the world." There were boroughs wholly under the command of the treasury. There were others which had no actual existence but in the return of members to the house—they had no existence in property, in population, in trade, in weight—the electors were the slaves of some person who claimed the property of the borough, and who in fact made the return. There were other boroughs where the return to parliament was sold to the best purchaser; and thus it was well understood that the Nabob of Arcot had no less than seven or eight members in that house. Mr. Pitt made a pointed allusion to one, now no more, of whom every member could speak with more freedom than himself. It was the opinion of that person that without the establishment of a "more solid and equal representation of the people, by which the proper constitutional connection should be revived, this nation, with the best capacities for grandeur and happiness of any on the face of the earth, must be confounded with the mass of those whose liberties were lost in the corruption of the people." Such were the opinions advocated by the son of Chatham, "with the ardor for melioration characteristic of ingenuous youth."* The Lord Advocate of Scotland, Dundas, with that assurance which never failed him, told the ingenuous youth that he must be mistaken with regard to the opinions of his father; for on searching the journals he had not found that Lord Chatham had ever brought in any reform whatever, and therefore plainly saw the constitution wanted no such alteration. Mr. Pitt's motion was rejected by a majority of twenty. Fox thought the defeat upon this proposition would have many bad consequences. The late ministry voted against it in a body. Of the new administration and their supporters friend was against friend. Fox had great difficulty to persuade Burke not to vote against the motion, but to leave the house; and Sheridan describes Burke, on a subsequent debate for shortening the duration of parliaments, as having "attacked William Pitt in a scream of passion and swore parliament was, and always had been, precisely what it ought to be, and that all people who thought of reforming it wanted to overturn the constitution."† Arguments such as those proclaimed by the younger Pitt in 1782 were left to smoulder, with occasional flickerings of combustion, under the subsequent policy of himself and his followers, till, after the lapse of fifty years, they burst out into a flame, which realized the prophecy of his father, in 1775, that "either the parliament will reform itself from within, or be reformed with a vengeance from without." Chatham assigned a term for the realization of this prediction. To the question of Lord Buchan, "What will become of poor England, that doats on the imperfection of her pretended constitution?" he answered, "The gout will dispose of me soon enough to prevent me from feeling the consequences of this infatuation." He assigned the end of the century as the period when the necessity for a general reform could no longer be resisted.‡ Whether the reform was to come from within or from without, it is clear that in 1782 the younger Pitt, if he had taken a statesman's view either of the power of the aristocracy or the influence of the people, could not have considered that the time had arrived for carrying to its logical conclusion of a practical change, the unquestionable theory of the inequality of the representation. It may be doubted whether Burke could have affirmed, except in a paroxysm of that temporary violence which sometimes clouded his marvellous comprehension of the great elements of a political question, that "parliament was, and always had been, precisely what it ought to be." But we may well understand how, in his intimate knowledge of the composition of parties, he might believe that an agitation for reform would then be dangerous because it would be useless. It has been truly said of Burke, "that he recognized in all its bearings that great doctrine which even in our own day is too often forgotten, that the aim of the legislator should be not truth, but expediency."* We must not too hastily accept the epigrammatic reproof of his contemporary, the most delightful of writers, but no very sound judge of political action or political philosophy, that he was "too fond of the right to pursue the expedient."

Three days after the debate on Mr. Pitt's motion for reform, a discussion of a very interesting nature came on in the House of Commons. A circular letter had been issued by the Earl of Shelburne, addressed to the chief magistrate of the principal cities and towns, submitting for their opinion a plan for augmenting the domestic force of the nation, by raising battalions or companies of volunteers in each locality, who were not to be moved from their places of abode except in times of actual invasion or rebellion. This plan had the support of the leading men of both parties; but some alarmists apprehended danger from arming the people, and the ministers were called upon to remember what were the consequences of putting arms into the hands of the Irish volunteers. Mr. Fox said that from the conduct of the Irish associations the people of this country might learn a great and a laudable example of public virtue, activity, and perseverance. He was answered that the volunteers of Ireland had subverted the government of their country, and overturned its constitution.† The house manifested great anxiety to stop this line of discussion. There was at that moment a crisis in the affairs of Ireland which called for the greatest forbearance and the most strenuous attempts at conciliation. We have deferred any passing glance at the affairs of Ireland, that we might present such a general view as would naturally lead to a brief narrative of the great constitutional change of 1782.

Five years before the publication of the "Drapier's Letters," in 1724, a bill was passed by the English parliament denying, in its preamble, the right of the Irish House of Lords to an appellant jurisdiction, and declaring "that the king's majesty, by and with the advice of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons of Great Britain, in parliament assembled, had, hath, and of right ought to have, full power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the people and the kingdom of Ireland."‡ In spite of the restrictions upon its commerce, Ireland had continued to improve in wealth, and consequently in a desire for independence. When Arthur Young wrote his "Tour" in 1779, he said that during the previous twenty years the towns of Ireland had been newly built over, and in a manner far superior to what was the case before. The Protestants were necessarily the sole exponents of the desire to emerge from a dependent condition; for the Roman Catholics were in complete subjection to those who alone were privileged to sit in parliament, and who filled every office in the state. These discontents were constantly excited by the appointments of Englishmen to the higher posts, whether ecclesiastical or civil. Swift kept up the natural jealousy during the administration of Sir Robert Walpole; and under the less politic rule of the Pelhams the desire for equal liberty and privileges took the form of a contest between the English government and the Irish House of Commons as to the application of a surplus revenue. This dispute took place in 1753. "From this era," says Mr. Hallam, "the great parliamentary history of Ireland began, and was terminated, after half a century, by the union."§

On the 7th of April, 1778, the British House of Commons, on the motion of Lord Nugent, went into committee on the acts relating to the trade and commerce of Ireland; and he moved a resolution, that

* Aikin, "Annals of George III." vol. i. p. 306.
† Russell, "Memorials of Fox," vol. i. p. 322.
‡ Note in "Parliamentary History," vol. xvii. col. 223.

* Buckle, "History of Civilization," vol. i. p. 416.
† "Parliamentary History," vol. xxiii. col. 1 to 10.
‡ 6 Geo. I. c. 5. § "Constitutional History," chap. xviii.

all goods and merchandise should be permitted to be exported direct from that kingdom to any of the plantations and settlements of Great Britain, with the exception of wool and woollen manufactures. Lord North gave his cordial consent to the proposal; and this resolution, as well as two others, permitting the importation of colonial produce to Ireland, removing the prohibition against the exportation of glass, and repealing the duties on cotton yarn of Irish manufacture, was carried unanimously. Then commenced that violent opposition from the great trading towns, with the exception of London, to which Burke referred in his letter to the people of Bristol.* The bills which were brought in were contested in every stage; and finally a very imperfect measure—a mere promise of relief—was obtained in that session. Popular clamor was too strong for honest statesmanship. The discontents in Ireland grew serious. The leading politicians of the Irish parliament became naturally restless in obtaining only a pitiful instalment of their just demands. Toward Ireland George III. manifested the same exclusive spirit which he had constantly manifested toward America. He thought that every concession, however small, ought to be received with gratitude from the inferior to the superior power, and he thus wrote in November to Lord North: "Experience has convinced me that this country gains nothing by granting indulgences to her dependencies; for opening the door encourages a desire for more, which, if not complied with, causes discontent, and the former benefit is obliterated." There was a national spirit rising in Ireland which made it unsafe to dole out fragments of justice. The difficulties of the government in carrying on the war with America and France gave a new power to the Irish patriotic party. There were no English troops in Ireland. The Militia Acts were there ineffective. A descent upon the northern coast was expected; and when the inhabitants of Belfast and Carrickfergus applied to the lord-lieutenant for forces to protect them, they were told that only sixty troopers could be sent from Dublin. The people resolved to defend themselves. They organized bodies of volunteers, without waiting for any sanction or encouragement from the state. On the 11th of May, 1779, the Marquis of Rockingham stated in the House of Lords that the independent corps and companies then in arms in Ireland amounted to ten thousand men, "all acting under illegal powers, under a kind of supposition that all government was at an end."

The Irish parliament met in October, 1779. In the June of that year a motion of Lord Shelburne, to address his majesty on the subject of the trade with Ireland, had been rejected in the British House of Lords by a large majority. At this juncture a leader of the Irish parliament arose, who, in all the great qualities of eloquence, vigor, and integrity, which sometimes gives to one man the power to speak and act for an entire nation, was especially fitted to be the champion of his country. Henry Grattan was then in his thirty-fourth year. He had listened to the orations of Chatham, and in a brief estimate of his character appears to have conceived the idea of what a kindred genius might accomplish. "There was in this man something that could create, subvert, or reform; an understanding, a spirit, and an eloquence, to summon mankind to society, or to break the bonds of slavery asunder, and rule the wildness of free minds with unbounded authority; something that could establish or overwhelm empires, and strike a blow in the world that should resound through its history."† Singular, almost grotesque in his delivery, Grattan had borrowed none of the studied graces of Chatham, the most perfect master of elocution; but he brought to the debates of a popular assembly the same power of reaching the point "by the flashings of his mind." The opportunity was come for exhibiting that power with a boldness and fervor which Chatham never exceeded, and which had the same character of intense nationality as the impassioned harangues of the great Englishman. On the 12th of October Grattan moved an amendment to the address, in which the magical words "Free Trade" carried the house with him, the members of the government not even calling for a division. In the same way he carried a vote for a money bill only of six months, instead of the usual period of two years. The government saw the necessity of yielding in the matter of free trade, Lord North himself proposing, on the 12th of December, 1779, three bills for the relief of the commerce of Ireland, which were carried without opposition. This concession, like concessions to the North American colonies, came too late. "We have gotten commerce but not freedom," exclaimed Grattan, on the 19th of April, 1780, when he moved "that the king's most excellent majesty, and the Lords and Commons of Ireland, are the only power competent to make laws to bind Ireland." The motion was then lost, by an amendment that the consideration of the question be adjourned. The question at issue of the legislative independence of Ireland has passed away; but there are passages in Grattan's speech in this memorable debate which have an enduring value. We take a few sentences as an example of the solidity of his views and the force of his expressions: "As anything less than liberty is inadequate to Ireland, so is it dangerous to Great Britain. We are too near the British nation, we are too conversant with her history, we are too much fired by her example, to be anything less than her equal—anything less, we should be her bitterest enemies. . . . There is no policy left for Great Britain but to cherish the remains of her empire, and do justice to a country that is determined to do justice to herself, certain that she gives nothing equal to what she received from us when we gave her Ireland. . . . It is not merely the connection of the crown, it is a constitutional annexation, an alliance of liberty, which is the true meaning and mystery of the sisterhood, and will make both countries one arm and one soul, replenishing from time to time in their immortal connection the vital spirit of law and liberty from the lamp of each other's light. Thus combined by the ties of common interest, equal trade, and equal liberty, the constitution of both countries may become immortal; a new and milder empire may arise from the errors of the old; and the British nation assume once more her natural station—the head of mankind."*

In the course of the debate on the Irish Trade Bills, in April, 1778, Lord North referred to the penal laws of Ireland against Roman Catholics. He was of opinion that the Irish parliament would see where the grievance lay and redress it. This salutary recommendation was tardily acted upon by the Irish parliament; but in December, 1781, upon notice being given by a member that he should bring in a bill for the relief of the Roman Catholics, Mr. Grattan said that they deserved every encouragement, for they had united with their Protestant fellow-subjects when the country was threatened with invasion, and had joined with them in a common endeavor to secure free trade. He quoted the observation of a member of the British parliament, that Ireland could never prosper till its inhabitants were a people. The bill for allowing Roman Catholics to enjoy property, freely to exercise their religion, educate their children, have no impediments to marriage, and retain the means of self-defence, was finally passed in February, 1782, Grattan exclaiming, as "the mover of the Declaration of Rights, I would be ashamed of giving freedom to but six hundred thousand of my countrymen, when I could extend it to two millions more." Grattan again brought forward this declaration on the 22d of February, two days after the question of Roman Catholic relief had been settled. The orator felt that he was supported by a physical force much more effectual than argument: "The strength which, at your back, supports your virtue, precludes your apostasy; the armed presence of the nation will not bend." The motion was then rejected by a majority of sixty-nine. But there were eighty-eight thousand men in arms in the four provinces—thirty-four thousand in Ulster, eighteen thousand in Munster, fourteen thousand in Connaught, twenty-two thousand in Leinster. Their commander-in-chief was the Earl of Charlemont; noblemen of wealth and influence were among their generals. The delegates of a hundred and forty-three corps had met at Dungannon on the 15th of February, and without a dissentient voice had adopted the resolution that had been proposed to parliament by Grattan—that no power but the king and the Lords and Commons of Ireland could bind that kingdom. Grattan failed in carrying his great motion upon its second proposition. He was not to be deterred from a third attempt, under more favorable auspices. At the end of February the administration of Lord North was in a minority in the British parliament. On the 14th of March, in the Irish House of Commons, a vote was passed that the speaker should write a circular letter to each member, requiring him to appear in his place on that day, as he should tender the rights of the Irish parliament. On the 27th of

* See *ante*, p. 893.

† "Miscellaneous Works of Grattan," p. 10.

* "Speeches of Henry Grattan," edited by his son, vol. i. p. 51.

March the Rockingham ministry entered upon office. The Earl of Carlisle was removed from the lord-lieutenancy with his secretary, Mr. Eden. The Duke of Portland was appointed to the viceroyalty. On the first day that the new ministry took their places in the House of Commons, the late Irish secretary, after giving a lengthened and alarming narrative of the proceedings of the volunteers and of the Irish House of Commons, proceeded to move the repeal of the act of the 6th of George I. He did not wish, he said, to precipitate matters, but something must be done, without the loss of a moment, to prevent consequences which it was not for him so much as to think of—to anticipate the wishes of Ireland, previous to the discussion of Mr. Grattan's motion on the 16th. Mr. Fox was naturally indignant at such a motion having been made without any consultation with the king's present advisers, who had turned their attention, he said, to measures which would conciliate the affections of the Irish people. The ex-secretary, having been severely reproved by many members for the indecency of his proceeding, withdrew the motion. On the next day Mr. Fox presented a message from his majesty, expressing his concern that discontents and jealousies prevailed among his loyal subjects in Ireland, and earnestly recommending the house to take the same into their most serious consideration, in order to such a final adjustment as may give a mutual satisfaction to both kingdoms. A similar message was delivered to the Lords by Earl Shelburne.

The dreaded 16th of April arrived. The administration had earnestly desired an adjournment of the great question then to be discussed; but Lord Charlemont wrote to Fox that he should greatly fear the consequences of any postponement. Grattan was ill; but he was inflexible in determining that there should be no adjournment "unless the Duke of Portland would pledge himself that all the claims of Ireland should be agreed to."* Mr. Hutchinson, the new secretary, when the House of Commons met on the 16th, delivered a message similar to that delivered to the British parliament. Mr. Grattan, upon the motion for an address, as moved by Mr. Ponsonby, rose, and, considering that the battle was won, thus commenced one of his splendid harangues:

"I am now to address a free people: ages have passed away, and this is the first moment in which you could be distinguished by that appellation.

"I have spoken on the subject of your liberty so often that I have nothing to add, and have only to admire by what heaven-directed steps you have proceeded until the whole faculty of the nation is braced up to the act of her own deliverance.

"I found Ireland on her knees; I watched over her with an eternal solicitude; I have traced her progress from injuries to arms, and from arms to liberty. Spirit of Swift! spirit of Molyneux! your genius has prevailed! Ireland is now a nation! In that new character I hail her! and, bowing to her august presence, I say, *Esto perpetua!*

"She is no longer a wretched colony, returning thanks to her governor for his rapine, and to her king for his oppression; nor is she now a squabbling, fretful sectary, perplexing her little wits, and firing her furious statutes with bigotry, sophistry, disabilities, and death, to transmit to posterity insignificance and war.

"Look to the rest of Europe and contemplate yourself, and be satisfied."

Grattan's motion for an amendment to the address embraced all the points of the previous Declaration of Rights. "No one man," wrote Fitzpatrick to Fox, "presumed to call in question a single word advanced by Grattan, and spoke only to congratulate Ireland on her emancipation, as they called it." The triumph was soon completed by the pressure of that national will which no sane administration could resist. On the 17th of May Mr. Fox presented to the House of Commons the resolutions of the Lords and Commons of Ireland on the king's message of the 16th of April, and he moved the repeal of that statute of George I. which asserted the dependence of Ireland. A bill for this repeal passed both houses without a division. Lord Holland ascribes the adjustment of 1782 to the confidence which Mr. Fox and Mr. Grattan placed in each other, as well as to "the force of circumstances and the skill of negotiation." The mutual confidence of two great men and the skill of negotiation would have little availed if the parliament of England had not acquired sufficient wisdom not to risk another civil war, with another possible dismemberment of a portion of the empire, for the sake of another assertion of legislative supremacy.

The parliament of Ireland was overflowing with gratitude to Mr. Grattan. They desired to vote him a hundred thousand pounds for the purchase of an estate. He at first refused to receive any such public acknowledgment of his services, but eventually accepted half the amount. There was another orator in the Irish parliament who regarded with embittered feelings the testimonies of national gratitude to one whose political experience had been far less than his own. Mr. Flood maintained that the mere repeal of the act of George I., which was simply a declaratory law, left the question of the English supremacy undisturbed. At the time of the repeal of that statute a case of appeal from Ireland remained undecided in the Court of King's Bench, and Lord Mansfield gave judgment, as he had before done, in the usual course of law. A violent contest sprang up in Ireland, which renewed the old distrust of England. Grattan lost some of his popularity. Flood labored to stimulate the ancient jealousies. The government of Lord Shelburne took the proper measure of endeavoring to quiet the alarm by bringing in a bill, in January, 1783, "for removing and preventing all doubts which have arisen, or might arise, concerning the exclusive rights of the parliament and courts of Ireland in matters of legislature and judicature, and for preventing any writ of errors or appeal, from any of his majesty's courts in that kingdom, from being received, heard, or adjudged, in any of his majesty's courts in the kingdom of Great Britain."

CHAPTER CLXXVI.

Overtures for peace between Franklin and Shelburne—Rival negotiators from England—Death of Lord Rockingham—Resignation of the secretaryship by Mr. Fox—The siege of Gibraltar—Naval affairs—Lord Howe—Loss of the Royal George—Howe's relief of Gibraltar after the first bombardment—Negotiations for peace concluded—The preliminaries laid before parliament—Parliamentary censures of the terms of peace—Lord Shelburne, being defeated, resigns—The king and the American minister—Washington's farewell to his army, and his retirement.

In securing the tranquillity of Ireland, by yielding in time to a force which could not be resisted, the administration were free to negotiate for peace, with a prospect of more favorable terms than the general issue of the war might authorize them to demand if the sister-kingdom were hostile. Ireland responded to an act of justice by an instant exhibition of cordiality. Her parliament voted a hundred thousand pounds for the levy of twenty thousand seamen. The overtures for peace were first opened by Dr. Franklin, in a letter which he wrote to Lord Shelburne. They had been known to each other during Franklin's diplomatic sojourn in London; and Franklin wrote to Shelburne on the 22d of March, before the ministry was settled, to congratulate him on the returning good disposition of England in favor of America. When Shelburne replied, he was secretary of state; and he adopted the course of sending a confidential friend, Mr. Oswald, to Paris, who was fully apprised of his mind, and to whom Franklin might give entire credit.* This gentleman assured Franklin that the new ministry sincerely wished for peace, and if the independence of the United States were agreed to, there was nothing to hinder a pacification. Franklin declared that America could only treat in concert with France, and Mr. Oswald had, consequently, an interview with the Count de Vergennes. This unofficial negotiator returned to England, and was authorized by a minute of the cabinet to proceed again to Paris, to acquaint Dr. Franklin that it was agreed to treat for a general peace. A more regular envoy was sent very quickly after Oswald. Mr. Thomas Grenville, the second son of George Grenville, was the bearer of a letter to Franklin from Mr. Fox. Oswald again went back to London, and again returned, to discuss the most important matters with Franklin, while Grenville was also in constant communication with him. The shrewd old American soon found himself "in some perplexity with regard to these two negotiators." He began to suspect that the understanding between the two secretaries of state was not per-

* Letter of Fitzpatrick, in "Memorials of Fox," vol. i. p. 395.

* Franklin's Works, vol. ix. p. 241.

fect. "Lord Shelburne seems to wish to have the management of the treaty; Mr. Fox seems to think it is in his department." * Grenville was annoyed by the interference of Oswald, and wrote bitter complaints to Fox. In the midst of these differences the head of the ministry, the Marquis of Rockingham, died on the 1st of July. The day previous Fox was in a minority in the cabinet upon the question of acknowledging the independence of America before a treaty of peace was arranged. He accordingly declared his intention to resign. It is not within the province of our history to enter into an examination of those disagreements between Lord Shelburne and Mr. Fox which led to another important though partial change of administration. "Differences of opinion, suspicions of underhand dealing, and hostile cabals and intrigues, and great resentment thereupon subsisted in the minds of Mr. Fox and Mr. Grenville." † There were the usual cabals about having another man of high title, great connections, and small abilities, to succeed Lord Rockingham as prime minister. It was not a mere contest for superior power between the two able secretaries. The Duke of Portland was recommended to the king to be the first lord of the treasury. The king appointed Lord Shelburne to the high office. Fox and Cavendish resigned; Burke and Sheridan followed their example. William Pitt became chancellor of the exchequer, Thomas Townshend and Lord Grantham secretaries of state. Grenville returned indignantly from his position at Paris, much to the annoyance of his brother, Earl Temple, who obtained the lord-lieutenancy of Ireland. Walpole observes that when the first lord of the treasury adorned his new board with the most useful acquisition of his whole administration, his chancellor of the exchequer, "young William Pitt," in accepting the seals, accepted "the more difficult task of enlisting himself as the rival of Charles Fox, who had fondly espoused, and kindly, not jealously nor fearfully, wished to have him as his friend." ‡ Their fathers were rivals. But of how much greater import was the rivalry of the sons of Holland and Chatham—how much longer was its duration; what mightier events called forth its unceasing exercise!

The public sympathy did not go along with the popular favorite upon the question of his abdication of office, at a time when unanimity of councils was essentially important. The parliamentary explanations of Fox and Burke have floated down the stream of time, with many other historical straws. The principle of the mistake into which the great Whig leader fell has been candidly stated by one who has a claim to speak with authority. Lord John Russell says, "The field of battle was the worst that could be chosen. Lord Shelburne, the friend and colleague of Lord Chatham, a secretary of state under Lord Rockingham, a man of varied acquirements and undoubted abilities, was, personally, far superior to the Duke of Portland as a candidate for the office of prime minister. The king, therefore, had a great advantage over Mr. Fox in the apparent ground of the quarrel. Had Mr. Fox declared that he would not serve under any one, or, at all events, not under Lord Shelburne, who had withheld from him knowledge indispensable to his performance of the duties of secretary of state, he would have stood on firm ground. The choice of a prime minister against the choice of the crown, and that in the person of a man whose rank and fair character were his only recommendations, appeared to the public an unwarrantable pretension, inspired by narrow jealousies and aristocratic prejudices." §

The session of parliament was prorogued on the 11th of July, immediately after the formation of Lord Shelburne's ministry. The king's speech was wise and temperate. He would make every effort to obtain peace; but if the hope of a speedy termination of the calamities of war should be disappointed, he trusted that the blessing of heaven upon our arms would enable him to obtain fair and reasonable terms of pacification. "The most triumphant career of victory would not excite me to aim at more; and I have the satisfaction to be able to add, that I see no reason which should induce me to think of accepting less." The contest in America was reduced to a very narrow field of exertion. Rodney's great victory had prevented any immediate attempts to renew the maritime war in the West Indies. There had been decided successes in the East Indies, after a series of events which occasionally threatened our ascendency; but the contest there was not yet ended. * One great struggle required to be decided before Spain would be willing to relinquish the chief object for which she engaged in the war—the reconquest of Gibraltar.

When the Spanish ambassador, on the 16th of June, 1779, presented a manifesto to the court of St. James's, which was considered equivalent to a declaration of war, General Elliott, the veteran governor of Gibraltar, was not quite unprepared for the possibility of hostilities. He had a force of artillery and engineers of about five hundred men, four English regiments, and three detachments of Hanoverians—altogether amounting to upward of five thousand rank and file. On the 21st of June the communication between Spain and Gibraltar was closed by an order from Madrid. A few small British ships were at that time in their usual anchorage off the fortress. A friendly intercourse had been previously carried on between the military of the fortress and the Spaniards of the neighboring villages. Excursions into the country and to the coast of Barbary "rendered Gibraltar as eligible a station as any to which a soldier could be ordered." † The rock of Gibraltar, projecting into the sea from the coast of Spain, could only be approached by that low neck of sandy land called "the neutral ground." The isolated fortress was very soon invested by the troops of Spain, and the supplies from the mainland were necessarily cut off. In July the Enterprise frigate brought a small quantity of fresh provisions from Tangier; and boats occasionally arrived from the African coast with live stock and fruit. But such supplies became very precarious through the presence of Spanish squadrons in the bay. The people of the town under the rock had always been required, even in time of peace, to have a store of six months' provisions. They had neglected this precaution, and in August many were compelled to seek subsistence elsewhere. Partial bombardments began. The apprehensions of famine in January, 1780, were very serious. Thistles, dandelions, and wild leeks, which grew upon the rock, became the daily sustenance of the families of officers and soldiers, for whom the pittance distributed from the victualling office was insufficient. The ingenuity of the Hanoverian soldiers was displayed in their contrivances for hatching chickens by artificial heat. But when the most frightful extremity of hunger appeared threatening, the fleet of Rodney arrived, after his victory over the Spaniards off Cape St. Vincent. Don Juan de Langara, the Spanish admiral, was carried as a prisoner to Gibraltar; and being desirous to go on board the ship of Admiral Digby, he there saw Prince William Henry, afterward William IV., serving as a midshipman. Great was the Spaniard's astonishment that a prince of the blood should tell him—with the same obedience to orders that any other petty officer would have shown—that the boat was ready for his returning; and the Spaniard exclaimed, "Well does Great Britain merit the empire of the sea!" The example has been followed in our own day; not, we may trust, in any compromise between rank and duty, but in that spirit which prescribes that every youth who aspires to the future command of others should thoroughly learn to do the humblest and the hardest work of the profession which he has chosen.

The storehouses of Gibraltar were now full; the garrison had received reinforcements; the troops were in good heart. In June an attempt was made to burn the British vessels by Spanish fire-ships, but it signally failed. The summer wore on without any very important incidents, although the blockade continued unremitting. But in the autumn the scurvy had broken out among the troops, from the continued use of salt provisions. Men crept to their posts upon crutches, or pined and died in the crowded hospitals. A Danish vessel, laden with lemons and oranges, was fortunately intercepted, and the sovereign remedy of lemon-juice, which Captain Cook had successfully tried, and the ignorance of which caused the ships' companies of Admiral Hosier and Commodore Byron miserably to perish, saved the garrison of Gibraltar. Want of provisions again became distressing. The intercourse with Tangier was prohibited by the Emperor of Morocco. At last, on the 12th of April,

* Franklin's "Journal of Negotiations," June 17.
† Lord Holland, in "Memorials of Fox," vol. i. p. 387.
‡ "Last Journals," vol. ii. p. 559.
§ "Memorials of Fox," vol. i. p. 467.

* The narrative of East Indian affairs, from the period of Hastings becoming governor-general, will be resumed in our next volume.
† In our narrative of this memorable siege, we have Captain Drinkwater's history constantly before us: but it will be unnecessary to refer to the particular passages of this excellent work.

1781, the half-starved troops and remaining inhabitants of the town saw a fleet of a hundred vessels entering the Gut, convoyed by men-of-war, who lay to under the Barbary shore. The relief was well-timed. The dread of famine was at an end. But on that day the Spaniards commenced a fierce bombardment from their lines, which continued uninterruptedly through May and June. The town was nearly destroyed, but the loss of life was not considerable. The works which the Spaniards had constructed were of the most formidable character, and they incessantly labored in making additions which became more threatening. The brave and sagacious Elliott, who had so long been satisfied with the passive resistance of firing upon the lines and batteries, now determined to hazard a sortie. At sunset on the 26th of November he issued his orders for two thousand men, under the command of Brigadier Ross, but accompanied by himself, to march out from the fortress and attack the batteries, which were three quarters of a mile distant. The surprise was complete; the Spaniards deserted their works in terror; and in an hour the object of the sally was effected by the destruction of the enemy's works by fire, and by the blowing up of their magazines. The batteries continued burning for five days, and then nothing but heaps of sand could be seen by the gazers from the summit of the rock.

The incessant activity of the besiegers and the besieged may be estimated from an expressive entry in Captain Drinkwater's narrative of the proceedings in May, 1782: "From seven in the evening of the 4th to the same hour the succeeding afternoon, both the garrison and the enemy were silent. This was the first twenty-four hours in which there had been no firing for the space of thirteen months." The ruined works of the Spaniards were repaired; and it became evident that, during the year, when a general pacification appeared a probable event, the Spanish monarchy would put forth all its strength to recover Gibraltar before the war should come to an end. The Duke de Crillon had returned from the conquest of St. Philip, in Minorca, to take the command of the army before Gibraltar. There were thirty-three thousand French and Spanish troops encamped on the neutral ground. Their batteries were served by a hundred and seventy heavy pieces of cannon. Preparations were making for a conjoined attack by sea and land. In the port of Algesiras ten large ships were cut down to serve as the foundations of floating batteries, impregnable and incombustible. General Elliott also prepared for a new mode of defence, suggested by the lieutenant-governor. Furnaces were distributed through the works for the purpose of making balls red-hot—for roasting potatoes, as the soldiers said, with the true English humor. But the peril was imminent. Was the government at home not aware of the amazing preparations for the reduction of Gibraltar, having the knowledge that the united French and Spanish fleet, which had been threatening the Channel in July, had sailed back to the southward? Before we pursue farther the narrative of the siege, it may be desirable to advert to the movements of the British navy.

Admiral Lord Howe, in 1776, had gone as a commissioner to America with an earnest desire to restore peace between Great Britain and her colonies. When he returned home in 1778 he and his brother were received with little cordiality by the members of the government. Until the overthrow of Lord North's administration Lord Howe was unemployed. He complained, as a member of the House of Commons, of the conduct pursued toward the navy, by men who had neither the ability to act on their own judgment nor the integrity and good sense to follow the advice of others. His value as an officer was universally known; and in a parliamentary debate which had reference to the determination of Howe to quit the service, Admiral Pigot gave a strong though homely testimony to the affection of the sailors for the brave admiral who had seen service for forty years, by repeating their common saying, "Give us Black Dick, and we fear nothing."* When the new administration was formed in 1782, Admiral Keppel was created a viscount, and was appointed first lord of the admiralty. Lord Howe was also raised to the peerage, and appointed to the command of a fleet to be employed in the Channel, or wherever else the king's service should require. On the 20th of April he embarked at Portsmouth for the Texel, to watch the Dutch fleet. Having confined the Dutch to their ports through the month of May, he received orders to return to Spithead; and was then directed to cruise off Brest, for the purpose of intercepting the combined fleets of France and Spain which had sailed from Cadiz on the 4th of June. He accomplished the great object of preventing the enemy attacking the West India convoy; but the French and Spaniards successfully evaded a general action, and Howe returned to Portsmouth on the 5th of August.

A few weeks were necessary for Howe to equip his fleet for the important service of the relief of Gibraltar, for which he was now ordered. A calamity which, amid the dreary catalogue of disasters at sea, will probably never lose its interest, occurred at Portsmouth during the short period of preparation. On the 29th of August the Royal George, a ship of a hundred and eight guns, suddenly overset in Portsmouth Harbor, filled, and sank; by which catastrophe, according to the inscription upon a monument in the churchyard of Portsea, nine hundred persons perished. The Royal George was the flag-ship of Admiral Kempenfeldt. He was in his cabin, unconscious of any danger, while sailors were clearing a lighter alongside, and stowing her freight of rum in the hold of the great ship, and the decks were crowded with women and children from the shore, and with Jews and other tradesmen. According to the narrative of one of the seamen who was saved, the ship was heeled on her larboard side, that the water-cock, which admitted sea-water to the hold on the starboard side, might be replaced by a new cock. To accomplish this the whole of the guns on the larboard side were run out as far as they would go, and those of the starboard side were drawn in amidship. About nine o'clock in the morning, says this narrative, "the additional quantity of rum on board the ship, and also the quantity of sea-water which had dashed in through the port-holes, brought the larboard port-holes of the lower gun-deck nearly level with the sea." The carpenter went on the quarter-deck twice, to tell the lieutenant of the watch that the ship could not bear this, and begged him to give orders to right. The lieutenant's answer was very testy, and the men around became uneasy, for they knew the danger. The drummer was then called, to beat "to right ship." There was no time to beat the drum, for the ship was sinking.*

"It was not in the battle;
No tempest gave the shock;
She sprang no fatal leak;
She ran upon no rock.

"His sword was in its sheath;
His fingers held the pen,
When Kempenfeldt went down
With twice four hundred men." †

It appears from the minutes of the court-martial held to inquire into this frightful accident, that "from the short space of time between the alarm being given and the sinking of the ship, the court was of opinion that some material part of her frame gave way, which can only be accounted for by the general state of decay of her timbers." ‡

On the 11th of September Lord Howe sailed from Spithead with a fleet of thirty-four sail of the line, six frigates, and three fire-ships, having on board two regiments for the reinforcement of the garrison at Gibraltar, and conveying transports with stores for their relief. On the 12th of September forty-seven sail of the line, with ten battering-ships and innumerable small craft, were assembled in the Bay of Gibraltar, to co-operate with an army of forty thousand men in one grand attack upon the fortress, which was defended by seven thousand tried veterans. A siege has since been conducted upon a grander scale; but the author of the history of this siege was right when he then said, "Such a naval and military spectacle most certainly is not to be equalled in the annals of war." On the morning of the 13th the ten battering-ships moored within ten or twelve hundred yards of the bastions of Gibraltar. The balls were heated in the furnaces of the garrison; and when the first ship dropped her anchors, the firing commenced from the fortress. Before ten o'clock on that eventful morning four hundred pieces of artillery were playing at the same moment. The battering-ships were as formidable as they were represented to be. The heaviest shells rebounded from their tops; the thirty-two pound shot seemed incapable of making any impression upon their hulls. Sometimes a battering-ship appeared to be on fire,

* Barrow's "Life of Earl Howe," p. 124.

* "Penny Magazine," June, 1834. † Cowper.
‡ Barrow's "Life of Lord Howe," p. 139.

but the flames were quickly extinguished by mechanical contrivances. An Italian officer on board the combined fleet has given a vivid description of the result of the persevering fire from the British works: "Our hopes of ultimate success became less sanguine when, at two o'clock, the floating battery commanded by the Prince of Nassau (on board of which was also the engineer who had invented the machinery) began to smoke on the side exposed to the garrison, and it was apprehended she had taken fire. The firing, however, continued till we could perceive the fortifications had sustained some damage; but at seven o'clock all our hopes vanished. The fire from our floating batteries entirely ceased, and rockets were thrown up as signals of distress. In short, the red-hot balls from the garrison had by this time taken such good effect that nothing now was thought of but saving the crews, and the boats of the combined fleet were immediately sent on that service. A little after midnight the floating battery which had been the first to show symptoms of conflagration burst out into flames, upon which the fire from the rock was increased with terrific vengeance; the light produced from the flames was equal to noonday, and greatly exposed the boats of the fleet in removing the crews. During the night one or other of these batteries was discovered to be on fire; they were so close to the walls that the balls pierced into them full three feet, but being made of solid beds of green timber, the holes closed up after the shot, and for want of air they did not immediately produce the effect. At five A.M. one of them blew up with a very great explosion, and soon after the whole of them, having been abandoned by their crews, were on fire fore and aft, and many of their gallant fellows were indebted to the exertions of the English for their lives. As the English boats were towing one of these batteries into the Mole, not supposing her to be on fire, she also blew up." *

The great operations of the 13th of September were decisive as to the eventual issue of the siege. Lord Howe entered the mouth of the Straits with his fleet on the 11th of October. The combined fleets of France and Spain avoided an engagement, and the stores and reinforcements were landed from the British squadron. "Gibraltar," to use the words of Mr. Pitt, "was relieved by a skill and courage that baffled superior numbers." A storm had driven the enemy's fleet from the immediate neighborhood of the port, and the object of landing the stores and reinforcements was partially accomplished. The fleets of France and Spain, and the British fleet, entered the Mediterranean, each driven by the storm. Howe drew up in line of battle; but the enemy declined to engage, and the British admiral returned to Gibraltar and completed the work for which he was sent. An attempt was made to cut off the rear of Howe's fleet, but it failed; and the French and Spaniards refusing a general action, Howe returned to England. The siege was languidly continued during the winter. On the 6th of February, 1783, the Duc de Crillon informed General Elliott that the preliminaries of peace had been signed at Paris on the 20th of January, and that Gibraltar was to remain in the possession of Great Britain. From the commencement of the blockade to the cessation of arms the siege had endured three years, seven months, and twelve days. The total loss of the garrison was twelve hundred, of whom only four hundred and seventy were killed, or died of their wounds, or were disabled.

The summer and part of the autumn were employed by the British envoy at Paris, and by Dr. Franklin, in discussions upon points that were essential to be settled before the basis of a treaty of peace with America could be established. Franklin states that Mr. Fitzherbert and Mr. Oswald, on the part of Great Britain, seemed at first studiously to avow their wish not to use any expressions that might imply an acknowledgment of American independence; "but our refusing otherwise to treat at length induced them to get over that difficulty, and then we came to the point of making propositions." † Three other commissioners were finally associated with Franklin, Mr. Jay, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Laurens. These associates were probably able to set aside the original determination, so strongly expressed by Franklin on the first overtures from Lord Shelburne, not to negotiate without the concurrence of the other allied powers. They conceived a distrust of France, which appears to have been unwarranted; although it was clear that in continuing the contest the allies looked to exclusive advantages alone. Spain could not readily forego her wish to recover Gibraltar; and even after the failure of the grand attack of September she persevered in a demand for its cession. At length, on the 30th of November, preliminary articles were signed between the commissioner of Great Britain and the commissioners of the United States. Franklin communicated the fact to the Count de Vergennes, who was naturally offended at what he considered the infraction of a mutual promise not to sign articles of pacification except with the joint consent of France and the United States. Franklin made rather an awkward apology: "Nothing has been agreed in the preliminaries contrary to the interests of France; and no peace is to take place between us and England till you have concluded yours. Your observation is, however, apparently just, that, in not consulting you before they were signed, we have been guilty of neglecting a point of *bienséance*." *

The parliament was opened by the king on the 5th of December, the houses having met on the previous 26th of November, and were then adjourned in the expectation of some definite result from the negotiations. The opening words of the speech are very memorable. His majesty declared he had lost no time in giving the necessary orders to prohibit the further prosecution of offensive war upon the continent of North America. Adopting with decision what he collected to be the sense of his parliament and his people, he had directed all his measures to an entire and cordial reconciliation with those colonies. He had not hesitated to go the full length of the powers vested in him, and had offered to declare them free and independent States, by an article to be inserted in the treaty of peace. Provisional articles had been agreed upon, to take effect whenever terms of peace should be finally settled with the court of France. The king then said, "In thus admitting their separation from the crown of these kingdoms, I have sacrificed every consideration of my own to the wishes and opinion of my people. I make it my humble and earnest prayer to Almighty God that Great Britain may not feel the evils which might result from so great a dismemberment of the empire, and that America may be free from those calamities which have formerly proved in the mother country how essential monarchy is to the enjoyment of constitutional liberty. Religion, language, interest, affections, may, and I hope will, yet prove a bond of permanent union between the two countries." The violent debates on the address belong to the history of faction rather than to the history of the country. Tories were indignant at the concession of American independence. Whigs complained that the concession had not been the first step in the negotiation. Lord Shelburne in former years had held that when the colonies should become independent the sun of England would be set; and he was now reproached for his inconsistency in granting their independence.

On the 20th of January, 1783, the preliminaries of peace were signed between Great Britain and France and Spain. With Holland there was a suspension of arms, and the preliminaries of peace were not signed until the 2d of September. The articles of pacification with the United States, with the exception of the first article acknowledging their independence, are now of minor importance. By the treaty with France, England ceded St. Lucia and Tobago, and gained back Granada, St. Vincent's, Dominica, St. Christopher's, Nevis, and Montserrat. The French recovered some possessions in Africa and in the East Indies. The old stipulations for the demolition of Dunkirk were given up. To Spain Great Britain ceded Minorca and the Floridas. The principle of the final treaty with Holland was on the basis of mutual restitution.

Thus, then, was finished one of the most calamitous wars that England had ever been driven into, through a mistaken view of the relative positions of a mother country and her colonies, and an obstinate reliance upon her power to enforce obedience. It might have been expected that a pacification which involved no humiliating conditions, beyond the acknowledgment of that independence of the United States which it was no longer possible to withhold, would have been received with unmingled satisfaction. On the contrary, a combination of parties was entered into for the purpose of removing Lord Shelburne and his ministry; a coalition which, to our minds, is not a pleasant exhibition of the motives which sometimes unite the most opposite factions in the pursuit of power. On the

* Barrow's "Life of Lord Howe," p. 133.
† "Works," vol. ix. p. 439.

* Letter to Vergennes, "Franklin's Works," vol. ix. p. 451.

17th of February the two houses took into consideration the preliminaries of peace with France, Spain, and America. In the House of Lords the ministers carried the address of thanks to the crown by a majority of thirteen. In the House of Commons they were defeated by a majority of sixteen. On the 21st of February Lord John Cavendish moved resolutions of censure on the terms of the peace, which were carried by a majority of seventeen. Mr. Fox and Mr. Pitt were on this occasion brought into immediate conflict—"the tug of war" which was to last for twenty years was now begun. The particular points of attack or defence in the conditions of the peace have little to interest us. But the principles exhibited by these great rivals on so stirring an occasion have a permanent value. Fox defended the coalition of parties which some had censured; but he emphatically proclaimed his adhesion to his own party: "I am free to boast of being connected with a set of men whose principles are the basis on which the state has for a long time past been preserved from absolute destruction. It is to the virtues of these men that I have surrendered my private opinions and inclinations. It is thus only that I could prevent myself from falling into those errors which the prejudices, passions, and perplexities of human nature will at times occasion. And thus I have been always answerable to my country for my conduct; for in every public transaction I have thought it most safe to resign my private opinion, when I found it departing from the general opinion of those with whom I was connected by friendship, confidence, and veneration. Those whose virtues claimed my respect, and whose abilities my admiration, could not but prove the best directors of a conduct which, alone, might fall by its temerity, or be lost by temptation." Pitt was self-reliant in his own confidence in the purity of his intentions: "High situation and great influence are desirable objects to most men, and objects which I am not ashamed to pursue, which I am even solicitous to possess, whenever they can be acquired with honor and retained with dignity. On these respectable conditions, I am not less ambitious to be great and powerful than it is natural for a young man, with such brilliant examples before him, to be. But even these objects I am not beneath relinquishing, the moment my duty to my country, my character, and my friends, renders such a sacrifice indispensable. Then I hope to retire, not disappointed, but triumphant; triumphant in the conviction that my talents, humble as they are, have been earnestly, zealously, and strenuously employed, to the best of my apprehension, in promoting the truest welfare of my country; and that, however I may stand chargeable with weakness of understanding or error of judgment, nothing can be imputed to my official capacity which bears the most distant connection with an interested, a corrupt, or a dishonest intention." The struggle for office was over. On the 24th of February Lord Shelburne resigned. One of his secretaries of state, Lord Grantham, wrote to Sir James Harris that the fallen minister trusted too much to his measures, and that the parliament, spoiled by long habits of interest, gave no credit to them.* The measures of Lord Shelburne contemplated a much wider field of action than his opponents, with the exception of Burke, could have admitted into their views. In the king's speech at the opening of the session, his majesty recommended a revision of our whole trading system, upon the same comprehensive and liberal principles that had been adopted concerning the commerce of Ireland. There is a letter of February, 1783, from Mr. Benjamin Vaughan to Dr. Franklin, in which, speaking of "the boldness of my friend's conduct," evidently alluding to Lord Shelburne, he thus describes the views of the minister who had secured peace for his country: "You will take pleasure in hearing that he talked of making England a free port, for which he said we were fitted by nature, capital, love of enterprise, maritime connections, and position between the Old and New World, and the north and south of Europe; and that those who were best circumstanced for trade could not but be gainers by having trade open." † Shelburne's opinions upon a liberal system of commerce were before his time. They were entirely opposed to the existing ignorance of the commercial public, and they would necessarily have failed. If he had remained in power, the great trading communities would have insured his fall, had he dared to promulgate the principles which could only be accepted when England had received the enlightenment of more than half a century's experience.

Jonathan Shipley, Bishop of St. Asaph, was an old and intimate friend of Dr. Franklin. To the bishop the American philosopher wrote some words, after the conclusion of the peace, which ought not to pass out of remembrance: "Let us now forgive and forget. Let each country seek its advancement in its own internal advantages of arts and agriculture, not in retarding or preventing the prosperity of the other. America will, with God's blessing, become a great and happy country; and England, if she has at length gained wisdom, will have gained something more valuable, and more essential to her prosperity, than all she has lost; and will still be a great and respectable nation." * To forgive and forget was perhaps more difficult to the King of England than to any one in his dominions. It has been asserted, and we think with much unfairness, that "the intense hatred with which George III. regarded the Americans was so natural to such a mind as his, that one can hardly blame his constant exhibition of it during the time that the struggle was actually impending. But what is truly disgraceful is that, after the war was over, he displayed this rancor on an occasion when, of all others, he was bound to suppress it." This assertion is supported by a statement that when Jefferson and Adams made their appearance at court in 1786, George III. "treated these eminent men with marked incivility, although they were then paying their respects to him in his own palace." † John Adams was the first minister of the United States accredited to Great Britain. He was presented to the king in June, 1785. Jefferson, who succeeded Franklin as minister to France, went to London in 1786, to arrange some treaties in concert with Adams; and he says that when he appeared at court he saw, or thought he saw, that "the ulcerations in the king's mind left nothing to be expected from him;" and that, on his presentation to their majesties at their levées, "it was impossible for anything to be more ungracious than their notice of Mr. Adams and myself." ‡ Mr. Buckle, in referring to these passages in Jefferson's correspondence, omits to mention the remarkable interview between George III. and Mr. Adams, on the 1st of June, 1785—an interview which the American ambassador described the next day to the American secretary, Mr. Jay, in a letter of permanent historical interest. He was left with the king and Lord Carmarthen, the secretary of state, alone. He presented his letter of credence as minister plenipotentiary, and expressed the desire of the United States to cultivate the most liberal and friendly intercourse between his majesty's subjects and their citizens. He then said, "The appearance of a minister from the United States to your majesty's court will form an epoch in the history of England and America. I think myself more fortunate than all my fellow-citizens, in having the distinguished honor to be the first to stand in your majesty's royal presence in a diplomatic character; and I shall esteem myself the happiest of men if I can be instrumental in recommending my country more and more to your majesty's royal benevolence, and of restoring an entire esteem, confidence, and affection, or, in better words, 'the old good-nature,' and the good old humor, between people who, though separated by an ocean, and under different governments, have the same language, a similar religion, a kindred blood. I beg your majesty's permission to add that although I have sometimes before been intrusted by my country, it was never in my whole life in a manner so agreeable to myself."

Mr. Adams, in continuing his narrative, says that the king listened to every word he said with an apparent emotion; that he was himself much agitated; but that his majesty "was much affected, and answered me with more tremor than I had spoken with." The king said, "Sir, the circumstances of this audience are so extraordinary, the language you have now held is so extremely proper, and the feelings you have discovered so justly adapted to the occasion, that I must say, that I not only receive with pleasure the assurance of the friendly disposition of the United States, but that I am very glad the choice has fallen upon you to be their minister. I wish you, sir, to believe, and that it may be understood in America, that I have done nothing in the late contest but what I thought myself indispensably bound to do, by the duty which I owed to my people. I will be

* "Correspondence of the Earl of Malmesbury," vol. i. p. 501.
† Franklin's Works, vol. ix. p. 489.

* Franklin's Works, vol. ix. p. 499.
† Buckle, "History of Civilization," vol. i. p. 423.
‡ Tucker, "Life of Jefferson," vol. i. p. 226.

very frank with you. I was the last to conform to the separation; but the separation having been made, and having become inevitable, I have always said, as I say now, that I would be the first to meet the friendship of the United States as an independent power. The moment I see such sentiments and language as yours prevail, and a disposition to give this country the preference, that moment I shall say, let the circumstances of language, religion, and blood, have their natural and full effect." *

There is one man who was the chief instrument in the hands of Providence for conducting the war, by his energy, prudence, and constancy, to that triumphant assertion of independence which has built up the great North American republic. To Washington the historian naturally turns, as to the grandest object of contemplation, when he laid aside his victorious sword—that sword which, with those he had worn in his earlier career, he bequeathed to his nephews with words characteristic of his nobleness: "These swords are accompanied with an injunction not to unsheathe them for the purpose of shedding blood, except it be for self-defence, or in defence of their country and its rights; and in the latter case, to keep them unsheathed, and prefer falling with them in their hands to the relinquishment thereof." † On the 4th of December, 1782, Washington bade farewell to the principal officers of his army. He filled a glass and said, "With a heart full of love and gratitude I now take leave of you. I most devoutly wish that your latter days may be as prosperous and happy as your former ones have been glorious and honorable." He asked that each companion in arms should come and take him by the hand. In silence the friendly grasp was given and returned, as each passed before him. On the 20th of December the commander of the American armies resigned his commission to a deputation from Congress, in a modest speech, of which these were the concluding words: "Having now finished the work assigned me, I retire from the great theatre of action; and, bidding farewell to the august body under whose orders I have so long acted, I here offer my commission, and take my leave of all the employments of my public life." Eight days after this act, he wrote to a friend, "I feel myself eased of a load of public care. I hope to spend the remainder of my days in cultivating the affections of good men, and in the practice of the domestic virtues." There was public work for Washington yet to do—the work of "directing the formation of a new government for a great people, the first time that so vast an experiment had ever been tried by man—finally retiring from the supreme power to which his virtue had raised him over the nation he had created, and whose destinies he had guided as long as his aid was required." ‡

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF TREATIES.

(Continued from page 801.)

1750 October 5: Treaty between England and Spain, by which England renounced the *Assiento contract* for the supply of slaves, included in the peace of Utrecht, in 1713.
1755 June 8: Commencement of war by the English, by the attack on two French frigates in America.
1756 January 16: Treaty of alliance between Prussia and England. Hanover put under the safeguard of the King of Prussia.
1756 May 1: Alliance between Austria and France concluded at Versailles.
1756 June 9: War formally declared by France against England.
1756 August 17: Saxony invaded by Prussia. Beginning of the Seven Years War.
1756 September 30: War between Austria and Prussia.
1757 July 17: War between Great Britain and Austria.
1757 August 24: Hostilities commenced between Sweden and Prussia.
1757 September 10: *Convention of Closterseven.*
1757 October 22: Treaty of peace concluded between the province of Pennsylvania and the Delaware and the Shawanee Indians.
1761 August 15: *The Family Compact* between the different branches of the House of Bourbon signed at Paris.
1762 January 23: War declared by England against Spain, in consequence of the Family Compact.
1762 May 1: The Spanish and French invade Portugal, and an army sent from England to assist the Portuguese.
1762 May 5: *Peace of Petersburg*, between Russia and Prussia. Russia restored all her conquests to Prussia.
1762 May 22: *Peace of Hamburg*, between Sweden and Prussia.
1762 May 23: War declared by Portugal against Spain.
1762 November 3: Preliminaries of peace signed at Fontainebleau between France and England.
1763 February 10: *Peace of Paris*, concluded between France, Spain, Portugal, and Great Britain. Cession of Canada by France, and of Florida by Spain.
1763 February 15: *Peace of Hubertsberg*, between Prussia, Austria, and Saxony, end of the Seven Years War.
1765 March 22: American Stamp Act.
1768 February 24: *Treaty of Warsaw*, between Russia and Poland.
1768 October: War between Russia and Turkey.
1771 January 22: A treaty concluded between Great Britain and Spain, confirming the possession of the Falkland Islands to the former.
1772 February 17: Secret convention for the partition of Poland by Russia and Prussia.
1772 August 5: *Treaty of St. Petersburg*, for the same object, between Austria, Russia, and Prussia.
1773 December 21: The disturbances in America began with the destruction of the tea on board three sloops at Boston.
1774 July 21: *Peace of Kutchuk kainarji*, between Russia and Turkey. Crimea declared independent, Azoph ceded to Russia, and freedom of commerce and navigation of the Black Sea granted.
1774 December 5: Congress opened at Philadelphia.
1775 April 19: Hostilities commenced at Lexington, North America, between Great Britain and the colonists.
1775 May 20: The American provinces sign articles of union and alliance.
1776 July 4: American Declaration of Independence.
1778 February 6: A treaty ratified with the States of America by France, who acknowledged their independence.
1778 March 13: War between England and France.
1779 May 13: *Peace of Teschen* ratified, between Austria, Saxony, and Prussia.
1779 July 13: Spain joins the war against England.
1780 December 20: War declared by Great Britain against Holland.
1780 July 9 and August 1: First conventions for the armed neutrality, between Russia, Denmark, and Sweden. December 24, the States-General acceded.
1781 May 8: King of Prussia accedes to the armed neutrality.
1781 October 9: The Emperor of Germany joins the armed neutrality.
1782 November 30: The independence of America acknowledged by England, and preliminaries of peace signed at Paris between the British and American Commissioners.
1783 January 20: Preliminary articles of peace signed at Versailles between Great Britain, Spain, and France.
1783 January 20: Crimea passes under the dominion of Russia.
1783 September 2: Preliminaries of peace between Great Britain and Holland signed at Paris.
1783 September 3: *Definitive treaty of peace* between Great Britain and America, signed at Paris; when the latter power was admitted to be a sovereign and independent state. On the same day the definitive treaty was signed at Versailles between Great Britain, France, and Spain.
1784 June 20: *Definitive treaty of peace* between Great Britain and Holland signed at Paris.

---

* Works of John Adams, vol. viii. The remaining passage of the official letter of Mr. Adams is sufficient evidence that the king did not treat the first eminent American who came into his presence with "marked incivility." "The king then asked me whether I came last from France; and upon my answering in the affirmative, he put on an air of familiarity, and smiling, or rather laughing, said, 'There is an opinion among some people that you are not the most attached of all your countrymen to the manners of France.' I was surprised at this, because I thought it an indiscretion and a descent from his dignity. I was a little embarrassed, but determined not to deny the truth on the one hand, nor leave him to infer from it any attachment to England on the other. I threw off as much gravity as I could, and assumed an air of gayety and a tone of decision, as far as was decent, and said, 'That opinion, sir, is not mistaken; I must avow to your majesty I have no attachment but to my own country.' The king replied as quick as lightning, 'An honest man will never have any other.'"

† "Will of Washington," 1799.

‡ Lord Brougham, "Statesmen," vol. ii. p. 333.

CHAPTER CLXXVII.

Political despondency at the close of the American war—Supposed decay of population—Its real increase—Development of the productive power of the country—Agriculture extended and improved—Agricultural condition of the Eastern, South Midland, North Midland, and South-Eastern counties—Norfolk—Mr. Coke—Suffolk—Essex—Buckinghamshire—Oxfordshire—Northamptonshire—Bedfordshire—Francis, Duke of Bedford—Improved breeds of sheep and oxen—Robert Bakewell—Consumption of animal food in England—Cambridgeshire—Lincolnshire—The great level of the Fens—Lincoln Heath and the Wolds—Nottinghamshire—Derbyshire—Surrey—Middlesex—Kent—Sussex—Hants—Berkshire—Windsor Forest.

The summer which followed the close of the American war is described as "an amazing and portentous one."* There were alarming meteors and tremendous thunder-storms. For many weeks of June, July, and August the sun was clouded over with a smoky fog that proceeded from whatever quarter the wind blew. At noon it cast "a rust-colored ferruginous light;" at rising and setting it was "lurid and blood-colored."† The phenomenon prevailed over the whole of Europe. The people looked with a superstitious awe on the "disastrous twilight." The poet asked of contending factions,

> "Is it a time to wrangle, when the props
> And pillars of our planet seem to fail;
> And nature with a dim and sickly eye
> To wait the close of all?"‡

With "fear of change," monarchs were perplexed. Politicians of every rank, subject as Englishmen are to skiey influences, then especially believed that their country was ruined. Sir John Sinclair, one of the most enlightened men of his time, who, with a few others, had confidence in the resources of British spirit and industry, ventured to hold a different opinion. He says that in 1783, in the midst of much terror and despondency, he hesitated not to assert that Britain might still preserve its elevated rank among the powers of Europe, although his ideas were then considered visionary.§ He rested his confidence upon the principle that debts and taxes were not alone sufficient to effect the ruin of a nation; and he was supported by the fact that for a century previous the same gloomy prognostications had always resulted in the undeniable advance of the country in material prosperity. Some of these prognostications were not the mere clamors of popular ignorance, or factious exaggeration, or foreign jealousy. Lord Lyttleton, in 1739; Lord Bolingbroke, in 1745; David Hume, in 1761; Adam Smith, in 1776; Dr. Price, in 1777; Lord Stair, in 1783—each honestly believed that England was fast approaching the condition of inevitable bankruptcy. In 1784 Marshal Conway, who, as one of the Shelburne administration, had been ejected from power in the previous year, writes to his brother, "I feel rather obliged than angry at all those who have anyhow contributed to shuffle me out of the most troublesome and dangerous scene this country was ever engaged in. I don't desire to be an actor in the ruin of my country; and if the vessel must sink, I had rather be a passenger than the pilot. . . . The sums spent in losing America are a blow we shall never recover."‖

The statesmen and economists who predicted absolute ruin from any increase of the public debt beyond a certain maximum—seventy-five millions, or a hundred millions—never appear to have adequately contemplated the possibility of the productive power of the country keeping pace with the additional load of taxation. Sir William Blackstone, who in general exhibits a pleasant optimism as to matters of government, speaks out very plainly as to the inconveniences of enormous taxes caused by the magnitude of national incumbrances. He tells the public creditor that money in the funds does really and intrinsically exist only in "the land, the trade, and the personal industry of the subject, from which the money must arise that supplies the several taxes."¶ The pledges for the security of these debts being thus defined, the question of the value of the security can only be answered by estimating the capacity of a country to make constant advances in a course of material improvement.

The common notions of the decline of England that prevailed during the first and second decades of the reign of George III. were associated with the vehement assertion that her population was decreasing. Poets and statists equally maintained that "wealth accumulates and men decay."** Goldsmith admits that the depopulation which his exquisite poem deplores is affirmed by several of his wisest and best friends as "nowhere to be seen." Yet Goldsmith had supporters in his opinion who had no pretensions to "the poet's imagination." Dr. Price maintained, in 1777, that England and Wales contained no more than 4,763,000 souls. Arthur Young, in 1770, says, "It is asserted by those writers who affect to run down our affairs, that, rich as we are, our population has suffered; that we have lost a million and a half of people since the revolution; and that we are at present declining in numbers."* The estimates of Gregory King, founded upon the return of the hearth-money collectors, exhibited a population of five millions and a half at the period of the revolution.† Either those estimates were utterly fallacious, and ought to have shown a million and a half less of people, or the belief was a delusion that "it is employment that creates population"—that "all industrious countries are populous, and proportionably to the degree of their industry."‡ From the accession of George I. to the war with the North American colonies—a period of sixty years—the country had been steadily progressing in a course of improvement; in partial inclosures of cultivable waste land, in better methods of husbandry, in extension of manufactures, in more complete means of internal communication. The advance was slow compared with what remained to be done. An elaborate and careful statistical writer of 1774, in setting forth the improving position of the country, puts in the title-page of his work that it is "intended to show that we have not as yet approached near the summit of improvement, but that it will afford employment to many generations before they push to their utmost extent the natural advantages of Great Britain."§ Could this sensible writer have contemplated the possible approaches to "the summit of improvement," made by only two generations, his readers of that period would have regarded him as a madman. Yet at that period the industrial energies of the people were stimulated to turn aside from the beaten track in many new directions. The capability of Britain greatly to multiply her resources began to be dimly perceived. We now know, as a reliable fact, that the population had increased and was increasing.

A comparison of the excess of baptisms over burials, corrected by the experience of positive enumerations, shows that from 1751 to 1781 the population had increased at a rate exceeding 400,000 for each decennial period, the increase in the whole of the previous fifty years having been little above 200,000. Upon that increase of nearly a million and a quarter in thirty years, there was a still larger increase of more than a million and a half in the twenty years from 1781 to 1801.‖ The start in the national industry, supplying new sources of profitable labor and new means of subsistence to increasing numbers, appears to have been singularly concurrent with that outburst of public spirit which attended the administration of the first William Pitt. The shutting up of one portion of British commerce by the war with America had no permanent effect upon the development of the general prosperity of the country; although we are in no condition to judge how far that development might have been impeded by the waste of capital in war. The industrial period, from the accession of George III. to the war of the French Revolution, is a very interesting one to be described in detail. We apply ourselves to the task, in something like a continuation of the plan of that general view of national progress which we have given at the period of the accession of the house of Hanover, and partially through the reign of George I.¶

Arthur Young, one of the most exact of those economical inquirers who had no official data upon which to found their calculations, in reckoning the entire population in 1770 at 8,500,000 souls, appears to have overestimated the total number by about a million and a quarter. The population of agriculture, exclusive of landlords, clergy, and parochial poor, he reckoned at 2,800,000. The number of farmers he reckoned at 111,498; of men-servants and laborers, at 557,490. In the census of 1851 we have a return for England and Wales of 225,318 occupiers of land, employing 1,445,067 laborers. The farmers would thus appear to have doubled in eighty years; the laborers to have almost trebled. This comparative estimate, imperfect as it is, enables us to form some notion of the agricultural industry of those eighty years, as giving the means of subsistence to all who were employed upon the land. But the improvement appears far more striking when we consider that, in 1770—taking the population at Young's estimate of 8,500,000, and reckoning the adult

* White's "Selborne," letter lxv. † Ibid.
‡ Cowper, "Task," book ii.
§ "History of the Revenue," vol. ii., Appendix iv.
‖ MS. letter in the possession of the author of the "Popular History."
¶ Kerr's edit vol. i. p. 322. ** "Deserted Village."

* Young, "Northern Tour," vol. iv. p. 556.
† *Ante*, vol. iv. p. 601, and Table, p. 616.
‡ Young, "Northern Tour," vol. iv. p. 551.
§ Dr. Campbell, "Political Survey," 2 vols. 4to.
‖ "Report on the Census of 1851," p. lxviii.
¶ *Ante*, vol. iv. chapters cxviii. and cxix.

males at a fourth of that number—one third of the adult male population, as enumerated by him, was employed in providing food for themselves and their families, and for the other two thirds of the population: in other words, while one man was cultivating the land, two men were engaged in other occupations. This proportion indicates a high state of civilization. But a much higher condition was reached in 1851, when only 26 per cent of the adult males were agricultural; that is, while one man was cultivating the land three men were engaged in some other employment. The ascendency of scientific theory over traditional practice has produced this striking change; and that ascendancy has been called forth more and more by the certainty of the profitable application of capital to agricultural enterprise. This application of capital, in the first twenty years of the reign of George III., may be in some degree indicated by the circumstance that the inclosure bills passed from 1760 to 1779 were more than a thousand in number. Improved methods of husbandry were concurrent with this extension of the area of cultivation. The great features of this period of the development of the vast productive powers of the soil are very marked, and, without touching upon the technicalities of agricultural science, we may not unprofitably enter upon such a general view of the condition of particular districts as may show how earnestly many were then laboring to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before, and yet how much they left to be done by the labors of other generations. Incidentally we shall notice the condition and manners of the rural population.

We commenced our previous general view of the national industry with a brief survey of the West of England, the seat of the greatest commercial and manufacturing prosperity at the beginning of the eighteenth century. We now propose to make a similar examination of the agricultural condition of the East of England, continuing our former sketch of the development of the resources of that portion of our island. We use the term "East" as a general phrase, in the same way that Arthur Young used it in his "Farmer's Tour through the East of England." If a line be drawn from the British Channel, keeping to the east of the Avon, on to the Humber, also keeping to the east of the Trent, it will include four of our great registration divisions, in which pastoral and agricultural industry is the predominant feature now, as it has been from the earliest times. These divisions—the Eastern, the South Midland, the North Midland, the South-Eastern—comprise twenty counties out of the forty of England. Their progress in population was not very marked till after the beginning of the present century. According to Gregory King they numbered, at the revolution, 2,364,735 souls. They had increased, in the census of 1801, to 3,078,591; but in that of 1851, to 5,674,494. They always fully kept pace with the general advance of the population of England and Wales, amounting, as nearly as may be, to one third of the whole, at the three several periods.*

"All England may be carved out of Norfolk, and represented therein," says the quaint Thomas Fuller. He there saw fens and heaths, light and deep soils, sand and clay, meadows and pasture, arable and wood lands. The variety of the shire made its ancient cultivation necessarily as various. Experimental agriculture proceeded very slowly. The fens were undrained; the sands were unmarled. Gradually Norfolk and its neighbor Suffolk became the nurseries of what was termed "the new husbandry." Arthur Young states that at a period not beyond sixty years, forty years, and even thirty years, from the time when he travelled through Norfolk, all the northern and western, and a part of the eastern tracts of the county were sheep-walks, let as low as from 6*d.* to 1*s.* 6*d.* or 2*s.* an acre.† The great change came with inclosures, long leases, and large farms, by the marling of light lands, and by the introduction of an excellent course of crops, in which the culture of turnips and clover was the distinguishing feature. "Turnips on well-manured land, thoroughly hoed, are the only fallow in the Norfolk course." Farmers in many other districts had attempted the turnip husbandry, but found it unprofitable through their own ignorance and slovenliness. In the East Riding of Yorkshire very few would incur the labor of hoeing their turnips.‡ Some alleged that small turnips were better than large, because the sheep would eat up the small and leave much of the large. The wisest of the Norfolk farmers sliced their turnips, even without a special machine for saving that labor. The four-course system of crops was that of the Norfolk farmers—turnips, barley, clover, wheat. Many other cultivators attempted to obtain two and even three white crops in succession, and then left the land to recruit itself in a year, or several years, of barrenness, in which the rapid growth of weeds made the supposed rest a real exhaustion. Six years after Arthur Young had been eulogizing the husbandry of a portion of Norfolk, Mr. Coke came into possession of his estate at Holkham. In that year of 1776 the whole district was uninclosed. The only wheat consumed in that part of the county was imported. Mr. Coke "converted West Norfolk from a rye-growing to a corn-growing district."* But he did something even better. Unable to let his estate even at five shillings an acre, he determined to become a farmer himself. He did not set about his work with the self-conceit that might have been produced by a large fortune and high connections. He gathered about him all the practical agriculturists of his district, who came once a year to partake his hospitality, and to communicate their experience to the spirited young man who wanted to learn. He very soon was enabled to become an instructor himself. The annual sheep-shearings of Holkham grew famous throughout the civilized world. Men came from every quarter to see a great English gentleman—who had raised his rents from tens to hundreds, and had yet enriched his tenants as much as himself—mixing, with a far nobler simplicity than that of the feudal times, with guests of every rank; seeking from the humblest yeoman who was earnest in his calling the knowledge of some new fact that would benefit his district and his country. Mr. Coke's agricultural knowledge was not mere theory. He taught the Norfolk farmers to turn their turnip-husbandry to a better use than that of producing manure, by teaching them how to improve the qualities of their stock, in the judgment of which he was thoroughly skilled. During his long life he had the satisfaction of seeing most of the triumphs of scientific husbandry; and his example pointed the way to that continued course of improvement which has effected such marvels since the British agriculturist became self-reliant, and saw that his prosperity needed no protective laws to maintain a supply of food quite commensurate with the rapid multiplication of the people.

The agriculture of many parts of Suffolk is described by Arthur Young as emphatically "true husbandry." He says, "Those who exalt the agriculture of Flanders so high in comparison with that of Britain, have not, I imagine, viewed with attention the country in question." Thomas Tusser, who was a Suffolk farmer in the middle of the sixteenth century, attributes the plenty of Suffolk—the mutton, beef, corn, butter, cheese, and the abundant work for the laboring man—to the system of inclosures, which he contrasts with the common fields of Norfolk. Suffolk, as well as Essex, was very early a county "inclosed into petty quillets," according to Fuller, whence the proverb "Suffolk stiles," and "Essex stiles." Sir John Cullum, in 1784, describes the drainage of the arable lands as the great improvement that had fertilized spots that before produced but little. The farmer was no longer content to let his soil be "water-slain," the old expressive term in Suffolk for undrained wet land. He knew nothing of draining-tiles; but he cut drains two feet deep, and wedge-shaped, filling them with bushes, and with haulm over the bushes. Sir John shows how the cultivators had learned the value of manure, instead of evading the compulsory clause of their leases by which they were bound not to sell the manure made in their own yards. He paints, as "the late race of farmers," those who "lived in the midst of their enlightened neighbors, like beings of another order. In their personal labor they were indefatigable; in their dress homely; in their manners rude." Their "enlightened neighbors," he says, lived in well-furnished houses; actually knew the use of the barometer; and instead of exhibiting at church the cut of a coat half a century old, they had every article of dress spruce and modern. The ancient farmers had, however, a spirit of emulation among them, which they displayed in the drawing-matches of their famous Suffolk punches—that wonderful breed of which two would plough an acre of strong wheat land in one day. We have the details of a drawing-match in 1724.† Young says of this breed, that

* See Table, *ante*, vol. iv. p. 616.
† "Eastern Tour," vol. ii. p. 150.
‡ "Northern Tour," vol. i. p. 247.

* Earl Spencer in "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. iii. p. 1.
† "History of Hawsted," chap. iv.

"they are all taught to draw in concert; that teams would fall upon their knees at the word of command, and at a variation of the word would rise and put out all their strength." * Improving as was the general agriculture upon the good lands of Suffolk, the sandy districts on the shores of the Channel were in a miserable condition before some tincture of geological science had taught the cultivator to look for the elements of fertility in the organic matter below the sand. Crabbe, with his exquisite fidelity, has described the husbandry of his own native district of the river Alde. It is a most impressive picture, not only of the peculiar barrenness of that district, but of other districts where slovenly cultivation had not called forth the resources of art to aid the churlishness of nature:

"Lo! where the heath, with withering brake grown o'er,
Lends the light turf that warms the neighboring poor;
From thence a length of burning sand appears,
Where the thin harvest waves its wither'd ears;
Rank weeds, that every art and care defy,
Reign o'er the land, and rob the bighted rye:
There thistles stretch their prickly arms afar,
And to the ragged infant threaten war;
There poppies nodding mock the hope of toil;
There the blue bugloss paints the sterile soil;
Hardy and high, above the slender sheaf;
The slimy mallow waves her silky leaf;
O'er the young shoot the charlock throws a shade,
And clasping tares cling round the sickly blade." †

The Suffolk laborers were fed abundantly but somewhat coarsely. They ate their country's rye-bread with their country's stony cheese—"too hard to bite," as Bloomfield found it; while the farmer luxuriated in his "meslin bread," half wheat and half rye. The plough-boy's breakfast was the brown bread soaked in skimmed milk. When the country was overrun with rabbits, before the improved system of agriculture was introduced, the indoor servants stipulated that they should not be fed with "hollow-meat," as rabbit flesh was termed, more than a certain number of days in the week.‡ Fuller speaks of the rabbits of Norfolk as "an army of natural pioneers"—the great suppliers of the fur for the gowns of grave citizens, and of "half beavers," the common hats.§ The trencher was not then superseded by pewter and earthenware. The old simplicity was not gone out:

"Between her swagging panniers' load
A farmer's wife to market rode." ‖

The good matron looked impatiently for the "pack man," who came to her gate periodically with fineries from Norwich or Ipswich, and with smuggled tea from the eastern coast, when three fifths of the tea used was clandestinely imported. She delighted in the housewifery of the "horky," when the last load had come home with garlands and flags, and the lord of the harvest, the principal reaper, led the procession, to be led home himself when the strong ale had done its work.

Norfolk and Suffolk are now the principal seats of the manufacture of those implements which, in 1851, were held to have saved one half of the outlay of a period only twelve years previous, in the cultivation of a definite amount of crop. The Suffolk "Farmer's Boy" describes the rude plough (probably almost wholly made of wood) in which "no wheels support the diving-pointed share." The boy did not take kindly to the swing-plough, which was more difficult to guide. From ridge to ridge moves "the ponderous harrow;" "midst huge clods he plunges on forlorn." He breaks the frozen turnip with a heavy beetle. The seed is sown broadcast. Arthur Young laments that, "if a person, the least skilled in agriculture, looks around for instruments that deserve to be called complete, how few will he meet with."¶ At Lawford, near Manningtree, he rejoices to have found "a most ingenious smith," who has made a new iron swing-plough, a horse-rake on wheels, and a hand-mill for grinding wheat.** Out of the persevering ingenuity of such men have proceeded the manifold instruments of modern agriculture—the lighter ploughs; the "cultivators," that save ploughing; the clod-crushers and scarifiers; the drills; the horse-hoes; the threshing and winnowing machines; the turnip-cutters and chaff-cutters; the draining ploughs and drain-tile machines. The application of machinery and chemical science to the production of food has produced results as important as in any other branch of manufacture, under which term we must now include the modern achievements of the spirited farmer.

The limited economical observation of the author of "The Farmer's Boy" suggested a lament that "London market, London price," influenced the production of his county; that "dairy produce throngs the eastern road;" that along that highway were travelling

"Delicious veal and butter, every hour,
From Essex lowlands and the banks of Stour;
And further far, where numerous herds repose,
From Orwell's brink, from Waveney or Ouse."

Thirty years later William Cobbett, who from his farm at Botley sent the earliest lambs to the London market, expressed his rabid indignation that the fat oxen of Wilts were "destined to be devoured in the Wen"—his favorite name for the metropolis.* The demagogue knew full well that the demand of the markets of London, and of other great cities, gave the natural impulse to the productiveness of the country; and that the greater part of "the primest of human food" was not there devoured by "tax-eaters and their base and prostituted followers." The profits derived in the olden time from Essex calves furnished the capital whose gradual increase gave Essex land-owners and farmers the means of draining their marshes and of rescuing land from the sea. "It argueth the goodness of flesh in this county, and that great gain was got formerly by the sale thereof, because that so many stately monuments were erected anciently therein for butchers—inscribed *carnifices* in their epitaphs." † Essex veal preserves its reputation, and so Essex oysters. Essex saffron is a thing of the past, though its former celebrity lingers in the name of Saffron Walden. The use of saffron as a condiment in food has long been at an end; its value as a medicine is very equivocal. We now import the small quantity of saffron that we consume. The husbandry books of a century ago contain the most elaborate directions for its cultivation upon a large scale. Coriander and caraway, and canary are extensively grown in the clay district of Essex; ‡ but the good roads, the coast navigation, and the vicinity to London give this county the full power to maintain its old superiority in producing the great staples of human food.

Several of the South Midland counties have their records and traditional traces of old modes of husbandry, and of their accompanying manners, which strikingly contrast with the course of modern improvement.

Buckinghamshire had an ancient reputation for fertility. "A fruitful country, especially in the Vale of Aylesbury," says Fuller. Arthur Young journeyed through this famous vale a hundred and ten years after Fuller wrote, and found the husbandry almost as bad as the land is good. The wheat crops only yielded fifteen bushels per acre; the barley crops sixteen bushels. The poverty of the crops is chiefly imputed to the want of draining. Young expresses his surprise that the landlords have made no attempt at inclosing. "All this vale would make as fine meadows as any in the world." § It was very long before this county discovered that open fields and large tracts of waste capable of cultivation presented effectual barriers to improvement. ‖ Nevertheless, many of the wastes of the Chilterns could not be profitably cultivated. But the long ranges of hills covered with beech—such as were the indigenous growth of the chalk in the earliest times—are picturesque to ride beneath, recalling the memory of Hampden and the stout yeomen who chose to fight rather than be taxed out of their liberty. Buckinghamshire is finding uses for the beech, in manufacturing cheap chairs, at the rate of a thousand a day, at High Wycombe and the neighborhood. She is using up her resources and getting rid of her nuisances; administering the relief of the poor so as not to drive land out of cultivation; and extirpating the game instead of having a fertile county little better than a large preserve, especially as it was once in one

* "Eastern Tour," vol. ii. p. 174. † "The Village," book ii.
‡ Forby's "Vocabulary of East Anglia," vol. ii. p. 423.
§ "Worthies." ‖ Gay. ¶ "Eastern Tour," vol. ii. p. 498.
** Ibid., p. 212.

* "Rural Rides," 1830, p. 534. † Fuller's "Worthies."
‡ "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. v. p. 39.
§ "Eastern Tour," vol. i. p. 23.
‖ "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. xvi. p. 306.

ducal domain.* The county has discovered that large dairy farms are better than wheat crops of fifteen bushels per acre. Butter is now produced here as a great manufacture. It is held that there are 120,000 acres in Buckinghamshire devoted to dairying, on which, with the aid of some arable land, 30,000 cows are kept, producing annually the almost incredible amount of 6,000,000 lbs. of butter, chiefly sent to the London market by railway. It was stated before the Aylesbury Railway Committee that 800,000 ducks were reared in the county, for the early supply of the all-devouring metropolis—a possible exaggeration. Butter and ducks will never want a ready market and command a fair price. The old Buckinghamshire trade of pillow-lace making—the "bone-lace" of former times—leaves "the free maids" to the miserable pittance of sixpence for a day's labor.

Oxfordshire cultivation was, a century ago, somewhat below the average of the inland counties. Its progress has not been very remarkable. The chief bar to improvement was the existence of large tracts as common field. There were few wastes. The culture of green crops and root crops has gone on, though not very rapidly. The farm buildings are generally old and inconvenient; the implements are of old fashion; the occupation roads are execrable. The large farmers are described as intelligent and industrious but not so spirited or progressive as the tenantry of some other counties. The lesser yeomen too often "crawl on in the same track their ancestors jogged over a century ago." They have inherited the prejudices of former times, with their sterling qualities of industry and hospitality.†

Fuller exults that his native county of Northampton has "as little waste ground as any county in England—no mosses, meres, fells, heaths." It was a county full of "spires and squires"—a grass country, where fox-hunting was carried to perfection by its resident gentry, and its graziers grew rich without much pains of cultivation. Arthur Young grows almost poetical in his contemplation of the large grazing farms. "The quantity of great oxen and sheep is very noble. It is very common to see from forty to sixty oxen and two hundred sheep in a single field, and the beasts are all of a fine large breed. This effect is owing in no slight degree to the nature of the country, which is wholly composed of gentle hills, so that you look over many hundred acres at one stroke of the eye, and command all the cattle feeding in them in a manner nobly picturesque." ‡ But in this bright picture there is a dark shade. The fine grass on the excellent soil is overrun with thistles, and is full of ant-hills; none of its wet places are drained; one eighth of the whole is really waste land. The great improver exhorts the Northamptonshire farmers to get rid of rushes, ant-hills, thistles (which were regularly mown), nettles, "and all the et cæteras of slovenliness."§ The arable husbandry was little better. The light land was considered only fit to grow rye—soils which now yield abundant crops of wheat. Common fields, with all their evils, were almost universal. Their general inclosure has made some local terms obsolete, such as "balk—a narrow slip of grass dividing two ploughed or arable lands in open or common fields;" and "meer—a strip or slip of grass land which served as a boundary to different properties." ‖ As late as 1806 some tracts continued in this state of imperfect cultivation. In a report of that year on the farming of the county, a celebrated locality is thus described: "From Welford, through Naseby, the open field extensive, and in as backward a state as it could be in Charles the First's time, when the fatal battle was fought." Naseby field, according to Young, contained six thousand acres. The miserable farm-buildings of the days when "the master" always sat in his "long settle" in the kitchen (which was called "the house,") have survived in many places to our days; small barns and stabling, ill-contrived yards, no capacity for stall-feeding, with the horse-pond ready to receive all the soluble parts of the manure. ¶ In some grazing districts there has been retrogression instead of improvement. The land has been let in large quantities to non-resident occupiers, who have pulled down the cottages and farm premises, and only set up a few cow-houses or shelter hovels. The sheep-shearing festivities, with the beechen bowl filled with furmety, are at an end; the worsted-spinners are no longer to be found in the villages, drinking tea twice a day, which custom Young much deplores. The farmer still hires his servants at the "stattie" (statute fair), and some of the ancient holidays are kept up. But the old genial intercourse between the farmer and his laborers has been too much destroyed by a system which fears to provide sufficient cottage accommodation, through the baneful influence of the Law of Settlement. The repeal, in 1775, of the Act of Elizabeth against building cottages, which act the legislators of George III. truly said "laid the industrious poor under great difficulties to procure habitations," was insufficient to remove the rate-payers' jealousy of parochial burdens; and that jealousy has produced an amount of misery and demoralization which cannot be too quickly remedied.

The improvements of Bedfordshire are intimately associated with the exertions of Francis, Duke of Bedford. He labored at Woburn to accomplish results similar to those which Mr. Coke produced at Holkham. Burke, in his famous "Letter to a Noble Lord," tells the duke that his landed possessions "are more extensive than the territory of many of the Grecian republics; and they are without comparison more fertile than most of them." These possessions, says the rhetorician, are irresistibly inviting to an agrarian experiment. "Hitherto they have been wholly unproductive to speculation, fitted for nothing but to fatten bullocks and to produce grain for beer." The sans-culotte carcass-butchers and the philosophers of the shambles are regarding his grace as they would a prize ox; "their only question will be that of their Legendre, or some other of their legislative butchers, how he cuts up? how he fattens in the caul or on the kidneys?" These bitter sarcasms upon the Duke of Bedford's political opinions cannot be adequately understood except as having reference to his enthusiastic labors for the improvement of the land, and of the stock that fed upon it. Burke did not despise such pursuits. He was himself an agricultural improver. Young saw him experimenting on carrots at his farm at Beaconsfield, and says, "Buckinghamshire will be much indebted to the attention this manly genius gives to husbandry." What the great Commoner was doing upon a small scale, the no less patriotic nobleman was accomplishing on a large scale. In his early time two thirds of Bedfordshire were in common field; a third of the arable land was under a dead fallow every year; the part under crop was wofully damaged by water; the meagre-looking sheep were often swept off in entire flocks by the rot; the neat cattle were of no distinct breed; the farm implements were of the rudest kind. "No one that lived in or near the times of the Duke of Bedford can be ignorant of the efforts which that nobleman put forth to arouse the torpor-stricken agriculturists of his day." The duke did not, like his friend and fellow-laborer, Mr. Coke, live to see the triumph of improved farming; by which, according to the report from which we quote,* "there are scores of farms now producing 50 per cent more corn than in 1794, and supplying the metropolitan markets with a stone of meat for every pound supplied at the former period."

The great agricultural reformers who succeeded Lord Townshend, the introducer of the turnip-husbandry, came at a period when Robert Bakewell, a yeoman of Leicestershire, held levees in his kitchen at Dishley, of the greatest in rank, and the most eminent in science, who came to learn his new art of producing breeds of sheep and oxen that would fatten the most readily, and be the most valuable when fat. With regard to oxen, "the old notion," says Young, "was, that where you had much and large bones, there was plenty of room to lay flesh on; and accordingly the graziers were eager to buy the largest horned cattle." Bakewell maintained that the smaller the bones the truer will be the make of the beast, the fattening quicker, and the weight would give a larger proportion of valuable meat. The proportion of value to the cost of production was the real question. He applied the same principle to sheep—that of fattening on the most valuable part of the body.† When Paley was told that Bakewell could lay on the flesh of his sheep wherever he chose, the blunt divine said it was "a lie." His art really was to deduce, from a series of observations on many beasts, a knowledge of the

* "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. xvi. p. 315.
† Ibid., vol. xv. ‡ "Eastern Tour," vol. i. p. 54.
§ Ibid., p. 62. ‖ Baker, "Northamptonshire Glossary."
¶ "Journal of Agricultural Society," vol. xiii. p. 86.

* Mr. Bennett on the Farming of Bedfordshire, "Royal Agricultural Journal," vol. xviii. p. 26.
† Young, "Eastern Tour," vol. i. pp. 110 to 134.

peculiar make in which they all agreed in fattening readily, or the contrary.* Bakewell's mode of management was as peculiar as his wonderful inductive skill in accomplishing the improvement of breeds. He made all his cattle docile. He trained bulls to be as gentle as horses under Rarey. They stood still in the fields to be examined. "A lad, with a stick three feet long and as big as his finger, will conduct a bull away from other bulls, and his cows from one end of the farm to the other. All this gentleness is merely the effect of management; and the mischief often done by bulls is undoubtedly owing to practices very contrary, or else to a total neglect." † To Robert Bakewell, independently of his merit as the founder of the famous breed of Leicester sheep, is to be ascribed the great impulse which raised the occupation of the grazier into an art. This progress, concurrent with the turnip husbandry, the general improvement in the cultivation of arable land, and the conversion of barren sands and drowned fens into rich corn-bearing districts, has enabled the supply of an improved quality of meat constantly to keep pace with the increase of population. The population has trebled since the days when the Dishley yeoman gave lectures upon stock, to peers who desired to learn, and to farmers who came to sneer, as he smoked his pipe in his great chimney corner, or walked over his fields in his brown coat, red waistcoat, leather breeches, and top-boots. The average weight of the ox and the sheep has been doubled since the beginning of the eighteenth century. The number produced has increased in a greater ratio. In 1732 there were seventy-six thousand cattle and five hundred thousand sheep sold at Smithfield; in 1770, eighty-six thousand cattle and six hundred and fifty thousand sheep; in 1859, two hundred and sixty thousand cattle and a million and a half of sheep.

The consumption of animal food in England has always been a matter of surprise to foreigners. An intelligent Frenchman, M. Grosley, who came to this country in 1765, speaks of the large export of grain, under the bounty-system, as exciting his astonishment, being compared with the extent of cultivation. "In the counties of England through which I travelled, upon my way either to London, Oxford, or Portsmouth, I saw scarce anything but commons, meadows, large parks, wilds, heaths, and very little arable land." He considers the land leased by rich farmers to be well cultivated. "Nevertheless," he continues, "it is not so much the plentifulness of the harvests as the small consumption of corn by the English, which enables them to export a great quantity of corn. In fact, six or seven ounces of bread are sufficient for the daily subsistence of an Englishman, and that even among the lower sort. They, properly speaking, live chiefly upon animal food."‡ M. Grosley saw the Londoners eating two or three thin slices of bread and butter with their tea at breakfast; and he says of their bread-eating capacity, "What would be scarce enough for a Frenchman of an ordinary appetite would suffice three hungry Englishmen." § He had not seen the laborers of the South eating their rye bread with their hard cheese, and rarely tasting animal food; nor those of the North, satisfied with their oatmeal feast of crowdie or parritch. It was estimated, upon the most careful inquiry, at the beginning of the reign of George III., that not more than one half of the people were fed on wheaten bread; ‖ and therefore the ordinary consumption of the fine bread of London would supply no criterion of the general use of coarser bread in the country districts. Rye-bread, barley bread, and oat-cake, supplied the usual food of the rural population. Notwithstanding this limitation of the consumption of wheat, the increasing numbers of the people could not have been adequately fed without an extension of the area of cultivation. Even after the American war the quantity of uncultivated land, and the indifferent husbandry, were manifest to the foreigner who could see and compare. Jefferson came here in 1786, and he thus writes from France to a friend in America: "I returned here but three or four days ago, after a two months' trip to England. I traversed that country much; and own, both town and country fell short of my expectations. Comparing it with this, I found a much greater proportion of barrens; a soil in other parts not naturally so good as this; not better cultivated, but better manured, and therefore more productive." *

There can be no more interesting feature in the progress of our country than that of the conversion of its "barrens" into fertile fields. The steady as well as rapid course of this great change is strikingly illustrated in the agricultural county of Cambridge. It contains about 536,000 acres of land. In 1794, 112,500 acres were fens, commons, and sheep-walks. In 1806, 63,000 of these wastes had been inclosed and cultivated. In 1846 only 10,000 of these "barrens" remained uninclosed, and of these, 5000 were mown and fed in the summer.† The Isle of Ely, the fen district, is that which offers the most remarkable example of improvement. The subject of the fen cultivation of Cambridgeshire may be treated in common with that of the neighboring county of Lincoln.

Since Richard de Rulos, eight hundred years ago—being "a person much devoted to agricultural pursuits, and who took great delight in the multitude of his cattle and sheep"—embanked the River Welland, and "out of sloughs and bogs accursed formed quite a pleasure garden," ‡ there have been many generations of improvers, laboring in the Great Level of the Fens, with the same laudable objects. They have succeeded, as all persevering work will succeed, in spite of opposing obstacles, whether of the forces of nature or the prejudices of man. This great morass extended from Cambridge to Lincoln, and was inhabited in the time of Elizabeth by men who walked upon stilts, fishing and fowling, and keeping a little stock upon the hay which they secured out of the fat grass when the streams had retired under the summer drought. In the reign of Elizabeth, and in that of James I., several attempts were made to bring a part of this district under cultivation. In 1630 the undertaking was vigorously set about by Francis Earl of Bedford, and a company of adventurers was formed, who undertook to drain the land, having ninety-five thousand acres for their recompense. The men who walked upon stilts were indignant at these innovations, which threatened to exterminate the wild ducks, which they cherished as more profitable than sheep or oxen; and they destroyed the drainage works, in a true conservative spirit. The district upon which these incorporated adventurers worked was called the Bedford Level, in honor of the nobleman who was the great encourager of the undertaking. They engaged Cornelius Vermuyden, a Dutch engineer, as the director of the works. They embanked the Welland River, the Nene River, and the Ouse. They made deep cuts, of sufficient length to obtain the name of rivers. The Lincolnshire fens were undertaken to be drained by other companies, about the same period. Various local acts were passed, and the work went on, more or less prosperously. But the waters sometimes broke down the embankments, and scientific engineering, with all the powers of the giant steam, was not applied till very recent times. Mr. Pusey considers that "though the body of stagnant water was greatly reduced, still it was not subdued, so that the fen land was worth little, even when George III. came to the throne." § In 1800 it was stated that more than 300,000 acres in Lincolnshire suffered, on an average, a loss of 300,000*l.* a year for want of an efficient drainage. Mr. Rennie looked upon the wide waste with the comprehensive glance of science, and saw that the outfall to the sea was not sufficient to carry off both the waters of the low lands and of the rising slope which surrounded the whole margin of the Fen. He made a separate channel to carry off the upland waters. The great invention of Watt pumped out the water into the artificial rivers, instead of the feeble windmills that did the work imperfectly in the eighteenth century, a plan first introduced in the reign of George I. The whole land has been made dry. Districts growing nothing but osiers, three feet deep in water, and reeds filled with water-fowls; watery deserts of sedge and rushes, inhabited by frogs and bitterns—these now bear splendid crops of corn. Sheep are no longer carried to islets of rank pasture in flat-bottomed boats; cows are no longer turned out of their hovels, to forage for a morsel of food, swimming rivers and wading up to their middles. The cattle were as wretched as the wild inhabitants of the isolated huts to whom

* Whateley. See "Quarterly Review," vol. ciii. p. 396.
† "Eastern Tour," vol. i. p. 113.
‡ "Tour to London," translated by Nugent, vol. i. p. 139.
§ Ibid., p. 69.
‖ Eden's "State of the Poor," vol. i. p. 562.

* Tucker, "Life of Jefferson," vol. i. p. 225.
† "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. vii. p. 35.
‡ *Ante*, vol. i. p. 60.
§ "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. iv. p. 290.

they belonged.* "Since the drainage of the Fens numerous villages have sprung up where previously was nothing but a watery waste, without house or inhabitant, and several of the bordering towns have doubled their population."† The effect of these vast changes upon the health of the people of this district, seventy miles in length and from twenty to forty miles in breadth, is no less important than the additions they have made to the productive power of the country.

The fens of Lincolnshire are not the only portions of that great county which have been reclaimed from barrenness to fertility. On a sunny November morning of 1842, Mr. Pusey, having journeyed through a high level tract from Sleaford toward Lincoln, stood under a tall column by the roadside, about four miles from Lincoln, on which it is recorded that it was erected for the public utility in the year 1751. That column, says the great agricultural reformer, "was a land lighthouse," built "as a nightly guide for travellers over the dreary waste which still retains the name of Lincoln Heath, but is now converted into a pattern of farming." The district over which he had passed was "a cultivated exuberance" such as he had never seen before. Thousands after thousands of long-wooled sheep were feeding in netted folds upon the most luxuriant turnips. Every neatly built farm-house, with its spacious courts, was surrounded with abundant ricks. And yet the farms were not large; the land showed no marks of natural fertility. Most justly does Mr. Pusey say, "This Dunston pillar, lighted no longer time back for so singular a purpose, did appear to me a striking witness of the spirit and industry which in our own days have reared the thriving homesteads around it, and spread a mantle of teeming vegetation to its very base." Beyond Dunston pillar he continued to see the same "beautiful farms" till he reached Lincoln. Passing through the Roman arch, he travelled by the old Ermine Street for twenty miles, along North Lincoln Heath, where similar neat inclosures, heavy turnip crops, numerous flocks, spacious farm-buildings, and crowded corn-ricks, met his gaze. Through the whole day he saw to the right a long range of hills running parallel to the heath, from south to north. These were the Wolds of Lincolnshire, where the same high farming prevailed. "This vast tract of hill land had been redeemed, like the heath, from nearly equal desolation, within living memory." About 1760 Arthur Young saw this great district of the Wolds, and writes, "It was all warren for thirty miles, from Spilsby to Caistor." In 1799 he beholds great improvement. "By means of turnips and seeds there are now at least twenty sheep kept to one there before." But there were then still many miles of waste on the same range of hills, and the farmers said the land was "good for nothing but rabbits." This district, nearly as large as the county of Bedford, has now been added to the corn-land of England.‡

In the county of Nottingham Arthur Young saw little to admire. The quantity of good land which was in an improved state of culture was small, in comparison of the lands which were almost uncultivated. These light soils were called "forest land," being part of the vast tract of the old forest of Sherwood. § In 1794, when a report of the agriculture of this county was published, the greater portion was still a sandy waste, divested, for the most part, of its ancient oaks, and no longer affording covert to the stag and the roe—no longer the hunting-ground which would suggest memories of Robin Hood and his merry men. In the time of Camden the woods were much thinner than of old. Few uncleared spots now remain. But half a century ago Sherwood Forest presented nothing but desolation. "As the forest was cleared of its stately trees it was left one wide waste, so naturally sterile as scarcely to have the power of clothing itself with the scantiest vegetation; even in the present day some districts remain which bear testimony to its former sterility." But art has triumphed over nature. Where only rabbits once browsed, large flocks of sheep are now fed. The gorse and the fern have been driven out by the turnip and the alternate wheat crops. The introduction of the Swede turnip has mainly produced the improved farming of Nottinghamshire. At the extreme northern part of the county six thousand acres of bog-land, called "The Cars," were attempted to be reclaimed about the beginning of the century. The success of the effort was very imperfect. The difficulty of drainage threatened again to throw the morass out of cultivation. The steam-engine at last effected what drains without its aid could not accomplish.*

The agriculture of Derbyshire has derived its great impulse from the progress of the cotton manufacture. The first cotton-mill was established upon the Derwent, at Cromford, near Matlock, by Arkwright. The streams of this beautiful county were soon employed in driving the spindles of the spinning frame. Large factories were established in rural districts. The new population gave a stimulus to the industry of the cultivator. "Agriculture and manufactures joined hands."†

Our glance at the rural economy of the South-Eastern counties must be very rapid. Surrey has made no remarkable strides in improvement. Its "barrens" are probably now more extensive than in any other county of southern England. The mutton of Banstead Downs used to be famous; but a great landowner of that district says that this common, as well as Walton Heath, not now worth 3*d.* or 4*d.* an acre, would be worth 14*s.* an acre if inclosed.‡ We should, perhaps somewhat selfishly, grudge this gain; for round a metropolis of three millions of people we want the old wide breathing-spaces. Middlesex is described in the agricultural survey of 1798 as abounding in commons, the constant rendezvous of gypsies and strollers, and the resort of footpads and highwaymen. Finchley Common and Hounslow Heath were, at the end of the last century, the terror of all travellers. Gibbets, by the wayside, told their horrible tale of the absence of prevention and the ineffectiveness of punishment. The grass farms to the north of London were the admiration of Arthur Young in 1770. Enfield Chase, a vast useless tract of fine land, he regarded as a nuisance. East Kent and the Isle of Thanet have the admiration of this excellent judge: "This tract of country has long been reckoned the best cultivated in England, and it has no slight pretensions to that character. Their drill-husbandry is most peculiar; it must astonish strangers to find such numbers of common farmers, that have more drilled crops than broadcast ones, and to see them so familiar with drill-ploughs and horse-hoes."§ Gray, in 1766, was surprised at the beauty of the road to Canterbury. "The whole country is a rich and well-cultivated garden; orchards, cherry grounds, hop grounds, intermixed with corn, and frequent villages."‖ Arthur Young enters Sussex in a pleasant mood. The roads from Rye to Hawkhurst were good; the villages numerous, with neat cottages and well-kept gardens. He speaks as if such a sight were rare: "One's humanity is touched with pleasure to see cottages the residence of cheerfulness and content."¶ The iron furnaces of wooded Sussex were not then superseded by the coal of the midland districts. The Downs then carried that breed of sheep whose value has never been impaired. The Isle of Wight did not disappoint his expectation of finding "much entertainment in excellent husbandry." Of the New Forest, that vast tract which has so long been suffered to run to waste, under the pretence of furnishing a supply of oak for the navy, Arthur Young said, what many have since repeated, "There is not a shadow of a reason for leaving it in its present melancholy state." Much of the picturesqueness which Gilpin described is gone. The hundreds of hogs, under the care of one swineherd, led out to feed on the beech-mast during the "pawnage month" of October, no longer excite the wonder of the pedestrian. Some of the old romance of Hampshire has also vanished. The deer-stealers of the time of George I., known as the Waltham Blacks—for whose prevention a special statute was made,**—were not quite extinct in the days of Gilbert White. They are gone, with the Wolmer Forest and Waltham Chase, that tempted their depredations.

In Berkshire the king was setting a good example to the agricultural portion of his subjects, and earning the honorable name of "Farmer George." In the great park of Windsor he had his "Flemish farm," and his "Norfolk farm." He was a contributor to Young's "Annals of Agriculture," under the signature of "Ralph Robinson." Meanwhile the Forest of Windsor exhibited one of the

* "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. xii. p. 306.
† Ibid., p. 259.
‡ See Mr. Pusey's most interesting paper in "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. iv. p. 287.
§ "Eastern Tour," vol. i. p. 427

* "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. vi.
† Ibid., vol. xiv.
‡ Ibid., vol. iv. p. 307.
§ "Eastern Tour," vol. iii. p. 108.
‖ Letter to Wharton.
¶ "Eastern Tour," vol. iii. p. 125.
** 21 Geo. I.

many examples of a vast tract wholly neglected or imperfectly cultivated. It comprised a circuit of fifty-six miles, containing twenty-four thousand acres of uninclosed land. It was not till 1813 that an act of parliament was passed for its inclosure. Much of this district was that desolate tract of sand known as Bagshot Heath and Easthampstead Plain; but very large portions, where only fern and thistles grew, were capable of cultivation. Much has been turned into arable; more has been devoted to the growth of timber, under the direction of the Office of Woods and Forests. Vast plantations have been formed of oak and fir; plains, where a large army might have manœuvred fifty years ago, are covered with hundreds of thousands of vigorous saplings; heaths, where a few straggling hawthorns used to be the landmarks of the traveller, are now one sea of pine. The farms, scattered about the seventeen parishes of the forest, were small. The cultivation was of a very unscientific character. The manners of the farmers and their indoor laborers were as primitive as their turf fires. This obsolete homeliness is as rare now as the thymy fragrance of the thin smoke that curled out of the forest chimneys. The large kitchen, where the master and mistress dwelt in simple companionship with their men and their maidens; the great oaken table, which groaned with the plentiful Sunday dinner—the one dinner of fresh meat during the week; the huge basins of milk and brown bread for the ploughman and the carter and the plough-boy before they went afield; the cricket after work in summer, and the song and chorus in the common room as the days grew short—these are pleasant to remember amid the other changed things of a past generation. "The scenes which live in my recollection can never come back; nor is it fitting that they should. With the primitive simplicity there was also a good deal of primitive waste and carelessness. Except in the dairy, dirt and litter were the accompaniments of the rude housekeeping. The fields were imperfectly cultivated; the headlands were full of weeds. I have no doubt that all is changed, or the farm would be no longer a farm." *

CHAPTER CLXXVIII.

Agricultural condition of the South-Western counties—Wiltshire—Dorsetshire—Devonshire—Somersetshire—Cornwall—Wales—The West Midland counties—The North Midland—Yorkshire—Improvers of the moors—James Croft, an agricultural collier—Northern counties—Durham—Northumberland—Westmoreland—The Lake District—Agricultural condition of Scotland—The Lothians—Sheep flocks—Ayrshire—Burns—Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire—North-western parts—Agricultural condition of Ireland—The potato cultivation.

Confining, for the present, our general view of the remaining moiety of England to its pastoral and agricultural condition before the end of the eighteenth century, we proceed to the South-Western, the West Midland, the North-Western, and the Northern counties; also including Wales. Those divisions of the country contained a population of about two millions and a half at the end of the seventeenth century; of four millions and a half at the end of the eighteenth century; and of ten millions and a half at the end of the first half of the nineteenth century.* Such quadrupling of the population in the course of a hundred and fifty years is an evidence of the direction of productive labor to manufacturing and commercial industry, in particular districts, having an extraordinary command of raw material. We have indicated the partial growth of such employments in the reign of Anne and of George I.† We shall have to show their greater expansion in the first half of the reign of George III. But we desire first to exhibit, during the latter period, how the rapid growth of a trading population was stimulating the employment of capital in the rural districts; and, above all, what a vast field existed for its employment in the direction of science and labor to the neglected tracts and imperfect cultivation of a country capable of a wonderful enlargement of its fertility. In this rapid sketch we shall add an equally brief glance at Scotland and Ireland.

William Cobbett, who had an intense enjoyment of rural life, and a power of expressing his pleasure which almost rises into poetry, says he would rather live and farm among the Wiltshire Downs "than on the banks of the Wye in Herefordshire, in the vale of Gloucester, of Worcester, or of Evesham, or even in what the Kentish men call their garden of Eden." He looks with rapture upon the "smooth and verdant downs, in hills and valleys of endless variety as to height and depth and shape;" he rejoices in beholding, as he rides along on a bright October morning, the immense flocks of sheep, going out from their several folds to the downs for the day, each having its shepherd and each shepherd his dog. He saw two hundred thousand Southdown sheep at Weyhill fair, brought from the down-farms of Wiltshire and Hampshire. * But upon these down-farms he was surprised to see very large pieces of Swedish and white turnips. The pastoral district was then, some thirty years ago, becoming agricultural. At the present time "the rapid extension of tillage over these high plains threatens before long to leave but little of their original sheep-walks." † When the mallard was the chief tenant of the fens, and the bittern of the marshes, large flocks of great bustards ranged over the Wiltshire downs, running with exceeding swiftness, and using their ostrich-like wings to accelerate their speed. They usually fled before the sportsman and the traveller, but they have been known to resent intrusion upon their coverts of charlock or thistles, attacking even a horseman. Wesley, in his "Account of John Haine," one of his enthusiastic followers, relates what was supposed to be a supernatural appearance to reprove the poor man for a paroxysm of religious frenzy. "He saw, in the clear sky, a creature like a swan, but much larger, part black, part brown, which flew at him, went just over his head, and, lighting on the ground, at about forty yards' distance, stood staring upon him." The apparition is explained by the author of the "Life of Wesley," to have been a bustard; and he quotes a relation by Sir Richard Hoare, of two instances, in 1805, of the bustard attacking a man and a horse. The author of "Ancient Wiltshire" says that a report of these incidents in the "Gentleman's Magazine" of 1805, "is probably the last record we shall find of the existence of this bird upon our downs." ‡ The bustard has now utterly disappeared. He stalks no longer where the furrow has been drawn.

Wiltshire is said not to be remarkable in our time for a very high standard of farming. Aubrey says of England generally, before the year 1649, when experimental philosophy was first cultivated by a club at Oxford, that it was thought not to be good manners for a man to be more knowing than his neighbors and forefathers. "Even to attempt an improvement in husbandry, though it succeeded with profit, was looked upon with an ill eye." § He applies this character more particularly to Wiltshire. "I will only say of our husbandmen, as Sir Thomas Overbury does of the Oxford scholars, that they go *after* the fashion; that is, when the fashion is almost out they take it up: so our countrymen are very late and very unwilling to learn or to be brought to new improvements." The late Mr. Britton, a Wiltshire man, who edited Aubrey's "Natural History," and wrote a memoir of him, says, "In the days of my own boyhood, nearly seventy years ago, I spent some time at a solitary farmhouse in North Wiltshire, with a grandfather and his family, and can remember the various occupations and practices of the persons employed in the dairy, and on the grazing and corn lands. I never saw either a book or newspaper in the house; nor were any accounts of the farming kept. ‖

Dorsetshire, the great county of quarries and of fossil remains—of the Portland stone of which St. Paul's was built, and of the Purbeck marble whose sculptured columns adorn the Temple Church and Salisbury Cathedral—Dorsetshire was eighty years ago a district where agricultural improvements had made little progress. Arthur Young describes its bleak commons, quite waste, but consisting of excellent land; its downs, where sheep were fed without turnip culture; its three courses of corn-crops, and then long seasons of weeds. The Dorsetshire farmers, he implies, held his lessons in contempt, as the warreners and shepherds of Norfolk would have held them half a century before; and would have "smiled at being told of another race arising who should pay ten times their rent, and at the same

* "Once upon a Time," by Charles Knight.
† *Ante*, vol. iv. chaps. cxviii. and cxix.

* "Rural Rides." † "Quarterly Review," vol. ciii. p. 135.
‡ Southey, "Life of Wesley," vol. ii. p. 124 and p. 192.
§ "Natural History of Wiltshire," Preface, edit. 1847.
‖ Ibid., p. 103.

time make fortunes by so doing."* The downs were not broken up, to any extent, until our own days. The foxes and rabbits have at last been banished from the wastes, where a few sheep used to feed amid the furze and fern. Where one shepherd's boy was kept, five men are now employed. From 1734 to 1769 there had been about five thousand acres inclosed; from 1772 to 1800, about seven thousand acres. During the first half of the eighteenth century more than fifty thousand acres had been inclosed.† Cranborne Chase, where twelve thousand deer ranged over the lands, and the laborers were systematically poachers, was not inclosed till 1828. The condition of the Dorsetshire peasantry, which was a public reproach, appears to have been essentially connected with "very large tracts of foul land," and with "downs that occupied a large portion of the county." The "mud-walled cottages, composed of road-scrapings and chalk and straw," made the Dorsetshire gentlemen take shame to themselves in 1843; and many set about remedying the evil, in the conviction that agricultural prosperity and a wretched and demoralized population could not exist together.

Aubrey has an interesting story of the agriculture of the middle of the seventeenth century. "The Devonshire men were the earliest improvers. I heard Oliver Cromwell, protector, at dinner at Hampton Court, 1657 or 8, tell the Lord Arundell of Wardour, and the Lord Fitzwilliam, that he had been in all the counties of England, and that the Devonshire husbandry was the best."‡ In 1848 it is written, "It cannot be denied that the farming of Devon is at the present time inferior to that of most of the counties of England."§ And yet a large proportion of the Devonshire population are, as they always have been, agricultural. The quantity of waste land is very great. Dartmoor contains a quarter of a million of acres, about one half of the wastes of Devonshire. The severity of the climate of Dartmoor is attributed as much to the want of drainage as to its great elevation."‖ Any attempts at cultivating these sterile regions would have been commercially useless in the eighteenth century, when so many fertile districts remained uncultivated. The absolute necessity of supplying the great mining and metal-working population of South Wales with the farm produce that cannot be raised in their own boundaries, may eventually clothe even the barrens of North Devon with fertility.¶

Somersetshire presented to Arthur Young a signal instance of neglect in its vast ranges of waste. High land and low land were equally unimproved. Leaving Bridgewater on his road to Bath, he passed "within sight of a very remarkable tract of country called King's Sedgmoor." He described this as a flat black peat bog, so rich that its eleven thousand acres wanted nothing but draining to be capable of the highest cultivation. "At present," he says, "it is so encompassed by higher lands that the water has no way to get off but by evaporation. In winter it is a sea, and yields scarce any food, except in very dry summers."** King's Sedgmoor had probably been little changed since 1685, when Monmouth looked from the top of Bridgewater Church on the royal army encamped in the morass, amid ditches and causeways, and speculated upon a night march by which he should surprise his enemy.†† Much of this moorland is now under arable cultivation, and contains some of the richest grazing land of the country.‡‡ The Quantock hills are described by Young as wholly waste; as eighteen thousand acres yielding nothing. This range is now smiling with farms and gentlemen's residences, with woods and plantations. Exmoor, consisting of twenty thousand acres, was crown land, yielding a scanty picking to a few hundred ponies, and summer feed to sheep from neighboring farms. Even from the time of its inclosure, improvements have been very slowly curtailing the range of the black-cock. The wild stag has not disappeared. A dwindled breed of sheep, kept chiefly for their wool, still occupy the sheep-walks. "Sometimes," says Mr. Pusey, "you find a large piece of the best land inclosed with a high fence, and you hope that the owner is about to begin tilling his freehold. On the contrary, the object of this improvement is to keep out the only sign of farming, the sheep, and to preserve the best of the land (because where the land is best the covert is highest) an undisturbed realm for the black-cock." And yet Mr. Pusey saw that Exmoor consisted in great part of sound land; and a farmer said to him, "Here is land enough idle to employ the surplus population of England." Every black-cock, in Mr. Pusey's opinion, had cost more than a full-fed ox.* In Somersetshire the disproportion between the population and the amount of agricultural employment is very great. For every 100 acres in this county there were 41 persons returned in the census of 1841; in Norfolk there were 32 persons, and in Lincoln 22, taking the average of the several counties.†

Of Cornwall, it need only be remarked that its agriculture, at the end of the last century, was a very secondary object. Fishers and miners constituted the great body of the population. At the present time not more than 7 per cent are agricultural. The farms were small, as they still are, chiefly cultivated by the occupier and his family. Corn crop formerly followed corn crop till the soil would yield no more. The turnip-culture was unknown till 1815. But improvement is making its way against old prejudices; and the Cornish cultivator may in time be as remarkable for intelligence as the Cornish miner.

South Wales, before the war of the French Revolution, grew little corn, and pasturage was the main occupation. The peasantry lived chiefly upon oatmeal and barley-meal. The war came, and corn was grown for export to England. The iron works and copper works multiplied; and then South Wales in time became an importing district. North Wales was almost exclusively pastoral. The small sheep ran upon the mountains for three or four years, till they were sold to drovers. The lean black cattle could not be fattened where they grew, but were drafted off to the border fairs. A little tillage gradually mingled with the pasturage; but all the modern system of economizing manures for cereal crops, and of feeding stock with green crops, was utterly unknown. Like the cultivators of most mountainous districts, remote from towns, the farmers and the laborers were equally prejudiced and obstinate in their adherence to old practices. Much of this conceit still abides, with the hard diet, and the coarse home-made frieze, of former days.

The West Midland counties present few, if any, remarkable agricultural features which it may be proper to notice, with the view to mark the contrast between the past and the present. In Gloucestershire the sheep farms upon the Cotswolds, and the dairies in the valley of the Severn, are not peculiar to recent times. Cider and perry are produced, as of yore. The Gloucestershire farmer planted his beans, and sometimes his wheat, in drills, before drilling-machines were invented. The Gloucestershire laborer, slowly as he moves, has kept that slow movement with his team, like others of the West, from time immemorial. Herefordshire, Shropshire, and Worcestershire have not started into good cultivation in the course of half a century, but have gone on steadily improving.

One singular example of the slowness with which novel cultivation was extended, and new products were used, has been recorded, by an octogenarian, of his native county of Worcester. The late Mr. Thomas Wright Hill—a man most deservedly venerated in his own day, and whose sons have done service to their country, which will not speedily be forgotten—says, in an autobiographical fragment, "My uncle had heard of potatoes"—this was about 1750—"perhaps tasted that root. In any case, however, he procured some seed potatoes from a gentleman's gardener near Bewdley, and planted them in his garden. The plants came up, and gave every promise of an excellent crop; but when the time of potato harvest arrived, and the tops were well ripened, my uncle gathered a few of their balls, and to his utter disappointment found them anything but good potatoes." The stems withered during the winter. The spring came; and when the good man dug up his supposed unproductive patch, he found that the plant which Raleigh gave to Devonshire, and which was the common food of Lancashire, was worth cultivating.‡

In Warwickshire the system of under-drainage was discovered ac-

* "Eastern Tour," vol. iii. p. 409.
† "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. iii. p. 440.
‡ "Natural History of Wiltshire," p. 103, Britton's edit.
§ "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. ix. p. 495.
‖ Ibid., p. 486.
¶ See an interesting paper in "Journal of Bath and West of England Society," vol. xiii. 1860.
** "Eastern Tour," vol. iv. p. 13. †† *Ante*, vol. iv. p. 582.
‡‡ "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. xi. p. 698.

* "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. iv. p. 309.
† Ibid., vol. xi. p. 754.
‡ "Remains of T. W. Hill," privately printed, 1859.

cidentally by Joseph Elkington, of Princethorpe, in 1764. His fields were so wet as to rot his sheep. He endeavored in vain to drain them by a deep trench, but could not effect any real remedy. He was meditating by the side of his drain, when a man passing with a crowbar, the inquiring farmer took the tool, and forced it three or four feet below the bottom of his trench, with a view of discovering the nature of the subsoil. Water burst up when he removed the crowbar and ran plentifully into the drain. He acted upon the hint by boring; rendered his own land fertile; and received a reward of a thousand pounds from parliament for the improvements consequent upon his discovery.* Staffordshire, the country of potteries and collieries, was too rapidly advancing at the end of the last century, in manufactures, to exhibit great changes in cultivation. Its wastes, in some parts, are still uncultivated. Cannock Chase, a low ridge of thirteen thousand acres, with the potteries and the fires of Dudley within view, is described by Mr. Pusey as a fertile wilderness, feeding only a few starving sheep, but capable of being brought under the plough.†

To speak of Lancashire in connection with agriculture may appear like an attempt to "give to Zembla fruits, to Barca flowers." Yet Lancashire was an agricultural county at the period we profess to describe, and its slowly developing manufactures were intimately blended with the occupations of an agricultural population. We shall have to trace the association of the spinning-wheel in the village and the loom in the town, in our next chapter. Meanwhile, before the cotton era arrived, Southern Lancashire was very imperfectly cultivating the surface of its great coal-fields. The farms were small, the implements rude, the cultivators poor and prejudiced. Chat-Moss was, of course, left to its primeval state of desolation, man scarcely daring to tread where the railway now bears its thundering burdens. The middle district, with the exception of Preston, is wholly agricultural, as it was in the last century. On the north of the Ribble the hill-farmers are a primitive race, differing little from their grandfathers and great-grandfathers. Pasturing their black-faced sheep upon the moors, they care little for the quality of the land. They have no green crops, and no farm-yards for their cows in the winter. Turf is their only fuel, and their chief food is the oat-cake, baked on the hot hearth. What these cultivators are now may show what they were eighty years ago. We descend into the district called the Fylde, to the north of the Wyre, and we look upon operations which are now as much a modern triumph for Lancashire as the wealth of her factories. The mosses of this district amount to twenty thousand acres. "From a state of perfect sterility, producing nothing but moor-fowl and snipes, they are now being gradually converted into the most productive land of the kingdom."‡

Cheshire, like Lancashire, was, for a large portion of the county, in the transition state from agriculture to manufactures in the middle of the reign of George III. Its rich pastures and its dairy-farms have only been improved in degree, but not in kind. Its arable was imperfectly cultivated, without green crops. One mode of raising the productiveness, both of arable and pasture, was forbidden by a barbarous fiscal policy. The foul or dirtied salt, produced in hundreds of tons by the salt-works of Cheshire, was utterly lost, the heavy duty laid upon refuse salt preventing its use as manure.§

To attempt any minute description of the rural condition of Yorkshire, eighty or ninety years ago, divided as that great county is into three ridings, each having many peculiar characteristics of soil and climate, is far beyond the scope of our imperfect sketch of national progress in this department of industry. The great landed proprietors of the time led the way to that course of improvement which has made Yorkshire as remarkable in agriculture as in manufactures. The Marquis of Rockingham, the leader of the Whig party, was more successful as a cultivator than as a politician. But, even around Wentworth House, he had to contend with those obstinate prejudices which beset the rich and noble, as well as the poor and lowly, improver. The marquis had to deal with "a set of men of contracted ideas, used to a stated road, with deviations neither to the right nor left." Arthur Young is not describing legislators, but farmers. "His lordship, finding that discourse and reasoning could not prevail over the obstinacy of their understandings, determined to convince their eyes." He showed the agriculturists of the West Riding, in the management of two thousand acres of his own lands, what would be the result of draining, of cultivating turnips properly, of using better implements. "Well convinced that argument and persuasion would have little effect with the John Trot geniuses of farming, he determined to set the example of good husbandry as the only probable means of being successful."*

In the East Riding we may trace, in the pages of Arthur Young, the beginnings of that extension of the area of cultivation which has converted a quarter of a million of acres of almost barren hills—the chalk district of the Wolds—into a country of luxuriant harvests, and of pasture and green crops for innumerable herds and flocks. There was a great improver at work upon these wild moors in 1770. Sir Digby Legard, who resided at Ganton, on the edge of the Wolds, experimented upon five thousand acres of uninclosed wold-land near his house. About five hundred acres were in tillage. The land was let at a shilling an acre. The annual value of the corn and wool of the five thousand acres was under 1000*l.*, and they maintained a hundred inhabitants. He was sanguine enough to believe that the same land might, at no great expense, be so cultivated as in a few years to produce a five-fold increase of corn, support twice the number of cattle, and be let at eight times its then rent. Mr. George Legard, in his prize essay on the farming of the East Riding, says, "It can be proved that in the very district to which Sir Digby Legard refers, the produce of wheat has been doubled, that of oats has been increased fivefold, of barley sixfold; and that wherever skill and capital have been applied to these uncultivated hills, rent has been advanced even as much as twentyfold."†

Arthur Young rides on, during his tour, amid the waste places and the cultivated grounds of Yorkshire, with alternate feelings of regret and of exultation. He passes from Newton by the road "across Hambledon, a tract of country which has not the epithet black given it for nothing; for it is a continued range of black moors, eleven or twelve miles long, and from four to eight broad. It is melancholy to travel through such desolate land, when it is so palpably capable of improvement."‡ After traversing a vast range of dreary waste he looks down "upon an immense plain, comprehending almost all Cleveland, finely cultivated, the verdure beautiful."§ About Newbigill he sees "many improvements of moors by that spirited cultivator, the Earl of Darlington." On the road from Bowes to Brough he deplores that, of a line of twelve miles, through a country exhibiting a fine deep red loam, not more than nine miles are cultivated. "It is extremely melancholy to view such tracts of land that are indisputably capable of yielding many beneficial crops, lie totally waste, while in many parts of the kingdom farms are so scarce and difficult to be procured, that one is no sooner vacant than twenty applications are immediately made for it."‖ At Swinton, near Masham, where Mr. Danby had a colliery, upon the edge of his vast moorlands which did not yield him a farthing an acre, Arthur Young saw an example of improvement which showed him of what the land was capable. The proprietor had allowed some of the more industrious of his colliers each to inclose a field out of the moors. Upon one of these humble improvers the agricultural tourist has conferred a fame as truly deserved as that of the Cokes and Bedfords of that age. James Croft, one of the colliers, thirteen years before Young visited the district, began his husbandry by taking an acre of moor. By indefatigable labor he soon raised oats and barley, and obtained fine grass land. He next took eight acres, which he could not cultivate all at once, for the land was full of large stones. But he finally succeeded. When his eulogist saw him he was at work upon eight acres more, attacking the most enormous stones, cutting them in pieces, carrying them away, and then bringing mould to fill the holes up. He had thus brought nine acres into excellent cultivation. He was clearing eight more acres of fresh land, paring and burning, confident of deriving from them an additional support for his family. Had James Croft assistance either of money or labor?

* Sinclair's "Code of Agriculture."
† "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. iv. p. 310.
‡ Ibid., vol. x. p. 22. § Aikin's "Manchester," p. 45.

* "Northern Tour," vol. i. pp. 307 to 353.
† "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. ix. p. 95.
‡ "Northern Tour," vol. ii. p. 98.
§ Ibid., p. 202. ‖ Ibid., p. 206.

He had done everything with his own hands. He had worked in the mine from twelve o'clock at night to the noon of the next day. "From the time of leaving off work in the mine till that of sleeping, he regularly spent in unremitting labor on his farm." The enthusiasm of Arthur Young on beholding this marvel of industry becomes eloquent: "Such a conduct required a genius of a peculiar cast. Daring in his courage and spirited in his ideas, the most extensive plans are neither too vast nor too complicated to be embraced with facility by his bold and comprehensive imagination. . . . The greatest, and indeed the only, object of his thoughts is the improvement of the wilds that surround him, over which he casts an anxious but magnanimous eye, wishing for the freedom to attack, with his own hands, an enemy, the conquest of whom would yield laurels to a man of ample fortune." * Out of such stuff as James Croft was made of has arisen that wondrous race of enterprising men of the North who—some from beginnings as humble as this cultivator of the moors—have largely contributed to build up the material prosperity of their country; have contended with prejudice, with jealousy, with dishonesty; have been ridiculed as projectors, under the once popular nickname of "conjurors;"—the daring men who, whether as creators of canals and railways, inventors of machines, organizers of factories, adventurous merchants, or spirited cultivators, have brought to their tasks the same qualities as James Croft brought—"a penetration that sees the remotest difficulty; a prudence and firmness of mind that removes every one the moment it is foreseen." †

Young says of his agricultural collier, "His ideas are clear and shining; and though his language is totally unrefined and provincial, insomuch that some attention is necessary to comprehend the plainest of his meaning, yet whoever will take the pains to examine him will find him a genius in husbandry." Considerable attention would certainly have been necessary, if the intelligent Yorkshireman had expressed himself, as to the troubles of a Craven cultivator, in what is represented to have been the language of the country at the beginning of the present century. To the question of farmer Giles, "Whear's yawer Tom?" neighbor Bridget thus replies: "He's gaan aboon two howers sin weet fadder to git eldin, nabody knaws how far; an th' gaite fray th' moor is seea dree, unbane, and parlous: Lang Rig brow is seea brant, at they're foarced to stang th' cart; an th' wham, boon t' gill heead, is seea mortal sumpy an soft, at it taks cart up tot knaff ommost iv'ry yerd. Gangin ower some heealdin grund, they welted cart ower yesterday, an brack th' barkum, haams, and two felks." ‡ The author of "The Craven Dialect" says that the inhabitants of this district, pent up by their native mountains, and principally engaged in agricultural pursuits, "had no opportunity of corrupting the purity of their language by the adoption of foreign idioms." He expresses a regret, with which few will sympathize, that, "since the introduction of commerce, and in consequence of that a greater intercourse, the simplicity of the language has, of late years, been much corrupted." The dialect of Craven has taken its departure with the herds of wild white cattle, whose cows hid their young in the ferns and underwood of the wastes of Craven, and whose bulls were hunted by large assemblages of horsemen and their followers on foot, with something of the grandeur of the chase of the middle ages. §

The four northern counties have many points of interest, especially in the character of their population. Durham was a very neglected agricultural district in the second half of the last century. "Within a comparatively recent period a large portion of this county was uninclosed and uncultivated, and lay either in wide tracts of desolate moor or in more sheltered, though equally neglected, 'stinted pastures.'" ‖ The land under cultivation was universally in want of draining. The farm-yard manures were insufficient, for little stock was kept. The county was indeed famous for a breed of cattle known as the Durham shorthorns—animals which were fattened into wonderful size, and were sold at fabulous prices. This breed has been improved into the most esteemed stock of England.

Arthur Young is indignant at the wretched breed of sheep that ranged over the Northumberland moors, in flocks as large as forty thousand, which did not pay for their keep more than a shilling or two per head. The millions of acres of improvable moors he holds to be "as waste as when ravaged by the fury of the Scottish borderers." * Northumberland contained "large districts, which even within the last eighty years were in a state of nature, covered with broom, furze, or rushes." † It was long after the union that the inhabitants of this border land acquired settled and industrious habits. But the fertile vales of the northern parts of the county attracted settlers, who soon introduced better cultivation than that of the small crofts which surrounded the miserable farm hovels. The famous agriculturists known everywhere by the name of Culley settled in the district of Glendale in 1767. Their example, and that of other cultivators and breeders, "gave a stimulus to the surrounding district; and in a few years the inexpert operations and languid system of husbandry which had previously prevailed, gave place to others of extraordinary expedition and efficacy." ‡

When Gray entered Westmoreland from Yorkshire, in 1769, he saw a pleasing display of a rural population: "A mile and a half from Brough, on a hill, lay a great army encamped." It was the Brough cattle fair, held on the 29th and 30th of September. "On a nearer approach, appeared myriads of horses and cattle on the road itself; and in all the fields round me, a brisk stream hurrying cross the way—thousands of clean, healthy people in their best parti-colored apparel, farmers and their families, esquires and their daughters, hastening up from the dales and down the fells on every side, glittering in the sun, and pressing forward to join the throng." § The poet travels on into the heart of the beautiful lake district. At the village of Grange, near Borrodale, he finds a contrast to the bustle of the fair at Brough. He is entertained by a young farmer and his mother with milk and thin oaten cakes, and "butter that Sisera would have jumped at, though not in a lordly dish." The farmer was a noted man of the district. He was "himself the man that last year plundered the eagle's aiery: all the dale are up in arms on such an occasion, for they lose abundance of lambs yearly." The bold dalesman "was let down from the cliff on ropes to the shelf of rock on which the eagle's nest was built, the people above shouting and hollowing to fright the old birds, which flew screaming round, but did not dare to attack him." The eagles are gone, never to return. Every season, says Miss Martineau, there is a rumor of an eagle having visited some point or another; "but, on the whole, we find the preponderance of belief is against there being any eagle's nest among the mountains of Westmoreland or Cumberland." ‖

Poetry has made the lake district her home; and amid the glorious mountains, the lakes, and the tarns, will poetry ever abide. The gifted writer who has added another celebrated name to the illustrious who have delighted here to dwell, has said of a mountainous district, "It is the only kind of territory in which utility must necessarily be subordinated to beauty. . . . Man may come and live, if he likes, and if he can; but it must be in some humble corner, by permission, as it were, and not through conflict with the genius of the place. Nature and beauty here rule and occupy: man and his desires are subordinate, and scarcely discernible." ¶ It was thus, on the slopes of the mountains, or in vales inaccessible, that the dalesmen, deriving their name from the word *deyler*, which means to distribute, occupied their little crofts as tenants of their ecclesiastical or military lord. These were the predecessors of the "statesmen," or "estatesmen," who still survive, though in diminished numbers, struggling with their small skill against the march of agricultural science and the extension of farm holdings. Even nature herself cannot resist this progress. The Kentmere Tarn, by whose shallow waters Bernard Gilpin might have meditated three centuries ago, has been drained in our own day. Wherever corn can be made to spring, the reed and the rush no longer flourish. The social condition of the population is as rapidly changing. The shepherd will

* "Northern Tour," vol. ii. p. 298.
† Ibid., p. 299.
‡ From "The Craven Dialect," 1824, p. 6. The following are from the "Glossary" of this curious volume: *eldin*, fuel; *gaite*, road; *dree*, tedious; *unbane*, distant; *parlous*, perilous; *brant*, steep; *stang*, to put a lever on the wheel; *wham*, bog; *boon* or *bane*, near; *gill*, glen; *sumpy*, wet; *tot*, the whole; *knaff*, nave; *heealdin*, sloping; *welted*, overturned; *barkum*, collar made of bark; *felks*, felloes of a wheel.
§ Culley, in Bewick's, "Quadrupeds."
‖ "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. xvii. p. 93.

* "Northern Tour," vol. iv. p. 337.
† "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. ii. p. 151.
‡ Ibid., p. 153.
§ "Journal."
‖ "The Land we Live in," vol. ii. p. 235.
¶ Ibid., p. 217.

still go upon the hills, "into the heart of many thousand mists." His dog will still bring down the flock from heights untrodden by man—that faithful servant, of whom it has been said, "without the shepherd's dog, the mountainous land in England would not be worth sixpence." The occasional peddler will still carry his pack to the cottage door. But the whole district has been brought into communication with the outer world, and its inner life has undergone a very marked change. "Book-farming" is no longer held up to ridicule.* Turnips were first grown as a field-crop in the vale of Bassenthwaite, in 1793. Oats are still half the grain crop; but the food of the people is wondrously altered since the time when a wheaten loaf could not be bought in Carlisle, and "it was only a rich family that used a peck of wheat in the course of a year, and that was used at Christmas."† Hemp and flax were grown in small patches for domestic use, the females spinning the flax, and the males plaiting the hemp into cordage, for leather for harness was not used till the end of the last century. "Wonderful Robert Walker," the good curate of Seathwaite, spun the wool out of which the cloth was woven which his wife made up into apparel for themselves and their eight children. But Yorkshire and Lancashire manufactures have banished such thrift. Wordsworth records how the change from hand-labor to machinery intruded itself into Seathwaite: "At a small distance from the parsonage has been erected a mill for spinning yarn. It is a mean and disagreeable object, though not unimportant to the spectator, as calling to mind the momentous changes wrought by such inventions in the frame of society." The spinning wheel went out when drills came in. "About the year 1795, the ancestor of the present Mr. Dixon, of Rucroft or Ruckcroft, in the parish of Ainstable, procured a barrow-drill for sowing his patch of turnips with; and so highly was it esteemed as a saving of labor, by himself and his neighbors, that it was lent all round the country, and worked day and night during the season."‡ The one-horse cart gradually drove out the pack-horse, which the farmer employed to carry his grain to the mill or to the market. Looking from Little Langdale, "a horse road is discerned sloping up the brown side of Wrynose, opposite. This track was once the only traffic-road from Kendal to Whitehaven; and it was traversed by pack-horses."§ Not only are the usages of the lake district changed, but the inhabitants are, in the more beautiful regions, changed from poor cultivators into luxurious gentry; the miserable farm steadings have given place to splendid villas. Gray shows us what Grasmere was, ninety years ago: "A white village, with the parish church rising in the midst of it; hanging inclosures, corn-fields, and meadows green as an emerald, with their trees, hedges, and cattle, fill up the whole space from the edge of the water. . . . Not a single red tile, no flaring gentleman's house or garden walls, break in upon the repose of this little unsuspected paradise; but all is peace, rusticity, and happy poverty, in its neatest and most becoming attire."

"We entered Scotland," says Smollett, "by a frightful muir of sixteen miles, which promises very little for the interior parts of the kingdom. . . . That part of Scotland contiguous to Berwick nature seems to have intended as a barrier between two hostile nations." In a few hours he sees a plain "covered with as fine wheat as ever I saw in the most fertile parts of South Britain."‖ This fertility was exceptional. The agriculture of Scotland—even in the Lothians, now models of farming excellence—was in the rudest and almost barbarous state, when George III. came to the throne. East Lothian claims the honor of having led the march of improvement. But in the middle of the last century there was not a single mile of continuous hard road in the district. Grain was carried to market on horseback. The whole county of Haddington, long after the middle of that century, was open field. The tenantry frequently resided together in a cluster of mean houses called a town. Green crops were unknown, and the thistles among the corn were carefully gathered to feed the husbandry horses. The implements were of the rudest kind—"better fitted to raise laughter than to raise mould," according to Lord Kaimes, an agricultural improver. The married ploughman was paid, as now, in the produce of the farm; but he received a far less proportion of oats than at the present time, and he had no potatoes in his patch of garden. The only occupation that flourished was that of smuggling.* Such was the agricultural state of the southern shores of the Frith of Forth. The pastoral district of the Lammermuir hills had no improved breeds of sheep till the beginning of the present century.

The beautiful country watered by the Tweed and the Teviot was for the greater part uninclosed seventy years ago. Roxburghshire exhibited the dominion of the plough in irregular and detached patches, the intermediate portions being devoted to grazing cattle, which were put under the charge of a herd, to prevent them trespassing upon the scanty divisions set apart for corn.† The produce of wheat was only in the proportion of one twelfth to that of oats and barley. The great novelist has described Liddesdale as exhibiting "no inclosures, no roads, almost no tillage—a land which a patriarch would have chosen to feed his flocks and herds." He has perhaps somewhat exaggerated the abundance of "Charlie's Hope"—the noble cow-house and its milch-cows, the feeding-house with ten bullocks of the most approved breeds, the stable with two good teams of horses—the appropriate wealth of so worthy a yeoman as "Dandie Dinmont."‡ Selkirkshire has been rendered familiar to us by "The Ettrick Shepherd," as regards some aspects of its pastoral life. We see his flock, as he was driving them home, suddenly frightened, scampering over the hills, followed by his dog "Sirrah." A dark night is passed in fruitless search, Hogg and his man wandering over the steeps and dells from midnight till the rising sun. At length, at the bottom of a deep ravine, the faithful colley and his charge are found, not a lamb missing. This is the life which knows little change from one century to another; but time yet brings changes. Hogg laments that the black-faced "ewie wi' the crooked horn" had been banished from her native hills. Soberer records inform us that the sheep which once covered the Ettrick wastes produced a crop of wool of the coarsest kind, little adapted for manufacture.§ The introduction of the Cheviot breed was one of the marks of progress. The management of sheep flocks in Eskdalemuir, the mountain region of Dumfriesshire, attests the innovations of a century. Smollett observes of the sheep which he saw upon the hills, that "their fleeces are much damaged by the tar with which they are smeared, to preserve them from the rot in winter, during which they run wild night and day, and thousands are lost under huge wreaths of snow. 'Tis a pity the farmers cannot contrive some means to shelter this useful animal from the inclemencies of a rigorous climate."‖ When snow-storms of any long continuance came, it was the practice of the farmers of Eskdalemuir to fly with their sheep to Annandale. It was the same in the neighboring mountain districts, when every part of Nithsdale, Annandale, and the lower part of Eskdale, were filled with them. The pastures of the valleys to which the sheep fled are now subdivided and inclosed. Better provision is made upon the hills for food and for shelter, and the sheep continue around their own farms.¶

The agriculture of Ayrshire, at the accession of George III., was in a rude condition; the arable farms very small, the tenants without capital, the tenure incumbered with services to the landlord. In the parish of Mauchline was the farm of Mossgiel, upon which Burns spent nine years of a life of rural industry. In the neighboring parish of Tarbolton his father dwelt, on the farm of Lochlee. "The Cotter's Saturday Night" is descriptive of the simple household of the humble cultivator. The Cotter, says Gilbert Burns, was "an exact copy of my father in his manners, his family devotion, and exhortations. He lived with the most rigid economy, that he might be able to keep his children at home, thereby having an opportunity of watching the progress of our young minds, and forming in them early habits of piety and virtue; and from this motive alone did he engage in farming, the source of all his difficulties and distresses." The supper that "crowns their simple board" is

"The halesome parritch, chief o' Scotia's food."

* "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. xiii. p. 225.
† Eden, "History of the Poor," vol. i. p. 564.
‡ "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. xiii. p. 241.
§ "Land we Live in," vol. ii. p. 254.
‖ "Humphrey Clinker."

* "New Statistical Account of Scotland," Haddington, p. 375.
† "Journal of Royal Agricultural Society," vol. i. p. 105.
‡ "Guy Mannering."
§ "New Statistical Account," Selkirkshire, p. 76.
‖ "Humphrey Clinker."
¶ "New Statistical Account," vol. iv. Dumfriesshire, p. 410.

The mother, "wi' her needle and her sheers,"

"Gars auld claes look amaist as weel's the new."

Burns prays that Scotia's "hardy sons of rustic toil" may long be preserved "from luxury's contagion." Smollett describes the peasantry as "on a poor footing all over the kingdom;" and there was then no great distinction between the occupier of a small farm and his "elder bairns at service out amang the farmers roun'." But Smollett says of this peasantry, "they look better, and are better clothed, than those of the same rank in Burgundy, and many other places of France and Italy; nay, I will venture to say they are better fed, notwithstanding the boasted wine of these foreign countries." They seldom or never taste flesh meat, he adds, nor any kind of strong liquor, except twopenny, at times of uncommon festivity. He describes the breakfast of oatmeal, or peasmeal, eaten with milk; the pottage for dinner, composed of kale, leeks, and barley; the supper of sowens or flummery of oatmeal. "Some of them have potatoes; and you find parsnips in every peasant's garden. They are clothed with a coarse kind of russet of their own making, which is both decent and warm. They dwell in poor huts, built of loose stones and turf, without any mortar, having a fireplace or hearth in the middle, generally made of an old millstone, and a hole at top to let out the smoke. These people, however, are content, and wonderfully sagacious. All of them read the Bible." Out of this poor but acute stock came the poet

"who walked in glory and in joy,
Following his plough along the mountain-side."

To judge from his own verse he must have been as energetic in his labor as "his auld mare, Maggie;"

"Aft thee and I, in aught hours gaun,
In guid March weather,
Hae turn'd sax rood beside our han',
For days thegither."

Sax rood! This is one half more than was ploughed by the Suffolk "punches." We fear that the unprofitable land of Mossgiel had merely surface ploughing with the rude implement of poor Burns' time, as different from the Suffolk plough as the soil was different upon which the punches worked. The fields about Mauchline "are of a light sandy or mixed kind." *

The changes of Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire during eighty years are more remarkable in manufactures than in agriculture. Great have been the alterations in the industry of towns such as Glasgow and Paisley. But here, as throughout all Scotland, morasses have been drained, lochs have been made to bear corn, the domain of unproductive nature has been compelled to supply the necessities of man. There is a charming paper by John Wilson, entitled "Our Parish," in which the eloquent writer exhibits, in no placid mood, the ruthless invader of poetical wastes. A great part of our parish, the moor, was "ever so many miles long, and ever so many miles broad, and nobody thought of guessing how many miles round. But some twenty years ago it was absolutely measured to a rood by a land-louper of a land-surveyor—distributed, drained, inclosed, utterly ruined for ever. No, not for ever. Nature laughs to scorn Acts of Parliament, and we predict that in a quarter of a century she will resume her management of that moor. We rejoice to hear that she is already beginning to take lots of it into her own hands. Wheat has no business there, and should keep to the carses." The prophecy has no doubt failed. The dogma upon which it is built is obsolete—"Agriculture, like education, has its bounds." †

The north-western parts of Scotland are noticed by Smollett as "by no means fertile in corn. The ground is naturally barren and moorish. The peasants are poorly lodged, meagre in their looks, mean in their apparel, and remarkably dirty." The soil, in the district around Stirling, is described by him as "poorly cultivated, and almost altogether uninclosed." But on the margin of the Clyde, from Glasgow to Dunbarton, "groves and meadows and corn-fields interspersed," delight his eye. The banks of Loch Lomond "display a sweet variety of woodland, corn-field, and pasture." His own "Leven Water" was "pastoral and delightful" then, as it still remains. He goes to Inverary. In Argyleshire he sees "hardly any signs of cultivation, or even of population;" but "a margin of plain ground, spread along the sea-side, is well inhabited, and improved by the arts of husbandry." Of this vast Highland district it is now computed that more than three hundred thousand acres are cultivated. But eighty years ago, to speak of the cultivation of the Highlands would be to describe a region in which agriculture was despised; where the mountaineers chiefly confided in the spontaneous bounty of nature, which gave them fish in the streams, and fowl in the heather, and rare patches of pasture for a few black cattle. Smollett says that "the granaries of Scotland are the banks of the Tweed, the counties of East and Mid Lothian, the Carse of Gowrie, and some tracts in Aberdeenshire and Moray." The Carse of Gowrie maintains its ancient reputation as "the garden of Scotland." But other parts of Perthshire have witnessed great changes. The graziers of the lowland districts no longer quit their little farms to drive their cattle to shealings on the hills to graze during the summer, the men fishing and hunting while the women tend the cows and spin.* The Highlanders no longer come down to the cattle-markets at Crieff, and take unceremonious possession of the firesides and beds of the country people.† The tenantry of certain districts are no longer compelled, as one of the modes of feudal slavery, to grind their corn at the lord's mill and shoe their horses at the lord's forge. The whole system of cultivation in parts of Perthshire may be taken as a fair sample of the mode in which the cultivation of a large portion of Scotland was proceeding long after the middle of the last century. The farms lay in what was termed "runrig," consisting of "infield," upon which all the manure was laid, and "outfield," occasionally cropped, and then consigned to common pasture, if any feed could be got off it. There was no wheat, or artificial grass, or potatoes, or winter turnips. There were no separate farms; the cultivators lived in hamlets, upon the ancient principle of mutual protection. Tully Veolan exhibits a lively picture of such a hamlet—the garden where the gigantic kale was encircled by groves of nettles; the common field where the joint labor of the villagers cultivated alternate ridges and patches of rye, oats, barley, and peas; the miserable wigwam behind some favored cottage, where the wealthy might perhaps shelter a starved cow or sorely-galled horse; the stack of turf on one side the door, and the family dunghill on the other.‡ In such a village hand-labor did more than the plough; but when that cumbrous instrument was used, it barely scratched the soil, without turning it over. Sledges were employed instead of carts. It is unnecessary to point out the contrast of a period half a century later, especially in the more remote districts of the north of Scotland, in which the country has been made accessible by roads, water communication, and railways, and its cultivation has no longer to struggle with other impediments than those of soil and climate. The climate itself has been ameliorated by judicious planting. Johnson was abused for dwelling on the bareness of the country, Fife in particular, through which he passed in his "Journey." Boswell, in defending him, says, "Let any traveller observe how many trees, which deserve the name, he can see from Berwick to Aberdeen." There is now scarcely a parish in Fifeshire, described in the "New Statistical Account," in which there is not mention of extensive plantations, which, "instead of presenting to the eye a naked and barren landscape, enlivened with verdure our higher grounds." At Inverary there are noble trees, planted in 1746 by Archibald, Duke of Argyle; the plantations were extended in 1771; but within the last quarter of a century plantation has gone on at the rate of half a million of oak and fir trees in five years.§ In an interesting paper upon Moray it is truly said, with reference to cultivation, "The change which a single century has wrought in northern Scotland can hardly be exaggerated." ‖

The remarkable powers of observation possessed by Arthur Young are signally displayed in his "Tour in Ireland," made in the years 1776 to 1779. In 1779 Lord North saw the necessity of yielding to the national spirit which Grattan had evoked, and he carried three

* "New Statistical Account."
† "Recreations of Christopher North," vol. ii. p. 238.

* "New Statistical Account," vol. x. Perth, p. 556.
† Ibid., p. 270. ‡ "Waverley."
§ "New Statistical Account," vol. vii. Argyleshire, p. 14.
‖ "Westminster Review," vol. xiii. p. 91.

bills for the relief of the commerce of Ireland.* The tillage and grazing of that country had been long impeded by prohibitory laws, which prevented the importation of black cattle to England, and which discountenanced the woollen manufacture, and consequently discouraged the breeding of sheep. The monopolizing spirit of jobbery went so far in 1759 that a bill of the Irish parliament for restricting the importation into Ireland of damaged flour was thrown out in England, at the instigation of a miller of Chichester. The natural fertility of Ireland, and her consequent advantages in carrying her agriculture to perfection, are shown by Arthur Young to be very great—a fertility superior to that of England, taking acre for acre. But the capital and skill that had made England what it was, even eighty years ago, were wanting in Ireland. Among the greatest evils were the "middlemen." "The very idea," says Young, "as well as the practice, of permitting a tenant to relet at a profit rent, seems confined to the distant and unimproved parts of every empire." † It had entirely gone out in the highly cultivated counties of England; in Scotland it had continued to be very common. The class of Irish middlemen has been familiarized to us by the admirable pictures of Maria Edgeworth. Young describes them as screwing up the rent to the uttermost farthing, and relentless in the collection of it—the hardest drinkers in Ireland—masters of packs of wretched hounds, with which they wasted their time and their money. But whether the tenantry of Ireland were miserable cotters, or "the largest graziers and cow-keepers in the world," all were "the most errant slovens." In the arable counties the capital employed upon a given amount of land would not be a third of that of an English farmer; hence "their manuring is trivial, their tackle and implements wretched, their teams weak, their profits small." Wonderful as it may appear, the "barbarous custom" denounced by the statute of the 10th and 11th of Charles II., of ploughing, harrowing, drawing, and working with horses by the tail, was not exploded at Castlebar and other places. In the mountainous tracts Arthur Young saw instances of greater industry than in any other part of Ireland; for the little occupiers, who could obtain leases of a mountain-side, made exertions in improvement. The cotter system of labor resembled what had then recently prevailed in Scotland, and which was probably the same all over Europe before arts and commerce changed the face of it. "The recompense for labor is the means of living. In England these are dispensed in money, but in Ireland in land or commodities." The shrewd agricultural observer weighs the comparative advantages for the poor family, of payment in land, to produce potatoes and milk, or of a money payment. He seems to decide for the plentiful supply of food, although the mud hovel of one room may blind the family with its smoke, and the clothing be so ragged that a stranger is impressed with the idea of universal poverty. "The sparingness with which our English laborer eats his bread and cheese is well known. Mark the Irishman's potato-bowl placed on the floor, the whole family on their hams around it, devouring a quantity almost incredible; the beggar seating himself to it with a hearty welcome, the pig taking his share as readily as the wife, the cocks, hens, turkeys, geese, the cur, the cat—and all partaking of the same dish." ‡ We now know what was the terrible end of this rude abundance of one species of food, produced upon small holdings, of which, in 1847, 500,000 acres maintained 300,000 families; while in England one laborer was employed to about fifteen acres of arable land. The abuse of the right of property in land, which went on for more than half a century, in allowing the landlords to consume the whole produce of the soil *minus* the potatoes,§ resulted in that visitation which was regarded by the Society of Friends in Ireland as "a means permitted by an all-wise Providence to exhibit more strikingly the unsound state of our social condition." Arthur Young did not anticipate the frightful climax of the almost exclusive potato-cultivation. He saw a population under three millions. He could not anticipate what would be the result when that population was more than doubled, without an adequate improvement in the cultivation of the land and a more equal distribution of its produce among the great body of the miserable cultivators.

* *Ante*, vol. vi. p. 903.
† Young, "Tour in Ireland," vol. ii. p. 329.
‡ Ibid., p. 118.
§ John Mill, "Political Economy," vol. ii.

CHAPTER CLXXIX.

Revolution in the peaceful arts—Great captains of industry raised up in Britain—The Duke of Bridgewater and Brindley—Canals first constructed in England—The cotton manufacture—The fly-shuttle of Kay—Cotton-spinning machines—The spinning-jenny of Hargreaves—Cotton-spinning ceasing to be a domestic employment—Richard Arkwright—His water-frame spinning-machine—The first water spinning-mill—Samuel Crompton—His Hall-in-the-Wood wheel, known as the mule—General rush to engage in spinning cotton—Rapid increase of Lancashire towns—Dr. Cartwright—His power-loom—Dr. Roebuck—First furnace at Carron for smelting iron by pit-coal—Wedgewood—Potteries of Staffordshire—Commercial treaty with France—Watt—Progress of his improved steam-engine—Its final success.

In the last year of the reign of George the Second, and in a few years after the accession of George the Third, there was begun in this country an enormous revolution in the arts, for accomplishing which Providence raised up very special instruments. The great designs of superior beneficence may be as readily traced in the formation of minds which are destined to effect mighty changes in social organization by what may seem humble labors, as in the permission given to lawgivers and warriors to operate upon the destinies of nations by more direct exercises of power. The revolution in the peaceful arts in the middle of the eighteenth century in Britain, which was commenced and carried forward in various directions by a knot of men not greater in number than the mythical seven champions of Christendom, exhibited an unequalled series of bloodless triumphs over physical and moral obstacles, and produced immediate and still developing results which have raised this little band to the unquestioned honor of being the great captains and champions of modern industry. During less than half a century the labors of these men had increased the resources of their country to an extent which chiefly enabled it to sustain the pressure of the most tremendous war in which it ever was engaged; had bestowed upon a population increasing beyond all previous example abundant opportunities of profitable labor, and had opened new and unlimited fields of production for the multiplication and diffusion of the necessaries of life and of the comforts and refinements of civilization. While tracing the individual course of these remarkable contemporaries, we cannot fail to perceive what an intimate connection of apparently diverging purposes existed between each and all—how, while Brindley, Arkwright, Crompton, Cartwright, Roebuck, Wedgewood, and, greatest of all, Watt, each pursued his one absorbing object, there was a natural harmony in their labors—how no one attempt could have been carried to perfection without the aid of another effort, differing in degree but the same in kind.

In the old timbered manor-house of Worsley, about six or seven miles from Manchester, there were three men in 1758 daily occupied in discussing one of the boldest schemes of public improvement that had ever been devised by associated or private enterprise. One of these men was Francis Egerton, third Duke of Bridgewater. He was in his twenty-second year. Of weak health as a boy, his education had been neglected, but he had travelled, and had seen much of the unsatisfactory pleasures of the life of London, at a period somewhat notorious for the dissolute manners of the great. He had endured a matrimonial disappointment, and had retired to this one of his family estates to pursue a course of the strictest economy, and to devise plans for the improvement of his fortune by making his encumbered property more productive. The estate of Worsley contained a rich bed of coal, but it was comparatively valueless. Within an easy distance was the great town of Manchester and its suburbs, with a population of about 40,000, ready to welcome an additional supply of fuel for domestic and manufacturing uses. But Worsley and its neighborhood could not supply coal so cheaply by land carriage as the pits on the other side of the town. Liverpool also offered a vast market, if coal could be cheaply conveyed thither from Manchester; but the water carriage was twelve shillings per ton, and the land carriage was two pounds per ton. Could these difficulties be surmounted? Could a canal be constructed from Worsley to Manchester? Might the line not be extended to the Mersey? Such were the ideas that pressed upon the inquiring mind of the young nobleman in his self-enforced solitude. There was a neighboring canal in course of construction, which arose out of an act passed in 1755 for making the

Sankey Brook navigable, and finally a canal was opened in 1760, following the course of the stream. It was a work in which the country through which it passed presented few difficulties. But the Duke of Bridgewater had grander views. He would adopt a line which should render locks unnecessary—which should cross rivers and cut through hills, like the railway works of our own time. The duke had made two energetic men the confidential participators in his schemes. One was John Gilbert, a land agent, who had been engaged in mining speculations, and who was especially useful in raising money to carry on the projected operations. The other was James Brindley, a millwright—almost without the rudiments of education, and totally deficient in scientific training. This extraordinary man, the greatest civil engineer that had appeared in England before the present century—one whose constructive genius enabled him to overcome difficulties which appeared insuperable to other engineers of more technical pretensions—was twenty years older than his adventurous employer. He had effected some improvements in machinery, and had obtained a small provincial reputation. But when the professional men and the general public looked upon stupendous mounds of earth raised in deep valleys, and heard of an aqueduct to be carried over the Irwell, high enough for masted vessels to sail under it—when they inquired whence the supply of water was to be drawn to fill a canal of nine miles in length—they came to the conclusion that the duke and his engineer were equally mad, and that the project would end in total ruin. We have now become familiar with engineering difficulties far more vast, and can therefore scarcely forbear to smile at such forebodings. The aqueduct at Barton was opened in 1761. It has been said that when the moment arrived for admitting the water into this aqueduct, "Brindley's nerve was unequal to the interest of the crisis, that he ran away and hid himself, while Gilbert remained cool and collected to superintend the operation which was to confirm or confute the clamor with which the project had been assailed." *

The subterranean canals in the coal-works at Worsley were as remarkable as the canal itself and its branches. The open works, all of one level, extended thirty-eight miles; the tunnels were originally about a mile and a half in length, although they now extend forty-two miles, of which two thirds have gone out of use. When the works, above ground and under ground, were finished in 1762, they were described as "the greatest artificial curiosity in the world." † The immediate effect of the Duke of Bridgewater's first great undertaking was sufficiently demonstrative of the public value of canals. The price of coals in Manchester was reduced one half after its completion. The duke and his brother-in-law, the first Marquis of Stafford, were the chief promoters of the Grand Trunk Navigation, generally known as the Staffordshire Canal, and Brindley was the engineer. This work brought the iron and pottery districts into easy communication with the Mersey and the Trent. A letter dated from Burslem, in 1767, contains an interesting notice of the engineer: "Gentlemen come to view our eighth wonder of the world, the subterraneous navigation, which is cutting by the great Mr. Brindley, who handles rocks as easily as you would plum-pies, and makes the four elements subservient to his will. He is as plain a looking man as one of the boors of the Peak, or one of his own carters; but when he speaks all ears listen, and every mind is filled with wonder at the things he pronounces to be practicable." ‡ Brindley did not live to complete the Grand Trunk. But this, and concurrent undertakings which he designed or superintended, connected the Thames, the Humber, the Severn, and the Mersey, and united London, Liverpool, Bristol, and Hull, by water communication, passing through a district unsurpassed in natural resources and productive industry.

Fourteen years after the Duke of Bridgewater had established his claim to be called "the father of British inland navigation," the eventual success of these undertakings was regarded somewhat doubtfully: "Canals for carrying on inland navigation are new, and lately introduced, so as not to warrant great commendations; but the prospect is fair." Again: "What the actual advantages that will be derived from these canals, when finished, may be, time and experience only can determine." * In 1794 the extent of canal speculation produced the inevitable protest against "bold and precarious adventure." There were the same rivalries of competing lines as we have seen in railways, and the same losses and disappointments. Yet the grandeur of these works excited the admiration even of those who doubted their eventual profit. "At the beginning of this century it was thought a most arduous task to make a high road for carriages over the hills and moors which separate Yorkshire from Lancashire, and now they are pierced through by three navigable canals." †

The local historian of Manchester, who thus looks with a mixture of apprehension and of wonder at canal enterprise, says, "Nothing but highly flourishing manufactures can repay the vast expense of these designs." He adds, as if to enforce his doubts that when the plans under execution are finished, Manchester "will probably enjoy more various water communications than the most commercial town of the Low Countries has ever done." ‡ The principal cause of this sudden increase to the power of cheap carriage possessed by Manchester—a power greater than that which made the prosperity of Ghent and Bruges—was that within a quarter of a century it had become the metropolis of cotton—the centre of that manufacture which, from very small beginnings, had grown into proportions then deemed gigantic, however dwarf-like they may appear in comparison with its present development. The population, busy in the middle of the eighteenth century with "small things called Manchester ware," had passed away. § Wagons had driven out pack-horses for the conveyance of goods. Canals had come in great part to supersede wagons. But the Manchester merchant still sent out his "riders" with patterns in their saddle-bags, and the manufacturer did not disdain to mix with the humbler tradesman in a common public-house, to take his glass of punch, and hear the news of the town. There was such a house of great resort in the market-place, which had been kept by the same landlord for half a century: "It is not unworthy of remark, and to a stranger is very extraordinary, that merchants of the first fortunes quit the elegant drawing-room to sit in a small dark dungeon, for this house cannot with propriety be called by a better name; but such is the force of long-established custom." ‖

It is asserted, in a pamphlet published in 1788, that "not above twenty years before that time the whole cotton trade of Great Britain did not return £200,000 to the country for the raw materials, combined with the labor of the people." ¶ This calculation takes us back to the period at which was invented the hand-machine for spinning cotton, termed "a jenny." A previous invention in the process of weaving stimulated the mechanical attempts for increasing the quantity of yarn to be woven. About 1760 the cotton weavers began to use a simple but efficacious plan of throwing the shuttle, introduced by John Kay, of Bury, "which enabled the weaver to make twice as much cloth as he made before." This was called "the fly-shuttle." The greater speed attained in the weaving process "destroyed the arrangement which up to that time existed between the quantity of yarn spun and the weavers' demand for it." ** John Kay was subsequently "mobbed out of the country, and died in obscurity in a foreign land." This was probably in consequence of some further invention to supply the place of hand-labor in spinning wool, to which the fly-shuttle was originally applied. Dyer, in his poem of "The Fleece," published in 1757, having noticed the spinning-wheel, the distaff, and wheels, "double spoled, which yield to either hand a several line," says that "patient art,

> "Sagacious, has a spiral engine formed,
> Which, on an hundred spoles, an hundred threads,
> With one huge wheel, by lapse of water, twines." ††

The writer of a very able article on "Cotton-spinning machines" implies that this was supposed to be a spinning-machine, introduced into Yorkshire by John Kay. ‡‡ Robert Anderson, the editor of the valuable edition of "British Poets" published in 1795, appends this note to the passage in "The Fleece:" "Paul's engine for cotton and fine wool." Lewis Paul, in 1738, took out a patent for a machine "for the spinning of wool and cotton in a manner entirely

* "Quarterly Review," vol. lxxiii. p. 311—a delightful paper by the late Earl of Ellesmere.
† Kippis, "Biographia Britannica," art. Brindley.
‡ Ibid., p. 601.

* Campbell's "Political Survey," vol. ii. p. 261 and p. 265.
† Aikin's "Manchester," 1795, p. 137. ‡ Ibid., p. 137.
§ *Ante*, vol. iv. p. 609. ‖ Aikin, p. 189. ¶ Ibid., p. 178.
** "Life of Samuel Crompton," 2d edition, 1860, p. 20.
†† Book iii. ‡‡ "Quarterly Review," vol. cvii. p. 53.

new." Several attempts were made to work this machine, persons of some note being concerned in the speculation, among others, Edward Cave, the proprietor of "The Gentleman's Magazine." But Paul's machine, however ingenious, brought losses upon all concerned in it, and was finally abandoned. The demand for fine yarn still went on unsupplied, and it was increased by a growing market for fabrics in which it was endeavored to compete with Indian muslins. An extensive manufacture of fabrics composed wholly of cotton does not appear to have been contemplated a few years before this period. "Bombaya's wharfs," writes Dyer, "pile up

> "Wool-resembling cotton, shorn from trees,
> Not to the fleece unfriendly; whether mixed
> In warp or woof, or with the line of flax,
> Or softer silk's material." *

The demand increased more and more, and it pressed on invention to find modes of supply. In 1764 the Society of Arts voted fifty pounds to Mr. Harrison "for a masterly improvement in the spinning-wheel, by which a child may do double the business that even a grown person can with the common wheel." † At length a great practical change was achieved.

In 1767 James Hargreaves completed his "spinning-jenny." He was a weaver near Blackburn, and his wife and children were employed in spinning weft for him to work upon at his loom, the warp being supplied by the wholesale manufacturers who gave him employment. The spindle of the spinning-wheel was always horizontal. The spinster's machine in Hargreaves' cottage being accidentally overturned, it was observed that the wheel and the spindle continued to revolve. In the position of the wheel on its side, the spindle became perpendicular. The ingenious man caught the idea, and forthwith constructed a multiplying wheel, with eight rovings and eight upright spindles. He knew what would be the fate of a labor-saving inventor if he made his discovery public. He long worked in secret at his "jenny;" but such mysteries cannot be preserved. His jealous neighbors broke into his house, destroyed his invention, and compelled him to fly for his life to Nottingham. He there received assistance to enable him to take out a patent; but he had sold several of his machines before the date of his patent; the invention became common property; and the instrument, surreptitiously imitated, was soon found in every weaver's cottage in Lancashire. Thomas Highs, about the same period, invented a somewhat similar hand-machine. Samuel Crompton, the inventor of the "mule," which changed the whole course of cotton-spinning, when sixteen years of age, in 1769, was spinning upon one of Hargreaves' machines of eight spindles.‡

The time was fast approaching when the spinning of cotton would cease to be a domestic manufacture. The weaving would long continue under humble roofs; but machines, driven at first by water-power, would gradually banish the wheel and the jenny. The double occupation of weaver and small farmer was very common in Lancashire. This united business was conducted with small profit to the yeoman, who occupied a few acres, and worked at intervals at one loom. It was far from advantageous to the general interests of the country. Arthur Young described the North of Ireland as "a whole province peopled by weavers: it is they who cultivate, or rather beggar, the soil, as well as work the looms; agriculture is there in ruins. . . . The lands are infinitely subdivided; no weaver thinks of supporting himself by his loom; he has always a piece of potatoes, a piece of oats, a patch of flax, and grass or weeds for a cow." Young held the two occupations to be incompatible. "A weaver who works at a fine cloth can never take the plough or the spade in hand without injury to the web." § The Lancashire weavers had not driven out the farmers proper, as in the North of Ireland, but the same system was in partial operation in the whole cotton-working district. The father of Samuel Crompton was the occupier of a farm near Bolton; he and his family, "as was the custom at that time, employing their leisure hours in carding, spinning, and weaving." In 1758 he became the tenant of a portion of an old mansion, also near Bolton, called Hall-in-the-Wood. The father died soon after this removal. The widow continued the labors of the little farm, and devoted all her leisure, as before, to the spindle and the loom. * Bolton was then a place of very inconsiderable population. Their wants were so small that not more than one cow used to be killed in the town for a week's supply. To the weekly market London and Manchester traders resorted, to purchase the heavy fabrics for which Bolton was the chief mart. "The fustians, herring-bones, cross-overs, quiltings, dimities, and other goods, were carried to market by the small manufacturers (who were for the most part equally small farmers) in wallets balanced over one shoulder, while on the other arm there was often hung a basket of fresh butter." † There was one bustling man in Bolton, who must have been among the most active on the market-day—Richard Arkwright, the barber, who had come from Preston, his native place, and hung out his attractive invitation to the townsman and the visitor, of "a clean shave for a penny." But he had higher aspirations. He was a peruke-maker, and travelled about the country as a merchant in a peculiar line. An adroit man he must have been, and a pleasant; for at the statute fair he marked down the lass with the most attractive locks; and although he might not have played "with the tangles of Neæra's hair," he contrived to possess himself of the treasure for a pecuniary consideration, and bear it off to his wig-making shop in whatever new locality he chose to plant himself for a year or two. He saw many men, and acquired many valuable notions. He had a mechanical genius, and thoughts of "perpetual motion" sometimes engrossed his mind. At Warrington he became acquainted with John Kay, a clock-maker, the son of the fly-shuttle inventor; and the two set their ingenuity to work upon something likely to be more practicable and more profitable than "perpetual motion." Kay had been thinking of schemes for superseding the spinning-wheel, incited probably by having been employed by Thomas Highs in making the wheels and springs of his "jenny." Out of this communication of the ideas of Highs, who is alleged to have conceived the notion of spinning by rollers, was matured, by the ingenuity and perseverance of Arkwright, the invention which was very speedily to convert the region which Gray called "the deserts of Lancashire" into the busiest district of the world. Arkwright went to Preston, and having expended his last shilling in completing, however imperfectly, a machine of a new construction, it was exhibited, in 1768, in that town. In a lucky hour for Arkwright, murmurs and threats reached his ear. He hastily packed up his apparatus in the dread of mob-law, went to Nottingham, obtained two moneyed partners, of whom Jedediah Strutt was one, and took out his first patent in 1769.

We must suppose that by the previous operation of carding, the cotton wool has been so combed and prepared as to be formed into a long untwisted line of about the thickness of a man's finger. This line so formed (after it has been introduced into the spinning-machine) is called a roving, the old name in hand-spinning. In order to convert this roving into a thread, it is necessary that the fibres, which are for the most part curled up, and which lie in all directions, should be stretched out and laid lengthwise, side by side; that they should be pressed together, so as to give them a more compact form; and that they should be twisted, so as to unite them all firmly together. In the original manner of spinning by the distaff those operations were performed by the finger and thumb, and they were afterward effected with greater rapidity, but less perfectly, by means of the long wheel and spindle. For the same purpose, Arkwright employed two pairs of small rollers, the one pair being placed at a little distance in front of the other. The lower roller in each pair is furrowed or fluted lengthwise, and the upper one is covered with leather; so that, as they revolve in contact with each other, they take fast hold of the cotton which passes between them. Both pairs of rollers are turned by machinery, which is so contrived that the second pair shall turn round with much more swiftness than the first. Now, suppose that a roving is put between the first pair of rollers. The immediate effect is merely to press it together into a more compact form. But the roving has but just passed through the first pair of rollers, when it is received between the second pair; and as the rollers of the second pair revolve with greater velocity than those of the first, they draw the roving forward with greater rapidity than it is given out by the first pair. Consequently, the roving will

* Book iv. † "Annual Register," vol. vii. p. 66.
‡ Ure's "Cotton Manufacture," vol. i. book iii. chap. i.
§ "Tour in Ireland," vol. ii. p. 305.

* French, "Life of Crompton," chap. ii.
† Life of Crompton, chap. ii.

lengthened in passing from one pair to the other; and the fibres of which it is composed will be drawn out and laid lengthwise side by side. The increase of length will be exactly in proportion to the increased velocity of the second pair of rollers. Two or more rovings are generally united in this operation. Thus, suppose that two rovings are introduced together between the first pair of rollers, and that the second pair of rollers moves with twice the velocity of the first, the new roving thus formed by the union of the two will then be of exactly twice the length of either of the original ones It will therefore contain exactly the same quantity of cotton per yard. But its parts will be very differently arranged, and its fibres will be drawn out longitudinally, and will be thus much better fitted for forming a thread. This operation of doubling and drawing is repeated as often as is found necessary, and the requisite degree of twist is given by a machine similar to the spindle and fly of the common flax-wheel.

Such was the machine described in Arkwright's original patent of 1769. Those who look upon the operations of a cotton-factory of the present day may feel surprise that such complete machinery as now exists, with its wonderful results, should have grown out of so apparently simple and rude a machine as that claimed by Arkwright as his design. But the principle existed in that machine, out of which all the more elaborate contrivances of ninety years have proceeded. "The principle remains the same, namely, to enable rollers to do the work of human fingers, with much greater precision, and incomparably cheaper." * The machines of the small factory at Nottingham, which Arkwright was enabled to establish with his partners, were worked by horse-power. In 1771 a site was selected by them where water-power might be applied. In the beautiful valley of the Derwent, at Cromford, was erected the first water-spinning mill. Henceforward the machine was called the water-frame, and the yarn which it produced was called water-twist. But the great merit of Arkwright, however disputable his claim as an inventor, was as an organizer of the labor required in a cotton-factory. The mechanics who made his machines had to be formed; the workmen had to be trained to accommodate their irregular habits to automatic precision. All the difficulties that interpose between the completion of an invention and its commercial value had to be overcome; and but for the wondrous energy of Arkwright his career might have been as unsuccessful as that of Lewis Paul. "We find that so late as the year 1779, ten years after the date of his first patent, his enterprise was regarded by many as a doubtful novelty." † It was five years before any profit was realized at Cromford. But in the mean time Arkwright had, in 1775, taken out a second patent. His right to the inventions therein claimed was contested. His monopoly was invaded on every side. Actions at law were decided at one time in his favor; at another time the decisions of the courts were adverse. In October, 1779, a mill which he had erected in the neighborhood of Chorley was burned by a mob, who in a similar manner destroyed the cotton-spinning machines at Manchester, Wigan, Blackburn, Bolton, and Preston. The Lancashire weavers had been reasoned out of their opposition to the jenny, and it was generally adopted. They abstained from destroying the water-frame only through the terror of the sword and the halter. The combinations of rivals and the violence of mobs had no power to turn the courageous Arkwright from pursuing the career which had opened to his sanguine view. To the fullest measure of success which could be reached by indomitable industry and perseverance, he devoted himself without relaxation, even when enormous wealth was accumulating around him. As he rose into rank and importance, he felt the necessity of correcting the defects of his early education; and after his fiftieth year he applied two hours of each day, snatched from sleep, to improve himself in grammar, orthography, and writing.

The career of Samuel Crompton presents as striking a contrast to that of Richard Arkwright as the difference in the characters of the two men. The orphan boy of Hall-in-the-Wood was shy, sensitive, studious, a mathematician, a musician, an inventive artisan. Arkwright was pushing, callous, ignorant, unrefined, without originality in his ideas, but a most skilful appropriator. The bold man died worth half a million sterling, for he had self-confidence, tact, and knowledge of human character. The timid man was easily disheartened, shrinking from speculation, and easily deceived. He would have lived a poor weaver to the end of his days, unable, as he said of himself, "to contend with men of the world," had not parliament, in 1812, granted him a paltry compensation of 5000*l.* for the great invention which he "gave up to the country," as he said, but which he was really cheated into giving up by a host of selfish manufacturers, who made fortunes out of his simple trust. Crompton was spinning with Hargreaves' jenny four or five years after Arkwright had produced harder and finer yarn by his water-frame than the jenny could produce, whatever amount it had added to the quantity spun. Crompton saw what was wanting. With a few common tools, and a clasp-knife, he worked for five years before he perfected what was originally called the Hall-in-the-Wood wheel. "The great and important invention of Crompton was his spindle-carriage, and the principle of the thread having no strain upon it until it was completed. The carriage with the spindles could, by the movement of the hand and knee, recede just as the rollers delivered out the elongated thread in a soft state, so that it would allow of a considerable stretch before the thread had to encounter the stress of winding on the spindle." * This was "the corner-stone of the merits of his invention," which Crompton connected with the system of rollers, and thus added the second great and permanent principle of the machinery for cotton-spinning.

In 1779, when this machine was completed by the young weaver, the riots broke out by which Arkwright's mill at Chorley was destroyed. From the solitary room where Crompton had been so long working in secret he heard the shouts of a mob who were breaking to pieces a carding-engine in the adjoining hamlet of Folds. He was prepared for such an emergency. He had cut an opening in the ceiling of his room to the loft above, which aperture he had fitted with a trap-door. He hastily took his machine to pieces, and hoisted the parts into the dark hole, where they were concealed for many weeks. The riots were put down, and tranquillity was restored, but not till after the jennies had been destroyed for miles round Bolton. While working upon his invention Crompton had married. He took to wife a young woman of good family and education, but who, being left an orphan in reduced circumstances, maintained herself by spinning. The home of the young people was in a cottage attached to the Hall-in-the-Wood; and in a room of the old mansion they secretly worked on the now-perfected mule. No yarn comparable for fineness and firmness had ever been produced as that which Crompton carried to the Bolton market, obtaining a proportional price. People began to think that there was some mystery. Fingers could not produce such yarn, nor could the jenny. Manufacturers gathered round, some to buy, others to endeavor to penetrate the secret. They in vain tried to obtain admission to the old house. They climbed up to the windows to look in. The bewildered man soon saw that it would be impossible to keep his secret. In a manuscript which he left behind him, he says, of this anxious period, "During this time I married, and commenced spinner altogether. But a few months reduced me to the cruel necessity either of destroying my machine altogether or giving it up to the public. To destroy it I could not think of; to give up that for which I had labored so long was cruel. I had no patent, nor the means of purchasing one. In preference to destroying it I gave it to the public." Manufacturers had come about him with tempting promises, and had persuaded him to give up his secret, upon the condition, recited in a formal document, of subscribing sums to be affixed to the name of each "as a reward for his improvement in spinning." The whole sum they subscribed was 67*l.* 6*s.* 6*d.* The subscription paper is in existence. "The list is curiously interesting as containing among the half-guinea subscribers the names of many Bolton firms now of great wealth and eminence as mule-spinners, whose colossal fortunes may be said to have been based upon this singularly small investment." † In five years Crompton's "mule" was the machine chiefly employed for fine spinning, not only round Bolton, but in the manufacturing districts of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

The common piracies of Arkwright's water-frame, its more exten-

* "Knowledge is Power," by Charles Knight, p. 219.
† Ure, vol. i. p. 237.

* "Memoir of Crompton," by John Kennedy; quoted in Mr. French's "Life."
† French, "Life of Samuel Crompton," p. 72, from which interesting volume we derive the facts thus briefly related by us.

sive use when the patent expired in 1784, and the general appropriation of Crompton's mule, very soon changed the neighborhood of which Manchester was the centre, from a country of small farmers into a country of small manufacturers. Houses on the banks of streams whose currents would drive a wheel and shaft were greedily seized upon. Sheds were run up in similar situations. The clank of wheels and the buzz of spindles were heard in once solitary places upon the branches of the Irwell. The smaller streams that flowed from the barren hills into secluded valleys might be apostrophized in the lines of Ebenezer Elliott :

> "Beautiful rivers of the desert! ye
> Bring food for labor from the foodless waste."

Crompton's mules, worked by hand, "were erected in garrets or lofts ; and many a dilapidated barn or cow-house was patched up in the walls, repaired in the roof, and provided with windows, to serve as lodging-room for the new muslin wheels."* Amid this hurried system of expedients to obtain the gains of cotton-spinning, these small factories were supplied with the labor of children by a mode which excited the indignation of all right-thinking persons. Children of very tender age, collected from the London workhouses, and other abodes of the friendless, were transported to Manchester and the neighborhood as apprentices. These were often worked through the whole night ; had no regard paid to their cleanliness ; and received no instruction. Aikin, who records these grievances, adds that in many factories remedies had been adopted. It was forty years before the legislature effectually interfered to protect factory children.

A greater change than that produced by the water-frame and the mule was impending. The period was quickly approaching when the tall stalk would start up in the by-streets of quiet towns, and gather around its clouds of smoke a new population. Of Bolton, whose inhabitants had more than doubled from 1783 to 1789, it is recorded that "the want of water in this district is made up by the ingenious invention of the machines called mules."† The want of water would in a few years be made up by a far more manageable power. Bury had its "cotton manufacture, originally brought from Bolton," with "factories erected upon the rivers and many brooks within the parish."‡ Its population had increased in a larger proportion than that of Bolton ; but the increase would be far more rapid when the rivers and brooks were no longer essential for the movement of rollers and spindles. In 1794 some small steam-engines, made by Mr. Sherrard, a very ingenious and able engineer, had begun in Manchester to be "used in cotton-mills, and for every purpose of the water-wheel, where a stream is not to be got." This local manufacture of steam-engines was beginning to encounter a formidable rivalry : "Some few are also erected in this neighborhood by Messrs. Bolton and Watts, of Birmingham, who have far excelled all others in their improvement of the steam-engine."§ In this stage of his career, the name of the Glasgow mechanic whose statue is in Westminster Abbey appears not to have been sufficiently known to be spelled correctly by a writer of note. Dr. Aikin probably knew little of the achievements of the man who, "directing the force of an original genius, early exercised in philosophic research, to the improvement of the steam-engine, enlarged the resources of his country, increased the power of man, and rose to an eminent place among the illustrious followers of science and the real benefactors of the world."‖ The rotatory steam-engine of Watt was first applied to the textile manufactures of Lancashire in 1787, when one was erected at Warrington. It had been applied in Nottinghamshire in 1785.

In 1856, according to the report of the Factory Commissioners, the steam-engines employed in 5000 factories represented 161,000 horse-power, giving motion to the astounding number of 33,000,000 spindles. It is calculated, in the statistical account of the population of 1851, that in Great Britain "more than a million young women are *spinsters*"—the still recognized name for unmarried women. To produce the same amount of yarn spun in the old domestic way would probably require not only all the spinsters of our own country, and all the spinsters of our great Indian empire, where the Hindoo girl still produces the finest yarn from her primitive wheel, but all the spinsters of the habitable globe. The rate at which the spindles of a cotton-mill move so far exceeds the rate of the spinning-wheel that no smaller number, we may presume, could convert a thousand million pounds of raw cotton into yarn in one year, as is now done in Great Britain. But if the rate of speed were equal, and the object could be effected by the daily movement for ten hours of thirty-three millions of spindles, it would be necessary that every British spinster should have the power of giving activity to thirty-three wheels with one spindle each ; or that, having the advantage of the spinning-jenny with eight spindles, she should have the power of working four jennies at one and the same time. The contrast between the old spinning-wheel and the spinning-mill cannot be put in a stronger point of view.

Inventions connected with the more rapid processes of spinning were not long behind the jenny and the water-frame. Such was the cylindrical carding-engine. The natural progression of machinery in spinning, from the simplest domestic wheel to the complex mule, would, we may presume, have suggested that the same advance would be applicable to weaving ; that as the fly-shuttle had doubled the rate at which a hand-weaver could work, so some invention might double, or even supersede, the still tardy process of the hand-weaver. Such an invention did come, though in a very rude and imperfect state. Edmund Cartwright, a clergyman, bred at University College, Oxford—a poet and a critic—was at Matlock in 1784, when in a mixed company in which were some persons from Manchester the talk was about cotton—how the want of hands to weave would operate against the spinning-mills. Cartwright knew nothing of machines or manufactures ; he had never even seen a weaver at work ; but he said that if it came to a want of hands, Arkwright must invent a weaving-mill. The Manchester men maintained that such a notion was impracticable. Cartwright went home, and, turning his thoughts from weaving articles for the "Monthly Review," labored assiduously to produce a loom that would weave cloth without hands to throw the shuttle. His children remembered him as walking about as if in deep meditation, occasionally throwing his arms from side to side, and they were told that their father was thinking of the action of the shuttle.* He completed his machine, which, he says, required the strength of two powerful men to work at a slow rate, and whose springs were strong enough to have thrown a Congreve rocket. He took out a patent. Cartwright's power-loom, improved by the inventor by incessant exercises of ingenuity, came very slowly into use. A mill, the first erected for their employment on a large scale, was wilfully set on fire, and five hundred of the power-looms were destroyed. The patent expired, having been to the inventor a constant source of loss and anxiety. The invention, great as its results have been, was scarcely recognized in the last century. The power-loom was first brought into profitable use at Glasgow in 1801. But the ultimate advantage of the principle of automatic weaving was fully acknowledged ; and in 1807, upon a memorial of the principal cotton-spinners, parliament granted Dr. Cartwright 10,000*l.*, for "the good service he had rendered the public by his invention of weaving." There were only 2300 power-looms at work in Great Britain in 1813. In 1833 there were 100,000. At the present time they are as universal as spinning-machines—very different in their beautiful construction from Cartwright's invention, but the same in principle. The returns of the factory inspectors for 1856 show the employment of 369,205 power-looms, of which 298,847 were for weaving cotton. Such has been the progress of an idea casually impressed upon the active mind of a scholar, who was previously conscious of no aptitude for mechanical pursuits. His parliamentary reward did not repay his expenses in working out his scheme.

The history of the cotton manufacture, as of most other arts, abounds with examples of the struggles of inventors, if not against neglect and fraud, against the almost insuperable difficulties of carrying forward an invention to commercial success. Bentham has expressed a great truth in forcible words : "As the world advances, the snares, the traps, the pitfalls, which inexperience has found in the path of inventive industry, will be filled up by the fortunes and the

* French, p. 76.
§ Ibid., p. 177.
† Aikin, p. 262.
‖ Lord Brougham's epitaph on Watt.
‡ Ibid., p. 267.

* The late Mrs. Penrose, whose "History" is known as that of "Mrs. Markham," was a daughter of Dr. Cartwright.

minds of those who have fallen into them and been ruined. In this, as in every other career, the ages gone by have been the forlorn hope, which has received for those who followed them the blows of fortune."* Dr. John Roebuck, "who may be said to have originated the modern iron manufacture of Britain, though his merits as a great public benefactor have as yet received but slight recognition,"† was one of those who encountered the snares and pitfalls in the path of inexperience. We have shown what the iron manufacture was in 1740.‡ In 1774 we find it alleged that "there is no room to doubt, that in every one of the three kingdoms there may be enough iron found to supply all the British dominions, and yet we import very large quantities from the North, from Spain, and from America. The reason of this is because the inhabitants of these countries can make it cheaper." They had a great command of fuel for charcoal. "It is earnestly to be wished," says the writer, "that, as it hath been often proposed and promised, the use of pit-coal could be generally introduced, so as to answer in all respects as well as charcoal." He adds, "At this time, as I have been well informed, iron is wrought with pit-coal at the Carron Works in North Britain."§ The founder of these Carron Works, and the inventor of the economical processes which first gave cheap iron to our country, in many forms of utility, was Dr. John Roebuck.

The man who succeeded in proving, by the commercial results of his processes, that iron could be smelted by pit-coal, everywhere in abundance, instead of by charcoal from woods that were disappearing through the advance of agriculture, was a physician at Birmingham. He was a scientific chemist, as far as the science of chemistry was understood in the middle of the eighteenth century; and he was connected with a chemical manufactory, to which he devoted himself with the ardor of an experimentalist. By his improvements in the production of sulphuric acid (then called vitriolic acid), the use of which was even then extensive in manufactures, he reduced the price of that article to a fourth of its previous cost. He was one of those who led the way in those great chemical discoveries which have produced as wonderful changes in the productive power of the country as machinery has produced. Sulphuric acid, after Roebuck's time, partially did the work of bleaching that the sun and air were necessary to complete. But his attempts to connect bleaching processes with the vitriol works that he established at Preston Pans were not successful. Having abandoned his practice as a physician, and settled in Scotland, he turned his thoughts to smelting and manufacturing iron. At Carron, in the parish of Tarbert, in Stirlingshire, there were the great requisites for this manufacture. There was abundant coal, and ample command of water-power. Some iron-stone and lime were to be found within a mile; some was to be procured from places ten miles distant.‖ Workmen were brought from Birmingham and Sheffield; and on the banks of a river renowned in Scottish history was the famous foundry established, in 1759, which sent cheap grates into the homes of England, and cast the guns for Wellington's battery-train. To Dr. Roebuck has been assigned the honor of inventing the process of converting cast iron into malleable iron. But it is enough to give him an enduring name in the history of manufacturing industry that he first brought about that marriage between the neighbors coal and iron which time can never dissolve—that union which made iron "the soul of every other manufacture;" which, when the iron railing round St. Paul's was still pointed out as a great feat of charcoal-smelting, enabled a daring engineer, within fifteen years of the time when the first furnace was lighted at Carron, to throw a cast-iron bridge over the Severn of a hundred feet span; and which, during the lapse of a century, has covered our country with works that are among the noblest triumphs of a great era of the sciences and arts; compared with which structures the once famous Coalbrook Dale bridge appears a toy. Dr. Roebuck called Smeaton to his aid as an engineer, and he invited Watt to experiment upon the employment of his steam-engine in blowing the furnaces. He was at one time associated as a partner in the great career that was opening to Watt. But he became involved in other undertakings beyond his capital, and had the common fate of those who undertake mighty enterprises without an adequate command of the sinews of all enterprise, whether of war or of peace.

The historian who has brought so large a fund of good sense and liberality to his narrative of English affairs from the peace of Utrecht to the close of the American war, says that the year 1763 "was distinguished by an event of more real importance than the rise or the resignation of Lord Bute."* That year is considered memorable for the production of a new kind of earthenware, remarkable for fineness and durability. This ware was soon to remove the pewter dishes from their dingy rows in the tradesman's kitchen, and to supersede the wooden platter and the brown dish of the poor man's cottage. The artisan of Burslem, in Staffordshire, who brought about this change, was Josiah Wedgewood. We have already briefly indicated the condition of the Staffordshire potteries at the beginning of the eighteenth century.† Dr. Campbell, in 1774, makes this statement: "In the space of about sixty years, as I have been well informed, the produce of this ware hath risen from 5000*l.* to 100,000*l.* per annum. These are entered by the thousand pieces for exportation, which is annually about forty thousand."‡ In 1857 there were a hundred million pieces of British earthenware and porcelain exported to every European country (with the exception of France) and to America, the United States being by far the largest importers. It is to Josiah Wedgewood that the creation of this great manufacture and commerce is to be principally attributed. England had produced its Bow china, its Worcester china, and its Chelsea china, which was held to equal that of Dresden. But these elaborate tea-services and ornaments were for the luxurious. Palissy gave France the lead among industrious nations in her manufacture of expensive porcelain. But Wedgewood in his ware combined the imitation of the most beautiful forms of ancient art with unequalled cheapness. In his workshops we may trace the commencement of a system of improved design, which made his ware so superior to any other that had been produced in Europe for common uses. England, by the discovery of a contemporary of Wedgewood, Mr. Cooks worthy, of Plymouth, was found to possess, in the Cornish clay, a material equal to that of the Sèvres and Dresden manufactories. His patent was transferred to the Staffordshire potteries in 1777, and from that time we went steadily forward to the attainment of our present excellence in the production of porcelain, upon a scale commensurate with the general spread of the comforts and refinements of society.

The transference of power to Mr. Pitt, in 1784, and the firmness with which he was enabled to hold its possession, presented opportunities for wise endeavors to place the commerce of the kingdom upon a broader foundation. The first object attained was the removal, in 1785, of an odious system of restrictions and disabilities in the trade between Great Britain and Ireland. In the preliminary inquiries by a committee of the House of Commons some interesting details of manufactures were elicited. Mr. Wedgewood pointed out how greatly the industry of the potteries multiplied the industry of others besides that of the twenty thousand persons directly employed; the quantity of inland carriage it created; the labor it called forth in collieries, and in raising the raw material of earthenware; the employment of coasting vessels in the transport of this material from the Land's End to different parts of the coast; and the reconveyance of the finished goods to those ports "where they are shipped for every foreign market that is open to the earthenware of England." In 1787 the government carried through a bold measure of commercial freedom in a treaty of commerce and navigation with France, which opened new ports, not only to the earthenware of England, but to her woollens, her cottons, her hardware and cutlery, her manufactures of brass and copper. Previous to this treaty most of the staple p oductions of Britain had been prohibited for so long a period in France that the notion of exchange, under a system of moderate duties, had ceased to be contemplated by the merchants of either country. The political arguments by which this great measure was supported, and those by which it was opposed, will be noticed in a subsequent chapter. We introduce the subject here, because the debates in both houses of parliament supply some general views of the commercial policy of a period when, as we have seen, the industry of this country had received an extraordinary impulse from

* "Manual of Political Economy."
† "Quarterly Review," vol. civ. p. 78. ‡ *Ante*, vol. iv. p. 605.
§ Campbell, "Political Survey," vol. ii. p. 43.
‖ "New Statistical Account of Scotland—Stirlingshire," vol. viii. p. 373.

* Lord Mahon, "History of England," vol. v. p. 2.
† *Ante*, vol. iv. p. 606. ‡ "Political Survey," vol. ii. p. 18.

new inventions, and from increased energy in the long-established modes of production. The general argument for the treaty was put with great force by Mr. Pitt: "France was, by the peculiar dispensation of Providence, gifted, perhaps more than any other country, with what made life desirable, in point of soil, climate, and natural productions. It had the most fertile vineyards and the richest harvests; the greatest luxuries of man were produced in it with little cost, and with moderate labor. Britain was not thus blessed by nature; but on the contrary, it possessed, through the happy freedom of its constitution, and the equal security of its laws, an energy in its enterprises and a stability in its exertions, which had gradually raised it to a state of commercial grandeur. Not being so bountifully gifted by Heaven, it had recourse to labor and art by which it had acquired the ability of supplying its neighbor with all the necessary embellishments of life in exchange for her natural luxuries. Thus standing with regard to each other, a friendly connection seemed to be pointed out between them, instead of the state of unalterable enmity which was falsely said to be their true political feeling toward each other." * The principle laid down by Pitt has a permanent importance. The national and commercial jealousies by which the principle was assailed are simply curious, as an exhibition of plausible fallacies. Bishop Watson—one who had rendered good service to the arts of his country, by making chemistry popular in his amusing "Essays"—maintained that, as in the time of Charles II., the trade with France was held to be detrimental to our interests because it showed a balance against us "by which we lost a million a year," such a trade would not be lucrative and safe in the time of George III.: that is, because the British consumer of the seventeenth century had paid in money to the French producer a million a year above what the British producer received, "we lost a million a year," the satisfaction of the wants of the consumer being nothing in the account. All this dust, which, from time immemorial, had been thrown into the eyes of the nation, is now scattered to the winds. But the anxious prelate thought that if our home market, the richest market in Europe, was opened to France, her own industry and ingenuity would be dangerously stimulated. France, he said, was ambitious to rival us in its rising manufactures of cotton, cutlery, hardware, and pottery. If she were to cultivate manufactures in the same degree as we had done, our ruin would be inevitable. France, Dr. Watson maintained, had abundant pit-coal; was casting pig-iron; was making cutlery at Moulins cheaper and neater than that of Sheffield; and notwithstanding a recent law of England, prohibiting the exportation of tools and machines, France had got models of them, and would soon copy our tools, and not take our manufactures. The bishop proclaims, in his despair, that "every tool used at Sheffield, Birmingham, and Manchester, might be seen in a public building at Paris, where they were deposited for the inspection of their workmen." † Great manufactures are not created simply by possessing copies of another country's machinery. The French government obtained, in 1788, models of the cotton-spinning machines used in England; but while a peaceful intercourse enabled us to send France cotton fabrics she did not attempt to manufacture for herself. Cotton-mills were established in Normandy and at Orleans when the Continent was shut out by the war of the revolution from commercial exchange with England.‡ But there was a power possessed by our country that France and other continental nations did not possess, and had not capital and trained workmen to acquire by imitation; a power, of which it was said in 1819 that it had "fought the battles of Europe, and exalted and sustained, through the late tremendous contest, the political greatness of our land"—a power which, upon the return of peace, "enabled us to pay the interest of our debt, and to maintain the arduous struggle in which we were engaged with the skill and capital of countries less oppressed with taxation." § That great power was "our improved steam-engine."

In the year 1757, over the door of a staircase opening from the quadrangle of the college of Glasgow, was exhibited a board inscribed "James Watt, Mathematical-Instrument Maker to the University." In a room of small dimensions sat a young man in his twenty-first year, filing and polishing quadrants and sectors, to sell for his livelihood. He had come in his eighteenth year from his paternal home, at Greenock, where his father carried on the business of a ship-chandler, to endeavor to learn the art of a mathematical-instrument maker; but he could find no one in Glasgow capable of instructing him. By the advice of a kinsman of his mother, who was a professor in the Glasgow University, he went to London with the same object. For a year he worked with intense application in a shop in Finch Lane, Cornhill; but his health failing, he returned to Glasgow, having become a skilful mechanic, and possessing the far greater advantage of a sound mathematical education. He endeavored to establish a shop in that city. The Worshipful Company of Hammermen—in that spirit of exclusiveness which the lapse of a century has scarcely eradicated, where guilds and corporations have any remnant of antiquated privileges—resolved to prevent James Watt exercising his art.* He was, however, employed within the precincts of the university to repair some astronomical instruments; and several of the professors took the ingenious young man under their protection, and gave him a workshop within their walls. Here he soon attracted the notice and received the kind attentions of men whose names will be held ever in veneration—Adam Smith, Robert Simson, and Joseph Black. To these eminent philosophers even the members of the company of Hammermen would lowly bow; as they bowed to the magnates of Glasgow, the tobacco-lords, who walked in scarlet cloaks and bushy wigs apart at the Cross, and to any one of whom no tradesmen dared to speak till he caught the great man's eye, and was invited by him to come across the street and impart his humble requests.* Watt had an ardent friend in a college student, John Robison, about the same age with himself, who had also a genius for scientific pursuits. He has recounted that when he first went into Watt's little shop, and expected to see only a workman, he was surprised to find the quadrant-maker his superior in philosophy. But Robison left the university; went to sea as a midshipman; and was in the boat on the St. Lawrence with Wolfe on the morning on which the Heights of Abraham were scaled. The friends had conversed about steam-engines before Robison's departure. When the young man returned in 1763—having been employed by the admiralty to take charge of Harrison's chronometer on a voyage to Jamaica, to test its sufficiency for determining the longitude of a ship at sea—he found that his old companion in the college workshop had been making more rapid advances in scientific attainments than himself, and had been long engaged in trying experiments in the construction of a steam-engine upon principles different from that in common use. He had lighted upon the same principle as that now employed in a high-pressure engine. In that year of 1763 a small model of Newcomen's engine was put into the charge of Watt to repair. The imperfections of that invention, known as "the atmospheric engine," were evident to him; and he long labored unsuccessfully to discover how its defects could be remedied. The radical defect was that three times as much heat as was necessary for the action of the machine was lost. If one fourth of the heat could generate an equal amount of available steam, the saving of fuel alone would insure the adoption of an engine constructed to produce such an important economy. Newcomen's machine was used in draining mines, in raising water to turn water-wheels, and in blowing furnaces for iron-smelting. But its expense of working was enormous. Its construction was clumsy and imperfect. We may imagine Adam Smith telling Watt the story which he has so well told in the "Wealth of Nations," of the first fire-engine; in which "a boy was constantly employed to open and shut alternately the communication between the boiler and the cylinder, according as the piston either ascended or descended;" and how the boy, wanting to play, found out that "by tying a string from the handle of the valve which opened this communication to another part of the machine, the valve would open and shut without his assistance." † Improvements such as this had been accomplished by accidental observation. What improvements might not be effected by careful examination, grounded upon scientific knowledge. The experimental philosopher was still working in the dark, when he discovered that water converted into steam would heat about six times its own weight of water at 47° or 48° to

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxvi. col. 395.
† Ibid., vol. xxvi. col. 523, and col. 543.
‡ Say, "Cours d'Economie Politique," tome i. chap. xix.
§ Jeffrey, "Character of James Watt," 1819.

* "New Statistical Account—Lanarkshire," p. 232.
† "Wealth of Nations," book i. chap. i.

212°. He mentioned this fact to Dr. Black, who then explained to him his doctrine of latent heat, with which Watt had been previously unacquainted. He says of himself that "he stumbled upon one of the material facts by which that beautiful theory is supported." Among the principal features of scientific progress at this period, Sir John Herschel includes "the development of the doctrine of latent heat by Black, with its train of important consequences, including the scientific theory of the steam-engine." * The ceaseless preparatory labor of thought was now to produce its results. In a solitary walk Watt resolved the great problem upon which he had been so long intent. The necessity of working for his bread, while he eagerly desired to bring his ideas into a practical shape, was still forced upon him. But he saw his way. The invention was complete in his mind. To have a model constructed was a work of great difficulty. He had no capital to employ in engaging better workmen than the blacksmiths and tinmen of Glasgow. He struggled against these difficulties till he found a zealous and powerful ally in Dr. Roebuck. At length, in May, 1768, Watt had the happiness of congratulating his friend on the achievement of their mutual hopes: "I sincerely wish you joy of this successful result, and hope it will make you some return for the obligations I ever will remain under to you."

It was agreed that a patent should be taken out; and Watt repaired to London to accomplish this business. On his way thither, he had an interview at Birmingham with Matthew Boulton, who desired to join in the speculation. This eminent manufacturer, in every quality of sterling integrity, of generous feelings, of skill in organization, of prudent enterprise, was worthy of being the associate of a man of genius like Watt, who was timid, and sometimes desponding. Their partnership was unfortunately deferred till 1773, for Roebuck would not admit Boulton to a share of the patent, except upon terms to which the prosperous and ingenious proprietor of the works at Soho could not agree. Watt, meanwhile, had to maintain himself by the superintendence of several canals then in course of construction. The employment was disagreeable to him. He had no advantage from working his patent, for his partner, Roebuck, was engaged in too many losing undertakings to advance more capital. At length that partner, in whose misfortunes Watt deeply sympathized, agreed to sell his property in the patent to Boulton. In 1774 Watt went to Birmingham to superintend the construction of his machines; and he wrote to his father, "The fire-engine I have invented is now going, and answers much better than any other that has yet been made." There was very soon a change in the character of Boulton's manufactory. Dr. Johnson kept a Diary of a tour in Wales in 1774. On the 20th of September is this entry: "We went to Boulton's, who, with great civility, led us through his shops. I could not distinctly see his enginery—Twelve dozen of buttons for three shillings—Spoons struck at once." In 1776 Johnson and Boswell made an excursion to Oxford, and also saw Birmingham; of which Boswell has this record: "Mr. Hector was so good as to accompany me to see the great works of Mr. Boulton, at a place which he has called Soho, about two miles from Birmingham, which the very ingenious proprietor showed me himself to the best advantage. I wished Johnson had been with us; for it was a scene which I should have been glad to contemplate by his light. The vastness and the contrivance of some of the machinery would have matched his mighty mind. I shall never forget Mr. Boulton's expression to me—'I sell here, sir, what all the world desires to have—POWER!'" †

It is unnecessary, for our purpose, that we should pursue the history of the final establishment of the steam-engine of Watt to be the great operative power of the larger industries of Britain. It quickly superseded Newcomen's machines in draining the Cornish tin and copper mines. It multiplied cotton-mills in the towns of Lancashire and of Scotland, without reference to the previous necessity of choosing localities on the banks of the Irwell or the Derwent, the Tweed or the Clyde. It was blowing the iron-furnaces of Dudley, and hammering steel at Sheffield. It was forging anchors and impelling block-machinery at Portsmouth. Yet it was ten years before Boulton and Watt derived any profit from the discovery. They had to struggle, in the first instance, against the common prejudice which attaches to every new invention. All the business sagacity of Boulton was necessary to encourage its use by the most moderate price, or by stipulating only for a royalty upon the amount of fuel which it saved, charging nothing for the engine. The partners had to contend, in actions at law, against unscrupulous pirates. But parliament in 1775 had granted an extension of the patent, and the reward to the inventor and his admirable associate would come in time. They would be repaid, however tardily, by the pecuniary fruits of their skill and perseverance, before the invention was thrown open to the world. But even before that period what mighty effects had been produced upon British industry by this crowning triumph of an enterprising age! Without its aid the energy of the people had more than counterbalanced the waste of the national resources by an obstinate government in a foolish and unjust war. The steam-engine of the "Mathematical-Instrument Maker to the University of Glasgow" gave a new impulse to the same energy in another war against a gigantic military despotism, wielded by a man originally as humble as himself—a student of the military school of Brienne. Captain Sword and Captain Steam were to engage in a struggle not less arduous than that of "Captain Sword and Captain Pen." The one was to lay prosperous cities in ashes; the other was to build up new cities in desolate places. The one was to close the havens of ancient commerce; the other was to freight ships with products of such surpassing excellence and cheapness that no tyrannous edicts could exclude them from oppressed nations. The one was to derange every effort of continental industry; the other was to harmonize every form of British labor and invention, by lending to each an intensity and a concentration previously unknown. The one was to attempt the subjugation of the intellect of man to brute force; the other was to complete "the dominion of mind over the most refractory qualities of matter:" *

> "Engine of Watt! unrivall'd is thy sway.
> Compared with thine, what is the tyrant's power?
> His might destroys, while thine creates and saves,
> Thy triumphs live and grow, like fruit and flower,
> But his are writ in blood, and read on graves." *

CHAPTER CLXXX.

State of art in the reign of George II.—Inferiority of native artists—Formation of an English school of painting—Academies—First exhibition of works of English artists—Exhibition of sign-paintings—Foundation of the Royal Academy—Early exhibitions—Reynolds, Gainsborough, Wilson, and West—Engraving—Strange and Woollett—Mezzotint—MacArdell, etc.—Boydell and commerce in English engravings—Sculpture—Banks, Bacon, and Flaxman—Architecture—Sir William Chambers—Bridge-building.

A TRANSITION to the fine arts from agriculture and manufactures, from spinning-machines and cotton-mills, from iron-works and potteries, from canals and steam-engines, is not so abrupt as it may at first appear. In our immediate times, the intimate connection between the arts of design and those exercises of industry which have too exclusively been designated as the useful arts, has been distinctly recognized. It has been found, after a long experience, that taste is an essential element in the excellence of manufactures, and of their consequent commercial value. But this connection was perceived a century ago, when a society, now more flourishing than ever, founded by a drawing-master, proposed "to promote the arts, manufactures and commerce of this kingdom, by giving honorary or pecuniary rewards as may be best adapted to the case, for the communication to the society, and through the society to the public, of all such useful inventions, discoveries, and improvements as tend to that purpose." The Society of Arts gave medals to Mr. Curwen for agricultural improvements, and he stated that but for this stimulus he should never have been a farmer. The Society of Arts awarded premiums for improvements in dyeing and tanning, in spinning and weaving, in paper-making and lace-making, and may thus have somewhat excited the inventive power which superseded many of the old modes of hand-labor. The Society of Arts gave its modest grants of ten guineas to Banks and Flaxman, for their earliest efforts in sculpture; and probably without this encouragement these eminent ar-

---

* "Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy."

† It has been said that Boulton, upon being asked by George III. what he dealt in, replied, "What kings delight in—Power!" Boswell's story is more probable.

* Elliott, "Steam at Sheffield."

tists might never have been sculptors. The mutual dependence existing between the polite arts, as the arts of painting and sculpture were then termed, and the humbler industrial arts which form the foundations of the industrial fabric, was never more distinctly asserted than in the proceedings of this comprehensive association for the encouragement of seemingly diverging pursuits, but all of which tended to the same development of public prosperity.

In a former chapter we traced the history of art in England from the restoration to the reign of George II. At that time English art was in a very low state. Architecture had greatly declined from the position to which Wren had raised it. Painters and sculptors were numerous and well paid, but the high places of the professions were chiefly filled by Italians, Germans, Flemings, and Frenchmen. Even in portrait painting, the branch in which employment was most abundant, the English practitioners were content if they could produce a satisfactory likeness; while for everything but the head they trusted to the skill of "drapery painters," whose highest ambition it was so to complete the work that it might be recognized as in the style of Sir Godfrey Kneller. As a lively French writer said, "Englishmen make their portraits as they make their pins, each passes through several hands, one shapes the head, another the point; it takes as many painters to finish a full-length portrait as it does tradesmen to equip a *petit maître*." Whenever foreigners referred to the state of art in England it was with a sort of contemptuous pity. There is ample reward, it was said, for the foreign artist who shows even moderate skill, but nothing seems to evoke native talent; surely there must be something in the soil and climate inimical to artistic genius.* Even Englishmen shared the prejudice, or were too diffident of their own judgment to oppose in a matter of taste the acknowledged leaders of European opinion. Yet if there were no living English sculptor or historical painter of unquestioned eminence, the name of Hogarth might seem sufficient to have turned the edge of so dull a sarcasm. But Hogarth, however great he was admitted to be as a humorist, was scarcely recognized even by his countrymen as a painter. His fellow-painters regarded him as an interloper, and the fashionable critic pronounced him "rather a writer of comedy with the pencil than a painter." "As a painter," says Walpole complacently, "he has but slender merit.† Indeed, though Hogarth was the true founder of the English school of painting, his example had but little apparent influence upon his contemporaries or immediate successors, and it was no doubt in perfect good faith that Burke, in his eloquent eulogy on Reynolds—written seven-and-twenty years after Hogarth's death—affirmed, and affirmed without contradiction, that "Sir Joshua Reynolds was the first Englishman who added the praise of the elegant arts to the other glories of his country."

But however it might be in the days of George II., when his successor ascended the throne, it must have been evident to all but the most prejudiced that an English school of painting was in process of formation. Reynolds was already the acknowledged leader in portraiture, and Reynolds was an Englishman, and in no sense a disciple of Kneller; Wilson was strenuously asserting English superiority in landscape painting; and Gainsborough, though practising in a provincial town, was becoming known in the metropolis as a painter both of landscape and portrait, in a style at once thoroughly English and thoroughly original.

But what served most to give consistency to the labors of the artists, and to stimulate their efforts by bringing them distinctly before the public eye, was the foundation of the Royal Academy, with its great annual exhibition of works of art. The establishment of an academy of art had long been a cherished purpose with English artists. As early as 1711 a private academy for the study of art was instituted, with Sir Godfrey Kneller for its president; but after a time differences arose, and the members separated into two or three adverse parties. At the head of one of these (the English section) was Sir James Thornhill, who, in 1724, opened a new academy at his own house in the Piazza, Covent Garden, which continued till his death, in 1734. Hogarth, his son-in-law, having inherited "the apparatus of the academy," proposed to the other society, which held its meetings in Greyhound Court, by the Strand, and was presided over by Moser, the enamel painter, to unite into a single body, and to take a suitable room where thirty or forty persons might draw from the living model. "Attributing the failures of the previous academies," writes Hogarth, "to the leading members having assumed a superiority which their fellow-students could not brook, I proposed that every member should contribute an equal sum toward the support of the establishment, and have an equal right to vote on every question relative to its affairs. By these regulations the academy has now existed nearly thirty years, and is, for every useful purpose, equal to that in France, or any other."* This was the famous "Academy in St. Martin's Lane," so often referred to in the lives of English painters, and to which many of the best artists of this period were indebted for no small portion of their skill in drawing. But these academies, as well as others, like Shipley's and the Duke of Richmond's, were rather schools for drawing from the living model, or casts from the antique, than institutions such as we are accustomed to associate with the title of academies of art. Several efforts had been made, however, to establish societies of this more ambitious order. Before starting his own private school, Sir James Thornhill had submitted to Lord Halifax, for the royal consideration, the scheme of a royal academy, with apartments for professors, which he proposed to erect "at the upper end of the Mews"—and pretty nearly therefore on the site of the present Royal Academy—and which he estimated would only cost 3139*l.*†

A quarter of a century later the project was formally renewed, "with the consent, and indeed at the desire, both of artists and lovers of art," by Mr. Gwyn, an architect of reputation, and one of the original members of the Royal Academy. The French Academy was pointed out as the model, though it was added, if an "English Academy of painting, sculpture, and architecture" were to be erected, it would be desirable to consult the laws of all similar institutions in Europe.‡ In 1753 the members of the St. Martin's Lane Academy made an effort to raise their institution to the rank of a "Public academy for the improvement of painting, sculpture, and architecture." It was in opposition to this proposition that Hogarth addressed to Lord Bute the paper already quoted. Whether from internal opposition, or the apathy of the artists generally, the scheme fell to the ground; as did also a still more pretentious one for an academy to be incorporated by royal charter, put forth a couple of years later.§ Meantime the public interest in art was steadily gaining strength. The foundation, in 1734, of the Dilettanti Society, though its attention was directed chiefly to the arts of ancient Greece, had done something to foster the spirit of inquiry among the upper circles of society; and the Society of Arts had done still more to diffuse an interest in art among the middle classes. Failing in establishing an academy, it seems to have occurred to the artists that they might at least copy so much of the French plan as to set up a public exhibition of their works. Accordingly a committee was formed; the great body of artists were appealed to; the Society of Arts proffered

* Abbé du Bos, "Reflexions Critiques sur la Poësie et sur la Peinture," Par. 1755, vol. ii. 145-47. Le Blanc—"Lettres d'un Français," Par. 1745; and see the "Discours Préliminaire" to a 5th ed. of these Letters, Lyons, 1758; Rouquet—"L'Etat des Arts en Angleterre," Par. 1755. To the same effect were some remarks of Montesquieu, in his "Esprit des Lois," and of the Abbé Winckelmann. From the frequent references made to them by English writers on art for more than half a century, it is clear that these sarcasms were keenly felt by artists, and not without influence on patrons. Barry thought it necessary to write a formal answer to them in his "Inquiry into the real and imaginary obstructions to the acquisition of the arts in England," 8vo, 1775; and it was in order to refute them practically that he painted his series of pictures in the great room of the Society of Arts. (See the introduction to his "Account of a Series of Pictures," etc.) As late as 1791, the intelligent German, Wendeborn, notes that "it is rather singular that most of those who have excelled in the polite arts in England have been foreigners," and he adds, that though it is no longer exclusively so, among the artists are still many foreigners. Wendeborn, "View of England toward the close of the 18th century," vol. ii. p. 185.

† "Anecdotes of Painting," iv. 146, 160, ed. 1786.

* Paper by Hogarth in Nicholls' Hogarth, i. 293, and in supplement to Ireland's Hogarth; Walpole, "Anecdotes of Painting," v. 253; Edwards, "Anecdotes of Painting," introduction, etc.

† Walpole, iv. 46.

‡ "An Essay on Design: including Proposals for erecting a Public Academy," 8vo, 1749.

§ Edwards; Nicholls; Sir Robert Strange, "On the Rise of the Royal Academy," 8vo, 1775; "Plan of an Academy," etc., 4to, 1755.

the use of their room, and there, on the 21st of April, 1760, exactly a hundred years ago, was opened the first public exhibition in London of the works of living artists. The works exhibited were few in number, and the greater part of little worth; but the names of Reynolds and Wilson were among the painters; Roubiliac and Wilton among the sculptors; Woollett and Strange among the engravers, who contributed examples of their skill; and the public crowded in such numbers to the novel spectacle that it was resolved to repeat the experiment next year on a larger scale. The "great room," Spring Gardens, was accordingly hired, and there, in May, 1761, was held the exhibition which was really the progenitor of that which still, every returning May, attracts to itself alike the rank, the beauty, and the intelligence of the land. The admission was by catalogues, which, besides serving as guides to the exhibition, were adorned with a vignette by Wale, and a frontispiece and a tailpiece designed by Hogarth and engraved by Grignon—the one symbolizing the growth of the arts under the fostering care of Britannia and the benignant influence of the sovereign; the other ridiculing the miserable fate of the decayed "exoticks" which a connoisseur (typified by a monkey in court suit and ruffles), magnifying-glass in hand, is vainly watering. Thirteen thousand of these catalogues were sold at a shilling each—what would one be worth now?

"This exhibition," wrote Johnson to his friend Baretti,* "has filled the heads of the artists and the lovers of art. Surely life, if it be not long, is tedious, since we are forced to call in so many trifles to rid us of our time—that time which can never return." Next year, however, the sage, we may presume, took a less austere view of the matter, for the preface to the catalogue was clothed in his sonorous sentences.

But the great moralist was not alone in thinking that the artists were over-exuberant in their enthusiasm. Where the philosopher sighed, however, the wits laughed outright. London was startled by the announcement of a rival exhibition to be held "at the large room, at the upper end of Bow Street, Covent Garden," and which was to consist of "original paintings, busts, carved figures, etc., by the Society of Sign Painters," together with "such original designs as might be transmitted to them," the whole being "specimens of the native genius of the nation." The society was, of course, a myth. The burlesque originated with the famous Nonsense Club, its prime contriver being Bonnell Thornton, under whose superintendence it was really carried out in all its parts. The whim took. It was seen to be a harmless jest, and Hogarth himself, who had contributed some works to the Spring Gardens exhibition, readily lent assistance to the Bow Street parody, by giving a touch with his pencil where effect could be added by it: thus in the companion portraits of the Empress Maria Theresa and the King of Prussia, we are told that he changed the cast of their eyes so as to make them leer significantly at each other. Indeed the fun was altogether of this order. The apothecaries' sign of "The Three Gallipots" had for its companion "The Three Coffins." No. 16 in the catalogue was entitled "A Man," while the picture was nine tailors at work. In No. 37, "A Man loaded with Mischief," a fellow was painted carrying on his shoulders a woman, a magpie, and a monkey: a sign still occasionally to be seen on some of the low public-houses around London, and on one in Oxford Street. Some of the jokes were rather broader than would be tolerated now, and some of the journals were disposed to treat the matter seriously; but the laughers carried the day: the jest was enjoyed, and it was not spoiled by repetition.†

Only in London, and at such a time, could an exhibition of this kind have been possible. Although an act had been passed for the removal of such sign-boards as obstructed the public ways, almost every shop still had its sign, and every tradesman strove to render his board more attractive than his neighbor's, if not by beauty of design, by oddity of conception, or some sort of extravagance. A market for ready-made signs was kept in Harp Alley, Shoe Lane. But sometimes commissions for signs were given to painters of established reputation. Wale, for example, who was selected by his brother artists to draw the frontispiece for their exhibition catalogue, who was one of the first members, and subsequently professor of perspective and librarian of the Royal Academy, was not above painting signs; Penny and Catton, both among the first academicians, and the former the first professor of painting, with others of equal standing, at least occasionally employed their pencils in a similar manner. One of Wale's most famous signs was a portrait of Shakespeare, which hung across the road at the north-east corner of Little Russell Street, Drury Lane, and which, with its elaborate frame, is said to have cost five hundred pounds. This branch of art, however, outlived the exhibition but a very few years. A more stringent act was passed for their removal (11th Geo. III.), and sign-boards ceased to swing except over taverns.*

The members of the Spring Gardens Society obtained a charter of incorporation, and the exhibitions went on with increasing success. But the directors began to assume more authority than the other members were ready to allow. Differences ensued. The directors claimed the right of filling up all vacancies in their number. This the members refused to admit, and at a special meeting sixteen of the directors were ejected. The other eight shortly after resigned. They were all men of position and influence. West, one of their number, was the especial favorite of the king; Chambers was the royal architect; and they felt that if they could obtain the royal patronage they were strong enough to establish a new academy more comprehensive in purpose, but more exclusive in membership, than that they had just left. A draft of a constitution and laws was drawn up by Mr. (afterward Sir William) Chambers, with the assistance of West, Moser, and Cotes, and submitted to the king, who, entering with great zeal into the project, directed that the new institution should be called the Royal Academy, and placed under his immediate protection and patronage. By the "Instrument of Institution" the society was to consist of "forty academicians chosen from among the most able and respectable artists resident in Great Britain;" twenty associates from whom future academicians were to be selected; and six associate engravers. There is to be an annual exhibition of works of art, which is to be open to all artists to contribute works, subject to the approval of a committee of selection. Schools of painting and of drawing from the life and from casts are provided, which are to be open without charge to all students who have acquired proper rudimentary instruction, and who conform to the rules of the institution; and professors are annually to read courses of lectures on the principles of the arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture, and also on anatomy and perspective. Hogarth was dead; but had he been living he would not have joined the infant academy, "considering," as he wrote to Lord Bute, "the electing presidents, professors, etc., as a ridiculous imitation of the foolish parade of the French Academy." Reynolds held aloof from all the preliminary proceedings, and it was not until he was apprised that it was the wish of the king that he should be its first president, and that it was his majesty's intention on his installation into that office to confer upon him the honor of knighthood, that he consented to join the new society. The foundation of the Royal Academy dates from the 10th of December, 1768; its first exhibition was held at the auction room in Pall Mall in 1769. The list of the original members is a curious index to the state of art in England at that time. Of the thirty-three whose names are inserted in the first catalogue, eight or nine are foreigners; two are ladies; some are only known as designers and engravers; some were coach and sign-painters—most are mere names now: probably not more than half a dozen would be recognized except by the student of the literature of art.

Equally curious is it to compare the first thin, loosely printed catalogue of sixteen pages with one of the present day. Besides the thirty-three academicians, only seventeen non-members contribute. There are in all but 136 entries, and among these some are of engravings, and others of drawings in crayons and "stained drawings." No quotations enliven the dreary lists of "portraits," "flower-pieces," and "landskips;" but occasionally the descriptions are as curiously precise as though the painter supposed his picture would be carried for comparison to the very spot it was intended to represent. The fashionable landscape-painter, George Barret, one who was rich while Wilson starved, described his performances with the precision of a topographer. On the other hand Wilson has nothing appended to either of his three pictures but the single word a "Landskip." Rey-

* Boswell, under June, 1761.
† Chalmers' "Preface to the Connoisseur."

* Edwards, Introduction, and notice of Wale; Smith's "Anecdotes of Nollekens," etc.

nolds sent four pictures, all portraits, and all in classic guise, and Gainsborough had also four pictures. West contributed two compositions. Angelica Kauffman, R.A., had four classical subjects, and Mary Moser, R.A., two "flower pieces."

As soon as Somerset House, erected on the site of one of the royal palaces, was completed, the Royal Academy removed to a suite of rooms which the king had caused to be constructed in the new building expressly for their use, and there the annual exhibitions continued to be held till the academy was removed to the National Gallery. The first exhibition in Somerset House was held in 1780, and the progress from the opening exhibition eleven years earlier is very marked. While the academicians who exhibit remain in number the same, the non-academicians have increased to 183; the number of entries in the catalogue is 489, and the character of the works exhibited is evidently higher. Besides the names enumerated above, we now meet with some who are destined to sustain the reputation of the school in the succeeding generation: J. S. Copley, R.A., elect (the father of Lord Lyndhurst); Fuseli; de Loutherbourg; Zoffany; Stothard; Wyatt the architect; and the sculptors Banks, Bacon and Flaxman. At this time there was no limit to the number of works sent in, and we find Gainsborough on this occasion contributing six large landscapes and ten portraits, while in the next year Reynolds sent no fewer than one-and-twenty pictures, including his Dido, and the famous portraits of the Ladies Waldegrave for which Walpole (though not without grumbling) paid the artist a thousand guineas—being the largest sum up to that time ever paid to an English portrait-painter.

When the Royal Academy took possession of its apartments in Somerset House it stood alone as the visible exponent of British art. The Incorporated Society had persisted for some years in a vain struggle, but from the opening of the Royal Academy no new member joined its ranks; its exhibitions dwindled rapidly into insignificance; and it eventually succumbed before its too powerful rival. The humble Free Society, which had clung like a parasite to the Society of Arts, had also perished of inanition. The academy, though often assailed from without, and not always at peace within, has continued in an unbroken career of prosperity down to the present hour—unchanged in its constitution, and without increase in its members, though everything around it has changed, and the number of professional artists has increased fiftyfold since its foundation.*

Among the founders of the Royal Academy were indeed men of no common order; and the glory which they shed around it must have done much to insure its firm establishment. Reynolds, with whom the early years of the academy are most intimately associated, was a painter who at once raised English portraiture from sheer mindless mimicry to a level with that of the noblest days of art. Without attempting to rival the great masters in the higher walks of painting, he strove to compete with the worthiest in his own peculiar line. He has been condemned for not attempting loftier themes, but we may in these days be well content that he employed his pencil in handing down the portraits of the statesmen, soldiers, and writers, and of the matrons, maids, and children among whom he lived and moved, rather than in fabricating from the recipes and models of the painting-room eighteenth-century Phrynes, Venuses, and Epaminondases, or even apostles and madonnas. For not only was Reynolds the greatest colorist that England had ever seen, but her most intellectual portrait-painter, and she had men, women, and children well worthy the best pencil that could be found to hand down their features to posterity. But while Reynolds could do this, he wanted, for what are called the higher branches of art, alike sufficient technical training, power of studious application, historical insight, and poetic imagination. All that he aimed to do he did perfectly. His mastery over his materials is the more surprising the more his works are studied. His touch is always sure and firm, yet light as zephyr. His clearness of perception is almost perfect. To every part is given just the tone and touch and surface which most befits it. Where his colors have not lost their original hue, they glow with a sombre splendor, which, though borrowed neither from Flanders nor Venice, reminds the spectator of the greatest masters of both those countries. Then what fascination in his female forms and features, how charming his children, how manly his men! Reynolds lived always in easy intercourse with the most distinguished of his time, and something of the genial grace of such companionship is visible in his works. He did not copy a face with camera-like particularity, but he always gave what was most essential: his likenesses are not perhaps always the most faithful rendering of the man in his ordinary daily life, but they bring out his most intellectual and characteristic aspect. Burke was mistaken when he said that Reynolds was the first Englishman who added the praise of the elegant arts to the other glories of his country. But if he was not that, we cannot but regard him, when we reflect on the influence which he exerted alike by his pencil, his writings, and his character, as the true founder of the English school of painting.

Gainsborough had far less technical power than Reynolds, and in portraiture far less variety. But if he could not attain the elevation of Reynolds' Mrs. Siddons or Cornelia, he could more than equal Reynolds in depicting the lighter phases of female beauty. Those who saw Gainsborough's portraits in the wonderful collection brought together last year in the British Institution, or the exquisite specimens of his pencil in the great Manchester Exhibition, will be little likely to gainsay his powers as a painter of female portraits. But it is after all as a landscape painter, and the painter of those delightful "Cottage Doors," and similar homely rustic subjects which he painted with such unrivalled skill, that he ranks supreme. He was the first painter of the poetry of homely English scenery—the first who showed how the shallow ford, the village green, the leafy woodside, or shady river's bank might on canvas delight the eye and stir the memory and stimulate the fancy—and in his own way he has found no compeer and no successor.

By those whose tastes lead them to prefer what is called classic landscape, Wilson has always been placed above Gainsborough as a painter. But Wilson was less original and less native in style. Italian scenes with Phaëtons or Apollos in the clouds, and Niobes on the earth, will never come home to the common understanding. Wilson was neglected while alive; he has been perhaps over-praised since his death. Like Gainsborough, he was altogether a painter. But there was less spontaneousness in his constitution. Even his English scenes are painted on an Italian model. If he looked abroad on nature it was to consider how the scenery would "compose" into a picture. The men and women who walked about were to him but "figures." He was a great painter, but his greatness was conventional. Yet few landscape-painters of any country have had a finer eye for grandeur of form and largeness of effect, and if it be to Gainsborough that we can trace the love of simple unsophisticated English scenery, truth and freshness of color, and directness of imitation, which have ever since characterized English landscape-painting—the truest and noblest school of landscape that has yet been seen—it is to Wilson that we are indebted for its preservation in its early stages from vulgarity and commonplace.

Reynolds, Wilson, and Gainsborough were born within a few years of each other. The other painter whose name is most closely associated with them in these early days of English art, who succeeded Reynolds as president of the Royal Academy, and who must, we fear, be regarded as the founder of English historical painting, Benjamin West, was some years their junior. A native of Pennsylvania, then an English colony, he came to London at the age of five-and-twenty, and was introduced by Drummond, Archbishop of York, to George III., who, pleased with the simplicity of his Quaker manners and the grave religious character of his pictures and sketches, at once took the young American into his favor. West had

* The academy has had no historian: its origin and progress must be traced too often by the light of unfriendly pilots, amid all sorts of muddy banks and quicksands. The following are a few of the sources from which we have derived assistance: "Abstract of the Instrument of the Institution and Laws of the Royal Academy of Arts," 8vo, Lond. 1797; "Catalogues of the Royal Academy;" "The conduct of the Royal Academicians while members of the Incorporated Society of Artists of Great Britain, viz., from 1760 to their expulsion in 1769. With some part of their transactions since," 8vo, 1771, and Abstracts of Papers of Incorporated Society published in the "Literary Panorama," 1808; Galt's "Life of Benjamin West," vol. ii. chap. iv., where full particulars respecting the foundation of the academy are given on the authority of West himself, who conducted the negotiations with the king; the Lives of Sir Joshua Reynolds, by Malone, Northcote, and Cotton; Barry's Works; Pye on "Patronage of British Art;" "Reports (with evidence) of Committees of House of Commons," 1834 and 1836; Hogarth, Sir Robert Strange, Nicholls, Edwards, Cunningham, etc.

spent three years in Italy in the study of the old masters, and he had acquired a fatal facility of composition and execution. His pictures, when scriptural, were always illustrative of passages which stirred the sympathies of every person of religious feelings, and they were so painted that all could at once understand them; and his historical and classical subjects were hardly more recondite and were equally clear. The king saw in them pictures he could feel and comprehend. West received an unlimited commission, and as long as the king retained his faculties, West was duly paid his salary of 1000*l.* a year. The royal patronage would alone have insured the painter success, but the same qualities which delighted the king delighted a large section of his subjects also; and it was the popular belief that England possessed in West another Raffaelle. That belief has long passed away, and the reaction has been severe. West never rose above mediocrity, and mediocrity is as fatal to the painter as the poet. But worse painters have had a more enduring celebrity, and some pictures of West's ought to save him from oblivion. One of these is his celebrated "Death of General Wolfe," in which, in spite of the warnings of his friends, and it is said the united and semi-official protest of the president of the Royal Academy and the Archbishop of York,* West, instead of clothing the hero and his associates in the costumes of Greece or Rome, or that conventional "drapery" which painters were accustomed to substitute for the dress of any particular age or country, ventured on the daring innovation of making the actors wear the actual coats and cocked hats in which they fought. The picture was painted with unusual care, referred to an event which stirred every heart, and was treated in a manner which men of all conditions could appreciate. It had an immense success. The king was delighted; Reynolds was converted; but the painter's brother artists—hardest of all to satisfy—were not convinced. Barry undertook to show how the event should have been treated in the classic style. He painted the scene, and people were amazed at beholding Wolfe and his grenadiers braving the climate of Canada as well as the bayonets of Montcalm in a state of nudity. But if Barry outraged all "the proprieties," West, some thought, had not wholly resisted temptation. He had painted the dying general in the midst of his officers, who were grouped about him, not as they must have been under such circumstances, but plainly with a view to scenic effect, and he had brought into the foreground a naked Indian, though no such person was actually there. Penny, then professor of painting at the academy, undertook to depict the hero's death as it really occurred—almost alone and in the rear of the fight. But he too got entangled in conventionalisms, and was, moreover, incompetent to grapple with the theme, and West's triumph was complete. "The Death of Wolfe," we may say now, went but a little way toward settling the still unsettled question of the extent of license allowable to the painter of a familiar historical scene; but it at least put an end to the more outrageous anomalies previously tolerated, and the historical painter was thenceforth in this country understood to be to some extent amenable to the laws which govern the historical writer.

It had now become a favorite project to adorn our churches and public buildings with paintings after the fashion of those of the continent. It was decided to make the experiment on St. Paul's. The leading painters, with West and Reynolds at their head, offered at their own cost to cover the bare walls of the metropolitan cathedral with paintings of the leading events of Old and New Testament history, and the king and the Archbishop of Canterbury gave their cordial adhesion to the proposal. But the Bishop of London, whose veto was decisive, sternly refused his sanction, and the whole scheme fell to the ground—thereby, said the enthusiastic professors, throwing back historical painting in England for a century. That such willing service might not be lost, however, the Society of Arts (taking into account the profits derived by the exhibition of the pictures painted for the Foundling Hospital) invited the six painters designated by the Royal Academy to execute the paintings in St. Paul's, with four others, to paint around their great room ten large pictures from English history, for which they were to be remunerated by the proceeds of an exhibition of them when finished. The painters declined; but Barry, who had been burning to remove from English art the reproach cast upon it by Winckelmann and Du Bos, proffered to cover the entire room himself with a series of large allegorical paintings illustrative of human culture. The society accepted his offer, and though he had but sixteen shillings in his pocket, he commenced his mighty task, working at odd jobs for the booksellers by night to procure the sustenance necessary to carry on the work of the day. After laboring almost without intermission for nearly seven years, he brought his undertaking to a close. A work like this was almost heroic; and out of respect for the man who thus braved neglect and poverty that he might carry out worthily his patriotic enterprise, we would fain persuade ourselves that the work was not a failure. Happily for his own peace of mind, Barry himself never suspected that he missed his aim. In his celebrated letter to the Dilettanti Society, he speaks without stint of its "public interest, and ethical utility of subject; castigated purity of Grecian design, beauty, grace, vigorous effect, and execution." We read those words and turn with amazement from the pictures. But we look again and see ample evidence of genius, though of the genius that is near allied to madness. Few more efforts were made to achieve success in mural painting. It was reserved for our own day, and with another material, to show what English artists could effect in that branch of art. The frescoes of the new houses of parliament, and perhaps even more that in the great hall of Lincoln's Inn, have proved that if fitting opportunity offers, the skill will not be wanting to produce works worthy of the nation. But seeing what was in the eighteenth century regarded as the idea of historical painting—looking at the cold mediocrity of West and his followers on the one hand, and the unchecked extravagance of Barry and Fuseli on the other—it is a matter rather for rejoicing than regret that our churches and public places were not adorned with such illustrations of sacred and secular history as the painters of that day must have produced.

If we were attempting more than a few illustrations of the state of art, there are many other painters who would call for record. Romney, whose life is a romance, and who for a while divided the town with Reynolds, when Thurlow, like his sovereign, declared himself "of the Romney faction;" Fuseli, who imported into England the wildest extravagances of Germany;" Paul Sandby, by many regarded as the father of that essentially English art, water-color painting; Wright of Derby, and many another might afford matter for remark; to say nothing of those who succeeded them, and reflected for the most part more or less strongly their genius or their manner—Northcote, Opie, Copley, Stothard, and those others of equal fame who handed down the practice and the traditions of their elders to the painters of our own day.

Nor should those who by means of the art of engraving assisted in diffusing still more widely the works of the great artists who adorned this period be left unmentioned. Sir Robert Strange and William Woollett did for English line engraving all that Reynolds and his associates accomplished for painting. More they could not do in their own country; but beyond its limits they perhaps did more. English pictures, except in special instances, never found their way across the Channel; but the engravings of Strange and Woollett were eagerly purchased all over the continent. Both were men of rare genius. Strange confined his attention to historical engraving, and delighted in translating the works of the great masters of old. Woollett chiefly engraved landscapes, and especially those of British painters. Strange learned the art from Le Bas, one of the most distinguished French engravers of the day, and he cultivated his powers by diligent study in the great centres of Italian art. But while no engraver ever entered more into the spirit of the painters whose works he copied, his style was decidedly his own. Nearly all his plates were executed from drawings made by himself from the original pictures; and much as we may admire them when seen apart, it is only on examining such a collection of his engravings as that in the print room of the British Museum, where they fill three folio volumes, that his remarkable industry and fertility of resource, as well as his artistic feeling and the brilliancy of his technical skill, can be fairly appreciated. Woollett owed little to any instructor. His teacher was an obscure English engraver, and he never studied out of his native country. But he lived at a time when England was putting forth her strength in art, and he fully participated in the movement. Like our landscape painters, he refused to be bound by established practices. The effect he desired to produce he took what seemed the surest means of producing, without regard to its being

* See Galt's "Life of West."

the most regular. Etching, the graver, and the needle he freely used, as each seemed the most efficient for the purpose in view. The best of his plates consequently exhibit a union of force and delicacy scarcely to be found elsewhere in landscape engravings. His characterization of surface is nearly perfect. The landscapes of Woollett indeed gave a decided impulse to landscape engraving abroad as well as at home. He engraved the figure also with great ability, and his plate from West's "Death of Wolfe" is generally regarded as a masterpiece. But it is in his landscapes that his great originality and genius are shown, and Woollett is as justly considered the founder of the English school of landscape engraving as Strange is of that of historical engraving. Several other English line engravers, of very considerable skill, flourished during the same period, of whom it will be enough to name Major, who wrote himself engraver to the king; Basire, Byrne, Rooker, the able but unhappy Ryland, and the best of all our portrait engravers, William Sharp, who together created a school of line engravers which though not always adequately patronized, has continued with unabated powers to the present day.

In mezzotint engraving—a branch of engraving in which England has always maintained the lead—the first practitioner was James MacArdell, who did for the portraits of Reynolds at least all that his predecessor, John Smith, performed for those of Kneller. With MacArdell, or immediately succeeding him, practised Fisher, Valentine Green, Raphael Smith, W. Dickinson, Earlom, and the Watsons, James, Thomas, and Caroline; while Paul Sandby showed the capabilities of the infant art of aquatinta engraving. Along with the admirable native engravers, several distinguished foreigners found ample employment. Of these the chief were Bartolozzi, best known by the "chalk" engravings after his own designs, and the drawings of the great masters; Vivares, unrivalled for the freedom of his foliage, and the graceful ease with which he rendered the landscapes of Lorraine, Poussin, and Gainsborough; Grignon, who seems to have been equally expert in every class of subjects and in every style; and Gravelot, now recollected only by his book-plates.

English engravings had indeed become an important branch of commerce. If we may credit the statement made in the House of Lords by Lord Suffolk in his speech on Boydell's "Lottery Bill," "the revenue coming into this country from this source at one time exceeded 200,000*l.* per annum." Boydell was the principal agent in promoting this traffic. Himself an engraver, though of but small talent, he was led by observing the success of Hogarth's plates to speculate on the possibility of establishing a print-selling business on an extended scale. He tried and succeeded, and with every fresh success his boldness increased, until he was able to assert that he had laid out "above 350,000*l.* in promoting the fine arts in this country." * On the plates issued by him he employed engravers of the highest standing; and he set the example of publishing illustrated books of a more splendid character than had previously been issued by any English publisher. By his fellow-citizens he was elected alderman, and then lord mayor, but his highest ambition was to produce an edition of Shakespeare which should in its illustrations be the most perfect which the arts of the country could produce. To effect this he invited the principal painters of the day to paint finished oil pictures of incidents selected from the various plays; and to contain the pictures so produced he built a spacious suite of rooms in Pall Mall, which he designated the Shakespeare Gallery, but which is now the Gallery of the British Institution. The engravings as published formed a magnificent work in nine folio volumes. The pictures, with the gallery which contained them, Boydell intended to have bequeathed to the nation; but commercial losses arising out of the French Revolution compelled him to sell them, and he obtained the sanction of parliament for disposing of them by lottery. Boydell was of course not alone in his enterprise. His success stimulated other publishers, and some of them produced works scarcely less important than his own.

In the early years of the reign of George III. there was only one English sculptor of any reputation, and his celebrity arose rather from the paucity of competition than from his own ability. Into what strange defiances of common-sense the lack of imagination will lead artists who are poetic by rule, the monuments of Joseph Wilton which disfigure our metropolitan cathedrals will be sufficient to convince any one who will take the trouble to examine them. Banks (1735–1805), some thirteen years the junior of Wilton, was our first great English sculptor. He loved to work on classic themes, and Reynolds said that he had the mind of an ancient Greek. But his poetic subjects brought him only the poet's fare, and like most of his craft who find portraiture irksome he had to turn for profit to the sculpture of monuments. His real strength, however, lay in his poetic conception; his monumental groups are for the most part of inferior value—the exceptions being when there was something to call for simple poetic treatment, as in the exquisite monument to a child, Penelope Boothby, in Ashborne Church, a work which, when in the exhibition room at Somerset House, by its gentle pathos moved to tears the crowd that daily surrounded it. John Bacon (1740–1799) was a more popular, and in a pecuniary point of view far more successful sculptor than Banks; but in all the higher qualities of his art greatly his inferior. To his chisel we owe a very large proportion of the public monuments erected in the latter part of the last century.

Later in date than the sculptors just noticed, came one greater than either. Had his powers of execution been equal to his conception, John Flaxman would have been one of the very greatest sculptors of modern times. As it is, in chastened affluence of imagination, purity and grace, he has hardly a superior. His was a fancy which could soar into the highest heaven of invention, yet stoop without discredit to the humblest task-work. Some of his grander productions, like the Archangel Michael and Satan (at Petworth), are the glory of the English school of sculpture; his designs from Homer (and there are others scarcely less noble or beautiful) have won the admiration of the best critics throughout Europe; yet he was ready to model a porcelain cup or plate for Wedgewood, and in doing so never failed to produce one that an ancient Greek would have beheld with delight. Along with our three famous countrymen lived and labored a Dutchman, if not more famous than they, far more the favorite of fortune. This was Joseph Nollekens, a carver of Grecian deities, the best of which is renowned as the "long-sided Venus." But if he missed the ideal, he never missed sober every-day reality. He was in portrait-sculpture what Reynolds was in portrait-painting, and he prospered accordingly. He died at a ripe old age, worth 200,000*l.*—which is a fair measure of his ability.

We have traced * the progress of architecture from Wren down to Kent and Burlington. From the era of churches and mansions we have arrived at that of public and commercial buildings. Sir Robert Taylor was the leading architect when George III. ascended the throne. He was a man of taste and industry, but not of much original power: the wings he added to the bank, an adaptation of a design by Bramante, were much admired at the time, but were ruthlessly swept away by his successor as bank architect, Sir John Soane. Contemporary with Taylor was Dance, the architect of the Mansion House and of Newgate—the latter a work of most prison-like character. The Woods (father and son), of Bath, and the brothers Adam, of Edinburgh and London, call for honorable notice for their efforts to raise the character of our street architecture. Bath, "that beautiful city which charms even eyes familiar with the masterpieces of Bramante and Palladio," † may be said to have been created by the Woods; the taste of Robert and James Adam is fairly shown in the Adelphi—though they erected a large number of other buildings. But the greatest architect of the time was Sir William Chambers, whose fame—his Chinese fantasies being forgotten—now rests secure, on his one grand work, Somerset House—by far the noblest English building of its time, and, with all its faults, still one of the noblest buildings in the capital. Unfortunately it was never completed on its original plan; and the erection of King's College in an anomalous style—itself about to be rendered still more anomalous by the perversion of the semi-Greek chapel into semi-Gothic—will forever prevent the completion of its eastern side, a misfortune reudered the more obvious by Mr. Pennethorne's recent admirable completion of the western portion. Somerset House was the last crowning triumph of the Italian style, introduced by Inigo Jones, and carried on with very unequal success by succeeding architects. The investigations of two painters, James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, as made known in their "Antiquities of Athens" (1762–94), by calling the attention of professional men and the public to the architecture of

* Petition to House of Commons, "Annual Register," vol. xlvi.

* Vol. v. chap. cxlvi.

† Macaulay.

ancient Greece, effected an entire change in the received notions of architectural beauty. It was of course some time before the change became apparent in our public edifices, but, from the publication of the "Antiquities" there was a constantly growing approximation to Greek forms, however much the Greek spirit might be absent, until in our own day it culminated in the works of Sir Robert Smirke, and was followed by the inevitable reaction. Stuart himself, after the publication of the first volume of his great work, adopted the profession of an architect, and found considerable employment: his best known building is the Chapel of Greenwich Hospital—an elegant structure, but alone sufficient to show that he was by no means a purist in the application of Greek principles. Revett also practised as an architect, but without any marked success. It remains only to notice James Wyatt, who suddenly became famous by the erection of the Pantheon, Oxford Street (1772), and during the rest of the century secured a large share of public favor. His ambition in the first instance was to produce an Italianized Greek style; but later he unhappily turned his attention to Gothic, and to him is due the destruction of much, and the disfigurement of more, of the most precious of our mediæval remains. His tasteless additions are now for the most part removed, or in process of removal, but the injury to the originals is irreparable.

We ought not, however, to quit this part of our subject without mentioning the names of two or three architects to whom we owe some bridges of great value and beauty, though unfortunately in the chief instances deficient in the essential quality of stability. Of these architects—for bridge-building was not then considered a branch of engineering—the earliest was Labelye, a Swiss, builder of Westminster Bridge, opened in 1750, and now in process of replacement by a less picturesque but far more convenient, and we may hope more lasting structure. Blackfriars Bridge (opened in 1760), a more elegant but not more stable edifice than Labelye's, was the work of Richard Mylne. A competitor with Mylne for the erection of this bridge was John Gwyn, whose proposals for a Royal Academy we have mentioned. Gwyn had studied the subject of bridges and public ways closely, and was a man of remarkably clear insight. In his "London and Westminster Improved" (1766, to which Johnson wrote the "noble dedication," as Boswell terms it), Gwyn not only urged the necessity of replacing old London Bridge by a new one, carrying another bridge across the Thames near the site where Waterloo Bridge now stands, and removing Smithfield and Fleet Markets; but in maps, as well as in the text, clearly pointed out most of the new lines of thoroughfare and principal improvements which have been since effected in the metropolis, and others which yet remain unaccomplished. Gwyn was the builder of the well-known Magdalen Bridge, Oxford, and of the handsome but inconveniently steep English bridge at Shrewsbury.

CHAPTER CLXXXI.

Manners as depicted in the literature of the period—Changes in the commerce of literature—Samuel Johnson the link between two periods—Literature of George the Second's time—The novelists—Richardson—Fielding—Smollett—Sterne—Goldsmith—Literature of the first quarter of a century of the reign of George the Third—Manners—Stage-coaches—Highwaymen—The post—Inns—Public refreshment places of London—Ranelagh—Vauxhall—The Pantheon—The theatre—Garrick—Bath—Gaming tables.

On a rainy day, somewhere about the year 1780, a man of advanced age stood bareheaded in the market of Uttoxeter, making strange contortions of visage while he remained for an hour in front of a particular stall. It was Dr. Samuel Johnson, who had gone from Lichfield to this small market-town, to subject himself to the penance of rough weather and mocking bystanders, for expiation of an act of filial disobedience which he had committed fifty years before. His father was a bookseller at Lichfield, who died in 1731—a man who knew something more of books than their titles; a proud man struggling to conceal his poverty. He had a shop with a good stock of the solid folios and quartos of the age of Anne and George I. "He propagates learning all over this diocese," said a chaplain in 1716. His manner of trade was nevertheless somewhat different from that of the bookseller of a cathedral town in the next century. He carried some of his most vendible stock to markets around Lichfield. "At that time booksellers' shops in the provincial towns of England were very rare, so that there was not one even in Birmingham, in which town old Mr. Johnson used to open a shop every market-day."* The old man, being on a sick-bed, had requested his son Samuel to attend the book-stall at Uttoxeter. The young student had come home from Oxford too poor to complete his academical career. "My pride prevented me from doing my duty, and I gave my father a refusal," said the literary veteran, whose pride, during the fifty years that had elapsed between the committal of the fault and its singular atonement, had sustained many a grievous trial and sore indignity. As Johnson was enduring his hour of penance, we may well believe that thoughts of the great changes that he had witnessed in the commerce of literature would come into his mind. He had seen his father's book-stall at Birmingham succeeded by the circulating library which William Hutton established there in 1751. When he was a lad of sixteen, idling, as some thought, in the desultory reading offered to him in his father's shop, he might have learned from a pamphlet of that time that there were only twenty-eight "printing-houses in all the corporation towns of England," seven towns having two printers each, and fourteen towns only one each.† Half a century later the desire for news had called forth a printing-house in every considerable town, to provide its own "Postman," or "Mercury," or "Gazette," or "Courant," or "Chronicle," or "Times," or "Advertiser." In 1782 there were in England fifty provincial journals.‡ In the year that Johnson's father died, 1731, Cave issued his "Gentleman's Magazine." The "London Magazine" immediately followed. The rapid extension of a class of readers somewhat distinct from "the learned" produced "the golden age of magazines, when their pages were filled with voluntary contributions from men who never aimed at dazzling the public, but came each with his scrap of information, or his humble question, or his hard problem, or his attempt at verse."§ Johnson was to nurse the infant into manhood, with food more substantial than this spoon-meat. If the printer of St. John's Gate had no other claim to the respect of coming generations, it would have been praise enough that he was the first who gave the hard-earned bread of literature to Samuel Johnson, as a regular coadjutor in his magazine, "by which," says Boswell, "he probably obtained a tolerable livelihood." That form of popular literature which Cave originated was followed up, some twenty years later, by the more ambitious "Review." The "Monthly Review" was the parent of "The Critical," "The London," and other reviews, that addressed a great mixed class of readers. "The History of the Works of the Learned" might have higher aims, but it was not calculated for a large and enduring success. The monthly magazines and reviews called into existence a new race of authors. The division of large books into weekly or monthly numbers, so as to suit a more extended market, was another of the many indications of the growth of a different race of book-buyers than the purchasers of costly works.

Johnson came to London, a literary adventurer, in 1737. He was long destined to bear the poverty, and to encounter the supposed degradation, that surrounded the author who wrote for subsistence—the successor of the author who wrote for preferment. Coming at a period when the circle of readers was rapidly and steadily enlarging, he was rescued from the slavery of waiting in a lord's antechamber for five guineas for a dedication, to pass through the scarcely less painful dependence upon the capricious or mercenary publisher for a guinea for an article. But from this second stage of the author's misery relief was sure to come in time. Johnson swallowing the scraps from Cave's table, hidden behind a screen to conceal his ragged clothes—Johnson wandering about the streets, hungry and houseless, with Savage; or collecting a few shillings, when his acquaintances were few and as poor as himself, to redeem the clothes of Boyse from the pawnbroker—and Johnson the acknowledged head of the Literary Club of which Burke and Reynolds were members—are indications of social changes that were of more importance than the vicissitudes in the life of the individual. In many re-

* Boswell's "Life of Johnson," chap. i.
† See Nicholls' "Literary Anecdotes," vol. i. p. 288.
‡ Andrews' "History of Journalism," p. 274.
§ Southey, "The Doctor," chap. cxii.

spects Johnson may be regarded as the representative man of the literature of half a century—the magazine-writer, the essayist, the critic, the poet, the philologist—the chapman, with many articles of use or ornament in a crowded market. But, in a point of view not altogether fanciful, Johnson was something higher than a representative—he was a king. Of his death, in 1784, it has been said, "It was not only the end of a reign, but the end of kingship altogether, in our literary system. For King Samuel has had no successor; nobody since his day, and that of his contemporary Voltaire, has sat on a throne of literature, either in England or in France."* More fortunate than most sovereigns, King Samuel, from the time when he began really to reign instead of fighting his way to the royal chair, had an annalist who has not damaged the character of the potentate by a minute record of the frailties and prejudices of the man. Johnson has indeed an interest apart from that of being the hero of the most amusing book in any language, from his position as the chief connecting link between the literature of two periods which appear, at the first glance, to be very widely separated. In 1738 Johnson published anonymously his poem of "London;" and Pope is reported to have said, "The author, whoever he is, will not be long concealed." In 1783 Johnson "read with great delight" Crabbe's poem of "The Village," and suggested alterations in some of the lines. The association with Pope carries us back to the time of Anne. The association with Crabbe leads us onward to the time of William IV. But Johnson, isolated from the literature that preceded him and the literature that followed him, is the faithful mirror of the literature of his own age In social intercourse with him, we see a large number of the most distinguished of his brethren. In his estimates of their value, and of others his contemporaries—estimates often prejudiced to the extent of absurdity, but even in their prejudices reflecting the opinions of his day—we obtain a broader general view of the literature of a very remarkable period of transition than from any other source. Johnson, as preserved to us by Boswell, is the universal commentator. In his admiration or in his contempt, we collect who were the writers filling the largest space in the estimation of the public they addressed. We may trace them, like himself, obtaining almost an absolute command over the national thought, by lighting up the obs ,cure places of knowledgeand by bringing the remote places into easy communication.

The precise period at which Johnson launched his little bark upon the wide ocean of literature would appear, in many respects, as one offering small encouragement to a man possessing high genius, even if combined with the rarer faculty of turning his learning and abilities to account. The government of Sir Robert Walpole would bestow wages upon needy hacks, without much regard to the quality of the work that was to be done for the hire. To shower lucrative places upon Walpole's scribbling eulogists and defenders would have been to take the bread out of the mouths of the other hungry tribe who required sinecures as the payment for their votes. When Johnson came to London he found the authors up in arms against that partial interference with "the precarious dependence" of the wits which Walpole had accomplished by placing the stage under the control of a licenser.† Yet if, by the effect of this law, the lord chamberlain was to be the chief supervisor, who would not suffer one species of wit to be retailed without a permit, the restrictions upon the theatre had no influence upon the speedy and luxuriant growth of many other forms of intellectual production, adapted, like that of the stage, for a general diffusion among all classes of society.

It is not uncommon to hear the reign of George II. spoken of as an age of dulness. Except by looking accurately at bibliographical dates, we can scarcely form a notion of the literary vigor that was displayed in the last twenty years of that reign. The greatest of the productions of Pope was the fourth book of "The Dunciad," published in 1742. He died in 1744. The mighty intellect of Swift had been long shut up in hopeless imbecility when he died in 1745. Young, who had made his reputation and his fortune by his Satires in the latter years of George I., achieved what the world was inclined to consider a far higher distinction by the publication of his "Night Thoughts," in 1741. Thomson, who in 1726 had established his enduring claim to the honors of a true poet, published his "Castle of Indolence" in 1748, the year of his death. Another generation of poets was at hand, to fill up the choir when the elder race were silent. Johnson made a poetical name by his "London" in 1738, and by his "Vanity of Human Wishes" in 1749. Akenside's "Pleasures of Imagination" and Armstrong's "Art of Preserving Health" appeared in 1744. The "Oriental Eclogues" of Collins in 1742, and his "Odes" in 1746, marked the day-spring of a genius that was too soon clouded in a dark night. Gray's "Elegy" "first made him known to the public," according to Johnson, in 1751, and soon commanded that popularity which it never lost. His "Bard" and "Progress of Poesy" found few admirers upon their appearance in 1757, amply compensated by subsequent over-praise. The English poetical succession was thus honorably continued through the reigns of the foreigners who had succeeded to the throne of the Stuarts, and was handed on to that of their successor, "born and bred a Briton."

A new species of literature, that may almost be considered indigenous, is the marked characteristic of the period we are now regarding. In 1740 Samuel Richardson published the first part of his novel of "Pamela," of which the second part, issued in 1741, was regarded as the natural falling-off of most "continuations." To understand the extraordinary popularity of "Pamela," we must take Richardson's own account of the object which he proposed to himself in its composition: "I thought the story, if written in an easy and natural manner suitable to the simplicity of it, might possibly turn young people into a course of reading different from the pomp and parade of romance-writing; and, dismissing the improbable and marvellous, with which novels generally abound, might tend to promote the cause of religion and virtue." The novels to which Richardson alludes were not of English growth; for, with the exception of Defoe, we had no novelist who attempted to invest the ordinary concerns of the life of unheroic men and women with the charm of reality. We had translations from French romances, and imitations of French romances, from the time of Scudery to the time of Crebillon. It was reserved for Richardson to carry on a story with such an implicit reliance upon his power of exciting sympathy without "the improbable and marvellous," that the educated and the uneducated have confided in his fictions as absolute truths. That confidence has subsisted even to recent times, when these creations, too tedious for a more busy age, were not quite forgotten. Sir John Herschel has preserved a tribute to the genius of Richardson which is worth a wilderness of criticism: "I recollect an anecdote told me by a late highly-respected inhabitant of Windsor, as a fact which he could personally testify, having occurred in a village where he resided several years, and where he actually was at the time it took place. The blacksmith of the village had got hold of Richardson's novel of 'Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded,' and used to read it aloud in the long summer evenings, seated on his anvil, and never failed to have a large and attentive audience. It is a pretty long-winded book, but their patience was fully a match for the author's prolixity, and they fairly listened to it all. At length, when the happy turn of fortune arrived which brings the hero and heroine together, and sets them living long and happily according to the most approved rules, the congregation were so delighted as to raise a great shout, and, procuring the church keys, actually set the parish bells ringing."* "Clarissa" was not published till 1748; "Sir Charles Grandison" followed in 1751. There is a singular passage in a letter of Johnson to Richardson, which is suggestive, as it appears to us, of one of the peculiar merits of the novelist. He writes, speaking of "Clarissa," "I wish you would add an *Index rerum*, that when the reader recollects any incident he may easily find it." Johnson makes a similar suggestion when "Grandison" was published. "'Clarissa,'" he says, "is not a performance to be read with eagerness, and laid aside forever; but will be occasionally consulted by the busy, the aged, and the studious." It is one of the most characteristic excellences of Richardson, that there is not the minutest incident in his narratives which has not some distinct bearing upon the development of the complete story. To trace the connection of these circumstances would have been facilitated by an index; and it is not impossible that this was in Johnson's mind, although Mr. Croker regards the suggestion as an adroit piece of flattery to a vain man.† We remember to have heard an

* G. L. Craik, "Literature and Learning in England."
† *Ante*, vol. v. p. 790.

* "Address to the Subscribers to the Windsor and Eton Public Library;" 1833.
† Boswell, ed. 1848, p. 73.

eminent lawyer declare that he studied Richardson's plots as he would study a mass of evidence in a complicated case; and that the extreme art by which the chain was kept entire, in links not always apparent, could be readily traced by one who brought the legal mind to discover something beyond meaningless prolixity in the endless details of these novels.

In 1742 Henry Fielding published "The Adventures of Joseph Andrews," the hero of which history "was esteemed to be the only son of Gaffer and Gammer Andrews, and brother to the illustrious Pamela, whose virtue is at present so famous." No one now reads Fielding's first novel as a burlesque of Richardson, for which it was really intended. It would appear from a letter of Gray to West, that he had been amused by "Joseph Andrews," without a suspicion that any ridicule was intended of another novelist; and, indeed, Fielding, having discovered his own real power, appears very soon to have resigned himself to delineations of character and manners without much regard to his purpose of satirizing the overwrought sentiment of Richardson. Gray says: "The incidents are ill-laid and without invention; but the characters have a great deal of nature, which always pleases, even in her lowest shapes. . . . Throughout he shows himself well read in stage-coaches, country squires, inns, and inns of court." Johnson, who always professed contempt for Fielding in proportion as he admired Richardson, maintained that Fielding's characters were characters of manners, while Richardson's were characters of nature.* "Richardson used to say that had he not known who Fielding was he should have believed he was an ostler. Sir, there is more knowledge of the heart in one letter of Richardson's than in all 'Tom Jones.' I, indeed, never read 'Joseph Andrews.'" This dispraise of Fielding indicates his great value to those who would understand the manners of his age; in what Boswell properly termed "very natural pictures of human life," but which Johnson despised as "of very low life," Fielding, "well read in stage-coaches, country squires, inns, and inns of court," is a faithful historian, in his own line, of a condition of society that was worth the closest observation of one capable of exhibiting its characteristics. His "Jonathan Wild," published in 1743, can scarcely be regarded as a novel. Before the appearance of his greatest work, "Tom Jones," in 1749, another novelist came upon the field, with equal readiness of observation, but with a coarser power of delineating what he saw. Smollett's "Roderick Random" appeared in 1748. In 1751 were published both Fielding's "Amelia" and Smollett's "Peregrine Pickle." In 1753 Smollett's "Ferdinand Count Fathom" appeared. Fielding died in 1754. Another of equal genius with these two great novelists—at his outset equally popular—came in the last year of George II. The first two volumes of Sterne's "Tristram Shandy" were published in 1759, the other seven volumes at intervals extending to 1767. In 1776 Johnson said, with some truth, of this remarkable book, "Nothing odd will do long. 'Tristram Shandy' did not last." One whose hold upon readers of every class has never been loosened, from the hour when he appeared as a novelist in 1766, Oliver Goldsmith, produced, in his "Vicar of Wakefield," a picture of English life which puts us in far better humor with his time than the freer delineations of either of the great masters of fiction who had preceded him. The people had either become more lovable or they are presented to us by a more kindly observer.

In the decade immediately preceding the accession of George III. there was something like a revival of that species of literature which Addison and Steele had naturalized among us. In 1750 appeared the "Rambler," by Johnson, published twice a week. In 1758 "the great moralist," as he was called, commenced his "Idler." The "Adventurer," in which Johnson was also concerned, was issued in 1752. The "World," issued in 1753, and the "Connoisseur," in 1754, had more of the spirit of the earlier essayists than the measured periods in which Johnson descanted upon human follies. Edward Moore and Owen Cambridge, in the "World," George Colman and Bonnell Thornton, in the "Connoisseur," looked upon life in the spirit of the sage invoked by Johnson:

> "Once more, Democritus, arise on earth,
> With cheerful wisdom and instructive mirth."

The period had also its exponent in one whom the admirers of satire, made doubly attractive by personality, called "Aristophanes." Samuel Foote was not a vulgar libeller. In his caricatures of vice and folly, during thirty years from 1747 to 1776, we may see not the mere humors of individuals, but the marked characteristics of prevailing manners.

The literature of the first quarter of a century of the reign of George III. presents us much indifferent poetry, but some that has survived. The vigor of Churchill may yet be admired, in spite of his coarseness. If, with the exception of Goldsmith and Beattie, there was little verse that was unaffected and natural until the time of Cowper, a taste for simplicity and freshness, in preference to the artificial and elaborate, was produced by the publication of Percy's "Reliques of Ancient Poetry." Johnson did far less for a right direction of the national taste in his "Lives of the Poets," than Thomas Warton in his "History of English Poetry." Garrick made Shakespeare in fashion, and occasionally ventured, in his desire to give him a more fashionable dress, to patch the poet's golden mantle with the tinsel of the player's wardrobe. For graver literature this portion of the reign of George III. acquired a lasting distinction. It gave us Burke as the greatest of political philosophers; Adam Smith as an economist; and Hume, Robertson, and Gibbon as historians. More important as a painter of manners even than the novelists, the dramatists, or the essayists, that age bequeathed us Horace Walpole. The public of his own time knew little of his surpassing power of presenting the peculiarities of his own exclusive class; and, in common with other letter-writers of the same period, of introducing us to the saloons, where, hidden from profane eyes, the noble and the great were playing "Low Life above Stairs."*

Let us endeavor to note a few of the more prominent features of the national character and habits, as delineated in the light literature of half a century. It was the transition period from an age in which the decencies of life were very imperfectly observed, to an age in which decorum was beginning to assert an authority which has steadily gone on, to preserve a greater semblance of morality, and therefore, in no inconsiderable degree, to hold fast its substance. The grossness of society was reflected in the novelists and dramatists of the middle of the century; but, as we advance toward its end, we find the grossness veiled in double meanings, and the profaneness smothered in stars and dashes. Amid much deep-seated depravity in all classes there was a larger amount of indecorum. When the indecorum vanished, much of the vice, no doubt, remained behind; but in its hiding-places it unquestionably became less dangerous. We shall glance, in the first instance, at the public resorts of society—the places where all ranks meet, and to a certain extent associate.†

Stage coaches; inns; public conveyance; public accommodation. This is a large subject; a subject that, at the first view, might appear to touch only the surface of society. But it really involves many features of a nation's social life. In the days of our early novelists the stage-coach was an institution, and on some roads had arrived at the dignity of being called a "machine." But this rapid vehicle of four miles an hour was not for common travellers—indeed, very genteel travellers were content with cheaper accommodation. There was a mode of transit upon the North Road, which only cost a shilling a day to a passenger, and in conveying him from York to London did not occupy quite a fortnight. This was the conveyance of Roderick Random to the metropolis, and we may believe that the wagon and its inside have been faithfully portrayed out of Smollett's personal recollections. Random and his faithful follower, Strap, overtake the wagon upon the road, ascend by a ladder, and tumbling into the straw find themselves in the society of Captain Weazel with his spouse, and an old usurer with a vivacious female companion. The captain—an ensign made out of a nobleman's valet—when the wagon arrived at its inn, demanded a separate room for his lady and himself, with a supper apart. The innkeeper replied that "he could not afford them a room by themselves; and as for supping, he had prepared victuals for the passengers in the wagon without respect of persons." In the stage-coach we find the same assumption of superiority. "The human species are divided into two sorts of people, to wit, high people and low people. . . .

* Boswell, ed. 1848, p. 190.

* "George Selwyn and his Contemporaries," vol. i. p. 20.

† This sketch carries on the delineation of manners at the beginning of the century—*ante*, vol. v. chapters cxliii., cxliv., and cxlv.

These two parties, especially those bordering nearly on each other, to wit, the lowest of the high, and the highest of the low, often change their parties according to place and time." The bickerings of a stage-coach company illustrate this philosophic view of Fielding. Miss Graveairs, the daughter of a gentleman's steward who had been a postilion, would not demean herself to ride with Joseph Andrews, a footman. The youth had met with an accident: "There were wagons on the road," said the genteel personage. A young lady, who was an earl's granddaughter, begged, almost with tears in her eyes, that the poor fellow might be admitted. To the remark that "No one could refuse another coming into a stage-coach," the fine lady replied, "I don't know, madam; I am not much used to stage-coaches; I seldom travel in them." There is another witness to the assumption of gentility in female stage-coach passengers: "I have always remarked that within half a dozen miles of the end of our journey, if there has been a fine-spoken lady in the coach, though but a country shopkeeper's wife, who imagined herself a stranger to the company, she has expressed great anger and astonishment at not seeing the chaise, the chariot, or the coach, coming to meet her on the road." *

The pretension of the ladies to the respect due to "quality" is matched in the novelists by the boasts of the gentlemen to the confidence produced by courage. To be cool and collected in the presence of danger was as necessary in a journey from London to Bath as in the march from Carlisle to Culloden. The highwayman was an institution especially connected with the stage-coach. He had been growing into a power for many years. He was in his most high and palmy state when Fielding had ceased to write and George III. began to reign. In 1761 "the Flying Highwayman engrosses the conversation of most of the towns within twenty miles of London. . . . He robs upon three different horses, a gray, a sorrel, and a black one. . . . . He has leaped over Colnbrook turnpike a dozen times within this fortnight." † A lawyer, in Fielding's stage-coach, boasts that he had often met highwaymen when he travelled on horseback, but none ever durst attack him. A ruffian stops the coach, and the lawyer and the rest of the passengers quietly surrender their money; but the lawyer informs the company that if it had been daylight, and he could have come at his pistols, he would never have submitted to the robbery. A stage-coach is crossing Hounslow Heath at daybreak. The Heath at that period, and long after, invariably suggested the idea of highwaymen. The courage of a "son of Mars" was to assure the ladies of adequate protection: "Make yourselves perfectly easy on that head, madam. I have got a pair of pistols—here they are—which I took from a horse-officer at the battle of Dettingen; they are double loaded, and if any highwayman in England robs you of the value of a pin, while I have the honor of being in your company—" The oaths may be imagined. Two highwaymen appear in sight; the ladies begin to scream; a lawyer (the novelists delight to introduce a lawyer) exclaims, "No matter—we'll sue the county and recover," his teeth chattering; the warrior quietly gives up his pistols to Smollett's hero, who jumps out of the coach to face the robbers.

Such were the scenes when few persons travelled; when the facilities of locomotion did not make travellers, as in the later days of the mail, and in our own wondrous days of the railway. A little boy going to school, and his mother, are the only passengers in the one stage-coach from Worcester to Gloucester. The vehicle rolls about, and a horseman is seen speaking earnestly to the coachman, who is at last peremptorily ordered by him to stop. The horseman is not a robber. He is an honest farmer, who opens the coach door; tells the lady that the driver is so drunk that there will be an accident; conducts her and her son to his farm hard by; and finally puts a pillion upon his horse and carries them safely to Gloucester. The relator of the incident contrasts the one coach—probably not a daily stage—between Worcester and Gloucester, and its scanty supply of passengers, with the long and well-filled trains that vibrate many times a day between these two cities.‡ The coach which Fielding's Parson Adams could outstrip in pace as he walked before it, brandishing his crab-stick, was, in twenty or thirty years, to pass into a vehicle whose rapidity was somewhat dangerous upon roads very unscientifically made. Chatterton tells his sister that on his ride outside the stage from Bristol to London the coachman complimented him upon his courage in sticking upon the roof without holding to the iron. A Prussian clergyman, Charles Moritz, travelling in England in 1782, for the most part on foot, being anxious to return to London, mounts the outside of a "post-coach" at Leicester. To him it was a new situation. "I sat nearest the wheel, and the moment that we set off, I fancied that I saw certain death await me." The machine seemed to fly; it was a miracle that they still stuck to the coach. "At last, the being continually in fear of my life became insupportable, and as we were going up a hill, and consequently proceeding rather slower than usual, I crept from the top of the coach, and got snug into the basket." * The increased speed of the stage operated no reform in the conveyance of letters by the post. The letter-bags were carried by boys on horseback. If a bag reached its destination in safety, without being rifled, it was more by a happy chance than by any care of the post-office authorities for the prevention of robbery. As to accelerating the conveyance of letters, that was an impossibility. The post that left London on Monday night reached Worcester, Birmingham, Norwich, Bath, on the Wednesday afternoon. A letter from London to Glasgow was only five days on the road. What more could be done? The manager of the Bath theatre proposed a plan for bringing the letter-bags from Bath to London in sixteen or eighteen hours. Great was the merriment at so wild a scheme among the wise officials. Mr. Palmer persevered; and he had the support of a more vigorous power than that of the salaried haters of innovation. Mr. Pitt took the project under his care, and in 1784 the first mail-coach left London. There was an end of robberies of the mail—of the system under which "the mail is generally intrusted to some idle boy without character, mounted on a worn-out hack, and who, so far from being able to defend himself, or escape from a robber, is much more likely to be in league with him." † The letters went safely, and they went at twice or thrice their former speed.

Inns. Half a century ago the inns of a small English "borough" were described by Crabbe. More than half a century before Crabbe, Fielding and Smollett had shown us the inns of their time. Much of the poet's description is now of things passed away. The hostelries described by the novelists are as obsolete as the old signs over the London shops. We now rarely find the "Head Inn" of the time when the world travelled in carriages with post-horses; when the ready chaise and smart driver were to be had in five minutes; when the ample yard contained "buildings where order and distinction reign;" when the lordly host bent in his pride to the parting guest; when the lady hostess governed the bar and schooled the kitchen.‡ According to Fielding, "it was the dusk of the evening when a grave person rode into an inn, and, committing his horse to the ostler, went directly into the kitchen, and, calling for a pipe of tobacco, took his place by the fireside, where several other persons were likewise assembled." The grave person was Parson Adams, a clergyman of much learning, but humble means, who had been accustomed to take his cup of ale in the kitchen of the squire who had given him his curacy of twenty-five pounds a year, and whose lady did not think his dress good enough for the gentry at her table. It is true that in a nobler apartment of this inn there was another clergyman, named Barnabas, who had condescended to administer ghostly consolation to a poor man supposed to be dying; but "proceeded to prayer with all the expedition he was master of, some company then waiting for him below in the parlor, where the ingredients for punch were all in readiness, but no one would squeeze the oranges till he came." Select as the company in the parlor might be, there was no distinction in the kitchen. The next day, in that general temple of good cheer, the reverend punch-maker, the surgeon, and the exciseman, "were smoking their pipes over some cider-ale;" and Parson Barnabas having learned the profession of Parson Adams (for his cassock had been tied up when he arrived) invited him to adjourn, with the doctor and the exciseman, to another room, and partake of a bowl of punch. This libation finished, Barnabas takes his seat upon a bench in the

* Edward Moore, "World," November 29, 1753.
† "Annual Register," vol. iv. p. 189.
‡ "Remains of T. W. Hill," p. 109.

* "Travels through various parts of England.'
† Palmer's plan—presented to Mr. Pitt.
‡ Crabbe, "The Borough."

inn yard to smoke his pipe. This inn—the great coach inn—was a very different affair to the little public-house on the side of the highway described by Smollett: "The kitchen was the only room for entertainment in the house, paved with red bricks, remarkably clean, furnished with three or four Windsor chairs, adorned with shining plates of pewter and copper saucepans, nicely scoured, that even dazzled the eyes of the beholder."* In this description there is nothing obsolete; nor have the "parlor splendors" of Goldsmith's Auburn inn passed away—"the royal game of goose"—the "broken tea-cups wisely kept for show." It was proper that Corporal Trim should take his seat in the kitchen of the village inn; and natural that the sick lieutenant's son should make at the kitchen fire a piece of thin toast that his father fancied with a glass of sack. But Parson Adams, and Parson Barnabas, and the surgeon, and the exciseman, drinking in the kitchen, is a scene of other times. Forty years later landlords and landladies were growing exclusive, and despised vulgar company. The Lutheran clergyman, Moritz, set out upon a pedestrian tour to Oxford and the midland counties. Walking seems to have been considered in those days only fit for the poorest. The tired and hungry German enters an inn at Eton, and with difficulty obtains something to eat, and a bedroom that much resembled a prison for malefactors. "Whatever I got, they seemed to give me with such an air as showed too plainly they considered me a beggar. I must do them the justice to own, however, that they suffered me to pay like a gentleman." He was rejected when he applied for a bed, even at common alehouses. At last he obtained a place of refuge at Nettlebed. "They showed me into the kitchen, and set me down to sup at the same table with some soldiers and the servants. I now, for the first time, found myself in one of those kitchens I had so often read of in Fielding's fine novels; and which certainly gave me, on the whole, a very accurate idea of English manners." The next day, being Sunday, the pedestrian, having put on clean linen, was shown into the parlor, and "was now addressed by the most respectful term, sir; whereas the evening before I had been called only master."

Of the infinite diversities of the public refreshment life of London there are ample materials for a full description if our space would afford any such elaboration. The kindly Scot who let a lodging to Roderick Random over his chandler's shop told him, "There are two ways of eating in this town for men of your condition—the one more creditable and expensive than the other; the first is to dine at an eating-house, frequented by well-dressed people only; and the other is called diving, practised by those who are either obliged or inclined to live frugally." The young surgeon was disposed to try the diving, if it were not infamous. His landlord gave him convincing proof of its propriety: "I have seen many a pretty gentleman, with a laced waistcoat, dine in that manner very comfortably for threepence halfpenny, and go afterward to the coffee-house, where he made a figure with the best lord in the land." The experiment is determined on, and the hero of the novel dines luxuriously off shin of beef, "surrounded by a company of hackney-coachmen, chairmen, draymen, and a few footmen out of place or on board wages." When he is become more ambitious, he dines at an "ordinary"—a mode very different from the French table d'hote, and never quite naturalized in London. The ordinary had more success in the suburbs—such as Goldsmith frequented. "There was a very good ordinary of two dishes and a pastry, kept at this time at Highbury-barn, at tenpence per head, including a penny to the waiter; and the company generally consisted of literary characters, a few Templars, and some citizens who had left off trade."† The chop-houses were more popular than the ordinaries. "In these common refectories you may always find the jemmy attorney's clerk, the prim curate, the walking physician, the captain upon half-pay."‡ The tavern life of Dr. Johnson is as familiar to us as his rusty wig. The houses of entertainment which he frequented are as famous as the Devil Tavern of his dramatic namesake. We know by common fame, as well as from Boswell, of "the Mitre Tavern in Fleet Street, where he loved to sit up late"—the "old rendezvous" where grave divines and smart lawyers came to listen to his violent politics, his one-sided criticism, his displays of learning, his indignation against vice and meanness, his banter of Goldsmith, and his insolence to Boswell. Johnson maintained that "a tavern chair was the throne of human felicity." "There is nothing," he affirmed, "which has been yet contrived by man, by which so much happiness is produced as by a good tavern or inn;" and then he repeated, "with great emotion," Shenstone's lines:

> "Whoe'er has travell'd life's dull round,
> Where'er his stages may have been,
> May sigh to think he still has found
> The warmest welcome at an inn."

When Goldsmith, to complete what he called "a shoemaker's holiday," had finished his refection at Highbury-barn, he and his companions, about six o'clock in the evening, adjourned to White Conduit House to drink tea, and concluded by supping at the Grecian or Temple Exchange Coffee House, or at the Globe in Fleet Street." White Conduit House, near Islington, was an especial resort of the citizens. The coffee-houses, although frequented by peculiar classes, were open to all men. The "Connoisseur" has described the coffee-houses of 1754. Garraway's, frequented by stock-brokers; the Chapter, by booksellers; the Bedford, "crowded every night with men of parts," who echoed jokes and bon-mots from box to box; White's, where persons of quality resorted, who do not trouble themselves with literary debates, as at the Bedford. "They employ themselves more fashionably at whist for the trifle of a thousand pounds the rubber, or by making bets on the lie of the day."* The fashionable coffee-houses were gradually transformed into exclusive clubs, of which form of social life we shall have presently to speak. The more plebeian coffee-houses had sometimes to endure intruders, who asserted the independence which Englishmen sturdily maintained in the last century. Dr. Thomas Campbell, in 1775, strolled into the Chapter Coffee House, which he heard was remarkable for a large collection of books, and a reading society. "Here I saw a specimen of English freedom. A whitesmith in his apron, and some of his saws under his arm, came in, sat down, and called for his glass of punch and the paper, both which he used with as much ease as a lord. Such a man, in Ireland, and I suppose in France too, or almost any other country, would not have shown himself with his hat on, nor any way, unless sent for by some gentleman: now really every other person in the room was well dressed."† The Irish Dr. Campbell must have indeed been surprised at the contrast between England and Ireland, where, according to Arthur Young, nothing satisfies a landlord but unlimited submission. "Disrespect, or anything tending toward sauciness, he may punish with his cane or his horsewhip with the most perfect security."‡

"Such places of pleasure as are totally set apart for the use of the great world I meddle not with." Thus writes Fielding, in his capacity of magistrate.§ He goes on to say, "though Ranelagh and Vauxhall, by reason of their price, are not entirely appropriated to the people of fashion, yet they are seldom frequented by any below the middle rank." Ranelagh was opened in 1742: "The prince, princess, duke, and much nobility, and much mob besides, were there," according to Walpole. In two years Ranelagh had "totally beat Vauxhall." The usual amusement was to parade round and round the rotunda. The dulness was occasionally relieved by the depravity of the masquerade. Nevertheless, on ordinary nights, the dazzling illumination of the building, the music, the cheap refreshments (half-a-crown entrance included tea, coffee or punch), the opportunity of looking upon lords with stars and ladies with hoops—these attractions drew a motley group to Ranelagh, who were either genteel or affected gentility. The landlady of the Prussian clergyman, a tailor's widow, told him that she always fixed on one day of the year in which, without fail, she hired a coach and drove to

* "Sir Launcelot Greaves."

† Quoted from "The European Magazine" in Forster's "Life and Times of Oliver Goldsmith," book iv.

‡ "Connoisseur," June 6, 1750.

* No. 1.

† "Diary of a Visit to England, in 1775." "The Edinburgh Review" (October, 1859) gives an interesting article on this curious book, published at Sydney in 1854. The reviewer supposes that his copy is "the only one on this side of the equator." The author of this history met with a copy at the French Exhibition of 1855; and seeing its peculiar value wrote several notices of it, during his visit to Paris, in an English journal in which he had an interest, "The Town and Country Newspaper."

‡ "Tour in Ireland," vol. ii. p. 127.

§ "Causes of the Increase of Robberies," section i.

Ranelagh.* Johnson moralizes upon this scene: "When I first entered Ranelagh it gave an expansion and gay sensation to my mind, such as I never experienced anywhere else. But, as Xerxes wept when he viewed his immense army, and considered that not one of that great multitude would be alive a hundred years afterward, so it went to my heart to consider that there was not one in all that brilliant circle that was not afraid to go home and think." † Vauxhall was cheaper than Ranelagh in its price of admission, but far more costly in its refreshments. The citizen takes his wife and two daughters to the garden; grumbles over a chicken, no bigger than a partridge, which costs half-a-crown, and vows that the ham is a shilling an ounce. As he leaves the lamp-lit walks he moralizes also: "It would not have cost me above fourpence halfpenny to have spent my evening at Sot's Hole; and what with the coach-hire, and all together, here's almost a pound gone, and nothing to show for it." ‡ There was a great deal of good company indeed, declared the citizen's wife, though the gentlemen were so rude as to stare at her through their spy-glasses. Lady Caroline Petersham, "looking gloriously jolly and handsome," goes to Vauxhall with a large party, of which were Lord Granby, "very drunk," and Horace Walpole, and Harry Vane. Lady Caroline minced seven chickens in a china dish, and stewed them over a lamp; and Betty the fruit girl brought her strawberries and cherries, and supped by them at a little table. "The whole air of our party was sufficient to take up the whole attention of the gardens; so much so that from eleven o'clock till half an hour after one, we had the whole concourse round our booth," and Harry Vane took up a bumper and drank their healths.§ Mr. and Mrs. Tibbs were humble imitators of Lady Caroline Petersham and Harry Vane. They "would sit in none but a genteel box; a box where they might see and be seen." ‖ The Pantheon was opened in 1772—"a new winter Ranelagh in Oxford Road." Dr. Campbell was there in 1775, and saw "the Duke of Cumberland and Lady Grosvenor, a fine woman, lost to all sense of modesty;" and "Lady Archer, painted like a doll, whose feathers nodded like the plumes of Mambrino's helmet;" and some still more disreputable ladies who had longer peacock feathers.¶ Such was the mixed society of the public places of London, before the people of quality grew more exclusive, and set up coteries in which profligacy could be screened from vulgar eyes.

It has been said, "The stage, at this period (1774), was either a school of immorality, or a vehicle of slander." ** We venture to think that the stage, at this period, was singularly untainted with the grosser vices of society; and that what is termed its slander was a fearless expression of contempt for crimes and follies which even the pulpit suffered to flourish in their rankness. Looking candidly at the time when Wycherley, Vanbrugh, Congreve, Farquhar, and Mrs. Centlivre, had been succeeded, as the popular dramatists, by Goldsmith, Colman, Cumberland, Murphy, Sheridan, and Mrs. Cowley, it can scarcely be denied that the theatre was, comparatively, a school of purity. Blemishes of course there were. It was still too much the fashion to assign the virtues of truth and sincerity to the dissipated, and the vices of hypocrisy and meanness to the decorous. Situations and expressions that would not now be tolerated were presented and uttered without offence. But there was no systematic endeavor to make licentiousness the foundation and corner-stone of wit. The chief complaint against the stage of that time was that "the most popular plays and farces, if they were not founded on the scandal of the day, contained pointed allusions to the gossip of political and fashionable society, and persons conspicuous in either." †† Political and fashionable society had scarcely a right to complain of the scandal, when it was so little careful of its own reputation. We may well believe that the personalities of Foote, objectionable as a system of personal satire always must be, kept many of the fashionable in awe of ridicule, who held in scorn the disapprobation of the classes below them in rank; and somewhat abated the imitative ambition of many of the rich pretenders to distinction of the middle classes, who esteemed their fellows only in the proportion of their wealth.‡‡

The theatre, under the management of Garrick, directed, however imperfectly, the course of public taste. He did what Betterton had done before him, he gave Shakespeare an extended popularity by his wonderful power as an actor. But it was among the exaggerations of that flattery which had attended Garrick when living, and followed him in death, to pretend that the actor had given new life to the poet; that Garrick and Shakespeare were forever to shine as "twin stars." There had been thirteen editions of Shakespeare's play when it was pretended that they were sunk to death and lay in night;* of which nine editions had appeared in the preceding forty years. Garrick did also what Tate had done before him. He mangled Shakespeare, giving improved versions of Romeo and Juliet, the Midsummer Night's Dream, The Tempest, the Taming of the Shrew, the Winter's Tale, Cymbeline, and Hamlet. He patched the mammock'd plays with tawdry rags, in the "design to adapt them to the present taste of the public." † His conception of Shakespeare was as imperfect as his notion of the costume in which Shakespeare's characters should be presented. But Garrick unquestionably made the people understand the true and the natural in dramatic art, as opposed to the pomposity and the exaggeration of the actors whom he supplanted. Garrick, according to the critical Mr. Partridge, did nothing in Hamlet beyond what any man would do in similar circumstances: "I am sure if I had seen a ghost, I should have looked in the very same manner, and done just as he did." The king, who spoke "half as loud again," was the actor for Partridge's money.‡ The town had sense enough to confirm the verdict of Churchill, in the "Rosciad," of "Garrick, take the chair."

The Bath of the middle of the last century is familiar to all readers of the light literature of that period. The city, early in the reign of Anne, began to be frequented by people of fashion; but the nobility refused to associate with the gentry at any public entertainments. Gentlemen came to the balls in boots, and ladies in aprons. A dictator arose in the person of Mr. Richard Nash, who was elected master of the ceremonies, and presided over the company who assembled in a booth to dance and game.§ During a reign of many years this King of Bath had got his unruly subjects into tolerable order. He had compelled the squires to put off their boots when they came to the balls, and the ladies to forego their aprons. His dominions were the resort of all the sharpers and dupes in the land when the London season was over. Every game of chance was here played without restraint, and Nash had his full share of the spoil of the unwary. At Tunbridge he established a colony; and, like a great monarch, he often travelled there in state to receive the homage of his subjects, drawn in a post-chariot by six grays, with outriders, footmen, and French horns. All went merrily till a cruel legislature passed an act to declare basset and hazard and all other games of chance illegal. The statute was evaded; and an amended law was next year passed, to declare all games with one die or more, or with any instrument with numbers thereon, to be illicit. The lawmakers did not foresee that an instrument with letters thereon might be as effectual; and the well-known game of E. O. was invented, and first set up at Tunbridge. Nash brought the game to Bath, not to offend the decorum of the assembly-room, but to be carried on snugly in private houses, to which Nash introduced those who had money to lose, confederating with the E. O. table-keepers for a share of their profits. This answered for some time, until another statute effectually put down all gaming-houses and gaming-tables, as far as law could accomplish their suppression. There was no resource for the persecuted people of quality but to establish private clubs.

CHAPTER CLXXXII.

View of manners continued—The Duke of Queensberry—Club life—Excessive gaming—Excesses of Charles Fox—Dress—Conversation

* Moritz, "Travels through England." † Boswell, 1777.
‡ "Connoisseur," No. 68. § Walpole to Montague, June 23, 1750.
‖ "Citizen of the World," No. 71. ¶ "Diary," p. 47.
** Massey, "History of England during the reign of George III.," vol. ii. p. 220. †† Massey, vol. ii. p. 220.
‡‡ The masterly essay of Mr. Forster on "Samuel Foote" amply refutes the notion that he was a mere mimic, who caricatured peculiarities of manner, and an unprincipled lampooner who sold his forbearance.

* Epitaph on Garrick in Westminster Abbey:
"Though sunk to death the forms the poet drew,
The actor's genius bade them breathe anew."
† "Biographica Dramatica." ‡ "Tom Jones."
§ Goldsmith, "Life of Nash."

—The squires of England—The country justice—The clergy of England—The universities—Professional classes—The mercantile class—The lower orders—The rabble—Mobs—Police of London—The prisons—Social reformers—Howard—Coram—Hanway—Raikes—Education—Rise and growth of Methodism.

A FEW years after the beginning of the present century there was to be seen in Piccadilly, on every sunny day, an emaciated old man sitting in a balcony holding a parasol. The coachman of the Bath Road as he drove by would tell some wondering passenger that there was the wicked Duke of Queensberry; that he kept a man in readiness to follow any female not insensible to the bewitching ogles of his glass eye; that his daily milk bath was transferred to the pails of the venders of milk around Park Lane; with many other tales, more befitting the days of the second Charles than of the third George. This very notorious nobleman died in 1810 at the age of eighty-six. As Dr. Johnson was the link between the varying literature of two periods, the Duke of Queensberry was the link between the changed profligacy of two generations. He had flourished as the Earl of March and a lord of the bedchamber in the times when to violate every decency of life was to establish a claim to wit and spirit; when "at the rehearsal, on Wednesday night, of the speech, at Lord Halifax's, Lord Lichfield came extremely drunk, and proposed amendments;" * when Sir Francis Dashwood, chancellor of the exchequer in 1762, held his frantic orgies with his brother "Franciscans" at Medmenham Abbey, drinking obscene toasts out of a sacred chalice; when George Selwyn said, with as much truth as wit, when one of the waiters at Arthur's Club was committed on a charge of felony, "What a horrid idea he will give of us to the people in Newgate." Queensberry lived on into an age of comparative decorum, which to him was as insipid as he thought the Thames seen from his Richmond villa: "I am quite tired of it—there it goes, flow, flow, flow, always the same." † He had no resources for amusement out of the libertine society of the turf and the gaming-house. Even these resorts had become decent. He could no longer sup with the Duke of York (the brother of George III.) as in 1776, "with some of the opera girls." ‡ "Information, as acquired by books, he always treated with great contempt." § There was nothing left for him to do, as a vigorous octogenarian, but to sit in the balcony at the corner of Park Lane, gazing upon "the full tide of human existence;" or retire to his drawing-room to enjoy what Wraxall calls a "classic exhibition," which if the unrefined passers-by had chanced to see they would have broken every window of that mansion of ill-fame. He had utterly neglected the duties of his station; he had regarded his tenantry as the mere slaves of his will, and the poor upon his estates as vermin that might be buried in the ruins of dilapidated hovels. Sir Walter Scott described, in 1813, the rebuilding of the cottages at Drumlanrig, by the Duke of Buccleugh (the inheritor of the estate), for pensioners who, in the days of "old Q." were "pining into rheumatisms and agues, in neglected poverty." ‖

Time has removed the veil that hid the club-life of Queensberry and his set from the gaze of contemporaries. We are now permitted to see the fine gentlemen of the days of Chatham and Lord North pursuing their vocation of gambling with the assiduous perseverance of the most money-getting tradesman. If they were ruined there were two resources against starvation—a place, or a wife. "You ask me how play uses me this year," writes the Hon. Henry St. John to Selwyn in 1766: "I am sorry to say very ill, as it has already, since October, taken 800*l.* from me; nor am I in a likely way to reimburse myself soon by the emoluments of any place or military preferment, having voted the other evening in a minority." ¶ This distinguished honorable, for whose misfortunes it was the bounden duty of the government to have provided a refuge, became Lord Bolingbroke. He still pursued his calling with indifferent success in 1777, when Charles Townshend writes to Selwyn, "Your friend Lord Bolingbroke's affairs are in a much more prosperous state than those of the public. He is gone down to Bath in pursuit of a lady, who he proposes should recruit his finances. . . . It is said she has accepted his proposal." ** The reputation of Lord Sandwich has survived as one of the most profligate in his private life, and one of the meanest in his public career. His club-gambling has given a name to "a bit of beef between two slices of bread," the only food he took for four-and-twenty hours without ever quitting his game.* Common men pass away from the gambling clubs, whether to insolvency, or suicide, or death in a duel, without much sympathy from their fellows, who, like Lord Sandwich, are too much absorbed in their thirst for lucre to take warning from the fate of those they call their friends. The Right Hon. Tom Foley is sold up. The Rev. Dr. Warner gives an amusing account of the proceedings to George Selwyn. The creditors could not take the heirlooms; but every personal article was sold, whether of the right honorable or his lady. "He and she are left there among their heirlooms, chairs and tables, without anything to put upon them, or upon themselves, when the clothes on their backs become dirty." † The Hon. John Damer shot himself at the Bedford Arms in 1776. Lord Carlisle, who at this time was himself plunged in difficulties, says of this event, 'It is a bad example to others in misery. . . . There never appeared anything like madness in him, yet the company he kept seemed indeed but a bad preparation for eternity." ‡ At Bath Nash dealt rather severely with the duellist gamesters, for a few mischances might have thinned the numbers of his votaries by a general panic. He forbade the wearing of swords, "as they often tore the ladies' dresses, and frightened them;" and when he heard that a challenge was given and accepted, he immediately procured an arrest for both parties.

On the 24th of June, 1776, Gibbon, writing to his friend Holroyd, and dating from Almack's, says: "Town grows empty; and this house, where I have passed very agreeable hours, is the only place which still unites the flower of the English youth. The style of living, though somewhat expensive, is exceedingly pleasant, and, notwithstanding the rage of play, I have found more entertaining and even rational society here than in any other club to which I belong." Among "the flower of the English youth" was the Earl of Carlisle, who, when Gibbon thus wrote, was in his twenty-eighth year. He was a man of talent; ambitious to be a poet and a statesman; happy in his marriage; fond of his children; surrounded with every worldly advantage. In July, 1776, he writes to Selwyn: "I have undone myself, and it is to no purpose to conceal from you my abominable madness and folly. . . . I never lost so much in five times as I have done to-night, and am in debt to the house for the whole." A few days after this loss of ten thousand pounds he again writes to his friend, "I do protest to you that I am so tired of my present manner of passing my time—however I may be kept in countenance by the number of those of my own rank and superior fortune—that I never reflect upon it without shame." Lord Carlisle abandoned his dangerous course when not too late. This was not the case with one of far higher intellect. There is no scenic representation of the horrors of gambling so truly pathetic as the history of Charles Fox, nor one which conveys more fearful warnings.

The precocious son of Lord Holland was furnished by the overweening fondness of his father, with guineas to stake at the gaming-table at Spa when he was a boy of fifteen. "Let nothing be done," said the rival of Chatham, "to break Charles's spirit; the world will effect that business soon enough." He soon was in parliament. The acquirements of the young politician were as extraordinary as his abilities. His profligacy was as remarkable as either. Lord Brougham says: "The dissipated habits of the times drew him, before the age of manhood, into the whirlpool of fashionable excess. . . . The noble heart and sweet disposition of this great man passed unscathed through an ordeal which, in almost every other instance, is found to deaden all the kindly emotions." § Yet these excesses, at that period of his life when his transcendent powers had placed him in the first rank as a party leader, materially diminished the confidence which the nation would otherwise have reposed in him, and not unjustly rendered him obnoxious to his sovereign. They had probably a more fatal consequence in the encouragement of the heir-apparent in a course of profligacy, which the lower nature of the Prince of Wales cherished into that confirmed sensuality

* "Selwyn and his Contemporaries," vol. i. p. 352.
† "Life of Wilberforce," vol. iii. p. 417.
‡ "Selwyn," vol. ii. p. 47.
§ Wraxall, "Memoirs."
‖ Letter to Joanna Baillie, in Lockhart's "Life of Scott."
¶ "Selwyn," vol. ii. p. 102.
** Ibid., vol. iii. p. 247.

* Grosley, "Tour to London in 1765," vol. i. p. 149.
† "Selwyn," iv. 147.
‡ Ibid., viii. 148.
§ Lord Brougham, "Statesmen of the time of George III."

which rendered him unfit for the duties of his high station, and made him odious as a sovereign to a people who would otherwise have supported him with something better than "mouth-honor." In 1772 Fox was a lord of the admiralty, opposing, as a member of the government, the petition of some of the clergy that subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles should not be enforced at the universities. Gibbon writes, "Charles Fox prepared himself for that holy work by passing twenty-two hours in the pious exercise of hazard; his devotion only cost him about five hundred pounds an hour—in all, eleven thousand pounds." Lord Carlisle said of him at this period: "He is not following the natural bent of his genius; for that would lead him to all serious inquiry and laudable pursuits." * In 1778 Fox was in opposition—with a distant prospect of office. Lord Carlisle then says, "I do think it does Charles, or ought to do, great credit, that under all his distresses he never thinks of accepting a place on terms that are in the least degree disreputable." † In 1779 the same friend writes, "Charles tells me that he has not now, nor has had for some time, one guinea, and is happier on that account." ‡ Yet though he possessed this extraordinary elasticity of mind—could be found calmly reading Herodotus in the morning after having lost his last shilling the previous night—yet his sense of degradation, when he had to borrow money of club-waiters, and saw his goods seized in execution, must have been somewhat real, however carefully concealed. What might he not have been, great as he was, had he possessed the firmness of Wilberforce, founded upon a juster sense of honor than Fox possessed. Wilberforce has recorded his club-experience when he came up to London, young and rich, the member for Hull, in 1780: "The very first time I went to Boodle's I won twenty-five guineas of the Duke of Norfolk. I belonged at that time to five clubs—Miles and Evans', Brookes', Boodle's, White's, and Goosetree's. The first time I was at Brookes', scarcely knowing any one, I joined from mere shyness in play at the faro-table, where George Selwyn kept bank. A friend who knew my inexperience, and regarded me as a victim decked out for sacrifice, called out to me, 'What, Wilberforce, is that you?' Selwyn quite resented the interference, and, turning to him, said in his most expressive tone, 'Oh, Sir, don't interrupt Mr. Wilberforce; he could not be better employed.'" § Some time after he was persuaded to keep the bank at a faro-table of one of the clubs. "As the game grew deep," says his son, "he rose the winner of six hundred pounds. Much of this was lost by those who were only heirs to future fortunes, and could not therefore meet such a call without inconvenience. The pain he felt at their annoyance cured him of a taste which seemed but too likely to become predominant." ‖ Pitt once displayed intense earnestness in games of chance, but he suddenly abandoned gambling forever. He shunned the rock upon which his rival had been wrecked.

In the letters of some of the fine gentlemen of the time of George Selwyn, we find them writing about dress much in the style of boarding-school misses—giving their friends in Paris commissions for velvet suits and embroidered ruffles. The Macaroni Club was in great repute at the beginning of the reign of George III. Wraxall, in 1815, laments over the change which forty years had produced: "That costume, which is now confined to the levée or the drawing-room, was then worn by persons of condition, with few exceptions, everywhere and every day." Mr. Fox and his friends "first threw a discredit on dress. From the House of Commons and the clubs in St. James's Street the contagion spread through the private assemblies of London." The glories of buckles and ruffles perished in the ascendency of pantaloons and shoe-strings. "Dress never totally fell, till the era of Jacobinism and of equality, in 1793 and 1794." ¶

Cowper, in the days of his town life, wrote a paper on "Conversation." He holds that it is "in vain to look for conversation, where we might expect to find it in the greatest perfection, among persons of fashion: there it is almost annihilated by universal card-playing; insomuch that I have heard it given as a reason why it is impossible for our present writers to succeed in the dialogue of genteel comedy, that our people of quality scarce ever meet but to game." * There is a prevailing opinion, resting chiefly upon the reputation of George Selwyn, that this was the age of conversational wit. The sayings of witty men are always reported very imperfectly. They appear to little advantage without the accessories that gave them point. The anecdotes of Selwyn's "social pleasantry and conversational wit," appear now sufficiently commonplace. It does not require any great force of genius to utter such witticisms as these: A member of the Foley family having hurried to the continent to avoid his creditors, Selwyn remarked, "It is a passover that will not be much relished by the Jews;" or as this: Bruce having been asked if there were musical instruments in Abyssinia, and replying that he believed he saw only one lyre there, Selwyn whispered, "Yes, and there is one less since he left the country." † More vapid still were the *mots* of James Hare, which had a prodigious reputation; for example: His report of Burgoyne having been defeated at Saratoga being discredited, Hare said, "Take it from me as a flying rumor." ‡ Yet we cannot doubt that amid the frivolity and pretence of high society, the sterling qualities of Englishmen prevailed over the fashionable attempts to imitate French vivacity. Cowper truly says, "As the English consist of very different humors, their manner of discourse admits of great variety; but the whole French nation converse alike." § Arthur Young, travelling in France in 1787, observes that at the tables d'hôte of officers you have a voluble garniture of indecency or nonsense, and at those of merchants, a mournful and stupid silence. "Take the mass of mankind, and you have more good sense in half an hour in England than in half a year in France." ‖ It is government—all, all, is government—he says. The passing observations of the poet and the traveller are confirmed by the philosopher who looks back upon the manners of that period, for a solution, in part, of the causes of the French Revolution: "The men of that time, especially those belonging to the middle and upper ranks of society, who alone were at all conspicuous, were all exactly alike. . . . Throughout nearly the whole kingdom the independent life of the provinces had long been extinct; this had powerfully contributed to render all Frenchmen very much alike. . . . In England, the different classes, though firmly united by common interests, still differed in their habits and feelings; for political liberty, which possesses the admirable power of placing the citizens of a state in needful intercourse and mutual dependence, does not on that account always make them alike. It is the government of one man which, in the end, has the inevitable effect of rendering all men alike, and all mutually indifferent to their common fate." ¶

In England "the independent life of the provinces" was as vigorous in the days of Sir George Savile and the associations, as in the days of John Hampden and ship-money. The squires of England still exhibited the natural varieties of the rich soil upon which they flourished. From the monotonous gambling of the fashionables of St. James's Street, it is almost pleasant to turn to the rougher amusements of the country house. There was a considerable change in provincial manners during the last half of the reign of George III. Fielding presented Allworthy as a portrait of Allen, the friend of Warburton; benevolent, placable, not learned, but a competent judge of literature, improved by much conversation with men of eminence, Allworthy is one of the class who, with some narrowness, gave lustre to the great country party of the House of Commons. Squire Western, coarse, passionate, violent in his politics—a roaring, drinking fox-hunter—is not to be wholly despised, for out of his rough material was to be carved the decorous and considerate landlord of another century. There were few Allworthys and many Westerns in the last years of George II. Soame Jenyns has admirably described a visit to Sir John Jolly, he proposing to exchange the bustle of London for the soothing indolence of a rural retirement. It was the race week, and a great cavalcade set out from the mansion to the country town. The ordinary at the Red Lion before the race; the assembly, over a stable, after the race; the dancing and cards; the cold chicken and negus; the ride home as the sun rose—this repetition of the same dreary round of pleasure, day by day,

* "Selwyn," vol. iii. p. 23. † Ibid., p. 292.
‡ Ibid., vol. iv. p. 165. § "Life of Wilberforce," vol. i. p. 17.
‖ Ibid., p. 19.
¶ Wraxall, "Historical Memoirs," vol. i. p. 138.

* "Connoisseur," Sept. 16, 1756.
† "Selwyn and his Contemporaries," vol. i. p. 21.
‡ Ibid., vol. iii. p. 285. § "Connoisseur."
‖ "Travels in France," p. 135.
¶ De Tocqueville, "France before the Revolution," chap. viii.

wearies the Londoner, who gets away to his quiet lodgings next door to a brazier's at Charing Cross, rather than stay upon the assurance of the lady, that though the races were over he should not want diversion, for they should not be alone one hour for several weeks." * There is a somewhat loose clerical correspondent of George Selwyn, who describes Leicester "at *reace* time"—the country squires, with their triple bands and triple buckles on their hats, "to keep in their no-brain;" "the clod-pated yeoman's son in his Sunday clothes, his drab coat and red waistcoat, tight leather breeches, and light gray worsted stockings, with one strap of his shoe coming out from under the buckle upon his foot, his lank hair, and silk handkerchief, new for *reace* time, about his neck." With a touch of real wit this worldly parson finishes his picture of the yeoman's son: "depriving of all grace and rendering odious a well-fancied oath from the mint of the metropolis, by his vile provincial pronunciation." †

The squire sits for the portrait of the country justice, whose notions of law are not very different from those of the London justice who said, "he would commit a servant to Bridewell at any time when a master or mistress desired it." ‡ The fox-hunting justice before whom Parson Adams is taken will not condemn him at once to the hangman: "No, no; you will be asked what you have to say for yourself when you come on your trial; we are not trying you now; I shall only commit you to jail." In vain the poor curate asked, "Is it no punishment, sir, for an innocent man to be several months in jail?" His mittimus would have been signed had not a bystander affirmed that Mr. Adams was a clergyman, and a gentleman of very good character. Then said the justice, "I know how to behave myself to gentlemen as well as another. Nobody can say I have committed a gentleman since I have been in the commission." § But squires and justices were rapidly improving. In 1761 a writer, in a periodical work called "The Genius," attributes to "the intercourse between the town and the country, of late so much more frequent," an extraordinary change which he describes with a good deal of vivacity: "It is scarce half a century ago since the inhabitants of the distant counties were regarded as a species almost as different from those of the metropolis as the natives of the Cape of Good Hope. Their manners, as well as dialect, were entirely provincial; and their dress no more resembling the habit of the town than the Turkish or Chinese. But time, which has inclosed commons and ploughed up heaths, has likewise cultivated the minds and improved the behavior of the ladies and gentlemen of the country. We are no longer encountered with hearty slaps on the back, or pressed to make a breakfast on cold meat and strong beer; and in the course of a tour through Great Britain you will not meet with a high-crowned hat or a pair of red stockings. Politeness and taste seem to have driven away the horrid spectres of rudeness and barbarity that haunted the old mansion-house and its purlieus, and to have established their seats in the country." ‖ In 1766 the Rev. W. Digby rites to Selwyn, from Coleshill, "Thank you for your offer of Swift's works. They are arrived at this place; for you must know we are civilized enough in this country to have instituted a club called a book-club, where I never saw pipe nor tobacco, and take in all the new things we choose. This respectable corps consists of twenty neighboring clergy and squires, chosen by ballot." ¶

In the immediate vicinity of the country squire is the country parson. The permanent resident in the parish is almost invariably the curate. The incumbent is a pluralist, who passes much of his time in London, or Bath, or Tunbridge, or in the nobleman's establishment as chaplain; the arduous duties of his chaplaincy demanding a freedom from common parochial offices, and entitling him to hold several preferments and to do the duties of no cure of souls. From the revolution to the rebellion of 1745 the orthodox clergyman had a decided tendency to Jacobitism. After that period he gradually became less earnest in politics, and resolutely applied himself to uphold government and oppose innovation. He had his own peculiar business in life to perform, which was chiefly to make himself as comfortable as possible. The indecorum, if not the profligacy, of a large number of the English clergy, for a period of half a century, is exhibited by too many contemporary witnesses to be considered as the exaggeration of novelists, satirical poets, travellers, and dissenters. Passages of every variety of writer—private correspondence now laid open—strictures of those of their own profession—are overwhelming in their testimony to this deplorable laxity of morals. Ridicule, pity, indignation, produced little or no change for more than a generation. The curate of Fielding, engaged in a most excellent political discourse with the squire, during which they made a libation of four bottles of wine to the good of their country, is a sober picture.* The young fellow of Smollett, in the rusty gown and cassock, confederating with the exciseman to cheat two farmers at cards, swearing terrible oaths, and talking gross scandal of his rogue of a vicar, is probably a caricature.† The visitation dinner of Goldsmith, in which all are gormandizing, from the bishop to Dr. Marrowfat, may be received as the fancy-piece of a great humorist.‡ The Jack Quickset of Colman and Thornton is the representative of those "ordained sportsmen, whose thoughts are more taken up with the stable or the dog-kennel than the Church; who are regarded by their parishioners not as parsons of the parish, but as squires in orders." § The wits, it may be said, are thus attacking a sacred profession in the wantonness of their scurrility. What shall we say to the testimony of Dr. Knox, head-master of Tunbridge school? "The public have long remarked with indignation, that some of the most distinguished coxcombs, drunkards, debauchees, and gamesters who figure at the watering-places, and all public places of resort, are young men of the sacerdotal order." ‖ What, to the "shepherd" of Crabbe?

> "A jovial youth, who thinks his Sunday task
> As much as God or man can fairly ask;"

who comes not to the sick pauper's bed; and who, when the bier is borne to the churchyard, is too busy to perform the last office "till the day of prayer." ¶ Surely these writers are not conspiring against their own order. Hear a sober-minded traveller, if the novelists, essayists, and poets are not to be credited: "The French clergy preserved, what is not always preserved in England, an exterior decency of behavior. One did not find among them poachers or fox-hunters, who, having spent the morning in scampering after hounds, dedicate the evening to the bottle, and reel from inebriety to the pulpit. Such advertisements were never seen in France as I have heard of in England: 'Wanted a curacy in a good sporting country, where the duty is light, and the neighborhood convivial.'" ** A conscientious writer has pointed to the reverend Dr. Warner as an object of contemplation for "those who would hastily accuse Fielding of exaggeration in his portraitures taken from the Church." †† Let us regard a few traits of this popular preacher from his own letters. He desires Selwyn to send him "the magazine with the delicate amours of the noble lord, which must be very diverting." ‡‡ He describes a dinner with two friends: "We have just parted in a tolerable state of insensibility to the ills of life." §§ "I have been preaching this morning, and am going to dine—where?—in the afternoon. We shall bolt the door and—(but hush! softly! let me whisper it, for it is a violent secret, and I shall be blown to the devil if I blab, as in this house we are Noah and his precise family)—and play at cards." ‖‖ The Reverend Dr. Warner is an unimpeachable witness.

The apathy of the clergy at this period was as injurious as their indecorum. Their eloquence was of the tamest character. An accomplished foreigner thus describes their sermons: "The pulpit declamation is a most tedious monotony. The ministers have chosen it through respect for religion, which, as they affirm, proves, defends, and supports itself without having any occasion for the assistance of oratory. With regard to the truth of this assertion, I appeal to themselves, and to the progress which religion thus inculcated makes in England." ¶¶ Dr. Campbell goes to the Temple Church, where the brother of Thurlow preached: "The discourse was the most meagre composition, and the delivery worse. He stood like Gulliver stuck

---

* "World," No. 154. † "Selwyn," vol. iv. p. 311.
‡ "Tom Jones," book vii. chap. x. § "Joseph Andrews."
‖ Quoted in the "Annual Register" for 1761, p. 206.
¶ "Selwyn," vol. ii. p. 23.

* "Tom Jones," book iv. c. 10. † "Roderick Random," c. 9.
‡ "Citizen of the World," No. lviii.
§ "Connoisseur," No. 105. ‖ Knox's "Essays," 18.
¶ "The Village."
** Arthur Young, "Travels in France," 1789, p. 543.
†† Forster, "Life of Goldsmith." ‡‡ "Selwyn," iii. 394.
§§ Ibid., iv. 132. ‖‖ Ibid., p. 285.
¶¶ Grosley, "Tour to London," vol. ii. p. 105.

in the marrow-bone, with the sermon, newspaper-like, in his hand, and without grace or emphasis he in slow cadence measured it forth." * Goldsmith has hit upon the true cause of the dry, methodical and unaffecting discourses of the English preachers, delivered with the most insipid calmness: "Men of real sense and understanding prefer a prudent mediocrity to a precarious popularity; and fearing to out-do their duty, leave it half done." † He further says that the lower orders are neglected in exhortations from the pulpit—"they who want instruction most find least in our religious assemblies." The fear of being called Methodists was one of the causes that made too many of the clergy careless in their lives and indifferent in their vocation.

When Cowper denounced

"A priesthood, such as Baal's was of old,"

he tracked the "deep mischief" to its source. "The sage, called Discipline," had ceased to be reverenced in "colleges and halls;" he had declined into the vale of years; had fallen sick and died. Then "study languished, emulation slept, and virtue fled." The schools became a scene of solemn farce; scrutiny went stone blind; gowns were mere masquerade.‡ Is this only the declamation of a poetical enthusiast, moping on the banks of the Ouse? A distinguished fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, a master of arts, describes the externals of that consecrated place—superb dining halls; painted chapels; a peculiar race in the streets; doctors and proctors in solemn procession, with velvet sleeves, scarlet gowns, and hoods black, red, and purple. He then tells us what all this parade ends in—the most absurd forms of examination for degrees, "in which the greatest dunce usually gets his *testimonium* signed with as much ease and credit as the finest genius," in one stage of the process; and in another, when "the examiners and the candidates often converse on the last drinking bout, or read the newspaper, or a novel, or divert themselves as well as they can in any manner, till the clock strikes eleven, when all parties descend, and the *testimonium* is signed by the masters." So much for the bachelor's degree, which is attained after four years' term-keeping. For the degree of Master of Arts three more years must be employed in trumpery formalities; and then, "after again taking oaths by wholesale, and paying the fees," the academic issues into the world with an "undeniable passport to carry him through it with credit." § "Accidental visitors to Oxford," writes Knox, "are naturally led to conclude that here, at length, wisdom, science, learning, and whatever else is praiseworthy, forever flourish and abound." The Prussian clergyman, walking into Oxford at midnight, was introduced by a courteous pedestrian, who had overtaken him on the road, to an alehouse. "How great," he says, "was my astonishment, when, on being shown into a room, I saw several gentlemen in academic dress sitting round a large table, each with his pot of beer before him." He thought it extraordinary that at this unseasonable hour he should suddenly find himself in a company of Oxonian clergy. The foreigner was kindly received. He told them stories of riots in German universities. "O, we are very unruly here, too," said one of the gentlemen, as he took a huge draught of his beer, and smote the table with his fist. One "weakly and impiously attempted to be witty at the expense of Scripture; and I had the good fortune to be able to convict him of his ignorance of its language and meaning." As the morning drew near, after a carousal which stupefied the German, the gentleman who introduced him "suddenly exclaimed, 'I must read prayers this morning at All Souls.'" ‖ Cambridge was not behind Oxford in its capacity of qualifying its students as "gamesters, jockies, brothellers impure." Wilberforce entered St. John's in 1776, at the age of seventeen. He tells us his experience: "I was introduced, on the very first night of my arrival, to as licentious a set of men as can well be conceived. They drank hard, and their conversation was even worse than their lives. I lived among them for some time, though I never relished their society; often, indeed, I was horror-struck at their conduct; and after the first year I shook off in great measure my connection with them." He got into better society; he lived much among the fellows of the college. "But those," he complains, "with whom I was intimate, did not act toward me the part of Christians, or even of honest men. Their object seemed to be to make and keep me idle. If ever I appeared studious they would say to me, 'Why in the world should a man of your fortune trouble himself with fagging?'" * Wilberforce was one of the few who could "escape contagion, and emerge pure from so foul a pool."

It would be absurd to imagine that the professional class, and the trading class, were untainted amid the corruptions of the time. "Profusion unrestrained" producing unmitigated selfishness, was not likely to decrease, during half a century of very rapidly increasing wealth, among those who had a more than common share of the national advantages. Public servants were as rapacious in 1783 as when, forty years before, Smollett carried his qualification for a surgeon's mate to the navy office, and found that he had not the slightest chance of an appointment "without a present to the secretary, with whom some of the commissioners went snacks." † It was the system of corruption which gave the charge of a man-of-war to the brutal Captain Oakum, who declared with terrible oaths that there should be no sick in his ship while he had the command; and which chose for his successor, Captain Whiffle, who came on board in a coat of pink-colored silk, lined with white, his hair flowing upon his shoulders in ringlets, his blue meroquin shoes studded with diamond buckles—Whiffle, who languished on a sofa, his head supported by his valet-de-chambre, who from time to time applied a smelling-bottle to his nose.‡ Such were the vermin of the navy, till Rodney taught even fribbles to fight, and Collingwood showed bullies how gentle manners and tenderness of heart could be combined with the most heroic courage. The Weazels and other reptiles of the army were gradually exchanged for such as went from the ball-room at Brussels to fight in silk stockings. Young men of fashion drank deep and swore hard; but if they saw service, and they had ample opportunities in Chatham's day, they might have some sense of religion upon the principle laid down by Corporal Trim, that when a soldier "is fighting for his king, and for his own life and his honor too, he has the most reason to pray to God of any one in the whole world." §

The medical profession was so distracted by jealousies and rivalries between its different ranks, and between individuals of the same rank, that from Garth to Foote the satirists have always a joke ready for the physician's pomp and the apothecary's rapacity. The law was necessarily open to the ridicule which properly attached to the inflated harangues and absurd technicalities of the courts—"injunctions, demurrers, sham pleas, writs of error, rejoinders, sur-rejoinders, rebutters, sur-rebutters, replications, exceptions, essoigns, and imparlance." ‖ Quackery was keeping pace with the progress of luxury. Litigation was encouraged by the multiplication of statutes, and by the general ignorance even of the educated, of the laws and constitution of their own country, "a species of knowledge in which the gentlemen of England have been more remarkably deficient than those of all Europe besides." ¶

The members of the mercantile class were, in London especially, accumulating wealth and losing respectability. The citizen of the beginning of the century had become a hybrid of fashion before its close. After George III. had been ten years on the throne the traders began to desert the city. The capacious mansion in the narrow street was given up for the inconvenient house in the new-built square. It is curious to mark the changes in the fashionable estimate of locality. The citizen of ninety years ago is reproached for "the petty vanity of residing in the circle of fashion; to have descended from the first in the neighborhood of the Exchange, to be the last in Bloomsbury Square." ** The essayist asks a question, which has not yet been more satisfactorily answered than he answers it: "When the rich and respectable leave it, who are to fill its magistracies and its council? The lower orders of tradesmen, destitute of education and of liberal views, and thrust forward into office by nothing but their own pragmatical activity." The city had its evil reputation for gluttony and ignorance, which might be some excuse for the men of refinement and education deserting it. Dr. Campbell

* "Diary," p. 23.
† "Essays," No. 17.
‡ "The Task," b. 2.
§ Knox, Essay 77.
‖ Moritz, "Travels in England in 1782."

* "Life of Wilberforce," vol. i. p. 10.
† "Roderick Random," chap. xviii.
‡ Ibid., chap. xxxiv.
§ "Tristram Shandy."
‖ Foote, "The Lame Lover."
¶ Blackstone, section i.
** Knox, Essay 8.

is taken to dine with a citizen. He says, "I'll do so no more, for there is no entertainment but meat and drink with that class of people."* When Johnson was told that the society of Twickenham chiefly consisted of opulent traders, retired from business, he declared that he never much liked that class of people; "for, sir, they have lost the civility of tradesmen without acquiring the manners of gentlemen."† Johnson's contempt of trade was one of his prejudices. Boswell asked, "What is the reason we are angry at a trader's having opulence?" The answer was, "The reason is, we see no qualities in trade that should entitle a man to superiority." Reasonable men have ceased to be angry at a trader's having opulence, provided his wealth has proceeded from the true qualities of a tradesman, honesty, skill, perseverance, decision of character—qualities that in any position "should entitle a man to superiority." It is the pretence to be what they are not that has always made the traders ridiculous. Mr. Zachary Fungus learning to dance, and practising fencing, and keeping his riding-master waiting while he recites the speech which he has learned from Mr. Gruel, "the great orationer who has published a book," by which Fungus hopes to rise in the state;‡ this is the citizen to be despised, whether he be exhibited by Mr. Foote, or be labelled as "a snob" by a greater humorist.

Fielding, in "The Covent Garden Journal," has an amusing paper on the power of "the fourth estate," by which he means "the mob." Their insolence to passengers on the river, "whose dress entitles them to be of a different order from themselves;" their rudeness on the footpaths of the streets; the habits of carters and draymen "to exclude the other estates from the use of the common highways;" their abuse of women of fashion in the parks of a Sunday evening—these are the crimes which an acute observer lays to their charge. To the justice of peace and the soldier, whom they hold in awe, he considers that it is "entirely owing that they have not long since rooted all the other orders out of the commonwealth."§ Foreigners agree in this species of censure. M. Grosley says that the porters, sailors, chairmen, and day-laborers who work in the streets, "are as insolent a rabble as can be met with in countries without law or police." Their rudeness to foreigners he especially dwells upon; and he gives an example. His servant had followed the crowd to Tyburn, to see three men hanged. Returning home through Oxford Road he was attacked by several blackguards, and Jack Ketch joined in the sport. But two or three grenadiers, belonging to the French guards, who had deserted, rescued their countryman. The man was frightened, and would not go out for a fortnight; but M. Grosley says that if he, being a stout fellow, had taken his coat off and boxed with the weakest among them, they would have carried him home in triumph. Grosley admits that the obliging readiness of the citizens and shopkeepers sufficiently consoles the foreigner for the insolence of the mob.‖ Nevertheless he affirms that "even among those of the lowest rank, the people of London, though haughty and ungovernable, are in themselves good-natured and humane." Opposed to the complaint of Fielding against the carters and draymen, the Frenchman maintains that their good-nature appears in their great care to prevent the frays almost unavoidable amid the eternal passing of carriages in narrow streets, and in their tender treatment of children, and persons low of stature, in ceremonies which attract a crowd.¶ Moritz saw the proceedings at an election in Covent Garden: "What is called hanging-day arrived. There was also a parliamentary election. I could only see one of the two sights." There was no contest, and Sir Cecil Wray was elected to fill one vacant seat. "In the area before the hustings immense multitudes of people were assembled, of whom the greatest part seemed to be of the lowest order." The moment that the candidate began to speak, "even this rude rabble became all as quiet as the raging sea after a storm." Another gentleman spoke; and a gruff carter who stood near our foreigner exclaimed, "Upon my word that man speaks well." The enthusiasm of the Prussian is awakened; and it warms his heart to see "how in this happy country, the lowest and meanest member of society thus unequivocally testifies the interest which he takes in everything of a public nature—how high and low, rich and poor, concur in declaring their feelings and their convictions that a carter, a common tar, or a scavenger, is still a man and an Englishman, and as such has his rights and privileges defined and known as exactly and as well as his king and his king's ministers."* Moritz, who was familiar with our literature, had probably the fine lines of Goldsmith in his mind:

> "Fierce in their native hardiness of soul,
> True to imagined right above control,
> While even the peasant boasts these rights to scan,
> And learns to venerate himself as man."

It must not be forgotten, when we speak of the licentiousness of the lower orders in the period of which we are writing, that they were constantly stimulated by demagogues to abuse the liberty of which they were proud; that whatever was brutal in their nature was not softened by any care for their education; that the police of London was utterly inefficient; and that the frequency of executions would have rendered them bloodthirsty, if, with all their curiosity to see men hanged (which low taste they partook in common with George Selwyn and others of rank), they had not had essentially a greater respect for human life than any other people in the world. A writer, who presents us many vivid but rather vague generalizations on the manners of that time, says, "The rabble of London, though to this day the most brutal and odious rabble in Europe, were never sanguinary."† This is somewhat hard upon the rabble of London, if we consider that they have not the advantage of those lessons of politeness enjoyed by every other rabble in Europe—that they are not tamed by a soldiery always ready to shoot them down without magistrate or riot act. "The English rabble," continues this historian, "are chiefly remarkable for mischief and cowardice. They destroy property, but they rarely attempt life." One who had a very considerable experience in the political power of mobs, was anxious that what he considered their courage should be kept alive by the humanizing lessons of the gallows. Romilly describes a dinner in 1785, at which he was present with John Wilkes and Mirabeau: "The conversation turned upon the English criminal law, its severity, and the frequency of public executions. Wilkes defended the system with much wit and good-humor, but with very bad arguments. He thought that the happiest results followed from the severities of our penal law. It accustomed men to a contempt of death, though it never held out to them any cruel spectacle; and he thought that much of the courage of Englishmen, and of their humanity too, might be traced to the nature of our capital punishments, and to their being so often exhibited to the people."‡ When the system came to an end, under which ninety-seven malefactors were executed in London in one year, and twenty were hanged on one morning, did the "cowardice" increase; so that "a file of soldiers will, at any time, disperse the most formidable crowd; and a few resolute individuals, armed with bludgeons, can generally beat them off."§ The admirable metropolitan police of the present day has prevented any frequent opportunities of analyzing the composition of the qualities of the London rabble. Mischievous boys are generally more conspicuous than brutal men. The chairmen are gone, and so are the street porters. That large class who stand behind carriages in plush breeches and silk stockings are no longer the most turbulent in the theatres; no longer have private riots of their own of a character quite as formidable as those of the denizens of St. Giles's. A singular state of manners is presented in the following record of a scene which took place on the 11th of May, 1764. "A great disturbance was created at Ranelagh House, by the coachmen, footmen, etc., belonging to such of the nobility and gentry as will not suffer their servants to take veils. They began by hissing their masters; they then broke all the lamps and outside windows with stones; and afterward, putting out their flambeaux, pelted the company in a most audacious manner with brickbats, whereby several were greatly hurt, so as to render the use of swords necessary."‖ Can we have better evidence of the disorder of all society, in which the valet emulated the indecorum of his master, and the drunken mechanic copied the drunken lord?

The police of London in the last ten years of George II., and

---

* "Diary," p. 75. † Maxwell's "Collectanea," in Boswell.
‡ Foote, "The Commissary," act ii. § No. 40, June 20, 1752.
‖ "Observations on England," vol. i. p. 84. ¶ Ibid., p. 63.

* "Travels through England in 1782."
† Massey, "History during reign of George III.," vol. ii. p. 85.
‡ "Memoirs of Sir Samuel Romilly," vol. i. p. 61, 3d edit.
§ Massey. ‖ "Annual Register," vol. vii.

through the remaining years of the century, was a system that combined the hateful and the ridiculous to an extent that requires some strong power of relying upon evidence to believe in. The character of the watchman may be found in every novel. A sober traveller sums up the qualifications of these protectors of life and property: "London has neither troops, patrols, nor any sort of regular watch; and it is guarded during the night only by old men chosen from the dregs of the people, who have no other arms but a lanthorn and a pole; who patrol the streets, crying the hour every time the clock strikes; who proclaim good or bad weather in the morning; who come to awake those who have any journey to perform; and whom it is customary with young rakes to beat and use ill, when they come rioting from the taverns where they have spent the night." * A curious example of the influence of routine upon public functionaries is given by Wraxall. He went out amid the mob on the worst night of the riots of 1780, while the premises of Mr. Langdale, the distiller, were burning on Holborn Hill, and a frantic mob was raging in the street. "While we stood by the wall of St. Andrew's churchyard, a watchman, with his lanthorn in his hand, passed us, calling the hour as if in a time of profound tranquillity." † The police-officer of that day was called a "thief-taker"—he was in no sense of the word a detective or a preventive functionary. He knew the thieves, and the thieves knew him. His business was to "let the matter ripen" when he had information of a house to be broken open or a mail to be robbed. When he was sure of a capital conviction, he took his man, and obtained forty pounds "blood-money." It was a thriving trade. "I remember," said Townsend, the Bow Street runner, "in 1783, when Sergeant Adair was recorder, there were forty hung at two executions."

The horrible state of the prisons in 1738 has been already shown in some notice of a report of a parliamentary committee.‡ We may trace in the writers of fiction how little the dominion of cruelty, neglect, and extortion had been diminished at the accession of George III. Fielding's Mr. Booth is committed by an ignorant justice to Bridewell, upon a charge of assaulting a watchman, when he had only interfered to prevent an outrage by two men of fortune, who bribed the constable to let them escape. When he goes to prison a number of persons gather round him in the yard and demand "garnish." The keeper explained that it was customary for every new prisoner to treat the others with something to drink. The young man had no money; and the keeper quietly permitted the scoundrels to strip him of his clothes. All persons sent to Bridewell were treated alike, so far as the prison discipline was concerned. Three street robbers, certain to be hanged, were enjoying themselves over a bottle of wine and a pipe; the man without a shilling in his pocket had the prison allowance of a penny loaf and a jug of water. § Felons and debtors were in some cases separated; but there was little distinction in the treatment of the burglar and the bankrupt. Those who could pay exorbitant fees had privileges and indulgences—a full meal and unlimited liquor. In 1773 John Howard, in his capacity of high sheriff of Bedfordshire, had his eyes opened to the disgraceful condition of the prisons of England, and the enormities committed in them. Before 1775 he had personally inspected nearly every one of these abodes of vice made more wicked; of innocence corrupted; of human beings, whether innocent or guilty, subjected to filth, starvation, contagious disease, and the capricious temper of savage and mercenary jailers. In 1777 he published his book "On Prisons." He awakened public attention to the evil; and the legislature adopted some measures for its remedy—measures, however, founded upon no enlarged principles—mere palliatives, that fitted a state of society in which expediency might suggest a few obvious changes, but where principle made no attempt to go to the root of one of the most difficult of social questions—the mode of dealing with the criminal population. The system of the Hulks was commenced in 1776. In nineteen years 7999 convicts were ordered to be punished with hard labor on the Thames, and in Langston and Portsmouth harbors. It was something to have given fewer victims to the devouring maw of the gallows; but it was more than ten years before these offerings to Moloch had been diminished. But the Hulks utterly failed in producing the reformation of offenders. "Most of them, instead of profiting by the punishment they have suffered, forgetting they were under sentence of death, and undismayed by the dangers they have escaped—immediately rush into the same course of depredation and warfare upon the public." * The system of transportation to New South Wales commenced in 1787.

The efforts of individuals to compensate for the neglect of the government, by associating benevolent persons in attempts to remedy social evils, were at this period very remarkable. The reform effected by Howard was the seed in good ground. But it was not always that energy such as that of Howard could be found in companionship with his practical sense; or, at any rate, that the objects aimed at by philanthropy should be so little liable to misdirection, and so certain in their results, as his purification of the prison system. Thomas Coram, the master of a merchant vessel, had seen in the neighborhood of Rotherhithe infants exposed in the streets—left to perish by their unnatural mothers. He labored hard to establish a foundling hospital; and in 1739 obtained a charter for that institution which now possesses enormous funds from subscriptions and from estates, but which had originally very inadequate means compared with the number of those who rang a bell at the gate of the hospital, left a child with a particular mark upon it, and waited its admission or rejection. In 1756 the governors obtained a parliamentary grant of 10,000*l.*, and during the subsequent fifteen years had received more than half a million of the public money, to distribute in a manner calculated to produce far greater evils than those which they sought to remedy. The wise legislators stipulated, when the grant was first made, that all children above the age of two months should be received. The age was afterward limited to six months. A basket was hung at the gate, in which the deserted child was deposited. Purveyors of foundlings started up in the country districts, who carried infants to London in panniers slung across a horse. Many died on their journey. In four years from 1756, children to the number of 14,934 were taken under the management of this institution, of which only 4400 lived to be apprenticed. Parliament then interfered, and declared "that the indiscriminate admission of all children under a certain age into the hospital had been attended with many evil consequences, and that it be discontinued." The charity had offered a large premium for vice, and had been perfectly successful in the encouragement of what we now properly call "the great social evil." Another philanthropist, toward the close of the reign of George II., established two societies, which were incorporated in the subsequent reign. The one was the "Magdalen Asylum," the other "the Marine Society." To take distressed boys out of the streets, educate them for the seaman's life, and place them in the merchant service or the royal navy, was an object of no doubtful good. Jonas Hanway, whose exertions mainly established these two charities, is stated to have been "the first man who ventured to walk the streets of London with an umbrella over his head."

Amid a good deal of selfish indulgence in their own pleasures, about the middle of the eighteenth century, by the noble and the rich, there is abundant evidence that a feeling had been awakened of consideration for the miseries of the lowly and the indigent. Hospitals for the reception of the sick and the maimed were freely supported by voluntary contributions. The Westminster Hospital was the first of this character, having been instituted in 1719. St. George's Hospital dates from 1733; the London Hospital from 1740, in which year the Middlesex Hospital was also established; and the Small-pox Hospital was opened in 1746. But no benefit to society was greater than that produced by the partial extension of education to the humblest classes of the community. The old foundation-schools had, in too many instances, been wholly diverted from their original purpose of general instruction, to provide sinecures for clergymen, who pretended to instruct the few pupils to whom they could not refuse admission. Their funds were wasted and misappropriated till, in our own day, a man of extraordinary vigor tore down the cobwebbed screen that patronage and venality had raised up, to defraud the children of this land of their inheritance. What were called the free schools, or charity schools, dispensed reading and writing to select parties of boys and girls, marked out for the ridicule of their companions by a grotesque and antiquated costume

* Grosley, vol. i. p. 48.
† "Historical Memoirs," vol. i. p. 329.
‡ *Ante*, vol. v. p. 781.
§ "Amelia."

* Colquhoun, "Police of the Metropolis," p. 470, ed. 1800.

These boys were fortunate if they obtained a sufficient knowledge of arithmetic to serve behind a counter without a ready reckoner. Fielding has touched upon the state of popular instruction in his day, according to the experience of Joseph Andrews: "Joey told Mr. Adams that he had very early learned to read and write, by the goodness of his father, who, though he had not interest enough to get him into a charity school, because a cousin of his father's landlord did not vote on the right side for a churchwarden in a borough town, yet had been himself at the expense of sixpence a week for his learning." The extension of instruction to which we have referred was the work of Robert Raikes, the proprietor of the "Gloucester Journal." This excellent man was struck by the degraded state of the children in the suburbs of his city. On a Sunday their numbers were increased, and their filth and disorderly conduct more revolting. He procured a few women to teach some to read on the Sunday; he persuaded them to go to church with clean hands and face and combed hair; he gave them Testaments. Their self-respect was raised; from outcasts they became capable of honest industry. The good example was rapidly followed; and Sunday-schools were established all over the kingdom, after the successful experiment of 1781.

As we approach the period we have assigned as the limit to this general view of manners, we find that there has been, in some degree, an awakening of society to a more decorous, and, we may therefore presume, to a more virtuous exhibition of character and conduct. Literature has been very materially purified. Scenes and expressions in writers of fiction, which were held to be natural and amusing in the middle of the century, were deemed gross and revolting toward its close. Whether these exceptionable passages were derived from the tone of the age, which is most probable, or were the oozings out of the impure thoughts of the writers, which we are unwilling to believe, it is certain that they have condemned Fielding, Smollett, and Sterne to an oblivion from which their great powers would otherwise have saved them. We see, also, that the miseries of poverty and the degradation of ignorance had stirred up some feeling of what was required for the mitigation of evils not absolutely associated with humble station. In high life, the example of the court was working a gradual reformation. But there were influences more potent in operation to produce a more vital change than literature or fashion.

The observant Frenchman to whom we have several times referred, M. Grosley, says of "the sect of the Methodists:" "This establishment has borne all the persecutions that it could possibly apprehend in a country as much disposed to persecution as England is the reverse."* The light literature of forty years overflows with ridicule of Methodism. The preachers are pelted by the mob; the converts are held up to execration as fanatics or hypocrites. Yet Methodism held the ground it had gained. It had gone forth to utter the words of truth to men little above the beasts that perish, and it had brought them to regard themselves as akin to humanity. The time would come when its earnestness would awaken the Church itself from its somnolency, and the educated classes would not be ashamed to be religious. There was wild enthusiasm enough in some of the followers of Whitefield and Wesley; much self-seeking; zeal verging upon profaneness; moral conduct strangely opposed to pious profession. But these earnest men left a mark upon their time which can never be effaced. The obscure young students at Oxford, in 1736, who were first called "Sacramentarians," then "Bible Moths," and finally "Methodists," to whom the regular pulpits were closed, and who then went forth to preach in the fields—who separated from the Church more in form than in reality—produced a moral revolution in England which probably saved us from the fate of nations wholly abandoned to their own devices.

The individuality of opinion and conduct which is so characteristic of England—so different to the "all men alike" of France—led the two founders of Methodism into different paths. The principle of individuality originally isolated them from the torpid religion and the lax morality of the college life. It sent them to preach to the neglected poor wherever vice and ignorance most abounded, without much regard to the discipline of the Church of which they were members. But the characters of Whitefield and Wesley were in some respects very different. Whitefield was satisfied with rousing the sinful and the indifferent by his own fervid eloquence, without providing for the systematic continuance of his personal efforts. His preaching created a host of followers, who, branching off in their several localities, were content to be led by men without education. Starting up as teachers from the lowest ranks, such men, although too vain and presumptuous to see their own incompetence, were nevertheless better judges, in many cases, than the educated clergy, of the mode in which rude natures could be most effectually awakened to penitence for sin. Wesley, on the other hand, saw the danger of this indiscriminate admission of every fanatic to be a gospel-preacher; and he instituted and perfected by his incessant labors that remarkable organization known as Wesleyism. The exertions of these two men, each pursuing tracks not essentially diverging however separate, had produced effects in half a century of which their opponents could have formed no adequate estimate. The clergy, who preached and wrote against the excesses of coarse enthusiasts—the wits, who exhibited hypocrisy and credulity upon the stage, in the endeavor to laugh down the Methodists—could not wholly shut their eyes to the conviction that there was a real power at work which touched other natures than such as those of the Mawworms and Mrs. Coles. The power could not be despised which made floods of tears roll down the sooty cheeks of the colliers of Kingswood; and which, penetrating to Scotland, had called the lowest of the population of Glasgow to go forth to Cambuslang, and there, "at the foot of the brae near the kirk," hear the Word preached in the open fields, and surrender themselves to an irresistible influence, such as was wielded by the Puritans of old. To assist in "the extraordinary work of Cambuslang" Whitefield came, and saw thirty thousand persons assembled to receive the sacrament. There was beheld, upon the largest scale, scenes that were familiar in England among the earliest converts to Methodism — shrieks, violent agitations of body, shaking and trembling, fainting and convulsions. These manifestations were, by one party in the Church of Scotland, ascribed to the delusions of Satan; by another party, to the influence of the Holy Spirit; and by a third party, to natural causes, produced by sermons addressed "not to the understanding of the hearers, but to their imaginations and passions."* These early effects of the fervid preaching of the new sect passed away. But the gradual influence of a more earnest sense of religion was diffused through the whole community of Britain. The members of the Churches of England and Scotland ceased to ridicule even such extravagances as were seen at "the Cambuslang conversions." The separation between Establishment and Dissent became less marked by bitter hostility. The principle of individuality was not less strong; but it gradually put off the form of intolerance, for that honest rivalry in the attempt to do good which has, more than any other cause, enabled us to look back upon the morals and manners of the last century as a condition of society not likely to return.

* "Observations on England," vol. i. p. 356.

CHAPTER CLXXXIII.

Retrospect of Indian affairs — Hastings governor-general—Rohilla war—New council at Calcutta—Hastings and the council opposed to each other—Nuncomar—His execution—Dissensions at Madras—Mahratta war—Capture of Gwalior—Hyder Ali—The Carnatic ravaged—Hyder defeated by Coote—Death of Hyder—Succeeded by his son Tippoo Saib—Benares—Oude—The Begums—Committee of the houses of parliament on Indian affairs.

In June, 1783, when the news arrived at Calcutta that the preliminaries of peace had been signed between Great Britain and France, the misfortunes that had at one time foreboded the downfall of the British power in India had been mainly overcome. The war with Tippoo Saib and his French auxiliaries was still maintained, although it was evident that the energy of Warren Hastings had succeeded in averting the danger in the East, which, not long before, appeared to threaten as calamitous results as those which had attended our arms in the West. Before we resume our narrative of civil affairs at home, it will be proper that we should take up the history of events in India, from the period of the appointment of Hastings as the first governor-general.†

* Sinclair, "Statistical Account of Scotland," vol. v.

† *Ante*, vol. vi. p. 869.

Previous to the nomination of Hastings to this high office by the act of 1773, he had, in his capacity of Governor of Bengal, struck out a line of policy in which we alternately admire his sagacity, and blush, as his countrymen, for his unscrupulousness. In 1772 he was laboring, as an honest statesmen, to repair as far as possible the miseries produced by the famine of 1770, and by judicious fiscal arrangements to overcome the consequent embarrassments in the collection of the revenue of the depopulated districts. He freed the country from bands of robbers, by appointing local officers to maintain authority. He secured the administration of justice by instituting local courts of law. If he could have met, by just means, the unceasing demands of the directors of the East India Company for lacs of rupees, he would not have resorted to those modes of gratifying the cupidity of his masters, for which many apologies have been offered, but for which no adequate defence has ever been established. He was a faithful servant to the company, not waiting for direct orders to commit injustice, but securing his own tenure of power by violating the pecuniary engagements which Clive had made, and by driving excellent bargains, of which the only defect was that they compromised the English honor. When Clive put an end to the war among the native princes, giving the greater part of Oude to the Vizier Sujah Dowlah, he reserved the districts of Corah and Allahabad for the mogul, Shah Alum, and agreed to pay the fallen potentate twenty-six lacs of rupees annually. The successor of the great Mussulman conquerors of India was happy to have a certain revenue for his own luxurious gratifications, and he willingly executed a solemn deed, giving the English company the sole administration of the provinces of Bengal, Orissa, and Bahar. Hastings, in 1773, had a plausible excuse for setting aside those arrangements with Shah Alum which were costly to the company, or the violation of which would produce immediate advantages. The mogul had become dependent upon the Mahrattas, and had been compelled to sign an edict to transfer to them Corah and Allahabad. Hastings promptly occupied those districts with English troops, and resolved to pay no more tribute to the shadow of the sovereignty of Hindostan. Shah Alum lost his annual lacs of rupees, which amounted to nearly three hundred thousand pounds, and the districts which were taken from him were sold to Sujah Dowlah, the Vizier of Oude, for half a million sterling. To manage these transactions Hastings paid a visit to the vizier in his city of Benares ; and there the two allies concluded another bargain, which brought more gold into the treasury of Leadenhall Street. It was agreed that an English army should be hired by Sujah Dowlah to effect the subjugation of the Rohillas—a race of Afghans, who were among the bravest and the most civilized of the various populations of Hindostan. With troops under the command of Colonel Champion, the Rohilla country was invaded by the English in April, 1774, in concert with Sujah Dowlah and his soldiery. The English gained a victory. The forces of Oude looked on, and then applied themselves to devastate the fertile plains of Rohilcund, and to extirpate, as far as possible, the peaceful and industrious inhabitants. It was one of the charges of "high crimes and misdemeanors" against Warren Hastings that he entered into a private engagement with the Nabob of Oude, "to furnish him, for a stipulated sum of money, to be paid to the East India Company, with a body of troops for the declared purpose of thoroughly extirpating the nation of the Rohillas —a nation from whom the company had never received, or pretended to receive or apprehend, any injury whatever."

The Rohilla war was ended. The work of spoliation and massacre was going on under the declaration of the governor-general that "he had no authority to control the conduct of the vizier in the treatment of his subjects." The country, once a garden, without a spot of uncultivated ground, was reduced, by the brutal mode of carrying on the war, and by the subsequent misgovernment, to a state of utter decay and depopulation. At this period, October, 1774, three new members of the council, and the judges of the Supreme Court, appointed under the Regulating Act of 1773, arrived at Calcutta. The principal objects of that act were the reformation of the Court of Proprietors of the East India Company, and such a remodelling of the Court of Directors as should secure an enforcement of their authority upon their servants abroad ; the establishment of a court of justice capable of protecting the natives from the oppressions of British subjects ; the formation of a general council having authority over all the British settlements, and who would furnish the ministers of the crown with constant information concerning the whole of the company's correspondence with India. The provisions of this act were directed to the accomplishment of large and benevolent reforms ; but they were found wholly inadequate for the protection of the natives, for the improvement of the country, or for the construction of a firm and united government. The three new members of the council, General Clavering, Colonel Monson, and Mr. Francis, appear to have entered upon their duties with a concerted determination to oppose the measures of Hastings and of the other old servant of the company, Mr. Barwell. The new chief justice of the Supreme Court, Sir Elijah Impey, was a personal friend of the governor-general. Hastings naturally looked with great disfavor upon those who were come apparently with the determination to wrest all power from his hands, by constituting a majority of the council where he had only a casting vote. Without a day's delay they testified their abhorrence of the Rohilla war by recalling the English troops. Sujah Dowlah having died, and his son having succeeded him as vizier, they maintained that the treaties with Oude were at an end upon the father's death. They did some rash things which might be intended to remedy past evils, but which had the inevitable tendency of lowering the respect of the natives for that able administrator who had impressed them with a reverential fear. The natives saw, or believed they saw, that the power of Hastings was gone. Charges of corruption were made against him by his enemies, whether natives or Englishmen. An old enemy of Hastings was a Hindoo Brahmin, the Maharajah Nuncomar. He had been disappointed in his aspirations for the great and lucrative office of chief minister of the province of Bengal ; for Hastings had abolished the office, and had transferred its powers to the servants of the company. The crafty Hindoo bided his time for revenge. He soon discovered who would be his natural ally against the governor-general. He put into the hands of Francis a series of charges against Hastings, in which he was accused of setting offices to sale, and of receiving bribes to permit the escape of offenders. Francis brought the papers before the council. Hastings contended that they had no right to inquire into charges against the governor, especially into charges made by one so notoriously perjured and fraudulent as Nuncomar. Hastings and Barwell quitted the council-chamber, and the three remaining members called in Nuncomar, and allowed him to tell his story with new embellishments. Hastings instituted proceedings against the old Hindoo, and against others, upon a charge of conspiracy. But the fate of Nuncomar was decided upon a very different accusation. He was imprisoned at the suit of a native merchant, charged with having forged a bond five years before this period ; for which alleged offence he had been brought to trial in the mayor's court at Calcutta, and had been dismissed on the interposition of Hastings. The Supreme Court, that had now entered upon its functions, with Sir Elijah Impey as its head, had to take cognizance of such cases of lapsed justice. The apologists of the governor-general and the chief justice maintain that it was in the ordinary course of events that Nuncomar should have been tried, and only a strict measure of justice that Nuncomar should have been hanged, at the precise period when he was truly dangerous to the power and influence of Hastings. Forgery, under the common law of England, was punished as a misdemeanor, and under the statute of Elizabeth was not treated as a capital offence. The law was made more severe as the commerce of the country became more extensive. But in Hindostan the crime regarded as very venial, had never been dealt with capitally. Nuncomar was tried upon the severer English statute, although one of the judges associated with Impey pressed for his indictment under the earlier and milder enactment. He was tried by a jury of Englishmen, and was found guilty. He was sentenced to be hanged, and the power of reprieve which the Supreme Court possessed was not exercised. The council had no power to interfere, although the majority remonstrated in the strongest terms against the entire proceedings. The execution of the old man, to whom the agents of the company had once sued for favor and protection, to whom his countrymen looked up with awe as a Brahmin who was the very head of Brahmins, was inexorably resolved upon. He was carried in a palanquin to the common gallows, and he died with the most perfect composure. The punishment of Nuncomar put an end to all troubles and accusations against Hastings by native informers. The event we are assured, was a mere coincidence with the attempts to shake the

ascendency of the governor-general, and that his friend and school-fellow, the chief justice, was a pure administrator of the law without respect of person.

The public quarrels and the private immoralities of Hastings and Francis occupy, for several years, the general narratives of Indian affairs. The adulterous intercourse of Francis with the wife of a Calcutta barrister, and the excessive fine imposed upon him by Sir Elijah Impey; the very questionable relations of Hastings with Mrs. Imhoff, who afterward became his wife, and whose reception at her court by the rigid Queen Charlotte was attributed by satirists to the influence of some of the plundered wealth of India—these are matters which, however entertaining they may be, are now of little historical importance. The Council of Calcutta and its Supreme Court of Justice were as discordant an administrative body as ever precipitated an empire into ruin. But Hastings had the sagacity, amid all the rivalries which would have pulled down a man of less energetic will, to maintain his own power, and at the same time to look steadily at the aggrandizement of the British crown. Circumstances at home were favorable to him, although Lord North, strongly disapproving the Rohilla war, was bent upon his recall. But the governor-general could not be removed during the first five years of his administration, except by an address to the crown by the Court of East India Proprietors. The most strenuous exertions were made by the supporters of the ministry to obtain a vote against Hastings, but the proposition for the recall was finally negatived. The governor-general had once authorized his friend Colonel Maclean to tender his resignation if his conduct should not be approved; and though he had retracted that authority, Maclean in 1776 did tender the resignation. About that time Hastings had acquired a temporary supremacy by the death of Monson. His casting vote enabled him to defeat the proposals of Clavering and Francis, and to carry his own views into effect. In June, 1777, a packet-ship arrived with the announcement that the governor-general had resigned. Hastings denied that he had authorized any such act. Clavering and Francis claimed immediate authority. Hastings and Barwell maintained that the right of the governor to obedience should be upheld until further information should arrive. An appeal to military force would have unquestionably determined the victory for Governor Hastings and not for King Francis, as the presumptuous ex-clerk of the foreign office was called. The Supreme Court prevented such a conflict by deciding that the resignation of Hastings was invalid, and that Clavering had illegally assumed the power of governor-general. Hastings then contended that Clavering had forfeited his seat in the council by his attempt at usurpation; but the judges of the Supreme Court decided that the governor-general had no power to remove any member of the board. In two months after this contest Clavering died. A new member of the council, Mr. Wheler, arrived to fill up the vacancy caused by the death of Colonel Monson; and now Hastings had a majority to support him. The same course of unworthy and dangerous rivalries prevailed in the subordinate Council of Madras, between Lord Pigot and the members of his board. He maintained that he was not bound by a majority against him, and upon their refusal to yield ordered them to be suspended from their functions. They took a stronger step, and put the governor under military arrest, for which violent act they were recalled home by a vote of the House of Commons, were tried in the Court of King's Bench, and were sentenced to pay a moderate fine, which lenient sentence they probably owed to a speech of Erskine, in mitigation of punishment. Lord Pigot was also recalled, but he had died during his period of imprisonment. When the five years had expired during which Hastings could not be removed by the government without the concurrence of the East India Company he was reappointed. Lord North, in 1786, in a debate on the Rohilla war, the charge against Hastings being then under discussion, strongly expressed his disapprobation of the conduct of the governor-general, but said that in 1778, when the French war commenced, he did not think that a fit time to make an alteration in the constitution of our government in India, and considering Mr. Hastings as a man of abilities he continued him in his government.*

In the spring of 1778 the French government had openly made a common cause with the North American colonies, and war between England and France was inevitable. In the previous year a French agent had been negotiating with the Peshwa of the Mahrattas, at his seat of viceroyalty at Poonah, and an alliance dangerous to the British interests was likely to be formed. Hastings was for immediate war; and although two of the council were opposed to him, an army was sent to the Peshwa's country, with instructions to forward the claims of Ragoba, a pretender to the dignity of Peshwa. It was one of the charges against Hastings that on the 22d of June, 1778, he made the following declaration in council: "If it be really true that the British arms and influence have suffered so severe a check in the western world, it is more incumbent on those who are charged with the interests of Great Britain in the East to exert themselves for the retrieval of the national loss." Hastings alluded to the surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga. In a few weeks arrived the intelligence of hostilities with France. The French settlement of Chandernagore was immediately captured, Pondicherry was invested, and was surrendered after some resistance, and the Mahratta expedition was persevered in. Its results were very unfortunate. The small army under Colonel Egerton that had approached Poonah was surrounded by bodies of hostile cavalry; and the only chance of safety was a convention, by which it was agreed that the Mahrattas should recover what the British had gained from them since 1756. Hastings persevered, and other expeditions were more successful. General Goddard took the fort of Ahmedabad by storm, and the city of Bassein by siege. Captain Popham reduced the city of Lahar, and took by escalade the hill fortress of Gwalior, deemed impregnable. The government at home, on the first outbreak of the war with France, had sent Sir Eyre Coote to be the commander of the forces in India, with a seat in the council. There had been a partial reconciliation in that body between the discordant parties of Hastings and Francis. But the animosities were only smothered. A duel was fought between the two rivals, in which Francis was shot; and upon his recovery he resigned his office and returned to England. There were other fierce contests between the wielders of the political and the judicial power. Hastings and Impey were now bitter opponents. These feuds have ceased to command the interest which was once attached to them. Events of more real importance were now to call forth all the resources of the boldness and foresight of the governor-general. The abilities of Hastings were exhibited in connection with a policy which did not shrink from employing means to insure success which no amount of success can justify. However we may admire in him the great qualities which saved the British authority in the East from a danger as formidable as that which overthrew our power in the West, we cannot lament that his triumphs did not prevent him being accused as an offender against the rights of humanity, and that years of bitter anxiety and loss of fortune were the penalties he paid for his oppressions.

Hyder Ali, the sovereign of the great kingdom of the Mysore, had been at peace with the British since he concluded a treaty with the Council of Madras in 1769. This extraordinary ruler was now far advanced in years, but his energy was undiminished. It was one of the articles of charge against Hastings that his intrigues against the Peshwa of the Mahrattas had produced, among the chief princes and states of India, a general distrust and suspicion of the ambitious designs and treacherous principles of the British government. It was alleged that the two principal Hindoo powers—the Peshwa and the Rajah of Berar—and the two principal Mohammedan powers—Hyder Ali and the Nizam of the Deccan—renouncing all former enmities against each other, united in a common confederacy against the English. In 1780 Hyder Ali assembled an army computed to consist of ninety thousand men. These forces had been partly disciplined by French officers. He had a more personal quarrel to avenge than his dread of the extension of the English power. The Council of Madras, under Sir Thomas Rumbold, had given especial offence to Hyder Ali. His rival in the Carnatic, the Nabob of Arcot, was surrounded by English, who were his creditors, and who are accused of having carried on a continued plot in the divan for the destruction of Hyder Ali.* The revenge of the great chief of Mysore has been described in language which makes the soberer coloring of history look pale and ineffective. "Having terminated his disputes with every enemy and with every rival, who buried their mutual animosi-

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxvi. p. 46.

* Burke, "Speech on the Nabob of Arcot's Debts."

ties in their common detestation against the creditors of the Nabob of Arcot, he drew from every quarter whatever a savage ferocity could add to his new rudiments in the arts of destruction ; and compounding all the materials of fury, havoc, and desolation into one black cloud, he hung for a while on the declivities of the mountains. While the authors of all these evils were idly and stupidly gazing on this menacing meteor which blackened all their horizon, it suddenly burst and poured down the whole of its contents on the plains of the Carnatic. Then ensued a scene of woe the like of which no eye had seen, no heart conceived, and which no tongue can adequately tell. All the horrors of war before known or heard of were mercy to that new havoc. A storm of universal fire blasted every field, consumed every house, destroyed every temple. The miserable inhabitants, flying from their flaming villages, in part were slaughtered ; others, without regard to sex, to age, to the respect of rank or sacredness of function—fathers torn from children, husbands from wives—enveloped in a whirlwind of cavalry, and amid the goading spears of drivers and the trampling of pursuing horses, were swept into captivity, in an unknown and hostile land. Those who were able to evade this tempest fled to the walled cities. But escaping from fire, sword, and exile, they fell into the jaws of famine." *

The terrified inhabitants of Madras could trace the progress of the ruthless invader as columns of smoke rose from the burning villages. The danger was approaching to the very walls of the settlement. A force of three thousand men under Colonel Baillie had been cut to pieces by Hyder. Sir Hector Munro, with five thousand men, retreated toward Mount St. Thomas. When the evil tidings reached Hastings he at once adopted his course of action. He abandoned the Mahratta war, and proposed that a treaty of peace and alliance should be concluded. Sir Eyre Coote proceeded with every man that could be shipped from Bengal to take the command at Madras. Hyder Ali was alarmed when Coote took the field in January, 1781, and he immediately raised the siege of Wondewash and the siege of Vellore. At length on the 1st of July the English commander, having only a force of nine thousand men to oppose to Hyder's enormous army, brought him to action at Porto Nono, and obtained a signal victory. Another battle, on the 27th of August, was not so decisive. Peace was not concluded with the Mahrattas till early in 1782 ; and the continued war with Mysore and with Poonah involved so great a cost that Hastings had to look to extraordinary resources to enable him to carry on this struggle against the most dangerous enemy that had yet assailed the British power. He had to repeat the policy of 1773, when he violated a solemn compact with the mogul, and let out his troops to the Nabob of Oude for the enslavement of the Rohillas, with the sole object of replenishing his exhausted treasury.

The Rajah of Benares, Cheyte Sing, had become a tributary to the English, the Nabob of Oude having surrendered his rights to them in 1774. Cheyte Sing had regularly transmitted to Calcutta his tribute of a settled sum. Hastings demanded extraordinary aid from this Hindoo prince, and at the beginning of the Mahratta war, in 1778, had compelled him to make a contribution of five lacs of rupees (50,000*l.*) for the maintenance of three battalions of sepoys. The governor-general demanded that a similar contribution should be made in 1779, and again in 1780. Cheyte Sing endeavored to propitiate his taskmaster by a present of two lacs of rupees. Hastings concealed the transaction from the council at Bengal and from the directors. But after some delay he handed over the money to the accountant-general, and insisted upon the contribution of five lacs from Cheyte Sing, with a fine of an additional lac for neglect of payment. Hastings had evidently determined by excessive demands to drive the unhappy rajah into resistance, which would have ended in the confiscation of his possessions. To accomplish his purpose the governor-general proceeded to Benares, required a contribution of half a million sterling, and although the rajah expressed the most abject devotion placed him under arrest. But now the despotic Englishman had to encounter a power of which he made little account. The people of Benares had been mildly governed. The rajah was popular. The religious and national feelings of the Hindoo population were roused by this outrage upon their native prince. The streets of the great Brahminical city were filled by an angry multitude. The sepoys who had been appointed to arrest and guard Cheyte Sing were butchered, and the prince escaped from his palace-prison. Hastings had to barricade the house in which he had taken up his residence, and finally to leave the city by night, with a small band, amid the hootings of the populace. The rajah at first made offers of submission, to which Hastings did not vouchsafe a reply ; but Cheyte Sing, having been followed by a formidable body of insurgents, was able to make a stand with forty thousand undisciplined men. Popham, the victor of Gwalior, was ready to attack the rajah, who was utterly routed, driven from his states, and finally deposed.

Hastings was disappointed in the amount of treasure which he found, when the fortress of Bidgegur, which held the rajah's wealth, was surrendered to Popham, and the quarter of a million that was taken was divided as prize-money by the army. He had another booty in view. Asaph ul Dowlah, the Nabob and Vizier of Oude, had obtained from the British government a brigade to defend him against the aggressions of his neighbors. The weak and depraved prince had thus virtually become a vassal of the company. Hastings required heavy payment for his military aid. The nabob wanted money himself. The grandmother and mother of Asaph ul Dowlah, called the begums of Oude, were reputed to be possessed of enormous treasure, which they kept in their palace of Fyzabad. The nabob and the governor-general met in the fortress of Chunar, and there it was consented to by Asaph ul Dowlah that the begums should be stripped of the domains which they retained by his father's bequest and his own grants, and that their treasure should go to the English in liquidation of the arrears which Hastings demanded. A solemn treaty was entered into, but when the weak prince was no longer under the immediate dominion of the stern will of the governor-general, he relented in his meditated spoliation of his parents. Hastings sent the most peremptory orders to the English resident at Lucknow, Mr. Hamilton, to carry out the treaty, even if force were necessary. If the resident hesitated, Hastings would come himself to take the work out of feebler hands. The gates of the palace of Fyzabad were forced by the company's troops. The aged princesses were confined to their own apartments, it being alleged that they had been concerned in exciting the insurrection at Benares. Sir Elijah Impey hurried to Lucknow to receive depositions against the begums, and then hurried back to Calcutta. The begums would not part with their treasure, though imprisoned and dreading personal violence. An atrocity, which requires not the eloquence of Burke or Sheridan to rouse the indignation of every man jealous of his country's honor, was perpetrated upon the two eunuchs who presided over the household of Sujah ul Dowlah's widow. Through their persecution the treasure was to be extorted from the begums. They were put in irons ; they were half starved ; they were ordered to be debarred from all food till they yielded. The English resident, Nathaniel Middleton, signed this cruel order. The old men agreed to produce the sum that was then required. But the whole demand was not satisfied. They were removed to Lucknow. The British resident there incurred the disgrace of issuing this order to a British officer : "Sir, the nabob having determined to inflict corporal punishment upon the prisoners under your guard, this is to desire that his officers, when they shall come, may have free access to the prisoners, and be permitted to do with them as they shall think proper.' The eunuchs were imprisoned till, after months of terror, the begums had surrendered twelve hundred thousand pounds ; and Hastings was content.

The case of the Rajah of Benares and the case of the begums furnished the most exciting materials for that eloquence which determined the impeachment of Hastings, and which, during the first year of that procrastinated trial, attracted eager crowds to Westminster Hall, to listen to the greatest masters of oratory of that age—inferior probably to none of any age. From 1788 to 1795 was this memorable trial carried on. Amid the storm of invective which denounced him as a monster of cruelty and rapacity, Hastings was sustained by the proud consciousness that he had rendered eminent service to his country. In his address upon his defence he said, and said truly, "To the Commons of England, in whose name I am arraigned for desolating the provinces of their dominion in India, I dare to reply that they are—and their representatives annually persist in telling them so—the most flourishing of all the states of India. It was I who made them so. The valor of others acquired—I en

* Burke, "Speech on the Nabob of Arcot's Debts."

larged and gave consistency to—the dominion which you hold there. I preserved it." With the treasures which he extorted from rajahs and begums he carried on the war in the Carnatic till the death of Hyder Ali in 1782, and finally concluded an honorable peace with Hyder's son and successor, Tippoo, in 1783. His administration ceased in the spring of 1785, when a new system for the government of India was established, after a parliamentary contest of unexampled interest and momentous results.

CHAPTER CLXXXIV.

Coalition of Lord North and Mr. Fox—Pitt's second Reform Bill—Affairs of India—Fox brings forward his India Bill—The bill carried in the House of Commons—Rejected in the House of Lords—The coalition dismissed from office—Pitt the head of the government—His struggle against a majority of the Commons—His final triumph—Parliament dissolved—Results of the elections—The Westminster election—Pitt's financial measures—Commercial intercourse between Great Britain and Ireland—His third Reform Bill—Disputes between Holland and Austria—Pitt's sinking-fund—Commercial treaty with France—Consolidation of taxes—War with France averted—The Prince of Wales' debts—Mrs. Fitzherbert—The king becomes insane—Parliamentary conflict on the Regency Bill—The king's recovery.

THE coalition of the party headed by Lord North and of the party headed by Mr. Fox had succeeded in compelling Lord Shelburne and Mr. Pitt to resign; but it was not without difficulty that the coalesced chiefs could induce the king to admit them to power. After a considerable delay the Duke of Portland became first lord of the treasury, and Fox and North were appointed secretaries of state. The repugnance of the king to this extraordinary union of two political rivals—which, securing a majority in the House of Commons, forced upon him as the real prime minister a man whom he disliked with an intensity approaching to hatred—was more than tolerated by the majority of the nation. The coalition was odious to all men not bound by the trammels of party. Fox and North received the seals on the 2d of April, 1783. The acceptance of place by Fox rendered his re-election for Westminster necessary; and Romilly writes: "It is almost a general wish that some man of character and credit may be opposed to him as a candidate." He was re-elected because no candidate was found; "but the populace received him with hisses, hooting, and every other mark of displeasure." *

Pitt was now in opposition. He had in vain declared "a just and lawful impediment" to the "ill-omened and unnatural marriage," forbidding the banns "in the name of the public weal." The ministry were strong in their majorities. Pitt vainly opposed the conditions of the loan which they had raised upon very disadvantageous terms. On the 7th of May he, a second time, brought forward the question of parliamentary reform. He proposed that when the gross corruption of the majority of voters in any borough was proved before a committee of the Commons, the borough should be disfranchised, and that a large addition of knights of the shire and of members for the metropolis should be made to the representative body. But Pitt openly declared against the practicability of a perfectly equal representation, and held that those places known by the popular appellation of rotten boroughs were to be regarded in the light of deformities which in some degree disfigured the fabric of the constitution, but which he feared could not be removed without endangering the whole pile. Fox earnestly defended the proposition; North opposed it. Pitt's resolutions were rejected by a majority of 144. The young reformer was more successful in carrying through the House of Commons a bill for preventing abuses in the public offices, the chief object of which was to abolish an odious system of perquisites and percentages. In the House of Lords the adherents of the ministry threw out the bill. The session came to a close on the 16th of July.

The condition of India had for some time occupied the serious attention of British statesmen. Burke and Dundas had especially devoted their most earnest labors to unravel the complicated web of Indian policy, and to devise some remedy for the abuses which from time to time were brought to light. At the close of the session of July, 1782, the king, speaking the words of his minister, Lord Shelburne, congratulated parliament upon the diligence and ardor with which it had entered upon the consideration of the British interests in the East Indies: "To protect the persons and fortunes of millions in those distant regions and to combine our prosperity with their happiness are objects which amply repay the utmost labor and exertion." At the opening of the session in December of the same year the king said: "The regulation of a vast territory in Asia opens a large field for your wisdom, prudence, and foresight. I trust that you will be able to frame some fundamental laws which may make their connection with Great Britain a blessing to India." This was imperial language, befitting a great nation—language pointing to far higher objects than the gains of a trading company or the acquisition of extended territory. When the Shelburne ministry came to an end it was imperative upon the coalition to carry out those large views in a substantial proposal of their own. To Burke, especially, it was a labor of love to analyze the vast mass of facts that had been gathered from various sources on the affairs of India. In June, 1783, the ninth report and the eleventh report of the Select Committee were presented to the House of Commons. In those remarkable documents, drawn up by Burke, we have the clearest details of the state of the administration of justice in the provinces of Bengal, Bahar, and Orissa, and the largest views for the solution of the great problem submitted to the committee, "how the British possessions in the East Indies may be held and governed with the greatest security and advantage to this country, and by what means the happiness of the native inhabitants may be best promoted." Such were the preparations for a comprehensive measure for the future government of India.

The session of parliament was opened on the 11th of November. The Prince of Wales, previous to the arrival of the king, had been introduced to the House of Peers with great ceremony, and was conducted to his chair of state on the right hand of the throne.* Carlton House had been assigned to him as a residence. The question of India was the most important topic of the king's speech: "The situation of the East India Company will require the utmost exertions of your wisdom, to maintain and improve the valuable advantages derived from our Indian possessions, and to promote and secure the happiness of the native inhabitants of those provinces." On the 18th of November Mr. Fox brought forward his India Bill. The government had a commanding majority in the House of Commons and a working majority in the House of Lords. The dislike of the king to his ministers had not abated during their eight months' tenure of office; their unpopularity had not materially diminished. One false move would rouse the prejudices of the king into obstinate hostility, and carry the people with the king in direct opposition to the votes of their representatives. Such a danger was involved in the India Bill. The necessity for a decisive change in the administration of Indian affairs could not be disputed. The mode in which the change was proposed to be effected raised up a storm of indignation against the authors of the measure; its opponents did not stop to consider the real point at issue—the necessity of promoting the welfare of millions committed to our rule—but saw in the proposed enactments nothing beyond a desire in the ministry to grasp at a vast source of power and patronage, which would equally endanger the prerogative of the crown and the liberties of the people. In this view there was unquestionably much of exaggerated alarm, produced by the ordinary artifices of political rivalry. Mr. Fox proposed that the authority of the East India Company should be transferred to commissioners to be named by parliament, and not removable at the pleasure of the crown. "His plan," he said, "was to establish a board, to consist of seven persons, who should be invested with full power to appoint and displace officers in India, and under whose control the whole government of that country should be placed." There were to be eight assistants to this board, who should have charge of the commercial concerns of the company, but subject to the control of the other seven. The board was to be held in England; it was to be established for three or five years, to try the experiment.

* "Memoirs of Sir Samuel Romilly," Letter to Roget.

* The costume of the prince on this occasion may provoke a smile: "His Royal Highness was dressed in a black velvet, most richly embroidered with gold and pink spangles, and lined with pink satin. His shoes had pink heels; his hair was dressed much out at the sides, and very full frizzed, with two very small curls at the bottom."

If experience proved the utility of the board, then the king was to have the future nomination of its members.

The principle of Mr. Fox's India Bill was resisted upon its first introduction to parliament. Mr. Pitt declared his opinion that the whole of the proposed system was nothing more on one side than absolute despotism, and on the other side the most gross corruption. Mr. Jenkinson described the proposed commission as the setting up within the realm of a species of executive government independent of the crown. Upon the first reading of the principal bill, Mr. John Scott, who, as Lord Eldon, filled so important a place in the politics of his time, spoke temperately against a hurried decision upon so important a question. This was his maiden speech; and on that occasion Erskine also spoke for the first time in the house, in advocacy of the measure. Previous to the second reading of the bill the corporation of London, in common council assembled, adopted a petition to the House of Commons that the bill might not pass into law, setting forth that a measure "which directs a seizure and confiscation of powers, privileges, and property, granted by charter, secured and confirmed by various acts of parliament, hath exceedingly alarmed the petitioners, and raised their fears and apprehensions at so unconstitutional a measure." The example of the city was followed by many other corporations. Against the ministry all the light artillery of squib and caricature was used unsparingly. There was a famous caricature by James Sayer—"Carlo Khan's triumphal entry into Leadenhall Street"—in which Fox is represented riding on an elephant, whose face is that of Lord North, which elephant is led to the door of the India House by Burke, blowing a trumpet.* Fox himself ascribed some loss of popularity to this production, at a time when this species of humor was treated seriously in the conflicts of party. The eloquent minister felt the difficulty of his position, but he expressed himself privately with that manliness which marked his public speeches: "I am not at all ignorant of the political danger which I run by this bold measure. But whether I succeed or no, I shall always be glad that I attempted, because I know that I have done no more than I was bound to do, in risking my power and that of my friends when the happiness of so many millions is at stake." † Fox triumphed in the House of Commons by large majorities. The second reading of his bills was carried by a majority of 114, and on the 9th of December they were presented by the minister and a numerous body of members at the bar of the House of Lords.

On the day when the coalition ministry entered office the king wrote to Earl Temple, then lord lieutenant of Ireland, to express his hope that many months would not elapse before "the Grenvilles, the Pitts, and other men of character" would relieve him from a thraldom to which he had been compelled to submit.‡ The opportunity which the king so ardently desired did not come till the India Bill had provoked a manifestation of popular opinion which might enable the crown to defy a majority of the House of Commons. It was a dangerous experiment. The nobleman to whom the king had confided his sorrows in April was ready in December not only to whisper to the peers but confidently to state that whoever voted for the India Bill would be considered by the king as his enemy. The effect upon all those who desired to live only in the sunshine of royal favor was instantaneous. "The bishops waver and the flames fly from us," writes Fitzpatrick. He adds, "the public is full of alarm and astonishment at the treachery as well as the imprudence of this unconstitutional interference. Nobody guesses what will be the consequence of a conduct that is generally compared to that of Charles the First in 1641." * The India Bills were rejected in the upper house on the 17th of December by a majority of ninety-five to seventy-six. On the 18th, at midnight, a message was sent by the king to Lord North and Mr. Fox, commanding them to give up their seals of office by their under secretaries, as a personal interview would be disagreeable to his majesty. When the result of what Fox described as treachery on the part of the king and meanness on the part of his friends made it clear that his official power was at an end, he wrote, "We are so strong that nobody can undertake without madness; and if they do, I think we shall destroy them almost as soon as they are formed." † On the 19th Pitt was appointed first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer. Earl Temple, who had received the seals of secretary of state, was for the immediate dissolution of parliament. Pitt was against this, and Temple resigned on the 22d, leaving the young prime minister to sustain, almost alone, the most severe conflict for power recorded in the annals of parliament.

The anxiety which Mr. Pitt endured at the period of his extraordinary elevation, in his twenty-fifth year, to the great office which few statesmen had reached except through various stages of political experience, has been described by his former tutor, George Pretyman, who had become his private secretary. Lord Temple's resignation, he says, was determined upon on the evening of the 21st. "When I went into Mr. Pitt's bedroom the next morning he told me that he had not had a moment's sleep. He expressed great uneasiness at the state of public affairs, at the same time declaring his fixed resolution not to abandon the situation he had undertaken, but to make the best stand in his power, though very doubtful of the result." ‡ In forming his administration Pitt had scarcely a statesman of any reputation to support him, with the exception of Thurlow, as chancellor, and Dundas, who was not of the cabinet. His father's friend, Camden, stood by him in the House of Lords, although not originally forming one of the ministry. Pitt had almost wholly to depend upon his own ability and courage to sustain the attack he had to expect from a large majority of the House of Commons, headed by Fox, Burke, North, and Sheridan. His pretensions appeared so absurd to the great party by whom he would be opposed that when the writ for Appleby was moved for a burst of derisive laughter issued from the crowded opposition benches. The real parliamentary battle did not begin till after the Christmas holidays. During the recess the great sinecure of the clerkship of the Pells became at the disposal of the first lord of the treasury. Without any compromise of character, Pitt might have taken the place himself. He gave this office to Colonel Barré, upon the condition that he should resign the pension he had received from the Rockingham administration. The nation knew that Pitt was very poor. They now knew that his ambition was of a nobler kind than was ordinarily shown by those who chose politics as their vocation. His disinterestedness won him the public esteem, even while the people looked with little confidence upon his ability to maintain his perilous position. Had he dissolved parliament at the moment of his elevation, men's minds would have been greatly divided as to the fitness of an ambitious young man, however eminent his ability, to take the chief direction of the momentous affairs of a nation that required no common wisdom to repair her exhausted finances, and whose foreign relations might be compromised by the rashness of inexperience. Pitt determined that when he re-entered the House of Commons after the recess the nation should at least comprehend the courage with which he could resist an adverse majority.

* A copy of the print is given in Wright's "England under the House of Hanover," vol. ii. p. 83.
† "Correspondence of Fox," vol. ii. p. 219.
‡ "Court and Cabinets of George III.," vol. i. p. 219.

* "Correspondence of Fox," vol. ii. p. 220.
† Ibid., p. 221.
‡ Tomline, "Life of Pitt," vol. i. p. 233, 4th edit. (This prelate changed his name to Tomline in 1803.)

KNIGHT'S POPULAR HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

A HISTORY OF SOCIETY AND GOVERNMENT FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO OUR OWN TIMES.

By CHARLES KNIGHT.

VOLUME VII.

CHAPTER CLXXXIV. (*Continued*).

On the 12th of January, 1784, Pitt appeared in the House of Commons as the head of the government. Violent were the debates on points of form and questions of principle. The minister was beaten upon two divisions, and five adverse motions were carried against him that night. The king wrote to him the next day, "I am ready to take any step that may be proposed to oppose this faction, and to struggle to the last period of my life." It was well that the king had found a minister whose prudence was equal to his courage. Regardless of his defeat, Pitt, on the 14th of January, brought forward his own plan for the government and management of the affairs of the East India Company. His bill was read a first time. In a committee of the whole house on the state of the nation it was moved that "the continuance of the present ministers in trusts of the highest importance and responsibility is contrary to constitutional principles and injurious to the interests of his majesty and his people." The speech of Mr. Dundas opposed this motion by an argument difficult to controvert. He assumed that the resolution was in the nature and spirit of an address to the king, to appoint a new set of ministers, and that his majesty would thus reason with himself upon such an address: "You send me back the ministers I have just chosen; have I not then the right to choose my ministers? Certainly yes, you say. But what crimes have they committed? What is it they have so soon perpetrated? Certainly not one act of their administration is yet passed. Are they, therefore, without the confidence of the House of Commons? Are they men so unpopular, so incapable, so insufficient, that you will not bear with them, even for a moment? Is the minister who devotes himself to the House of Commons particularly so unpopular and so incapable? I had chosen him, I had singled him out, as a man of talents the most astonishing, of integrity the most uncorrupt, of a reputation the most extraordinary. I had fondly imagined him the favorite of the House of Commons. I had been taught to fancy that in celebrating his name all my people joined in one anthem of praise." The resolution was carried by a majority of twenty-one. An adjournment took place for a few days, but still no resignation. On the 23d of January Mr. Pitt's India Bill was thrown out, and Mr. Fox reproduced his own bill. The minister was then goaded by many speakers to declare whether he contemplated a dissolution of parliament. He resolutely persisted in silence upon that point, though he indignantly repelled some harsh language toward him which had been used by General Conway. Fox at length moved an adjournment to the next day, Saturday, when he hoped members would attend, that proper measures might be taken to vindicate the honor and assert the privileges of the house. It was the general expectation that parliament would be dissolved. Mr. Powys put a distinct question to the minister, "whether that house might expect to be in existence, and to meet again on Monday next?" Pitt, after remaining for some time silent, at length said that he had no intention by any advice he should give to prevent the meeting of the house on that day. The contest between the two parties was carried on, in various shapes, till the 8th of March. Attempts were made to form a union between the leading members of the late government and those of the present, but Pitt steadily refused to resign as the preliminary condition of such a negotiation. Fox threatened the most stringent measures to compel obedience to the votes of the House of Commons. In an early stage of the contest, Pitt, at a meeting of his friends, said, "What am I to do if they stop the supplies?" Lord Mahon answered, "They will not stop them; it is the very thing which they will not venture to do." * The supplies were not stopped. At every successive trial of strength the numbers of the opposition became reduced. On the 18th of February Pitt informed the house that his majesty, after a full consideration of the various resolutions that had been passed, had not thought proper to dismiss his ministers, nor had the ministers resigned. Fox said that the House of Commons had never before received from a prince of the Brunswick line such a flat and peremptory negative to their sentiments and wishes. Under such circumstances he wished the house to pause, and to waive, for a very short time, the question of supplies, which stood for that day. The question of adjournment was carried by a majority only of twelve. Another motion which contemplated the dismission of ministers was carried by a larger majority. An address to the king was resolved on by a majority of twenty-one. The king in his answer said that he was desirous that public affairs should be conducted by a firm and extended administration, but that he did not conceive that object would be advanced by the dismissal of those at present in his service. On the 27th of February a motion of adjournment, with a view to postpone the consideration of the navy estimates, was carried by a majority of seven. On the 28th a deputation of the corporation of London went in procession to Mr. Pitt's house, to communicate to him the resolution of the common council to present him with the freedom of the city. On that day he had been invited to dine with the Grocers' Company, and he proceeded, accompanied by the city deputation, to Grocers' Hall, where Wilkes, the chamberlain of the city, addressed him in a complimentary harangue, which thus concluded: "Your noble father, sir, annihilated party, and I hope you will, in the end, bear down and conquer the hydra of faction, which now rears its hundred heads against you. I remember his saying that, for the good of the people, he dared to look the proudest connections of this country in the face. I trust that the same spirit animates his son, and, as he has the same support of the crown and the people, I am firmly persuaded that the same success will follow." At night Fleet Street and the Strand were illuminated, and the populace drew the minister home in his carriage. Another address to the king, moved by Fox, was carried on the 1st of March by a majority of twelve. The king's answer was in exactly the same tone as his previous one. At length, on the 8th of March, an elaborate remonstrance, in the form of an address to his majesty, which was drawn up by Burke and moved by Fox, was carried by a majority only of one. The battle was over. The victory remained with Pitt. The Mutiny Bill was passed, the supplies were voted, and on the 24th of March the king went to the House of Lords, to put an end to the session, and to say, "I feel it a duty which I owe to the constitution and the country, to recur as speedily as possible to the sense of my people, by calling a new parliament." On the 25th parliament was dissolved.

During this extraordinary contest, from the 12th of January to the 8th of March, there were fourteen motions, upon which the house divided, carried against Mr. Pitt; besides many others, upon which

* Wilberforce, "Diary," December 23.

there was no division. The mode in which the coalition ministry was ejected, through the royal interference with the vote of the House of Peers upon the India Bill, was mean and unconstitutional. It has been conjectured that Pitt was probably acquainted with the manœuvres of Thurlow and Temple.* But it has been also said that when Temple resigned he "carried away with him the scandal which the best friends of the new government could not but lament. The fame of the young prime minister preserved its whiteness. He could declare with perfect truth that, if unconstitutional machinations had been employed, he had been no party to them." † Whatever opinion may be formed upon this point, even the political opponents of Pitt agree that in this fiery struggle of two months he "joined to great boldness, sagacity and discretion. By patience and perseverance he wearied out a foe who was more ardent than measured in his attacks, and while he bore his defeats with calmness, the country, saturate with calumny, began to resent the attempt of the coalition party as the cabal of a domineering aristocracy." ‡

Never did minister of Great Britain appear in so triumphant a position as William Pitt when he entered the House of Commons, on the 18th of May, to meet the new parliament. He had been himself returned at the head of the poll for the University of Cambridge. His friend Wilberforce, the son of a Hull merchant, had contested the county of York against two Whig candidates of large fortune and high connections. With the almost unanimous support of the manufacturers of Sheffield and Halifax and Bradford and Leeds he had beaten the great Yorkshire aristocracy, as the representative of the middle classes. The example presented by this stronghold of independent principles was powerful through the country. Pitt looked upon the benches of opposition, that for two months had echoed with the cheers of those who had denounced him with every virulence of invective, now thinned to a very powerless minority. The coalition had lost a hundred and sixty members. Fox took his seat as a Scotch representative; for although second upon the poll for Westminster, a scrutiny was demanded by his opponent, Sir Cecil Wray, and the high bailiff would not make a return. Out of this scrutiny a protracted contest ensued, which was among the memorable things of a period of intense political agitation. The election for Westminster occupied forty days, under the old system, in which corrupt influence, bribery, drunkenness, and riot made a great electioneering contest a scene as disgraceful to morality as unfavorable to freedom. The court exerted itself in the most undisguised manner to exclude Fox from parliament. The Prince of Wales was as openly committed against the interest espoused by his father. The beautiful Duchess of Devonshire was often present in Covent Garden, wearing the colors of Fox; and the report that she had won the vote of a hesitating butcher with a kiss was commemorated in many a gross caricature and many an indecent libel. The wits and rhymesters on the side of Fox had one invariable theme for their invective against Pitt—the purity of his private life. In the songs of Captain Morris during the election, and in the elaborate squibs of "The Rolliad," which subsequently were produced in a thick octavo volume, this charge is urged with a combination of the grossness of Swift and the stupidity of D'Urfey, which is revolting to taste as well as offensive to decency. "The virtuous youth," who "was taught by his dad on a stool," was little hurt by these missiles. The mud did not stick. But the virulence of the attacks by which he and his friends were long assailed, as well as his own wonderful success, contributed perhaps to impart to his public demeanor that cold and haughty aspect which was out of harmony with his real nature, which was amiable, affectionate, and even genial. The thinking and staid portion of the nation respected his decorous life, as much as they disliked the licentious habits of his great rival. Although the extraordinary endowments, the generous disposition, and the winning manners of Fox commanded the universal admiration of his friends, the people felt that Pitt was a safer minister. The ardor with which he applied himself to questions of finance and commerce, which Fox did not profess to understand, and probably thought beneath the leader of a powerful party, endeared the minister to the middle classes, and gave him the secure grasp of power and popularity during those nine years of real national prosperity which preceded the wars of the French Revolution.

Mr. Pitt commenced his career as a financial minister with more than common boldness. The permanent taxes produced half a million less than the interest of the debt, the civil list, and the charges to which they were appropriated. The annual land tax and malt tax fell far short of the naval and military expenditure and that of miscellaneous services. There was a large unfunded debt. The deficit altogether amounted to three millions. The confidence in the national resources was so low that the three per cents were fallen to about 56. Smuggling, especially of tea and spirits, was carried on to an enormous extent. The tea vended in the smuggling trade, conducted in the most systematic manner through consignments from foreign ports, was held considerably to exceed the five million and a half pounds annually sold by the East India Company. Pitt took the only effectual way to prevent smuggling. He reduced the duty upon tea from 50 per cent to 12½ per cent, and he also reduced the duties on foreign spirits. To compensate for the expected deficiency of revenue, he increased the tax upon windows. To meet the large general disproportion between receipt and expenditure, he imposed other taxes, that have been abolished, as injurious to industry, by the sounder economists of recent times. These taxes enabled him to provide for the interest of a new loan, in which a large amount of unfunded debt was absorbed. Taxes upon hats, linens, and calicoes have long been condemned, though the Commons of 1784 willingly granted them. Duties upon horses, excise licenses, and game certificates hold their ground. Taxes upon candles and upon bricks and tiles were among the devices that have had no permanent existence. The tax upon paper, which Mr. Pitt increased, appears to be the last of those restraints upon industry to which purblind legislators have clung, upon the principle that the consumers do not feel the tax—the principle announced by the minister of 1784, when he proposed his additional duty on candles, namely, that as the poorest cottagers only consumed about 10 lbs. of candles annually, that class would only contribute fivepence a year to his new impost.

The chancellor of the exchequer carried his proposed taxes without any difficulty. He was equally successful with his India bills. He relieved the East India Company from its financial embarrassments. He associated with its directors in the government of India that body of commissioners, appointed by the crown, which was long known as the Board of Control. Under this double government, our empire in India, constantly increasing in magnitude by extension of territory, and becoming year by year more complicated and dangerous, at last appeared to be falling to pieces in the great revolt, whose suppression will always be regarded as one of the most memorable examples of British energy. Under the imperial rule, we may hope that the honest aspirations of Burke and Fox for such a government of India as would regard the welfare of the natives as the first object of legislation will be realized; that the larger experience of three quarters of a century and the nobler aims of statesmen who will consider India as a sacred trust will more and more develop the beneficent powers of civilization among the millions over whom Providence has appointed us the guardians.

In the session of 1785 Mr. Pitt brought forward a subject announced in the king's speech, the commercial intercourse between Great Britain and Ireland. He described the system which had been pursued, from the revolution to a very recent period, as that of debarring Ireland from the enjoyment of her own resources; of rendering that kingdom completely subservient to the interest and opulence of England. That system had been reversed, and Ireland was free to export her produce to all parts of the world, and to import and re-export the produce of the British colonies. But no change had taken place in the intercourse between Great Britain and Ireland themselves. There were, he said, but two possible systems for two countries situated as these were in relation to each other. We had tried the system of having the smaller country completely subservient and subordinate to the greater. "The other system was a participation and community of benefits, and a system of equality and fairness, which, without tending to aggrandize the one or depress the other, should seek the aggregate interests of the empire. Such a situation of commercial equality, in which there was to be a community of benefits, demanded also a community of burdens, and it was this situation in which he was anxious to place the two countries." The

* "Correspondence of Fox," vol. ii. p. 253.
† Macaulay, "Biography of Pitt."
‡ "Correspondence of Fox," vol. ii. p. 253.

propositions of Mr. Pitt, large and liberal as they were, although incumbered with some provisions opposed to a really free commercial policy, were thoroughly distasteful to the manufacturers of England, and equally opposed to the narrowness of what in Ireland was deemed patriotism. The resolutions of the minister were carried by considerable majorities in the British parliament but being passed by a very small majority in the Irish parliament, the bill was withdrawn. While this measure was being debated at Westminster, Mr. Pitt a third time brought forward a bill for reform in parliament. His specific plan was to disfranchise thirty-six rotten boroughs, giving compensation to those who regarded them as property, to transfer the right of election to counties and to unrepresented large towns, and to extend the franchise in counties to copy-holders. The bill was not introduced as a government measure, and it was rejected by a large majority, as its author probably expected it would be. That Pitt was at this time sincere in his wish for a temperate reform there can be little doubt. George Rose says that he himself dreaded that a breach should be made in the representation which moderate reformers could not prevent being widened: "I determined against an acquiescence in Mr. Pitt's plan, which he pressed with enthusiasm, not only in the House of Commons but in private, with such friends as he thought he could influence." Rose offered to retire from his office, but to that the minister would not consent. The secretary of the treasury felt, however, what probably many others felt, "that a person in my confidential post, taking a different line from him on a question of such infinite magnitude, might lead to a doubt of his sincerity." *

At the opening of the session on the 24th of January, 1786, the king informed the parliament that disputes which appeared to threaten an interruption to the tranquillity of Europe had been brought to an amicable conclusion. The tranquillity of Europe was always liable to be interrupted by the intrigues of the great powers for extended territory and influence. The Emperor Joseph had been attempting to coerce the States of Holland, distracted by two contending political parties, into a surrender of the fortresses of the Austrian Netherlands, which had been always garrisoned by the Dutch since the conclusion of the War of the Succession, as a bulwark against the inroads of France. After four years of dispute and threatened war the court of Versailles concluded a treaty of commercial league and close alliance with Holland, by which the emperor was restrained, but which placed the States very much in the power of France. Great Britain abstained from interference. It would have been difficult to interfere while in Holland there was a powerful faction opposed to the house of Orange.

Pitt at this time was almost exclusively occupied with a great financial scheme, from which with more than ordinary complacency he sanguinely expected the most wonderful results. He wrote to Wilberforce, "The produce of our revenues is glorious, and I am half mad with a project which will give our supplies the effect almost of magic in the reduction of debt.' † It was the scheme of the sinking fund. The public income now happily exceeded the expenditure, and it was proposed that the notion of an accumulating fund to be applied to the reduction of the debt which was partially attempted by Sir Robert Walpole should be engrafted upon the perpetual financial arrangements; that a million should be annually placed in the hands of commissioners, so as to be beyond the power of a minister to withdraw. It was believed that, accumulating at compound interest, with the addition of such terminable annuities as should fall in, it would gradually extinguish the claims of the public creditor. The plan might have worked well if the minister had been debarred from contracting any new loans. For years the public had as much confidence in this scheme as its author had. It was boasted that "in eight years Mr. Pitt's sinking fund, in fact, purchased 13,617,895*l.* of stock at the cost of 10,599,265*l.* of cash;" and it was proclaimed that "this measure, then, is of more importance to Great Britain than the acquisition of the American mines." ‡ There was a superstitious belief, long entertained, that the new sinking fund would, "by some mysterious power of propagation belonging to money, put into the pocket of the public creditor great sums not taken out of the pocket of the taxpayer." * The delusion was manifest when it was demonstrated that during the war the debt had been actually augmented, to the extent of eleven millions, by the less advantageous terms upon which money was borrowed by the exchequer, compared with the purchases made by the commissioners who managed the sinking fund. A great authority in finance has put the whole philosophy of the matter in the form of an axiom: "No sinking fund can be efficient for the purpose of diminishing the debt if it be not derived from the excess of the public revenue over the public expenditure." †

On the opening of the session on the 23d of January, 1787, the king announced that he had concluded a treaty of navigation and commerce with the King of France. The negotiation was completed at Versailles, on the 26th of September, 1786. The provisions of this treaty were of the most liberal character. There was to be the most perfect freedom of intercourse allowed between the subjects and inhabitants of the respective dominions of the two sovereigns. The duties to be paid on French commodities in England were thus rated: Wines, no higher duties than on those of Portugal; brandy, seven shillings per gallon; vinegar, less than half the previous duty; olive-oil, the lowest duty paid by the most favored nation. The following duties were to be levied reciprocally on both kingdoms: Hardwares and cutlery, cabinet wares, furniture, turnery, not higher than 10 per cent ad valorem; cotton and woollen manufactures, except mixed with silk, 12 per cent; gauzes, 10 per cent; linens, same as linens from Holland; saddlery, 15 per cent; millinery, 12 per cent; plate glass and glassware, porcelain and earthenware, 12 per cent. We have already glanced at the general nature of this treaty in a commercial point of view.‡ Mr. Pitt set forth the political advantages of this measure in an argument worthy of a great statesman asserting principles of lasting importance: "Considering the treaty in its political view, he should not hesitate to contend against the too frequently advanced doctrine that France was and must be the unalterable enemy of Britain. His mind revolted from this position as monstrous and impossible. To suppose that any nation could be unalterably the enemy of another was weak and childish. It had neither its foundation in the experience of nations nor in the history of man. It was a libel on the constitution of political societies, and supposed the existence of diabolical malice in the original frame of man. But these absurd tenets were taken up and propagated; nay, it was carried farther; it was said that by this treaty the British nation was about blindly to throw itself into the arms of its constant and uniform foe. Men reasoned as if this treaty were not only to extinguish all jealousy from our bosoms, but also completely to annihilate our means of defence; as if by the treaty we gave up so much of our army, so much of our marine; as if our commerce was to be abridged, our navigation to be lessened, our colonies to be cut off or to be rendered defenceless, and as if all the functions of the state were to be sunk in apathy. What ground was there for this train of reasoning? Did the treaty suppose that the interval of peace between the two countries would be so totally unemployed by us as to disable us from meeting France in the moment of war with our accustomed strength? Did it not much rather, by opening new sources of wealth, speak this forcible language—that the interval of peace, as it would enrich the nation, would also prove the means of enabling her to combat her enemy with more effect when the day of hostility should come? It did more than this; by promoting habits of friendly intercourse and of mutual benefit, while it invigorated the resources of Britain, it made it less likely that she should have occasion to call forth those resources. It certainly had at least the happy tendency to make the two nations enter into more intimate communion with one another, to enter into the same views even of taste and manners; and while they were mutually benefited by the connection, and endeared to one another by the result of the common benefits, it gave a better chance for the preservation of harmony between them, while, so far from weakening, it strengthened their sinews for war. That we should not be taken unprepared for war was a matter totally distinct from treaty." It is painful to behold Mr. Fox contending "that France was the natural foe of Great Britain, and that she wished by entering into a commercial treaty with us to tie our

* "Diaries and Correspondence of George Rose," vol. i. p. 35.
† "Correspondence of Wilberforce," vol. i. p. 9.
‡ Chalmers' "Comparative Estimate, corrected to 1812," p. 189.

* Macaulay, "Biography of Pitt."
† "Works of David Ricardo," p. 149. ‡ *Ante*, vol. vi. p. 927.

hands, and prevent our engaging in any alliances with other powers." The argument for perpetual international hostility was carried to the point of absurdity by Mr. Francis, who thus declaimed: "It seems we are arrived at a new enlightened era of affection for our neighbors, and of liberality to our enemies, of which our uninstructed ancestors had no conception. The pomp of modern eloquence is employed to blast even the triumphs of Lord Chatham's administration. The polemic laurels of the father must yield to the pacific myrtles which shadow the forehead of the son. Sir, the first and most prominent feature in the political character of Lord Chatham was anti-Gallican. His glory is founded on the resistance he made to the united power of the house of Bourbon. The present minister has taken the opposite road to fame; and France, the object of every hostile principle in the policy of Lord Chatham, is the *gens amicissima* of his son."

That the commercial treaty was not a failure as regarded the products of our own country is evident from the fact that the annual average export of British manufactures to France in the six years ending with 1774 was 87,164*l.*; in the six years ending with 1792 it was 717,807*l.* Arthur Young, after the treaty had been in existence less than a year, found the French crying out for a war with England. "It is easy enough to discover that the origin of all this violence is the commercial treaty, which is execrated here as the most fatal stroke to their manufactures they ever experienced." He found this temper prevailing at Lisle.* The next year, at the fair of Guibray, near Caen, he saw many English goods, especially the crockery known as queen's-ware. Of this ware there were French imitations, but very inferior. Young asked the dealer if he did not think the treaty of commerce would be very injurious, with such a difference in the goodness of the manufactured articles. The sensible Frenchman replied, "Quite the contrary. However bad is our imitation, it is the best thing we have yet produced in France. We shall produce better next year—we shall improve—we shall go beyond you." I believe, adds Young, he is a very good politician, and that without competition it is not possible to improve any fabric.† The treaty was annulled in the frenzy of the revolution.

To Mr. Pitt belongs the honor, in this, the fourth year of his administration, of simplifying the complicated system of indirect taxation, by consolidating the several duties of customs, excise, and stamps. The duties required to be paid upon one article were sometimes to be hunted through twenty or thirty acts of parliament, each charging some additional duty, or making a special appropriation of the proceeds of a particular tax. The complication may be judged from the fact that three thousand resolutions were required to carry a measure of consolidation into effect. When Pitt had introduced his measure, Burke characterized the speech of the minister as one of extraordinary clearness and perspicuity, and said that it behooved those who felt it their duty frequently to oppose the measures of the government to rise up manfully, and, doing justice to the right honorable gentleman's merit, to return him thanks, on behalf of themselves and the country, for having in so masterly a manner brought forward a plan which gave ease and accommodation to all engaged in commerce, and advantage and increase to the revenue. "Thus," says Lord John Russell, "in the course of little more than three years from Mr. Pitt's acceptance of office as first lord of the treasury, great financial and commercial reforms had been effected. . . . The nation, overcoming its difficulties, and rising buoyant from its depression, began rapidly to increase its wealth, to revive its spirit, and renew its strength. Such was the work of Mr. Pitt, now no longer the minister of the court, but of the nation. The cry of secret influence, and the imputation of his being an organ of an unseen power, was heard less and less as the resources of his powerful understanding developed their energies and ripened their fruits." ‡

The amicable relations between the governments of Great Britain and France, which appeared to have been consolidated by the commercial treaty, were interrupted in the autumn of 1787 by the interference of France with the civil dissensions among the States of the United Provinces, which had taken a new direction after the disputes with the Emperor Joseph had been terminated. To the firmness and moderation of the British government it is owing that a war was averted. The great Frederick of Prussia had died on the 17th of August, 1786. His nephew and successor, Frederick William II., brother-in-law to the Prince of Orange, had espoused the cause of his sister's husband against those States who had stripped the stadtholder of his power and prerogatives. The Princess of Orange, a lady possessing great vigor of character, was proceeding to the Hague from Nimeguen, to hold a conference with the leaders of the Orange party, when she was stopped by a troop of armed burghers and placed under arrest. The King of Prussia immediately marched an army into the province of Zealand, and avowed his intention to restore the stadtholder to his hereditary authority. It is unnecessary for us to trace the course of these events, except as they bear upon the acts of the British government. These are very clearly related in the king's speech on opening the session on the 27th of November. While Great Britain had endeavored by good offices to restore tranquillity and maintain lawful government, she avowed her intention of counteracting all forcible interference on the part of France in the internal affairs of the Dutch republic. The King of Prussia having determined to obtain satisfaction for the insult offered to the Princess of Orange, the party who had usurped the government of Holland applied to the King of France for his assistance, who notified to the King of Great Britain his intention of granting their request. "I did not hesitate," said the king to parliament, "to declare that I could not remain a quiet spectator of the armed interference of France, and I gave immediate orders for augmenting my forces by sea and land." The success of the Prussian troops enabled the provinces "to deliver themselves from the oppression under which they labored, and to re-establish their lawful government." An explanation took place between France and Great Britain, and both countries mutually agreed to disarm, and to place their naval establishments upon the same footing as at the beginning of the year.

The career of Mr. Pitt—the only minister who appears to have received the entire confidence of George the Third without surrendering his own independent convictions on large questions of policy—was not wholly without difficulty and danger as regarded his relations to the king and the Prince of Wales, in the serious differences which had arisen between them. The pecuniary embarrassments of the Prince of Wales were of so onerous a nature that his friends thought it necessary to bring them under the consideration of parliament. When he took up his residence at Carlton House in 1783, 60,000*l.* had been voted by parliament to defray the expense of establishing a separate household. The king allowed his son 50,000*l.* a year out of the civil list, and the annual revenue of the duchy of Cornwall amounted to 12,000*l.* At the midsummer of 1786 the prince owed 160,000*l.* The king refused to give any assistance, and the heir-apparent dismissed the state officers of his household, sold his horses, and stopped the improvements going forward in his residence. But the debts were very slightly diminished. There were serious difficulties in making that application to parliament, which eager worshippers of the rising sun overlooked, although public rumor spoke with no doubtful voice upon a very delicate question. It was believed that the Prince of Wales, contrary to the provisions of the Royal Marriage Act, was married to Mrs. Fitzherbert, and that the lady being a Roman Catholic, such marriage, according to the Act of Settlement, had rendered the prince "forever incapable to inherit, possess, or enjoy the crown of this kingdom." On the 27th of April, 1787, Alderman Newnham, one of the members for the city, stated that he should propose an address to the king, praying him to take into consideration the state of the affairs of the Prince of Wales, and to grant him relief, which the house would make good. Mr. Rolle without hesitation said that this was "a question which went immediately to affect our constitution in Church and State," and that he would oppose the motion, whenever it was brought forward, by moving the previous question. Something was necessary to be done. On the 30th Alderman Newnham stated that he had been much pressed, from various quarters, to forego his purpose. He did not wish to bind the house to the form of an address, but said that the prince did not shrink from any inquiry. Mr. Fox, in the course of a short speech, took notice of the previous allusion to something full of danger to the Church and State. He supposed that allusion must have reference to a low malicious falsehood, propagated to depreciate the character of the prince—a pretended report of a fact impossible to have happened. In answer to a question from

* "Travels in France," p. 73.
† Ibid., p. 79.
‡ "Life of Fox," vol. ii. p. 138.

Mr. Rolle, Mr. Fox further said that "he did not deny the calumny in question, merely with regard to the effect of certain existing laws, but he denied it *in toto*, in point of fact as well as law. The fact not only never could have happened legally, but never did happen in any way whatsoever." He added that "he had spoken from direct authority." Bishop Tomline gravely remarks that "this unequivocal and authentic assurance could not but be highly satisfactory both to parliament and the public." And yet many of the parliament and some of the public had no belief in the assurance, although they believed that Mr. Fox was authorized to deny what he termed the malicious falsehood. At the end of December, 1785, Mr. Fox had written to the prince a letter, pointing out the extreme danger of "a desperate step" which he was informed that his royal highness intended to take. The prince replied, on the 11th, that "the world will soon be convinced that there not only is not but never was any ground for these reports which of late have been so malevolently circulated." Within ten days of the date of this letter, namely, on the 21st of December, Mrs. Fitzherbert was married by a Protestant clergyman to the Prince of Wales, in the presence of six witnesses. "Although the marriage of Mrs. Fitzherbert was void by the English law, it was sanctioned by the law of her own church, and she could without scruple live with the Prince of Wales as her husband."* On the day after his declaration in parliament a gentleman at Brooks's told Mr. Fox that he had been misinformed; "I was present at that marriage."† The prince is recorded on the same day to have said to Mrs. Fitzherbert, "Only conceive, Maria, what Fox did yesterday: he went down to the house and denied that you and I were man and wife."‡ Mr. Fox, says Lord John Russell, "perceived how completely he had been duped. He immediately renounced the acquaintance of the prince, and did not speak to him for more than a year." The matter was hushed up; the prince's debts were paid by parliament after negotiations and squabbles which are now of little interest. Mr. Fox could not retract his declaration without exposing the prince to the risk of losing his succession to the crown, according to Lord John Russell. His indignation at having been made the instrument of declaring a falsehood did not prevent him advocating the claims of the Prince of Wales to almost uncontrolled power, in the great question of the regency which arose in 1788.

On the 24th of October the king, having been out of health, went to the levée, "with a view of putting an end to the stories that were circulated with much industry."§ A violent fever ensued, and in a few days the sovereign was decidedly insane. On the 7th Mr. Grenville wrote, "I am afraid that it would be very sanguine indeed to say that there is even any hope that the king will recover both his health and his understanding."‖ The public were to be kept in ignorance of this alarming event. But the parliament was to meet on the 20th of November. An adjournment of a fortnight was agreed to. Meanwhile the physicians who had attended his majesty were examined on oath before the privy council. All agreed that the king could not attend to public affairs; three expressed confidence in his recovery. A committee of the two houses had also examined the medical authorities, and had reported their opinions. Mr. Fox had been travelling in Italy, but being summoned home he appeared in his place in parliament on the 10th of December, and there declared that, "in his firm opinion, his royal highness the Prince of Wales had as clear, as express a right to assume the reins of government, and exercise the power of sovereignty, during the continuance of the illness and incapacity with which it had pleased God to affect his majesty, as in the case of his majesty having undergone a natural and perfect demise." The two houses, he said, "were alone qualified to pronounce when the prince ought to take possession of and exercise his right; but as short a time as possible ought to intervene between the Prince of Wales assuming the sovereignty and the present moment."¶ Mr. Pitt maintained that, although the claim of the prince was entitled to the most serious consideration, in the case of the interruption of the personal exercise of the royal authority, without any previous lawful provision for carrying on the government, "it belonged to the other branches of the legislature, on the part of the nation at large, to provide, according to their discretion, for the temporary exercise of the royal authority, in the name and on the behalf of the sovereign, in such manner as they should think requisite; and that, unless by their decision, the Prince of Wales had no more right—speaking of strict right—to assume the government than any other individual in the country." In this first debate an amount of passion was displayed on the part of Burke which greatly detracted from his reputation as a sound authority upon constitutional questions. Pitt had said that to assert a right in the Prince of Wales, independent of the decision of the two houses of parliament, was treason to the constitution. Burke exclaimed, "Where was the freedom of debate, where was the privilege of parliament, if the rights of the Prince of Wales could not be spoken of in that house, without their being liable to be charged with treason by one of the prince's competitors?" Pitt quietly asked whether, "at that period of our history when the constitution was settled on that foundation on which it now existed, when Mr. Somers and other great men declared that no person had a right to the crown independent of the consent of the two houses, would it have been thought either fair or decent for any member of either house to have pronounced Mr. Somers a personal competitor of William the Third?"

The question of abstract right became merged in the more practical question of what powers should be confided to the Prince of Wales as regent. The views of Mr. Fox on this point were extreme. On the 15th of December he wrote to a friend in confidence: "I am afraid they will get up some cry against the prince for grasping, as they call it, at too much power, but I am sure I cannot in conscience advise him to give up anything that is really necessary to his government; or, indeed, to claim anything else as regent but the full power of a king, to which he is certainly entitled."* Mr. Pitt, on the other hand, brought forward propositions to prohibit the regent from creating peers; from disposing of the king's real or personal property; and from granting offices except during pleasure; and that the queen should have the custody of his majesty's person. There was a doubt whether the prince would not refuse the regency under these restrictions. But that imprudence was not added to the other grave errors of his friends. Burke had shocked the loyalty of all men by saying that the king had been hurled from the throne by the decree of the Almighty. Sheridan maintained that the prince had shown great moderation in not at once assuming the title and powers of regent, and thus disgusted those who possessed any knowledge of the principles of the English constitution. There was such an evident avidity to seize upon power in the prince and his friends—there was such a distrust of his character, and such a dread of beholding a court polluted with the abominations of gaming and riot—that the national sympathy was almost wholly with Pitt, who labored all along in the resolution that if his sovereign should be restored he should not find everything changed. He knew that his own chances of power under the regency were forfeited by the course he had adopted. He would "take his blue bag, and return to the bar."† Fox appears to have acted on the conviction that the chance of the king's recovery was very small indeed. The Regency Bill had passed the Commons on the 12th of February. But in the middle of the month it was known that a great amendment had taken place in the king's condition. On the 23d Mr. Pitt received a letter, "written in his majesty's own hand, couched in the warmest terms, thanking him for his unshaken attachment to his interests, and desiring to see him the next day."‡ On the 25th the issue of bulletins by the royal physicians was discontinued. On the 10th of March the commissioners who had been appointed by former letters-patent to open the parliament, by another commission declared further causes for holding the same; and proceeded to state to both houses that his majesty, being by the blessing of Providence recovered from his indisposition, and enabled to attend to public affairs, conveyed through them his warmest acknowledgments for the additional proofs they had given of affectionate attachment to his person. The other subjects of a royal speech on opening parliament were then detailed.

Pitt had won his second great victory. In 1784, against odds

* Lord John Russell's "Life of Fox," vol. ii. p. 185.
† Ibid., p. 186. ‡ Ibid., quoting "Memoirs of Mrs. Fitzherbert."
§ W. W. Grenville, "Court of George III.," vol. i. p. 431.
‖ Ibid., p. 435. ¶ "Parliamentary History," vol. xxvii. col. 707.

* "Correspondence of Fox," vol. ii. p. 300.
† "Diaries, etc., of George Rose," vol. i. p. 96.
‡ Greville, in "Court of George III.," vol. ii. p. 125.

almost incalculable, he had defeated the coalition with almost the unanimous support of the people. He had employed his unassailable tenure of power in carrying forward the resources of national prosperity by a series of measures conceived, not in the spirit of party, but with a large comprehension of what was essential to the public good. Another great trial came. He had to conduct another conflict, full of danger and difficulty, in which, fighting for his sovereign, he had in the same manner the support of the nation. Major Cartwright, so well known for his subsequent endeavors to promote a reform in parliament, wrote to Wilberforce: "I very much fear that the king's present derangement is likely to produce other derangements not for the public benefit. I hope we are not to be sold to the coalition faction."* When the battle was over, George the Third wrote to his persevering minister that "his constant attachment to my interest, and that of the public, which are inseparable, must ever place him in the most advantageous light."† On the 23d of April a public thanksgiving was appointed for the king's recovery. His majesty went to St. Paul's, accompanied by both houses of parliament, to return his own thanksgivings. The day was observed throughout the kingdom. Illuminations were never so general; joy was never so heartfelt. The minister, still only in his twenty-ninth year, had reached the pinnacle of power and popularity.

CHAPTER CLXXXV.

Symptoms of great changes in France—Constant financial difficulties—General view of the French social system—Expectations of a revolution—The Parlement of Paris—Meeting of the States-General—The Three Orders—The Tiers tat demand that all the orders shall unite—Excitement in Paris during this contest—Tiers État assume the title of the National Assembly—Their meeting in a tennis-court—The royal sitting—Open resistance of the Tiers État to the king's orders—The king yields—Dismissal of Necker—Destruction of the Bastille—March to Versailles of a Parisian mob—The royal family and the National Assembly removed to Paris.

On the 11th of July, 1788, the king, at the close of the session of parliament, said: "The general state of Europe, and the assurances which I receive from foreign powers, afford me every reason to expect that my subjects will continue to enjoy the blessings of peace." The differences with France on the subject of the United Provinces had been adjusted. On the 6th of September Mr. Pitt exultingly wrote to the Marquis of Stafford: "The state of France, whatever else it may produce, seems to promise us more than ever a considerable respite from any dangerous projects."‡ The "state of France" was that of a country in which the disordered condition of its finances appeared to render any new disturbances of Europe, from the ambition of the government and the restlessness of the people, something approaching to an impossibility. The "whatever else it might produce" was a vague and remote danger. Yet in September, 1788, there were symptoms of impending changes that, with a full knowledge of the causes operating to produce them, might have suggested to the far-seeing eye of that statesmanship that looked beyond the formal relations of established governments, some real cause for disquiet. Since the peace of 1783 there had been constant and increasing deficiency of revenue in France. The area of taxation was limited by the manifold exemptions from bearing a due proportion of the public burdens, which Turgot, in 1776, had vainly endeavored to abolish. He was dismissed, as the result of his attempts to impose taxes upon the noblesse and the clergy. Necker is summoned to fill the great post of controller-general of finance. He carries France through the American war by various temporary expedients; but there is still a deficit. He proposes some solid measures, and is dismissed in May, 1781. The war comes to an end. Englishmen flock to Paris in 1782, and there, wondrous disclosure! are "struck with surprise at the freedom of conversation on general liberty, even within the walls of the king's palace."§ Thus was George Rose impressed. He writes in his Diary, "On a Sunday morning, while we were waiting in an outer room to see the king pass in state to the chapel of Versailles, where several of the great officers were, there was a discussion almost as free as I have heard in the House of Commons, in which Monsieur Chauvelin was the loudest, who was in some employment about the person of the king, for he dropped on his knee, and gave his majesty a cambric handkerchief as he passed through the room." Pitt, accompanied by Wilberforce and another friend, went to France in 1783. He inquired particularly into the political institutions of the French, and in a conversation with Abbé de Lageard, "a man of family and fortune," he said to him, "You have not political liberty, but for civil liberty you have more than you believe you have."* There were things below the surface that Pitt did not see. Wilberforce records of Pitt, that "it was the singular position occupied by La Fayette which most of all attracted his attention: he seemed to be the representative of the democracy in the very presence of the monarch; the tribune intruding with his veto within the chamber of the patrician order."† Theoretical democracy was in fashion among the patrician order. They had been talking about abstract rights, and the perfectibility of society, in their Parisian salons, without a thought of the hopeless condition of the miserable peasantry that were ground into the most abject poverty by their seignorial rights. They had no public duties to fulfil; they were utterly isolated from the millions of whom they ought to have been the friends and protectors. The aristocracy received the doctrines of the political philosophers as if they were mere speculative opinions that would have no practical effects, and might be advocated as an indulgence of elegant sentiment which manifested their superiority to selfish prejudices. "The nobles shared as a pleasant pastime in these discussions, and quietly enjoyed their immunities and privileges while they serenely discussed the absurdity of all established customs. . . Not the barest notion of a violent revolution ever entered into the minds of the generation which witnessed it."‡ We need feel no surprise that the sagacious English minister felt no fear of the gathering clouds which foreboded a storm. Other controllers of finance succeeded Necker, with indifferent success. In 1783 Calonne took the onerous post. He got on for three years by loan upon loan, the court squandering without stint; the people excited by scandalous stories against the queen, with little foundation; a general ferment in all political circles. Calonne can do no more with the stock-jobbers, and he resolves upon a convocation of notables, influential men from all districts of France, to devise new plans of taxation. Such an assembly had not been heard of for a hundred and sixty years. Mr. Jefferson, the American ambassador at Paris, announces this fact to his government. He saw its significance, writing, in a private letter, "This event, which will hardly excite any attention in America, is deemed here the most important one which has taken place in their civil line during the present century."§ This body met toward the end of February, 1787. Calonne shows his terrible deficit; he proposes a new land-tax, from which no proprietors—neither noblesse, nor clergy, nor any other privileged class—shall be exempt. The majority of the notables was composed of these privileged classes. They would have nothing to do with the scheme of Calonne; and the controller, who had hoped for more effectual control over an enormous deficit than the worn-out system of borrowing, is dismissed to make way for others who may be able to manage more adroitly.

At this period an Englishman visited France who could observe more accurately, and reason more acutely, than diplomatists who moved in a narrow circle. Arthur Young travelled over various parts of that kingdom in 1787, 1788, and 1789. M. Tocqueville speaks of Young's "Travels," published in 1792, as "one of the most instructive works which exist on the former state of society in France."‖ Let us see how this man of large experience, who had uniformly regarded the prosperous condition of the laborers as an essential concomitant of the prosperity of the farmers, describes the French peasantry. He proceeds on his journey south from Paris to Orleans, and having crossed the Loire finds that the cultivators are *metayers*—men who hire the land without ability to stock it, the proprietor finding cattle and seed and the tenant labor, and dividing the

* "Life of Wilberforce," vol. i. p. 100.
† Rose, "Diaries, etc.," p. 97.
‡ Ibid., vol. i. p. 85.
§ Ibid., p. 41.
* "Life of Wilberforce," vol. i. p. 38.
† Ibid., p. 42.
‡ Tocqueville, "France before the Revolution," p. 261.
§ Tucker, "Life of Jefferson," vol. i. p. 253.
‖ "France before the Revolution," p. 179.

scanty produce. As he goes on he becomes excited at the wretched management and the miserable dwellings, in a country highly improvable—"the property, perhaps, of some of those glittering beings who figured in the procession the other day at Versailles. Heaven grant me patience while I see a country thus neglected, and forgive me the oaths I swear at the absence and ignorance of the possessors."* Having passed the Dordogne, he finds all the girls and women without shoes or stockings; and "the ploughmen at their work have neither sabots nor feet to their stockings." Everywhere, however, the roads are magnificent—in Languedoc "stupendous works"—"superb even to a folly"—but roads almost without traffic. There were two modes of executing these noble causeways, carried across valleys and through levelled hills. They were either constructed by the forced labor of the peasantry, called the *corvée*, or by assessment of the proprietors, under which the lands held by a noble tenure were eased, and those held by a base tenure were proportionably burdened. The King of France, during the administration of Turgot, tried to abolish the system of compulsory labor. The decree of this benevolent sovereign—who truly said, "I and Turgot are the only friends of the people"—contains this avowal: "With the exception of a small number of provinces, almost all the roads throughout the kingdom have been made by the gratuitous labor of the poorest part of our subjects. . . . By forcing the poor to keep them up unaided, and by compelling them to give their time and labor without remuneration, they are deprived of their sole resource against want and hunger, because they are made to labor for the profit of the rich." In spite of the decree, the system of compulsory labor was re-established in a few months. We have a striking picture of the operation of the *corvée*, in a description by M. Grosley, of a scene at a village near Langres. Sixty or eighty peasants arrive at night at this village, summoned from distant quarters, to begin next day a grand *corvée* upon the road. They could not get their carts and oxen over the mountains; they must pay a fine or go to prison; their feet were cut by the flinty by-ways; they were hungry. The little money they had was nearly exhausted by providing for the inexorable inspector. The traveller, an Englishman, who told Grosley the story, paid for the supper of twenty of these poor people, which procured him a thousand blessings. They were to go to work the next day without their teams.†

And yet, with such oppression, the French peasantry were not serfs, as in most of the German states. Many were even small proprietors of land. That subdivision of landed property, which some imagine to have been caused by the revolution, existed to a large extent before the revolution. Young was greatly surprised to find a state of things so different from that generally prevailing in England. He averred that half the soil belonged to these small proprietors. In the country of Bearne, in a ride of twelve miles from Pau to Moneng, he saw pretty cottages, neat gardens, and every appearance of comfort. The land "is all in the hands of little proprietors, without the farms being so small as to occasion a vicious and miserable population."‡ But this was an exceptional case. "All these small landowners were, in reality, ill at ease in the cultivation of their property, and had to bear many charges or easements on the land which they could not shake off."§ The ancient seignorial rights were the most oppressive; but the seigneur was not the local administrator. Neither did he select the parochial officers who exacted the various payments and services connected with the land. All the local officers were under the government and control of the central power. "The seigneur was in fact no longer anything but an inhabitant of the parish, separated by his own immunities and privileges from all the other inhabitants." The nobility had ceased to have any political power; they had no concern in maintaining public order or administering justice. Many had sold their land in small patches, and lived only on seignorial rights and rent-charges. The greater number did not dwell among the people who were the means of their support. The peasant only knew the nobleman as a living person or an abstract power, who was exempt from the taxes which the plebeian paid; who had the exclusive right of sporting; who compelled him to grind his corn in the lord's mill, and to crush his grapes in the lord's wine-press; who made him pay toll when he crossed a river, and tolled him in selling his corn in the public market; whose perpetual quit-rents, which could not be redeemed, were always an incumbrance on his little property. Arthur Young met with a poor woman who complained of the times, and said that it was a sad country. Her husband had a morsel of land, one cow, and a poor little horse. They had to pay a quantity of wheat to one seigneur, and a larger quantity to another seigneur, "besides very heavy *tailles* and other taxes." The poor woman was only twenty-eight years of age, but she might, "at no great distance, have been taken for sixty or seventy, her figure was so bent, and her face so furrowed and hardened by labor." She said that she heard that something was to be done by some great folks for such poor ones, but she did not know by whom or how—but God send us better, for "*les tailles et les droits nous écrasent.*"* There was no personal sympathy of the higher classes to ameliorate the burdens of their poor dependants. They knew them only as toilers from whom revenue was to be extracted. None of the gentry remained in the rural districts but such as were too poor to leave them. "Being no longer in the position of a chief, they had not the same interest as of old, to attend to, or assist, or direct, the village population; and, on the other hand, not being subject to the same burdens, they could neither feel much sympathy for poverty which they did not share, nor for grievances to which they were not exposed."†

In the rural districts, as well as in the provincial towns, the real administrative functions had gone out of the hands of individuals or bodies having a natural interest in local affairs, and qualified to direct them by local influence and intelligence, to be wielded by a vast army of functionaries all deriving their existence from a central authority in the capital. The king's council was an administrative and legislative power that decided upon all affairs of a public nature, that prepared laws, that fixed taxes, to which every question was referred, the centre from which was derived the movement that set everything in motion. The individuals composing this council were obscure; its power appeared to be that of the throne. The controller-general was the head of this council. Its instruments were the intendants of provinces, who had under them each a sub-delegate. These men were the real governors of France. The taxes, whether the ancient tax of the *taille*, or taxes of more recent date, were wholly under their regulation. The quota of men to serve in the militia for each parish was prescribed by the intendant. All the public works, all the roads, highways and by-ways, kept up out of the public revenue, were under the care of the council, the intendant, and the sub-delegate. The *marêchaussée*, or mounted police, distributed throughout the whole kingdom, were under the management of the intendants. There was no provision for the poor in the rural districts. Under circumstances of great pressure the intendant distributed corn or rice, and sometimes bestowed alms in the form of work at low wages. In the towns "a few families managed all the public business for their own private purposes, removed from the eye of the public, and with no public responsibility." But the council came in, and the government, through the intendant with his subordinate officers, "had a finger in all the concerns of every town, the least as well as the greatest." There were semblances of local freedom in the system of parochial government; but, "compared with the total impotence which was connected with them, they afford an example, in miniature, of the combination of the most absolute government with some of the forms of extreme democracy." The precise details of the complicated system of centralization presented by M. Tocqueville are thus summed up: "Under the social condition of France anterior to the revolution of 1789, as well as at the present day, there was no city, town, borough, village, or hamlet, in the kingdom—there was neither hospital, church fabric, religious house, nor college—which could have an independent will in the management of its private affairs, or which could administer its own property according to its own choice."‡ The system of centralization had so completely pervaded France that "no one imagined that any important affair could be properly carried out without the intervention of the state." The people had lost all power of managing their own affairs. "The French government," says M. Tocqueville, "having

* "Travels in France," p. 12.
† "Observations on England," vol. ii. p. 16.
‡ "Travels in France," p. 42. § Tocqueville, p. 45.

* "Travels in France," p. 134. † Tocqueville, p. 223.
‡ See the details of Book II., chapters 2 and 3.

thus assumed the place of Providence, it was natural that every one should invoke its aid in his individual necessities." May we not add that it was equally natural that when no help came from government at a season of calamity, the people should blaspheme the Providence to which they cried in vain, and in their rage break their false idols in pieces?

The pride of birth which made the aristocracy of France a caste, separating them wholly from the middle classes, was carried forward into a more hateful separation of the middle classes of the towns from those termed the common people. The great passion of the burgher was to become a public functionary. He could buy a place connected with some real or pretended duty arising out of the administrative system of centralization. Every man wanted to be something "by command of the king." But the honor was not altogether barren. The holders of place were exempted, wholly or in part, from public burdens. They quarrelled among themselves; but they were agreed in one principle—to grind the people below them. "Most of the local burdens which they imposed were so contrived as to press most heavily on the lower classes."* The isolation of classes had gradually proceeded to this height under that principle of the French monarchy which sought to govern its subjects by dividing them. The separate parts of the social fabric had no coherence. The whole fell to pieces when it was attempted to repair the rotten edifice. "The nation," said Turgot, in a report to the king, "is a community consisting of different orders ill-compacted together, and of a people whose members have very few ties between themselves, so that every man is exclusively engrossed by his personal interest. Nowhere is any common interest discernible. The villages, the towns, have not any stronger mutual relations than the districts to which they belong." To complete this remarkable isolation, Paris preponderated over the whole kingdom. It was the seat of all mental activity, it was the centre of all political action. "Circulation is stagnant in France," says Young in 1787. In 1789, while the mightiest events were passing in Paris, he found the people of Strasbourg and other towns perfectly ignorant of circumstances that most intimately concerned them. "That universal circulation of intelligence, which in England transmits the least vibration of feeling or alarm, with electric sensibility, from one end of the kingdom to another, and which unites in bonds of connection men of similar interests and situations, has no existence in France." †

Arthur Young appears to have been almost the only observer among Englishmen who, after the dismissal of Calonne in 1787, thought that a revolution was approaching. Loménie de Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse, had become controller-general. Young dined with a party whose conversation was entirely political. "One opinion pervaded the whole company—that they are on the eve of some great revolution in the government; that everything points to it"—financial confusion; no minister to propose anything but palliatives; a prince on the throne with excellent dispositions, but wanting in mental resources; a court buried in pleasure and dissipation, and adding to the public distress; a great ferment among all ranks of men, "who are eager for some change, without knowing what to look to, or to hope for; and a strong leaven of liberty, increasing every hour since the American Revolution." He adds, "All agree that the states of the kingdom cannot assemble without more liberty being the consequence; but I meet with so few men that have any just ideas of freedom, that I question much the species of this new liberty that is to arise."‡

Loménie de Brienne has dismissed the notables, who were beginning to be troublesome, some uttering strange words about liberty, a national assembly, and other unwonted sounds. They had recommended some practical reforms, such as the formation of provincial assemblies, the suppression of *corvées*, a modification of the *gabelle*. These measure were announced in edicts. But the deficit presses. New taxes must be imposed by edicts. These, however, must be registered by the *Parlement* of Paris. Very different from a British parliament was this ancient institution. It was originally only a court of justice; and some of the provinces had smilar courts, with local jurisdiction. The members of these parlements were formerly appointed by the king, and were removable at his will. The appointments were afterward sold, and those who bought the places were considered to hold them for life. The parlements thus gradually acquired a semblance of independence, and did not always register the royal edicts without inquiry. Toward the close of the reign of Louis XV. the Parlement of Paris, refusing to register some royal edicts, was suppressed, as well as some of the provincial parlements. They were restored to their functions, by Louis XVI., in 1774. In 1785 the Parlement of Paris refused to register an edict for a large loan; but the peremptory command of the king overpowered them. Calonne had then recourse to an assembly of notables, which was dissolved in 1787, as we have seen. One of the new taxes proposed by Loménie was a project of raising money by stamps. The Parlement of Paris refused to register the edict, unless the financial accounts were submitted to their examination. At the beginning of August they came to a resolution that a perpetual tax, such as that required to be registered, could only be imposed by the states-general. Then commenced a collision between the crown and the only body that stood between the crown and its absolute power. According to the old forms of the monarchy, a bed of justice was to be held—a ceremony in which the parlement should meet the king face to face, and hear his positive commands to register his decrees. On the 6th of August this command is given at Versailles. The parlement returns to Paris, and refuses to obey the solemn mandate, even though it issued from a bed of justice. The refractory parlement must be put down. The members are banished to Troyes. Paris is in a state of furious excitement. Large bodies of troops are marched into the city to suppress the growing disposition toward violence. At length a compromise is effected. The obnoxious edicts for taxation are withdrawn, and another is proposed and accepted, which recognized equality of taxation without exemptions. The parlement is now recalled from its exile. On the 19th of November the king held a royal sitting (*séance royal*), when he carried to the parlement an edict for a succession of loans for five years, amounting to nineteen millions sterling. He also submitted to them an edict for the relief of the Protestants. He called upon them to confine their functions to their ancient powers, and to show an example of loyalty and obedience. Violent discussions ensued, in which the Duke of Orleans, the relative of the king, took part against the court. The king departed, after a contest of nine hours, and the parlement declared the edicts null and void. The next day the duke was banished to one of his country-seats, and two of the most refractory members of the parlement were arrested by *lettres de cachet*. Temporary expedients for raising money must be resorted to, till something could be done with this rebellious parlement. Loménie had his scheme ready. It was to establish a grand council of state, to be called "La Cour Plenière," which should dispense with the parlements, and yet give a sanction to taxation that might be more satisfactory than the mere exercise of the royal authority. The plan was concocted in secret; but it became known, and produced the greatest agitation in the Parlement of Paris. Two of its most violent opponents, M. d'Espremenil and M. de Montsabert, were ordered to be arrested. They were taken into custody during a sitting of the parlement, in which, after the example of the Commons of England when Charles the First went to arrest the five members, not one of the parlement would point out the persons demanded by a military force. D'Espremenil and Montsabert surrendered, and were taken to prison. The provincial parlements were now in a state of revolt. The people were furious with excitement. The day after the arrest of the members, the king held another Bed of Justice at Versailles, in which he proposed a number of salutary reforms in six edicts, which provided for the more rapid administration of justice; which regulated the proceedings of the Parlement of Paris; which put all criminal procedure upon a footing which swept away many odious and cruel abuses; which established "La Cour Plenière;" which provided for local courts; and which suspended the proceedings of all other courts. These reforms, admirable as some were, were rejected. The edicts became waste paper, through the short-sightedness of the parlement and the violence of the people. A visitation of Providence then became the cause of general distress. A tremendous hailstorm, on the 13th of July, 1788, destroyed, in many districts, the crops of corn and the vineyards. The ruin was almost total for sixty leagues round Paris. An edict was issued on the 8th of August, that the states-general should be assembled in May of the following year. The royal treasury was becoming empty, and

* Tocqueville, p. 170. † "Travels," p. 147. ‡ Ibid., p. 66.

no means of warding off the pressure of the demands of the public creditors but by a measure declaratory of insolvency. The treasury payments shall, according to a proclamation of the 16th of August, henceforth be three fifths in money and two-fifths in paper. The alarm was universal. The court was terrified. There was no hope but in the recall of Necker, to become controller of the finances. Loménie was dismissed, with the solace of more ecclesiastical preferments. Paris was in a state of riot, which was suppressed with some bloodshed. But hope returned with the presence of Necker. He found himself a financial minister without finances. Offers of loans poured in upon him. The funds rose thirty per cent. The popular cause had triumphed, and Necker was the minister of the people. Nothing remained to do but to provide for the meeting of the states-general. An assembly of notables was again convened. They recommended that each of the three estates, the clergy, the noblesse, and the *Tiers État*, should send three hundred members. By the advice of Necker the king issued an edict that the clergy and the noblesse should each elect three hundred members, and the *Tiers État* six hundred. The states-general were to assemble on the 4th of May, 1789. The elections began in January.

On the morning of Monday, the 4th of May, the streets of Versailles were filled with thousands of people, to gaze upon the procession of the court and the states-general from the church of St. Louis, where all had assembled, to the church of Notre Dame, where a sermon was to be preached. One hundred and seventy-five years had passed since a king of France had met the states-general. As if to mark the long interval, the costume of the states-general of 1614 was prescribed. The clergy went first—the bishops in velvet robes and rochets, the curés in their plainer dress. The noblesse came next, in embroidered velvet mantles and gold vests, laced cravats, white plumes in their hats, such as Henri Quatre wore. The *Tiers État* came last, in plain black mantles, white cravats, and unfeathered hats. Lastly, came the king beneath a sumptuous canopy, with the queen, the princesses and high-born dames, and the king's brothers. The Duke of Orleans had contrived to walk in the last rank of the nobles, that he might appear to mingle with the first of the Commons. The Marquis de Ferrières has painted the scene with the most gorgeous tints—the respectful silence of the immense crowd, the windows filled with elegantly dressed ladies, the joy speaking from their brilliant eyes, the clapping of hands, the sound of trumpets, the chant of the priests—ravishing picture: "I called to mind the words of the prophet, Daughters of Jerusalem, your king advances; take your nuptial robes and run before him: tears of joy flowed from my eyes."* The daughter of Necker was at one of the windows. "I was abandoning myself," she says, "to the most lively hopes at seeing, for the first time in France, representatives of the nation. Madame de Montmorin said to me, 'You are wrong in rejoicing; out of this there will come great disasters for France and for us.'"†

The next day the states-general was opened. A large hall in the avenue of the palace had been provided for the assembly. This *Salle des Menus*, as it was called, was of sufficient size to contain the twelve hundred members, with galleries for spectators. There was a platform for the king and his court. Louis—with Marie-Antoinette by his side, looking pale and ill at ease—read an address, of which the principal subject was that of the finances. When the reading was finished, the king put on his hat, as he took his seat on the throne. The clergy and the nobility also put on their hats. Some of the *Tiers État* also took this mode of asserting their position, and there was great confusion, which the king stopped by taking off his own hat. The costume of the third estate was the same as in 1614, but the sentiment which then required them to kneel in the presence of the sovereign was gone. The keeper of the seals made a speech; and so did Necker, the controller-general of the finances—a speech which Arthur Young said was such "as you would expect from a banking clerk of some ability." The difficult question, whether the three estates should deliberate and vote in one body, or in separate chambers, was not touched upon. It seemed to have been arranged that, contrary to the strong opinion that had been expressed by some of the constituencies, the discussions and the votes should not take place in one common assembly. It had been intended that four chambers should be provided: one for the solemn meetings of the three orders together; and for each distinct order a separate chamber. By some difference between the court functionaries, who were of more importance than the sovereign or his ministers, the building set apart for the commons was refused to be given up by the administration of the stables. The *Salle des Menus* was therefore occupied by the third estate. The clergy and the nobles met in their appropriated chambers, and proceeded to the verification of their powers, having decided to do so by the votes of a majority in each of the two orders. The Commons refused to proceed to a separate verification; and for five weeks this contest went on, but without any decisive results of speeches and resolutions.

Milton has eloquently described the intellectual fervor of London in the early days of the Long Parliament. "The shop of war hath not more anvils and hammers waking, to fashion out the plates and instruments of armed justice, in defence of beleaguered truth, than there be pens and heads there, sitting by their studious lamps, musing, searching, revolving new notions and ideas wherewith to present, as with their homage and their fealty, the approaching reformation."* But in Paris, in 1789, the literary activity was of a very different character from that of London in 1644. There was the same disputing and discoursing upon "things not before discoursed or written of;" but in London "the study of highest and most important matters to be reformed" had regard to the differences of doctrine rather than the destruction of religion, and contemplated resistance to arbitrary power rather than the overthrow of all lawful authority. During the first month of the meeting of the states-general Arthur Young was in Paris, and "was much in company." He found "a general ignorance of the principles of government; a strange and unaccountable appeal, on one side, to ideal and visionary rights of nature; and, on the other, no settled plan that shall give security to the people for being in future in a much better situation than hitherto."† He saw the booksellers' shops filled with eager crowds, squeezing from the door to the counter to buy the pamphlet of the last hour. He saw the coffee-houses in the Palais Royal not only crowded within, but other crowds without, listening to orators who, from chairs or tables, harangued each his audience. The pamphlets and the orators were admired, exactly in the proportion in which they attacked Christianity with a sort of rage, without any attempt to substitute any other belief; and proposed to the French people, not that their affairs should be better conducted, but that they should take the conduct of them into their own hands—they "a people so ill-prepared to act for themselves, that they could not undertake a universal and simultaneous reform without a universal destruction."‡

On the 14th of June Arthur Young repaired to the *Salle des Menus* to behold what was to him, as it was to most Englishmen, a scene eminently interesting—"the spectacle of the representatives of twenty-five millions of people, just emerging from the evils of two hundred years of arbitrary power, and rising to the blessings of a freer constitution, assembled with open doors under the eye of the public."§ His feelings were roused; but he saw how the irregularities of the proceedings showed the representatives of the people to be without that self-control, in the absence of which a deliberative assembly is only an organized mob. The spectators in the gallery were allowed to applaud; a hundred members were on their legs at one time; the president, Bailly, absolutely without the means of keeping order. Specific motions, founded on distinct propositions, were drowned in abstract declarations, producing interminable harangues. Thus had the *Tiers État* been debating for five weeks. But with all their mistakes of procedure they clung firmly to their principle, that they would have no verification of their powers, except in common with the other orders. The stronger this inertia in the halls of the states-general, the more active was the public feeling without doors. Tumults were expected. Clubs, that afterward became memorable, stimulated the popular agitation. The excessive price of bread had already produced riots in the provinces. The court is alarmed. At length something more definite than the orations in the Palais Royal produces a terror that may end in some conflict between the orders

* "Mémoires de Ferrières."
† Madame de Staël, "Considérations sur la Révolution."

* "Liberty of Unlicensed Printing."
† "Travels in France," p. 105.
‡ Tocqueville, p. 305.
§ "Travels," p. 110.

among themselves, or of the crown with the states-general. On the 17th of June it was resolved, on the motion of the Abbé Sièyes, that the *Tiers État* should assume the title of "The National Assembly." The members all took an oath to discharge with zeal and fidelity the duties intrusted to their care. They passed several resolutions on the subject of the taxes and the dearness of provisions. These were not of a violent character; but they were proofs that the Commons were resolved to try their own strength. The clergy, on the 19th, determined, by a majority, that the definitive verification of powers should be made in the General Assembly. The nobility voted an address to the king, in which they protested against the assumption of power by the *Tiers État*. On the 20th of June it was proclaimed in the streets of Versailles that a royal sitting of the states-general would be held on the 22d, and that in the mean time the meetings of the three orders were suspended. At eight o'clock in the morning Bailly, the president, and the two secretaries, were at the door of their hall. It was closed against them by military. The deputies began to collect in great numbers in the avenue of Versailles—all angry, some desperate. But they soon learn that their president, having been permitted to take away his papers from the *Salle des Menus*, has taken refuge in a large building, the *Jeu de Paume* (tennis-court), in the Rue St. François. Upon the proposition of Mounier, each took an oath never to separate from that national assembly until the constitution of the kingdom was established. On the 22d it was proclaimed that the royal sitting was adjourned till the following day. The national assembly could not meet on the 22d, for the *Jeu de Paume* was occupied by the princes for their tennis-play. On the 23d the king came to the *Salle des Menus;* and one of the secretaries of state read a declaration to the effect that the distinction of the three orders should be maintained in its integrity, but that they might meet to deliberate together with the consent of the king. The resolutions of the *Tiers État*, on the 17th of June, were cancelled. Thirty-five articles were read, detailing the intentions of the king. Some pointed to useful reforms; others contemplated a strict adherence to established things, even to abuses. The king closed the sitting in a speech, wherein he rashly declared that if the three orders could not agree to effect what he proposed, "I alone will accomplish the good of my people." The king leaves the hall, followed by most of the clergy and all the nobles, having given his command that each order should meet in its distinct place on the following morning, but that they were now to separate. The Commons stir not. They look at each other in gloomy silence. De Brézé, the chief usher of the court, enters and says, "Gentlemen, you have heard the king's orders." Bailly said to the members around him, "I think that the assembled nation cannot receive any order." Then rose Mirabeau, the man of the most commanding power in that assembly, and thus addressed the awe-struck usher: "Yes, sir; we have heard what the king was advised to say; and you, who cannot be the organ of the king to the states-general—you, who have neither place nor right of speech here—you are not the person to remind us of what he has said. If you are commissioned to make us leave this place, you must ask for orders to use force; for we will only quit by the power of the bayonet."* Many speeches were made. The assembly affirmed that they persevered in their former resolutions; and upon the proposition of Mirabeau it was declared that the persons of the deputies were inviolable—that it should be a capital crime to arrest or detain any member, on whose part soever the same be commanded. On the 24th the majority of the clergy joined the *Tier État* for the verification of their powers in common. On the 25th between forty and fifty of the noblesse united in the same way. On the 27th the king, by letter, invited the whole body of the nobility and the clergy to do what he had protested against on the 23d. On the 30th the formal union is completed. The states-general have lost their ancient name. They are three orders no longer—they are the national assembly.

The extraordinary change in the resistance of the court to the union of the three orders was, in all probability, produced by the apprehension that the French guards could not be relied upon in any contest with the national assembly, if the military power and an insurgent populace should be brought into conflict. There were regiments of foreign troops in the king's service, and these might be gradually concentrated in the neighborhood of Paris where bread-riots were becoming very fearful. On the 18th of July Mirabeau stated in the national assembly that there were twenty-five thousand troops between Paris and Versailles, and that twenty thousand more were expected. He moved an address to the king that he would cause the troops to be removed. The king replied that the troops were there to maintain order and secure the freedom of their deliberations. Necker, who had become powerless to advise or to control, begged for permission to resign. On the 11th of July he was dismissed, and was requested to depart secretly from Versailles. On the 12th it became known that the ministry of Necker, from which so much had been expected by the people, was at an end; that other men hostile to the popular cause were in the royal confidence. Marshal de Broglie, who was minister of war, with the command of the troops, was reported to have written to the Prince de Condé, that with fifty thousand men he would disperse these wolves, the national deputies, and the fools who applauded them. Foulon was named intendant of marine—Foulon, who had said that if the people were hungry they might eat grass. The 12th of July was a Sunday. There were movements of troops from the suburbs to the city. Placards were issued in the name of the king inviting the inhabitants to keep their houses. The popular curiosity became more intense. At noon the Palais Royal was filled with eager crowds. A young man, who was hereafter to take a leading position, Camille Desmoulins, came out from the Café Foy with sword and pistol in hand, and mounting a table, cried, "To arms." A multitude rush forth, with green cockades or green boughs in their hats. They seize from an image-shop a bust of Necker and a bust of the Duke of Orleans, and, draping them in crape, bear them about in procession. Prince Lambesc, at the head of the Royal German regiment, encounters the procession, and disperses the people with musket and sabre. There are other fights between the Parisians and the foreign soldiery, the French guards taking part with the populace. The cry "To arms" goes through all the city. The night falls upon a population maddened with rage or fear. In the morning the cry is again "To arms." Thousands of fierce men are in the streets, searching for guns and ammunition in every public place. A municipal authority is hastily formed at the Hôtel de Ville. Public criers proclaim that all men should resort to their districts to be enrolled. In a few hours the national guard of Paris is constituted, each man wearing a red and blue cockade. But how to arm them? Smiths are making pikes; gunpowder has been obtained; but muskets are wanting. The great day of the 14th dawns, and the tidings go forth that at the Hôtel des Invalides there are ample stores of guns. By nine o'clock on that morning the Hôtel has been ransacked, and twenty-eight thousand firelocks are in the hands of these furious volunteers. "To the Bastille" is now the cry that gives a precise direction to the popular violence.

France had many Bastilles, where, without legal trial or sentence, men suspected of designs against the government, or who had given offence to a courtier or a royal mistress, might be shut up even to the end of their days, under the authority of a *lettre de cachet*, through whose mysterious agency they vanished out of society, and were as if dead. The great Bastille of Paris was a fortress built in the fourteenth century—a massive stone structure of nine towers, surrounded by a deep ditch. Other ditches, with drawbridges and strong barriers, were between the fortress and the Street St. Antoine. The Bastille had become celebrated throughout Europe by the remarkable narrative of the escape of two men, De Latude and D'Alegre, in 1756. Their adventures made the construction of this horrible prison familiar to Englishmen. The labor they went through for eighteen months—in plaiting ropes out of the threads of their linen, to form a ladder for their descent of eighty feet from the platform to the ditch, and in removing the iron bars from the chimney by which they were to gain the platform—this labor was almost incredible. But the perseverance of these two fellow-prisoners indicated how strong was the desire of escape from a den where men went mad, under the sense of injustice and the pressure of despair. In England the Bastille was the great symbol of the tyranny of the French government. Cowper described it in 1785 as "the house of bondage worse than that of old which God avenged on Pharaoh;" and he thus looks forward, almost with a prophetic eye, to the catastrophe of the 14th of July, 1789:

* "Histoire Parlementaire."

"Ye horrid towers, the abode of broken hearts,
Ye dungeons and ye cages of despair,
That monarchs have supplied from age to age
With music such as suits their sovereign ears,
The sighs and groans of miserable men!
There's not an English heart that would not leap
To hear that ye were fallen at last." *

The attack on the Bastille had been expected by the governor, De Launay. He had placed artillery on the tops of the towers. He had a hundred and fourteen men in the fortress, with arms and ammunition, but with scanty store of provisions. The committee at the Hôtel de Ville sent a deputation to the governor, to beg him to remove from the towers the cannon which commanded the quartier St. Antoine. The cannon were drawn back from the embrasures. But St. Antoine was not so easily quieted. That quarter was the residence of a great artisan population. Paris had been growing during the century into a very considerable manufacturing town; and in the Faubourg St. Antoine especially the working people were collected together in large numbers, in consequence of an edict of Louis XVI., intended "to relieve them from the restrictions which are injurious to their interests as well as to their freedom of trade." They had privileges then granted which relieved them from the tyranny of the guilds.† But the agglomeration of a vast working population, at a time of public excitement and of private distress, was a serious danger; and thus in every stage of the French Revolution the Faubourg St. Antoine was a terrible power in the hands of those who worked upon the popular passions. About noon of the 14th of July Thuriot de la Rosière, an advocate, has demanded to see the governor of the Bastille, to warn him of the cry which has gone forth in the more polite quarters of Paris, and to exhort him to surrender. De Launay and Thuriot went upon the battlements; and there they saw a vast multitude swarming toward the grim towers, along every street and every alley of the Faubourg. Thuriot shows himself from the battlements, descends, and addresses the crowd from a window in the governor's house with some words intended to calm their fury. He receives only their curses, and an attack commences in downright earnest. This roaring multitude have resolute men among them. Four with axes make their way from the roof of a neighboring house to the outer wall of the Bastille, jump down into the court, and begin hewing at the chains of the drawbridge The drawbridge at length falls, and the crowd pours into the exterior court. Another drawbridge impedes their progress. They rush at it, and are received with a fire of musketry. Dead and wounded men are carried forth, and the sight rouses the gathering multitude to additional fury. Large numbers of the French guards come to assist in the attack. De Launay fires upon the crowd from the battlements; the populace fire upon the Swiss and the Invalides who defend the fortress. There have been five hours of this contest without a reasonable expectation of the stronghold being taken. The garrison has only lost one man. Nearly two hundred of the assailants have been killed or wounded. But the Invalides wished to surrender; the Swiss expressed their desire to resist. De Launay, in his despair of being able finally to repel a mob of thousands animated by one spirit, attempted to apply a match to the powder magazine, but he was stopped by one of his officers. Moved by that almost instinctive fear of raging multitude which the bravest may feel, he was now inclined to capitulate but not to surrender. He wrote a note to the besiegers, to the effect that he had twenty thousand pounds of powder within the magazine, and would blow up the Bastille, and thus destroy its neighborhood, himself and his besiegers, if they did not accept a capitulation which would leave him and his garrison to go free. The note was given to Elie, an officer of the French guards, and he gave his assurance, in which his men joined, that if the drawbridge were lowered, the garrison should receive no harm. It was lowered. The furious crowd rushed in, passing the Invalides and the Swiss who were ranged in the inner court. The French guards could not wholly protect those to whom safety had been assured. It was determined to take De Launay to the Hôtel de Ville. As he moves along the yells of the multitude grow louder; the efforts to protect the unfortunate man are less and less availing. Hullin, one of the besiegers, even fights against the mob to defend his prisoner. Hullin is struck down, and De Launay is murdered. Major De Losme, one of the officers of the Bastille, was surrounded. He had always shown kindness to the prisoners, and one of the crowd, who had been under his charge, now seized a musket to defend him. De Losme was killed. Two of the Invalides were hanged by the mob. Many of the besiegers have been exploring the dungeons of the Bastille, where they find only seven prisoners. Others linger around the hated place shouting and singing in frantic joy. A vast number have marched off to the Hôtel de Ville, conducting their prisoners to receive judgment for the guilt of having been faithful to their duty. The officers of the French guard demand that the Invalides and the Swiss shall go free, as the reward of themselves and their men for their aid in this day's work. Another murder, that of Flesselles, a magistrate, was perpetrated that evening. Through the night Paris watched as if a foreign enemy were approaching to sack the city. The windows were lighted, patrols were in all the streets, orators were still haranguing the populace, among whom Marat was conspicuous. St. Antoine gave itself up to a frenzy of delight, and the pains of hunger were less keenly felt in the time of triumph and of revenge. The occurrences at Paris were imperfectly known at Versailles; but at midnight the Duke de Liancourt entered the king's bedchamber, and told him how the Bastille had fallen. "It is a riot" (*émeute*), said the king. "No, sire, it is a revolution," replied the duke. The danger which now threatened the throne, and all who surrounded the throne, was manifest. The power was passing away from the national assembly into the hands of an armed populace.

On the morning of the 15th of July the king suddenly appeared in the midst of the national assembly, to announce that he had given orders to the troops to withdraw from Paris and Versailles, and that he relied upon the assembly to restore order and tranquillity. The deputies loudly applauded; as the king returned to the palace the people vociferously shouted. A deputation of the assembly proceeded to Paris to proclaim at the Hôtel de Ville the glad words that Louis had that day spoken. The king, it was held, had authorized the establishment of the national guard. A commander must be found. In the hall was a bust of La Fayette; and a deputy pointing to it, the friend of Washington was elected commander by acclamation. In the same way Bailly was constituted mayor of Paris, in the place of Flesselles, the provost of the merchants, who had been shot the night before. The Parisians had now confidence in the king, and the king had confidence in the Parisians. He announced to the assembly that he would visit his good city. He would dismiss his ministers; he would recall Necker. But some who surrounded the king had not his trust in the disposition of the people. On the morning of the 17th the king is on his way to Paris, attended by a large number of the deputies. The Count d'Artois (the king's brother), the Prince de Condé, and others of royal blood; Marshal de Broglie, the Polignacs, and several of the recent ministry, are on their way to the frontiers. The queen vainly attempted to prevent the king going among a dangerous populace. "The king was of a weak character, but he was not timid," * and he kept to his determination. His reception was such as to fill him with hope for the future. Loyalty and patriotism joined in the universal cry, "Vive le Roi—Vive la Nation!"

The obnoxious ministers have fled from Versailles. One, the most obnoxious, Foulon, is reported to have died; for a sumptuous funeral has proceeded from his house. On the morning of the 22d of July some peasants of Vitry, near Fontainebleau, are leading into Paris an old man bound with ropes to the tail of a cart. On his back is fastened a bundle of grass, and a collar of nettles is round his neck. It is Foulon, who has been denounced as a speculator in famine—one who said the poor should eat grass if they could not get bread. He is dragged to the Hôtel de Ville to be judged. La Fayette arrived. Anxious to save the trembling man of seventy-four from the popular fury, he proposed to consign him to the prison of the Abbaye, that he might be tried according to the laws. "What is the use of trying a man," cried a voice, "who has been judged these thirty years?" The crowd rushed upon their victim, dragged him out of the hall, and in a few minutes he was hanging to a lantern at the corner of the street. His head was cut off, a bundle of hay was stuffed into the mouth, and this trophy of mob vengeance was car-

* "The Task," book v.

† Tocqueville, p. 139.

* Dumont, "Souvenirs sur Mirabeau," p. 31.

ried through the city. The same night Berthier, the son-in-law of Foulon—intendant of Paris, and hated as a tax-levier—is brought in a carriage to the Hôtel de Ville, surrounded by national guards, sent by the municipals to protect him. The protection avails him not. The superseders of law have him in their clutches. He fights against them with dogged resolution. But the lantern has its prey; and another ghastly head and a bleeding heart are carried in horrible procession. The municipal authorities of Paris have been trampled down by murderers. Bailly and La Fayette indignantly resigned their offices; but they were won back again when the municipality was reorganized under the name of La Commune.

The doings of Paris were not without successful imitations in the provinces. On the 20th of July Arthur Young was at Strasbourg, where he first heard the news of the overthrow of the Bastille. He writes, "The spirit of revolt is gone forth into various parts of the kingdom. The price of bread has prepared the populace everywhere for all sorts of violence." He soon saw the course which the violence was taking in the rural districts. He was at Besançon on the 27th. There he heard of châteaux burned or plundered, the seigneurs hunted down like wild beasts, their wives and daughters outraged; "and these abominations, not inflicted on marked persons, who were odious for their former conduct or principles." * In his inn at Dole there were "a gentleman, unfortunately a seigneur, his wife, family, three servants, an infant but a few months old, who escaped from their flaming château half naked in the night; all their property lost except the land itself; and this family valued and esteemed by their neighbors, with many virtues to command the love of the poor, and no oppressions to provoke their enmity." † The inquiries of Arthur Young led him to believe that the burnings and plunderings had not been committed by troops of *brigands*, but by the peasants only. The notion of brigands going through the country in troops eight hundred strong, and even to the number of sixteen hundred, was the prevalent belief in the towns. People came around Young to ask for news. "They were much surprised to find that I gave no credit to the existence of brigands, as I was well persuaded that all the outrages that had been committed were the work of the peasants only." ‡

The national assembly, all things being tolerably quiet in Paris, proceeds with its self-appointed work of sweeping away all ancient things, for the purpose of building up a wholly new system for the government of twenty-five millions of people. The assembly had been long occupied in drawing up a declaration of the rights of man. Some who were concerned in the preparation of this document, among whom was Dumont, considered it a puerile fiction. It declared that "men are born free and equal." It is not true, writes the fellow-worker of Mirabeau. Are men born free? They are born in a state of weakness and necessary dependence. Are they equal? By equality do we understand equality of fortune, of talent, of virtue, of industry, of condition? § The metaphysical difficulties of the national assembly were quickly absorbed in one vast measure of sweeping change. At a nocturnal sitting of the 4th of August, after a report of a committee on the troubled state of the kingdom had been read, it was proposed by two noblemen that all taxes should be proportionably paid by all, according to their income, as well as all other public burdens; that all feudal rights should be made redeemable by a money value; that *corvées* and all personal service should be abolished. A Breton deputy, in the dress of a farmer, rose and exclaimed, "Let the title-deeds, the terrible instruments which for ages have tormented the people, be brought here and burned—those parchments by which men are required to be yoked to a wagon like beasts—which compel men to pass the night in beating the ponds to prevent the frogs from disturbing the sleep of their luxurious lords. Declare the compulsory redemption of these services, and thus stop the burning of the châteaux." Dumont saw the extraordinary scene of the 4th of August, when a work "which would have demanded a year of care and deliberation, was proposed, voted, resolved by general acclamation. I know not how many laws were decreed: the abolition of feudal rights, the abolition of tithes, and the abolition of the privileges of provinces—three articles which in themselves embrace a whole system of jurisprudence and of policy, were decided, with ten or a dozen others, in less time than a parliament of England would have taken for the first reading of a bill of some importance." * Mirabeau was not present at that sitting. The next day he said to Dumont, "Behold our French; they take an entire month to dispute about syllables, and in one night they overturn all the ancient order of the monarchy."

On the 12th of August Arthur Young, being at Clermont, hears of the famous decrees of the 4th. "The great news just arrived from Paris, of the utter abolition of tithes, feudal rights, game warrens, pigeons, † etc., has been received with the greatest joy by the mass of the people." Sensible men, however, complained of the injustice of declaring what will be done, without regulations of what was to be done at the moment of declaring. About a fortnight later he was "pestered with all the mob of the country shooting." The declaration of the national assembly, "without any statute or provision to secure the right of the game to the possessor of the soil, according to the tenor of the vote, has, as I am everywhere informed, filled all the fields of France with sportsmen, to an utter nuisance. The same effects have flowed from declarations of right relative to tithes, taxes, feudal rights, etc. In the declarations, conditions and compensations are talked of; but an unruly, ungovernable multitude seize the benefit of the abolition, and laugh at the obligations or recompense." The barriers that stood between a people long misgoverned and oppressed, and all the ancient restraints of their servitude, being suddenly broken down, their excesses could scarcely be matter of wonder. There is very little exaggeration in what Mr. Eden wrote to Mr. Pitt from Paris, on the 27th of August, 1789: "It would lead me too far to enter into the strange and unhappy particulars of the present situation of this country. The anarchy is most complete; the people have renounced every idea and principle of subordination; the magistracy (so far as there remain any traces of magistracy) is panic-struck; the army is utterly undone; and the soldiers are so freed from military discipline that on every discontent, and in the face of day, they take their arms and knapsacks, and leave their regiments; the Church, which formerly had so much influence, is now in general treated by the people with derision; the revenue is greatly and rapidly decreasing amid the disorders of the time; even the industry of the laboring class is interrupted and suspended. In short, the prospect, in every point of view, is most alarming; and it is sufficient to walk into the streets, and to look at the faces of those who pass, to see that there is a general impression of calamity and terror." ‡

The scarcity consequent upon a bad harvest was growing more fearful, especially in Paris. The furious multitude, filled with vague suspicions by incendiary journalists and orators, ascribed the enormous price of bread to other than natural causes. "The people," says Dumont, "attributed the scarcity to the aristocracy. The aristocrats had caused the corn to be cut down while in the blade; the aristocrats had paid the bakers not to make bread; the aristocrats had thrown the grain into the rivers. There was no lie, no absurdity, that did not appear probable." § A foolish display of loyalty at Versailles turned the follies of the people into a new channel of rage against the court. A regiment of Flanders had come to Versailles; and the officers of the king's body-guard gave an entertainment on the 1st of October to the officers of this regiment. The king and queen entered during the banquet. The orchestra played "O Richard, O mon Roi," and shouts of "Vive le Roi" awoke the sentiment of loyalty even among officers of the national guard who had been invited. Some of them turned their national cockade, showing only the white beneath. Even black cockades were to be seen. There was an evident reaction against the popular cause. The Parisians heard of these demonstrations; and an insurrectionary feeling was fast spreading among the half-starved populace, who had broken open bakers' shops, and attempted to hang a baker, who was saved by the national guard. At daybreak on the morning of the 5th of October a woman went into a guard-room, and took a drum, which she beat as she marched along. Crowds of market-women came

* "Travels in France," p. 146. † Ibid., p. 149.
‡ Ibid., p. 155. § "Souvenirs sur Mirabeau," p. 98.

* "Souvenirs sur Mirabeau," p. 100.
† One of the exclusive privileges of the seigneurs was to have dove-houses for flocks of birds to feed upon the grain of lands of which these lords neither owned nor cultivated any part.
‡ Tomline's "Life of Pitt," vol. ii. p. 74.
§ "Souvenirs sur Mirabeau," p. 122.

forth, for this day, being Monday, was an idle day for them. They began to cry "Bread." There was no bread in the bakers' shops, and they would go to Versailles, to fetch the baker and his wife. The crowd of women increased to hundreds; and they soon filled the Hôtel de Ville. In four or five hours they were joined by a body of men, who obtained muskets and two pieces of cannon from the municipal stores. The excesses of the women, who wanted to burn the building, were stopped by Maillard, an usher of the court, who told them that he was one of the conquerors of the Bastille. By the consent of a superior officer he proposed to lead the women away on the road to Versailles, where they wanted to go, that the authorities might have time to collect their forces and stop the tumult. On the troop of Amazons went, with this tall man in black as their general. As the day advanced the affair became more serious. La Fayette and the committees of districts were at the Hôtel de Ville. The national guard, the French guards (now called grenadiers), the rough men from the Faubourg St. Antoine—all gathered round La Fayette, demanding to go to Versailles. The Commune deliberated till four o'clock, and then ordered La Fayette to march. Meanwhile Maillard, with his female host, had reached Versailles about three o'clock. The women demanded to enter the national assembly. Fifteen were admitted, with a soldier, who had belonged to the French guards. The soldier said Paris was starving, they came for bread; and for the punishment of the king's body guard, who had insulted the national cockade. Mounier, the president, could only get rid of the troublesome visitors upon the condition that he should accompany the deputation to see the king. They were admitted to the presence of Louis, who spoke to them affectionately; and they quitted the kind-hearted king crying "Vive le Roi." The women outside, growing more violent, said that they had been betrayed by their deputation; but they were pacified for a time, by a written paper, signed by the king, declaring that every care should be taken for the provisioning of Paris. A conflict then appeared imminent between the men of St. Antoine and the king's body-guard. The cannon which had been brought from Paris was pointed against the guard; but the powder was wet, and the men sulkily said, "It is not time yet." In this night of peril Mounier pressed upon the king the acceptance of the articles of the constitution, which assent he had not previously given. The king yielded. When Mounier returned to the hall of the assembly, it was filled with women, who interrupted the proceedings. There was a discussion upon the criminal laws. A fishwoman called out, "Stop that babbler; that is not the question; the question is about bread." At midnight La Fayette, with fifteen thousand of the national guard, arrived. He had made the men under his command swear fidelity to the law and the king. He entered the Salle des Menus; told the president that the men had promised to obey the king and the national assembly; and then, attended by only two commissioners, went to the king, and having explained to him the state of affairs, received orders to assign to the national guards the external posts of the palace; the body-guard and the Swiss remaining in the interior. At three in the morning the assembly separated, and La Fayette went to rest. About six in the morning a mob of Parisians, mingled with some of Versailles, got over the iron railing of the palace, and forced their way into the interior. The subsequent occurrences of that terrible 6th of October are differently stated by various authorities. There is one description by the side of which all other descriptions look pale; and yet the facts which "history will record" are more definite than the general truth as colored by the glowing imagination of Burke.* The mob of assassins and plunderers, when they had penetrated into the interior of the palace, directed their furious steps toward the queen's apartments. They were probably guided by some spy about the royal family. Madame Campan looked out of the antechamber, and saw a faithful guard, covered with wounds, who kept the passage from the hall against many men, and who cried out, "Save the queen; they come to assassinate her." She bolted the door; the queen jumped from her bed, and made her way to the king's apartments. The assassins did not reach the queen's chamber, says Madame Campan. The body-guard had taken refuge there, and there also the king had arrived. To the famous apartment called the Œil-de-Bœuf the guards had been sent by the king; and in his own apartment, to which he had returned, he was joined by the queen and her children. The mob were thundering at the door of the Œil-de-Bœuf when a detachment of the French guards arrived, under the command of Sergeant Hoche, a man famous in after days. They came to save their brother-soldiers; and they soon cleared the palace of those who thirsted after blood. Two of the guards had been killed on the staircase; and a ruffian cut off their heads, which were carried about on pikes. La Fayette arrived. The mob outside cried that the king must go to Paris. Louis showed himself on a balcony, and so did the queen with her children. La Fayette took the queen's hand, and raised it respectfully to his lips, and then the mob shouted "Vive la Reine." It was agreed that the king and the royal family should go to Paris; and the assembly voting that they were inseparable from the king, a hundred deputies were selected to accompany him. At one o'clock a most unregal procession was in motion—national Guards mingled with shouting and singing men of St. Antoine; cannon, with pikemen astride them; wagon-loads of corn, lent from the stores of Versailles; hackney-coaches; the royal carriage; carriages with deputies; La Fayette on horseback; and, swarming round the king and his family, vociferous women, crying "We shall no more want bread; we are coming with the baker, the bakeress, and the baker's boy." As the darkness deepens, the multitudinous array reaches the barrier. Mayor Bailly harangues the king; and then, at the Hôtel de Ville, there are more harangues. The king says he comes with pleasure and with confidence among his people. The mayor attempts to repeat the speech, but omits the word "confidence." "Say with confidence," interposes the queen. Before wearied royalty can sleep, with hasty accommodation in the palace of the Tuileries, long since disused, the king has to be shown to the people from a balcony by torchlight, wearing the tricolor cockade. In a few days the Tuileries looks something like a palace. There was an interval of tranquillity. The harassed king, the slave of circumstances, soon manifested an outward show of that confidence which he had professed to feel. An Englishman in Paris writes, on the 18th of October, "This morning I saw his majesty walking in the Champs Elysées without guards. He seemed easy and cheerful." *

CHAPTER CLXXXVI.

Connection of the French Revolution with English history—The public opinion of England on the Revolution—Views of eminent men—The King of France visits the national assembly—Session of the British Parliament—Divisions in the Whig party—The Test Act—Nootka Sound—War with Spain averted—Fête of the Federation in Paris—Burke publishes his "Reflections on the French Revolution"—Russia and Turkey—Siege of Ismaïl—Mirabeau president of the national assembly—His negotiations with the court—His death—Parliament—Breach of the friendship between Burke and Fox—Clamor against the dissenters—The Birmingham riots.

The history of the French Revolution is essentially connected with the history of England, almost from the first day of the meeting of the states-general. The governments of the two countries were not, for several years, brought into collision, or into an exchange of remonstance and explanation, on the subject of the momentous events in France. But these events, in all their shifting aspects, so materially affected the state of public opinion among the British people that they gradually exercised a greater influence upon our external policy and our internal condition, than any overthrow of dynasties, any wars, any disturbances of the balance of power, any one of "the incidents common in the life of a nation"—to use the words of Tocqueville—even a far greater influence than the American Revolution, which was the precursor of that of France. For this cause, we feel it necessary to relate the leading events of this signal uprooting of ancient institutions and established ideas, more fully than would at first sight appear proportionate in a general history of our own land. Nevertheless, we shall aim at the utmost brevity consistent with an intelligible narrative. At every act of this great drama we shall endeavor to show the effect of its memorable scenes upon the thoughts and feelings of those among us who guided the national sentiment as statesmen and writers. "Between the spring of 1789 and the close of 1792 the public mind of England underwent a great

* See "Reflections on the Revolution in France."

* Trail to Romilly, in "Romilly's Memoirs."

change."* To trace the formation of that aggregate public opinion—to which the most powerful statesman of the time was compelled to yield a reluctant obedience, and against which the most eloquent advocate of popular rights could only feebly protest—is a task of which the execution must be necessarily inadequate, but which, however imperfect, must have some illustrative historical value.

The "change in the public mind" with which the fluctuating opinions of many eminent men were identified—changes in most of those men very unjustly denounced as apostasy—proceeded from the original inability of the most sagacious to see the probable career, and to estimate the real strength, of the new-born liberty of France. "The English," says Tocqueville, "taught by their own history, and enlightened by the long practice of political freedom, perceived dimly, as through a thick veil, the approaching spectre of a great revolution. But they were unable to distinguish its real shape; and the influence it was so soon to exercise upon the destinies of the world, and upon their own, was unforeseen."† Much of the early feeling associated with the French Revolution depended upon youth and temperament. To young and ardent minds 1789 was a season of hope and promise.

> "Bliss was it in the dawn to be alive,
> But to be young was very heaven! Oh! times,
> In which the meagre, stale, forbidding ways
> Of custom, law, and statute, took at once
> The attraction of a country in romance."

Coleridge, who first gave to the world these verses of Wordsworth in his poem "On the French Revolution, as it appeared to enthusiasts at its commencement," says, in prose almost as eloquent as his friend's poetry, "Many there were, young men of loftiest minds, yea, the prime stuff out of which manly wisdom and practical greatness are formed, who had appropriated their hopes and the ardor of their souls to mankind at large, to the wide expanse of national interests, which then seemed fermenting in the French Republic as in the main outlet and chief crater of the revolutionary torrents; and who confidently believed that these torrents, like the lavas of Vesuvius, were to subside into a soil of inexhaustible fertility in the circumjacent lands, the old divisions and mouldering edifices of which they had covered or swept away."‡ "I was a sharer in the general vortex," adds Coleridge. Such a young man, one of loftiest mind, William Huskisson, was in his twentieth year residing with his uncle in Paris. That young man, destined to form one of the most important members of a Tory government advancing toward liberal opinions, was present at the taking of the Bastille, and was a member of one of the clubs of Paris. In 1823, when he was a candidate for Liverpool, he was accused of having been a member of the Jacobin Club. He denied the charge, but he frankly said, "In the earlier period of my life, when I was about nineteen, I was in France; and if I should then have been misled by a mistaken admiration of what I now think the errors of that revolution, I trust that the ardor of youth would be no discreditable excuse. . . . I am not ashamed to avow that I was anxious to see a rational system of liberty established in that fine country. . . . That guilt I share in common with many great and good men."§ The predilections of Mr. Huskisson did not prevent him receiving the appointment of private secretary to Lord Gower, then the British minister at Paris. The destruction of the Bastille was the type of the fall of tyranny to English men and also to English women. Hannah More writes to Horace Walpole, "Poor France! though I am sorry that the lawless rabble are so triumphant, I cannot help hoping that some good will arise from the sum of human misery having been so considerably lessened at one blow, by the destruction of the Bastille."‖ Dumont says that in England, the most free and the most noble of the nations, the destruction of the Bastille had caused a general joy.¶ He adds, however, what is correct, that the English government had not permitted this event to be celebrated in the theatres. An opera, founded upon the story of the Iron Mask, in which that mystery was blended with a scenic representation of the destruction of the Bastille, was "maimed and mutilated by the licenser."* As might be expected, Fox was in raptures at the great event of the 14th of July. He writes to Fitzpatrick, on the 30th of that month, "How much the greatest event it is that ever happened in the world, and how much the best."† Even Burke expresses himself soberly, within three weeks after that "greatest event." He writes to Lord Charlemont, on the 9th of August, "Our thoughts of everything at home are suspended by our astonishment at the wonderful spectacle which is exhibited in a neighboring and rival country. What spectators, and what actors! England gazing with astonishment at a French struggle for liberty, and not knowing whether to blame or to applaud. . . . The spirit it is impossible not to admire; but the old Parisian ferocity has broken out in a shocking manner."‡ There was another remarkable Englishman, of French extraction, who had seen much of France, was intimate with Mirabeau, and who attempted, though French vanity rendered the attempt useless, to imbue the national assembly, through Dumont, with some respect for salutary forms, established by the experience of the English Parliament. Samuel Romilly, then in his thirty-second year, wrote thus to Dumont, on the 28th of July, 1789: "I am sure I need not tell you how much I have rejoiced at the revolution which has taken place. I think of nothing else, and please myself with endeavoring to guess at some of the important consequences which must follow throughout all Europe. I think myself happy that it has happened when I am of an age at which I may reasonably hope to live to see some of those consequences produced. It will perhaps surprise you, but it is certainly true, that the revolution has produced a very sincere and very general joy here. It is the subject of all conversations; and even all the newspapers, without one exception, though they are not conducted by the most liberal or the most philosophical of men, join in sounding forth the praises of the Parisians, and in rejoicing at an event so important for mankind."§ The news of the murder of Foulon and his son-in-law somewhat abates his enthusiasm. When the events of the 6th of October were known in England, he dreads the removal of the national assembly to Paris: "I fear for the freedom of debate in the midst of a people so turbulent, so quick to take alarm, and so much disposed to consider the most trifling circumstances as proofs of a conspiracy formed against them." He had seen France during a rapid visit in September, and had ventured an opinion that "the horizon was overcast." In October he writes, to express what is a presentiment of a coming change in English feeling: "I find the favor with which the popular cause in France is considered here, much less than it was when I quitted England. We begin to judge you with too much severity; but the truth is, that you taught us to expect too much, and that we are disappointed and chagrined at not seeing those expectations fulfilled."‖

The interest excited by the revolution was not confined to the higher circles, metropolitan or provincial. Arthur Young, complaining in August of the apparent indifference to political affairs, as exhibited in their conversation, of the French in towns through which he passed, says, "The ignorance or the stupidity of these people must be absolutely incredible. Not a week passes without their country abounding with events that are analyzed and debated by the carpenters and blacksmiths of England." This was the result of what he frequently laments, the want of that rapid and easy communication which almost every part of our island enjoyed. The carpenters and blacksmiths of England had some prejudices corrected by the early struggles of the French to be better governed. Their old notion of the subjects of the Grand Monarque was, that they ate frogs and wore wooden shoes; that they were a starved people, who had not spirit to resist their oppressors. Hogarth appealed to the popular notions when he published his prints of "The Invasion," in 1756, and wrote under them certain patriotic lines about "lanthorn-jaw and croaking gut," and "the hungry slaves have smelt our food." There is a remarkable testimony to a change in the popular feeling, supplied by an intelligent foreigner in 1790: "The French used to be the great object of English national dislike and jealousy; but this seems now to be greatly abated, especially since the late

* Macaulay, "Life of Pitt."
† "France before the Revolution," p. 3.
‡ "The Friend," Essay ii.
§ Appendix to Huskisson's Speeches, vol. iii. p. 647.
‖ "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 170.
¶ "Souvenirs sur Mirabeau," p. 95.

* Wright, vol. ii. p. 177.
† "Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 361.
‡ Prior, "Life of Burke," vol. ii. p. 41.
§ "Memoirs," p. 272.
‖ Ibid., p. 282.

revolution in France has given the English rather a more respectful opinion of the French nation." *

The beginning of the year 1790 presents a singular contrast between the aspect of the parliament of England and of the national assembly of France. On the 21st of January George III. opened the session with a royal speech which notices "the interruption of the tranquillity of other countries;" and expresses his majesty's deep and grateful sense of the favor of Providence, in continuing to his subjects "the inestimable advantages of peace, and the uninterrupted enjoyment of the invaluable blessings which they have so long derived from our excellent constitution." On the 4th of February Louis XVI. went to the national assembly, which held its sittings in the Salle du Manège, near the Tuileries, and addressed the deputies in very remarkable words, indicative not only of his acquiescence in the great changes which the assembly had decreed, but of his earnest desire to unite with them in building up a solid and enduring fabric of public liberty. The assembly, during the four months in which it had sat at Paris, had passed some sweeping measures of reform. The most important was that of a new territorial division of the kingdom. The old boundaries of provinces, with their various and conflicting systems of administration, were swept away; and France was distributed into eighty-three departments, with each its subdivision of districts and cantons. Throughout France one system of administration, under municipal functionaries to be chosen by the people, was established. The king declared to the assembly that ten years previous he had desired to substitute some general system of administration for one founded upon ancient customs; but to the assembly was due the grand idea, the salutary change, of the new departmental division, which he would second by all the means in his power. The privileges of the nobility had been destroyed—feudal rights had been abolished—during the sittings of Versailles. A change of equal importance had since taken place. The question of church property, which in France was of enormous amount, had been warmly debated in the early sittings of the assembly. Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, contended that the nation had the right of making a new disposition of that property; the Abbé Maury maintained that the proprietary rights of the clergy should be preserved inviolate. On the 2d of November it was carried by a large majority that all ecclesiastical property is at the disposal of the nation, but charged with a suitable provision for the expenses of religious worship, for the support of the ministers of religion, and for the relief of the poor. A better income than previously existed was to be provided for the inferior clergy. The religious houses were also suppressed, but provision was to be made for their inmates, whose vows were declared no longer binding. The king, on the 4th of February, expressed in words of no common force his adoption of these changes, which were essentially a revolution. "In concert with the queen, who partakes all my sentiments, I will at the proper time prepare the mind and the heart of my son for the new order of things that circumstances have brought about." † The address of the king worked up the excitable Parisians to a fever-fit of constitutional loyalty, manifested in universal oath-taking and illuminations, each district having its own swearing and its candles in the windows. Nevertheless, journalism, and clubs, and secret advisers in the Tuileries, soon clouded this "day-star of liberty;" and Englishmen generally felt that they were safer from storms under that tutelary genius which George III. invoked on all occasions, "our excellent constitution." The time was approaching when those among us who looked with apprehension upon the French Revolution should be violently opposed to those who as violently became its partisans. The progress of this conflict of opinions was very gradual; but the tendencies toward a rupture of the old ties of one great political party were soon manifest. The distinctions of Whig and Tory would speedily be obliterated. Those who clung to the most liberal interpretation of the principles upon which our revolution of 1688 was founded, would be pointed at as Jacobins—the title which became identified with all that was most revolting in the French Revolution. The Tory became the anti-Jacobin. Thus, through ten years of social bitterness, execration and persecution made England and Scotland very unpleasant dwelling-places for men who dared to think and speak openly. Democratic opinions, even in their mildest form, were proscribed, not by a political party only, but by the majority of the people. Liberty and Jacobinism were held to be synonymous.

Burke, Fox, and Sheridan, from the commencement of the administration of Pitt, had been closely united as the chief leaders of the Whigs. They had been brought intimately together as managers of the impeachment of Hastings, whose trial at the commencement of the session of 1790 had been proceeding for two years. Fox and Burke had cordially joined with Wilberforce, who was supported by Pitt, in taking a prominent part in advocating the total abolition of the slave trade in 1789. On the 5th of February, 1790, when the army estimates were moved, Mr. Pitt held that it was necessary, on account of the turbulent situation of the greater part of the continent, that we should be prepared for war, though he trusted the system uniformly pursued by ministers would lead to a long continuance of peace. Mr. Fox opposed the estimates on the ground of economy alone. He had no dread of the increase of the army in a constitutional point of view. "The example of a neighboring nation had proved that former imputations on armies were unfounded calumnies; and it was now universally known throughout all Europe that a man by becoming a soldier did not cease to be a citizen." On the 9th of February, when the report on the army estimates was brought up, Mr. Burke proclaimed, in the most emphatic terms, his views on the affairs of France. He opposed an increase of our military force. He held that France, in a political light, was to be considered as expunged out of the system of Europe. "Since the house had been prorogued in the summer much work was done in France. The French had shown themselves the ablest architects of ruin that had hitherto existed in the world. In that very short space of time they had completely pulled down to the ground their monarchy, their church, their nobility, their law, their revenue, their army, their navy, their commerce, their arts, and their manufactures. They had done their business for us, as rivals, in a way in which twenty Ramilies and Blenheims could never have done." Burke held that in this fallen condition it was not easy to determine whether France could ever appear again as a leading power. Six years afterward he described the views he formerly entertained as those of "common speculators." He says, "Deprived of the old government, deprived in a manner of all government, France, fallen as a monarchy, to common speculators might have appeared more likely to be an object of pity or insult, according to the disposition of the circumjacent powers, than to be the scourge and terror of them all." * Burke's alarm, in 1790, was not an apprehension of France as a military power. In the age of Louis XIV. we were in danger of being entangled by the example of France in the net of a relentless despotism. "Our present danger, from the example of a people whose character knows no medium, is, with regard to government, a danger from anarchy; a danger of being led, through an admiration of successful fraud and violence, to an imitation of the excesses of an irrational, unprincipled, proscribing, confiscating, plundering, ferocious, bloody, and tyrannical democracy." He went on to say that, "in his opinion, the very worst part of the example set is in the late assumption of citizenship by the army." With the highest compliments to the masterly understanding and benevolent disposition of his friend, he regretted that Mr. Fox had dropped a word expressive of exultation at the conduct of the French army. He had no difference about the abstract principle whether the soldiers were to forget they were citizens. In France, where the abstract principle was clothed with its circumstances, he thought what was done there furnished no matter for exultation, either in the act or the example. Mr. Fox, in reply, avowed his deep obligations for the improvement he had derived from his friend's instruction and conversation. From him he had learned more than from all the men with whom he had ever conversed. His friend might be assured that they could never differ in principles, however they might differ in their application. He maintained his opinion of the conduct of the French soldiers as men who, "feelingly alive to a sense of the oppressions under which their countrymen had groaned, disobeyed the despotic commands of their leaders, and gallantly espoused the cause of their fellow-citizens." It was manifest that the difference between the two great orators was something more than the application of principles. The respect

* Wendeborn, "View of England," vol. i. p. 375.

† The speech is given in Thiers' "Révolution Française," note 15.

* "Letters on a Regicide Peace," Letter i. 1796.

which each felt for the understanding of the other prevented, at that time, a stronger expression of the thoughts that were tearing them asunder. A smaller man interfered in the friendly contention; and then the Whig ranks were first broken by Burke's war-cry. Sheridan elaborately defended the proceedings of the national assembly, apologized for the excesses of the French populace, and charged Burke with being the advocate of despotism. Burke rose, and declared, as an inevitable necessity, that henceforth his honorable friend and he were separated in politics.

The influence of the French Revolution upon great questions of our domestic policy was very soon manifested in the proceedings of parliament. In 1789 a bill for the relief of Protestant dissenters was rejected by a very small majority. During the prorogation the dissenters had agitated for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts with unwonted earnestness and considerable indiscretion. Some of the Establishment were equally zealous in the encouragement of a resistance to the claims of the dissenters. Mr. Fox, on the 2d of March, proposed the abolition of these religious tests. Mr. Pitt opposed the motion. Mr. Burke declared that had the repeal been moved for ten years before, he should probably have joined Mr. Fox in supporting it. But he had the strongest reasons to believe that many of the persons now calling themselves dissenters, and who stood the most forward in the present application for relief, were men of factious and dangerous principles, actuated by no motives of religion or conscience, to which tolerance could in any rational sense be applied. The motion was rejected by a very large majority. Two days after, a proposition made by Mr. Flood, to amend the representation of the people in parliament, was withdrawn; the minister, who had three times advocated reform, now holding that if a more favorable time should arise, he might himself bring forward a specific proposition; but he felt that the cause of reform might now lose ground from being agitated at an improper moment.

There was a warlike episode in May of this year, which indicated, perhaps advantageously to European powers, that Great Britain was not prepared to endure insults to her flag. In the previous year two English vessels had been seized by a Spanish frigate in Nootka Sound, a harbor of Vancouver Island, and the buildings for a settlement on that coast by English traders had been pulled down, by direction of the Spanish government, which claimed all the lands from Cape Horn to the 60th degree of latitude. His Catholic majesty long refused to make reparation. War was the tone of a royal message to parliament. A million was voted. But Spain yielded; and at a great crisis of European affairs we were saved from one of those petty quarrels which had so often been the beginning of lavish bloodshed for the attainment of small commercial advantages. Fox supported the minister in the spirited conduct which averted this conflict; and Pitt had the merit of obtaining, by resolute negotiation, concessions which rendered a future dispute improbable. The possibility of a war between Great Britain and Spain raised an important question in the French assembly. The governments of Spain and France were bound by treaty to mutual support. The question arose in the assembly as to the power of making peace or war. Mirabeau, with surpassing eloquence, prevented the legislative body from assuming that power to itself; and it was resolved that war can only be decided on by a decree of the legislative body, passed on the formal proposal of the king, and sanctioned by him. A resolution was carried by acclamation that the French nation renounced forever all ideas of conquest, and confined itself entirely to defensive war.

France during this summer presented the semblance of a happy people celebrating the triumphs of liberty and equality by a pompous spectacle in Paris; and the reality of disturbances in the army on the eastern frontier, with much bloodshed at Nanci, and a general resistance among the higher clergy to the adhesion required of them to the new order of ecclesiastical affairs. It was resolved that the anniversary of the taking of the Bastille should be honored by a magnificent festival in the Champ de Mars—a grand federation to which deputies should come from every one of the eighty-three departments of France. To prepare an immense amphitheatre for this gathering from the most remote parts, twelve thousand workmen were employed. But they worked too slowly. All Paris then went forth to dig and to move earth—all classes, men and women, coming in the early morning from their sections, and returning home by torchlight. Vast troops of federates had arrived in Paris, and were hospitably lodged. At six o'clock of the morning of the 14th of July three hundred thousand persons, of both sexes, dwelling in Paris and the neighborhood, had taken their seats on the grass of the amphitheatre, amid a pouring rain. The federates marched into the area, each troop with the banner of its department. Fifty thousand armed men were in the space surrounded by the spectators on their grassy elevation. The king and the royal family, the president of the national assembly, and the deputies, were on a raised seat, beneath an awning ornamented with *fleurs de lis*. Mass was celebrated by the Bishop of Autun, attended by three hundred priests, at an altar placed in the centre of the amphitheatre. La Fayette then ascended to the altar, and swore, in the name of the troops and the federates, to be faithful to the nation, the law, and the king. The president of the national assembly, and each of the deputies, took the same oath. Then Louis, standing in front of his throne, said: "I, king of the French, swear to the nation to employ all the power which is delegated to me by the constitutional law of the state, to maintain the constitution decreed by the national assembly, and accepted by me, and to cause the laws to be executed." The queen took the dauphin in her arms, and presented him to the multitude. The sun shone out; the cannon boomed; one universal shout went up as if to proclaim that France had attained the consummation of its felicity. But again a deluge of rain came down, while Talleyrand was blessing the banners of the eighty-three departments. Again sunshine, and illuminations, and dancing in the Champs Elysées; and merriment for a week before the federates went home—perhaps to think whether it were possible that the loving oaths of the 14th of July would ever be broken.

The sixteenth parliament of Great Britain, having nearly completed its full term of seven years, was dissolved soon after the prorogation in June, 1790. The new parliament assembled on the 25th of November, when Mr. Addington was chosen speaker. There was no allusion to the affairs of France in the king's speech. That the great events which had taken place in that country were occupying the thoughts of public men, there could be small doubt. While the royal speech, and the echoing addresses, dwelled upon a pacification between Austria and the Porte, upon dissensions in the Netherlands, upon peace between Russia and Sweden, and upon war between Russia and the Porte, the national mind was absorbed almost exclusively by conflicting sentiments about the revolution in France. A few weeks before the meeting of parliament Burke had published his famous "Reflections on the Revolution."* Probably no literary production ever produced such an exciting effect upon public opinion at the time of its appearance, or maintained so permanent an influence among the generation to whose fears it appealed. The reputation of the author as the greatest political philosopher of his age; his predilections for freedom, displayed through the whole course of the American Revolution; his hatred of despotic power, as manifested in his unceasing denunciations of atrocities in India; his consistent adherence to Whig principles as established by the Bill of Rights—this acquaintance with the character and sentiments of Burke first raised an unbounded curiosity to trace the arguments against the struggle for liberty in another country, coming from a man who had so long contended for what was deemed the popular cause at home. The perusal of this remarkable book converted the inquirer into an enthusiast. In proportion as the liberal institutions of our own country were held up to admiration, so were the attempts of France to build up a new system of government upon the ruins of the old system described as the acts of men devoted to "every description of tyranny and cruelty employed to bring about and to uphold this revolution." To the argumentative power was added an impassioned eloquence which roused the feelings into hatred of the anarchists who led the royal family captives into Paris on the 6th of October, and directed every sympathy toward a humiliated king, a proscribed nobility, and a plundered church. Burke was accused of an abandonment of his old principles, as he grew more and more strongly opposed to the French Revolution, even before the period of its greatest excesses. He who produced the most elegant and temperate

* The title of the book indicates that its chief purpose was to spread alarm as to the prevalence of revolutionary opinions in England: "Reflections on the Revolution in France, and on the proceedings in certain societies in London relative to that event."

answer to the "Reflections," most truly said: "The late opinions of Mr. Burke furnished more matter of astonishment to those who had distantly observed, than to those who had correctly examined, the system of his former political life. An abhorrence for abstract politics, a predilection for aristocracy, and a dread of innovation, have ever been among the most sacred articles of his public creed." * Coleridge, at a period when his Gallican enthusiasm had entirely sobered down, complains of "the errors of the aristocratic party," in lamenting with tragic outcries the injured monarch and the exiled noble, and displaying a disgusting insensibility to the sufferings and oppressions of the great mass of the population; and he adds, in a note, "The extravagantly false and flattering picture which Burke gave of the French nobility and hierarchy, has always appeared to me the greatest defect of his, in so many respects, invaluable work." † Another eminent thinker of our own day has thus given his opinion of the causes of Burke's indifference to the condition of the governed, and his sympathies with the governing: "It is the natural tendency of men connected with the upper ranks of society, and separated from the mass of the community, to undervalue things which only affect the rights or the interests of the people. Against this leaning, to which he had yielded, it becomes them to struggle." ‡

Mackintosh, writing in 1791, says: "No series of events in history have probably been more widely, malignantly, and systematically exaggerated than the French commotions." He adds, with reference to the furious indignation with which Burke had spoken of some popular atrocities: "The massacres of war, and the murders committed by the sword of justice, are disguised by the solemnities which invest them." § "The massacres of war" were never more fearfully exhibited than at the season when the revolutionists of France were held up to execration, and the savage murders perpetrated by the ministers of vengeance let loose by Catherine of Russia provoked no parliamentary denunciation, and excited little public feeling. On the anniversary of our Saviour's nativity, in 1790, Suwarrow, the Russian general, wrote to his court: "Glory to God and to the Empress, Ismaïl is ours. It is not necessary to read the two cantos of "Don Juan," which Byron devoted to the seige of Ismaïl, to shudder at the atrocities which have been perpetrated by established authorities. This fortress, the key of the Lower Danube, was stormed; the Turks obstinately resisted till midnight, and then the conquering Russians entered the body of the place. The rising sun exhibited such a spectacle in Ismaïl as had not for several ages shocked the feelings of mankind. In the morning, when the Russian generals put an end to the carnage, thirty thousand of the Turkish population, of all ages, sexes, and conditions, had perished. ‖

Mirabeau, in January, 1791, was named president of the national assembly. During the previous year he had pursued a systematic course of opposition to the measures of the extreme democratic party. He supported, as we have seen, the king's prerogative as to the right of peace and war. He opposed the violent measures that were contemplated with regard to emigrants. He maintained a complete independence of clubs and mobs. He saw that the revolution was passing out of the hands of the few who were qualified to guide it to a moderate course, into the management of factions, who were ready to stifle the comparatively sober voice of the legislative body. He dreaded the turbulence of those who were becoming a real and a terrible power, as the Club of the Friends of the Constitution (who, from their place of meeting, the Hall of the Jacobins' Convent, came to be known as Jacobins); and of another body, still more violent, the Club of the Cordeliers. There were in Paris, too, somewhat more than a hundred journals. Mirabeau was himself a journalist, and counselled in this character adherence to constitutional moderation. Marat, the representative of the fury of the revolution, was for erecting eight hundred gibbets, and for hanging Mirabeau the first, as the chief of the advocates of order. Nevertheless, the wonderful energy, the indomitable courage, the overwhelming eloquence of Mirabeau not only made him supreme in the national assembly, but gave him the hearty allegiance of the people, in their universal recognition of his intellectual supremacy. The very post-boys called the best horse of a team—the horse that did the most work—their Mirabeau. The King and Queen of France began to feel that their safety might depend upon the efforts of this man, who had done so much to destroy the ancient order of things, but in whom the will and probably the power abided of saving the monarchy. Mirabeau secretly met Marie-Antoinette at St. Cloud, to which palace the royal family had removed in the summer of 1790, and there enjoyed some little freedom. He came away with the conviction that she was the only man of the family. He was poor; and he doubtless accepted great presents from some source, for his style of living suddenly became extravagantly luxurious. Louis wrote to Bouillé that he had paid the services of Mirabeau at an enormous price. Dumont believes that Mirabeau thought himself, on receiving payment, as an agent who could accomplish salutary ends with adequate means. He also says that Mirabeau's only object was to have the ministerial power in his hands; that he had no notion of a counter-revolution; that his desire was to re-establish the royal authority, with a national representation; that he even would have endeavored to revoke the decree of the national assembly which had abolished the nobility; and that he was dissatisfied with the part he had himself taken as to the question of the clergy. When Mirabeau entered upon his functions as president of the national assembly, the versatility of his talent was signally displayed. He was no longer the impassioned tribune of the people. He was the moderator of a tumultuous body—the impartial supporter of orderly proceedings—the dignified assertor of the respect due to the legislature. But the physical health of this extraordinary man was gone. Dumont parted with Mirabeau, on quitting Paris after the nomination of his friend to the presidency of the assembly. "If I believed in slow poisons," said Mirabeau, "I should think I was poisoned. I am perishing. I am consuming with a slow fire." His mode of life, Dumont pointed out to him, would have long before killed any man not so robust as he was: unremitting work; imprudent regimen. Intellectual and sensual excess, Dumont might have added—those destructive agencies that, combined, always destroy the victims who unite the loftiest ambition to the grossest indulgence. "You should have been a salamander," said Dumont, "to live in a devouring flame without being consumed." The image was founded upon a popular error applied to a great truth. When Dumont quitted Mirabeau, the dying man, to whom an intense egotism was pardonable, said, "We shall never meet again. When I am gone they will know how to value me. The misfortunes which I have arrested will rush in from all parts over France. The criminal faction which trembled before me will no longer have any bridle. The commons won a victory in declaring themselves a national assembly, of which they have never ceased to show themselves unworthy. They have desired to govern the king, instead of governing by him; but very soon neither he nor they will govern. A vile faction will dominate over all, and fill France with horrors." * Mirabeau survived only three months after he had uttered this prophetic speech to Dumont. He repeated the same sentiments to Talleyrand. He died on the 2d of April. The pomp of his funeral—the procession of nearly all Paris to the church of St. Geneviève, the mournful music, the intermittent cannon, the thousand torches, the deep and solemn silence of the countless multitude—have often been described as the tribute of a great nation to the greatest of its citizens. By a decree of the assembly the church of St. Geneviève was to be called the Pantheon—was to bear the inscription, *Aux Grands Hommes la Patrie reconnaissante.* Mirabeau was the first occupant of the temple set apart by a grateful country as the tomb of its great men. In November, 1793, by a decree of the convention, his body was disinterred as that of an unworthy aristocrat.

Six months elapsed between the publication of Burke's "Reflections" and his final separation from his party, involving an irrevocable breach of friendship with Fox. The night of the 6th of May exhibited a scene in the House of Commons of no ordinary interest. From that time this country became divided into two hostile bands, each upholding opinions that were calculated to make men irrational partisans rather than calm reasoners; that opposed exaggerated

* Mackintosh, "Vindiciæ Gallicæ," Introduction.
† "The Friend," Essay I.
‡ Lord Brougham, "Statesmen of the Time of George III.," Art. "Burke."
§ "Vindiciæ Gal.," Mackintosh, Miscellaneous Works, vol. iii. p. 32.
‖ There is a very graphic account of this event in the "Annual Register," 1791.

* "Souvenirs sur Mirabeau," p. 186.

alarm to mistaken enthusiasm; that rendered the majority persecutors and the minority agitators. The passions then spread through the country inspired a panic about property, and a dread of revolution, when, as has been truly said, "the people were more heart-whole than they had been for a hundred years previously;"* and these passions drove a minister, really a friend to civil and religious liberty, into acts of tyranny, whose influence long survived the immediate occasion of their exercise, and produced fears and hatreds which arrested the march of social improvement for a quarter of a century. On the 15th of April Mr. Fox had incidentally spoken in somewhat extravagant terms about "the new constitution of France." He admired it, "considered altogether, as the most stupendous and glorious edifice of liberty which had been erected on the foundation of human integrity in any time or country." There had been animated debates on a proposition of Mr. Pitt for the government of Canada, which contemplated the establishment of two houses of assembly, one for the upper and one for the lower province. In the discussion of this question general principles of representative government were naturally brought under view. On the 6th of May, upon the question in committee that the Quebec Bill should be read paragraph by paragraph, Mr. Burke took occasion to raise his voice against the possibility of sending to our colonies "a cargo of the Rights of Man;" and then entered upon some recent circumstances in Paris—the interference of the people to prevent the king going to St. Cloud, as he proposed to do. The orator was proceeding in this strain when he was called to order. Five times he attempted to proceed in explanation of his views on the French Revolution, and five times was he interrupted by members of Whig party—his old associates. Burke pertinaciously held his ground. The irony of Fox and the remonstrance of Grey moved him less than the incessant calls to order of smaller men. At last he exclaimed:

"The little dogs and all,
Tray, Blanch, and Sweetheart, see, they bark at me."

Lord John Russell, quoting this anecdote from the "Life of Lord Sidmouth," says that Burke made his exclamation "with the grief, and somewhat, perhaps, of the insanity of Lear." The notion of attributing to insanity the extreme opinions of the most powerful mind of that age, has been maintained with much earnestness, and some attempts at proof.† To a certain extent it is true that Burke's mind, "once so steady, so little swayed by prejudice and passion, reeled under the pressure of events which turned the brain of thousands." But it may also be said, that the aspirations for a new era of happiness for mankind also turned the brains of sober men, to regard only what was full of hope and promise in that revolution, and to divert their eyes from its crimes and follies. The extreme views which produced enthusiasts on either side are very justly pointed out by a French lady, in her correspondence with Romilly: "We have had Mr. Paine's work in answer to Mr. Burke: it is the opposite extreme of madness."‡ On the night of the 6th of May, Burke, after his burst of indignation at "the little dogs," in answer to the taunt of Fox, that "minute discussions on great events, without information, did no honor to the pen that wrote, or the tongue that spoke the words," addressed him no longer as "his honorable friend." He complained of the asperity with which he had been treated that night. He had differed from Mr. Fox on former occasions; but no difference of opinion had ever before interrupted their friendship. There was no loss of friendship, Fox whispered; Burke instantly exclaimed that he had done his duty at the price of his friend; "their friendship was at an end." This was too much for the kind nature of Fox. He wept, and was for some minutes unable to speak. Then there was mutual explanation, and mutual recrimination. Mr. Curwen, the member for Carlisle, relates a circumstance which shows how intense was the hostility of Burke to any who exhibited even a slight indication of admiring or tolerating the principles of the French Revolution: "The most powerful feelings were manifested on the adjournment of the house. While I was waiting for my carriage, Mr. Burke came to me and requested, as the night was wet, I would set him down. As soon as the carriage-door was shut, he complimented me on my being no friend to the revolutionary doctrines of the French; on which he spoke with great warmth for a few minutes, when he paused to afford me an opportunity of approving the view he had taken of those measures in the house. At the moment I could not help feeling disinclined to disguise my sentiments: Mr. Burke, catching hold of the check-string, furiously exclaimed, 'You are one of these people! Set me down.' With some difficulty I restrained him—we had then reached Charing Cross: a silence ensued, which was preserved till we reached his house in Gerard Street, when he hurried out of the carriage without speaking."

In the debate on the proposed repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, on the 2d of March, 1790, Mr. Burke read extracts from a sermon of Dr. Price, and from the writings of Dr. Priestley and other nonconformists; inferring from certain passages that the leading preachers among the dissenters were avowed enemies to the Church of England, and that thence our Establishment appeared to be in much more serious danger than the Church of France was in a year or two ago.* The "Reflections on the Revolution" diffused this alarm more extensively through the country. Burke, in reprobating the harangue at the chapel in the Old Jewry of Dr. Price, said that "politics and the pulpit are terms that have little agreement;" that "no sound ought to be heard in the Church but the healing voice of Christian charity;" that political divines, "wholly unacquainted with the world in which they are so fond of meddling, and inexperienced in all its affairs, have nothing of politics but the passions they excite." But he addressed these just remarks to "political theologians," such as Dr. Price and Dr. Priestley, who preached from heterodox pulpits; not to those who from the pulpits of the Establishment made the French Revolution the constant theme of their invective; and whose churches "resounded with language at which Laud would have shuddered, and Sacheverel would have blushed."† The clamor was at last got up, that the Church was in danger. There were results of this spirit, which were perhaps more disgraceful to the English character than the violence of the Parisian populace in the attack upon the Bastille or the march from Versailles. It was a lower and a more contemptible fanaticism than had been evoked by the first call in France to fight for freedom, that produced the riots at Birmingham which broke out on the 14th of July, 1791.

Dr. Joseph Priestley, in 1780, became the minister of the principal Unitarian congregation in Birmingham. He was ardent in his political views, having written an answer to Burke's "Reflections," and he did not hesitate to avow his opposition to the Church, in his zeal to obtain what he deemed the rights of dissenters. But in his private life he was worthy of all respect, and in his scientific pursuits had attained the most honorable distinction. But even as a politician he avowed himself a warm admirer of the English constitution, as the best system of policy the sagacity of man had been able to contrive, though its vigor had been impaired by certain corruptions. He published, in 1791, "Familiar Letters to the Inhabitants of Birmingham"—a work in which, according to Robert Hall, "the seeds of that implacable dislike were scattered," which produced the outrages that we shall briefly relate.

On the 11th of July, according to a royal proclamation of the 27th of that month, "a certain scandalous and seditious paper was printed and published in the town of Birmingham," for the discovery of the author of which a reward of one hundred pounds was offered. This handbill called upon the people to celebrate on the 14th the destruction of that high altar and castle of despotism, the Bastille; but not to forget that their own parliament was venal, the ministers hypocritical, the clergy legal oppressors, the reigning family extravagant, the crown too weighty for the head that wears it. This paper, says the proclamation, was printed and published in the town of Birmingham.‡ William Hutton, a cautious man, says that it was fabricated in London, brought to Birmingham, and a few copies privately scattered under a table at an inn. On that 14th of July about eighty persons assembled at a tavern, known as Dadley's, to commemorate this anniversary; and at the Swan Inn some magistrates and persons opposed to the celebrationists met to drink "Church and King." There was a small mob about Dadley's tavern, who

* Coleridge, "Table Talk," vol. ii. p. 192.
† See Buckle, "Civilization in England," pp. 424 to 431.
‡ "Mr. Paine's work" was "The Rights of Man," Part I.

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxviii. col. 439.
† Mackintosh, vol. iii. p. 165. ‡ See "Annual Register," 1791.

hissed and hooted; and there was another mob around the Swan The dinner went off quietly among the friends of French liberty, the King and Constitution being duly toasted, and afterward the National Assembly of France. After the company had separated, a rabble broke into the tavern in search of Dr. Priestley, who had not dined there, crying out that "they wanted to knock the powder out of Priestley's wig." The loyal company at the adjacent Swan huzzaed; and it is affirmed that a gentleman said, "Go to the meetings." In another hour Priestley's chapel, in New Street, called the New Meeting House, was on fire. This work accomplished, the Old Meeting House was also quickly in a blaze. Dr. Priestley lived at Fair Hill, about a mile and a half from the town. He and his family had fled from mob vengeance; but his house was destroyed, and his books burned, with his manuscripts and his philosophical instruments. The disgraceful scene has been related by some with more or less of apology for a fury which it is held that Priestley had provoked; and by others with more or less of indignation against a brutal intolerance which it is alleged was encouraged by loyal churchmen. There was a young man then dwelling at Birmingham, who was a member of the congregation then under the care of Dr. Priestley, and to some extent was his pupil; for the younger members of Priestley's flock received instruction from him on moral and religious subjects. In after life he would relate to his children the scene which he witnessed on that night of July, 1791. One of the family, since so honorably distinguished, has given this interesting notice of a memorable incident in his father's life: "My father formed a strong attachment to Priestley, and when the famous, or rather infamous, riots of 1791 broke out, he, with a small body of his fellow-pupils, repaired to Dr. Priestley's house, which they offered to defend against the mob. To their sore disappointment their services were declined. The doctor had scruples as to the lawfulness of withstanding a religious persecution by force—the why and wherefore of this distinction between repelling civil injuries and religious, which indeed are only civil injuries on religious grounds, my father never comprehended. His companions went away, perhaps to escort their good pastor and his family, whose lives would not have been secure against the ruffians coming to demolish their home and property. My father barred the doors, closed the shutters, made fast the house as securely as he could against the expected rioters, and then awaited their arrival. He has often described to me how he walked to and fro in the darkened rooms, chafing under the restriction which had been put on him and his friends. He was present when the mob broke in, and witnessed the plunder and destruction, and the incendiary fire by which the outrage was consummated. Lingering near the house, he saw a working-man fill his apron with shoes, with which he made off. My father followed him, and as soon as the thief was alone, collared him, and dragged him to the jail, where he had the mortification to witness the man quietly relieved of his booty, and then suffered to depart, the keeper informing my father that he had had orders to take in no prisoner that night." * The burnings and plunderings, invariably of the houses of dissenters, continued till the night of Sunday, the 17th, in Birmingham and the neighborhood. On the 15th the house of Mr. Ryland, at Easy Hill, was burned down; six or seven of the rioters, who had drunk themselves insensible with the booty of the wine-cellar, perishing in the flames. Mr. Ryland was a friend of Priestley—a man devoted to the public interests of Birmingham, and emphatically described as "a friend to the whole human race." On that day Bordesley Hall, the residence of Mr. Taylor, another dissenter, was burned. The warehouse of William Hutton was then plundered; and on the next morning his country-house, at Bennett's Hill, was set on fire and consumed. Five other houses of dissenters, whether Presbyterians, Baptists or Unitarians, were that day burned or sacked. Justices of the peace sat in conclave; squires made speeches to the mobs, telling them they had done enough. The Birmingham magistrates issued a placard, addressed to "Friends and Brother Churchmen," entreating them to desist; for that the damage, which already amounted to £100,000, would have to be paid by the parishes. On the Sunday there were burnings of chapels and private houses in the neighborhood of Birmingham; and then three troops of light dragoons rode into the town, having come in one day from Nottingham, and this disgraceful exhibition was at an end. Five of the rioters were tried at the assizes at Worcester, for offences committed near Birmingham, but only one was convicted. A larger number were tried at the Warwick Assizes, and four were sentenced to death. Three of the whole number were executed. Every attempt was made to impede the conviction of the rioters. The prosecutions were confined to the ignorant mob, whose passions were undoubtedly inflamed by their superiors in station. There was no zealot prosecuted of the many whose offences were undoubtedly as great as that of the madman, Lord George Gordon, in 1780. There was in Birmingham a hateful spirit of slavishness and ferocity, in the guise of loyalty and religion, which unhappily, to some extent, pervaded the whole kingdom. The atrocities were almost justified from the pulpit as "a judgment." One of the most eloquent of dissenters—one strongly opposed to Priestley's theological opinions—published in 1791 a tract, in which he says, that to the unenlightened eyes of posterity "it will appear a reproach, that in the eighteenth century—an age that boasts its science and improvement—the first philosopher in Europe, of a character unblemished, and of manners the most mild and gentle, should be torn from his family, and obliged to flee, an outcast and a fugitive, from the murderous hands of a frantic rabble; but when they learn that there were not wanting teachers of religion who secretly triumphed in these barbarities, they will pause for a moment, and imagine they are reading the history of Goths or of Vandals." *

* Autobiography of Thomas Wright Hill, with "Continuation of Mr. Hill's Life, by his son Matthew Davenport Hill."—Privately printed, 1859.

CHAPTER CLXXXVII.

Flight from Paris of the king and his family—The national assembly after the discovery of the flight—Hatred of royalty—Thomas Paine—National or constituent assembly at an end—Meeting of the legislative assembly—The declaration of Pilnitz—French princes and emigrants at Coblentz—Opening of parliament—Pacific speech—Pitt's display of British prosperity—The slave trade—Pitt's eloquence—The libel law—Attempts to form a coalition—Proclamation against seditions—Chauvelin and Lord Grenville—Partition of Poland.

While from the night of the 14th of July to the night of the 17th the rabble of Birmingham were shouting "Church and king," and plundering and burning chapels and houses, the rabble of Paris, many thousands in number, were assembled on Sunday, the 17th, in the Champ de Mars, clamoring for the deposition of the king, and manifesting their patriotism by hanging two men denounced as spies. The magistrates of Birmingham looked smilingly on the loyal and orthodox havoc; but the authorities of Paris, with their mayor, Bailly, at their head, resolved to put down this mob-dictation, and, hoisting the red flag of martial law, to disperse the multitudes with volleys of musketry. What has produced this demand for the deposition of the king? He has attempted to fly from his good people of Paris. He broke out of his prison-house, and he has been brought back again. He had been suspected of a plan to escape, when he desired to keep Easter at St. Cloud; and a fierce mob, when he was seated with the queen in his carriage, then prevented their departure from the Tuileries, although La Fayette was desirous to make way for them by force. It was known that an Austrian army was gathering on the frontiers; that the royal princes, d'Artois and Condé, were surrounded by emigrants, ready to return in arms. "Citizens," wrote Marat, the most influential of the journalists because the most ferocious, "watch closely around the palace. . . . The genius of Austria is there, hidden in committees over which Antoinette presides. They correspond with foreigners, and furnish the armed tyrants who are assembling on your frontier with gold and materials of war." The writings of Marat echoed the denunciations of the clubs. The national assembly and the national guard were growing less and less popular with the anarchists. "What is La Fayette doing?" asked Marat, "is he a dupe or an accomplice? Why does he leave the avenues of the palace free?" The suspicions thus excited in the populace naturally produced a greater vigilance in La Fayette. For some time the whole of the interior of the Tuile-

* Robert Hall, "Christianity consistent with a love of freedom, being an answer to a sermon by the Rev. John Clayton," 1791.

ries was under the watchfulness of the national guard; and La Fayette and his officers were constantly about the palace, often till a late hour. The royal family, too, were surrounded by unfaithful menials. A waiting-woman had for several months been watching the queen; had seen her jewel-boxes empty, and had conjectured that the royal diamonds had left France. She reported her suspicions to an aide-de-camp of La Fayette; and for several nights a stricter watch had been kept within and around the palace. A secret correspondence had been maintained between the king and the Marquis de Bouillé, the commander of the royalist army in the frontier provinces of Champagne, Lorraine, and Alsace; but the loyalty of a few regiments only could be relied upon. It was arranged between Louis and his faithful general that the king should leave Paris on the night of the 19th of June; and De Bouillé took his measures of placing relays of horses on the road, and detachments to guard the royal family at certain stations through which they were to pass on their way to Montmédy, at which fortress the general had formed a camp where the fugitives would be safe. The arrangements were disturbed by the delay of one day in setting forth; and, as in many of the minor occurrences of life, the misadventures of an hour or two were fatal to success. The Count de Fersen, a Swiss, was admitted into the confidence of the king; and he accomplished the business of obtaining a passport for a Russian baroness, travelling home, with a waiting-woman, a valet, and two children; and he has had a new coach built; and has engaged horses. All at last is ready for a start. The Russian baroness is Madame De Tourzel, the gouvernante of the two royal children; her waiting-woman is the queen; the valet is the king. The king's sister, Elizabeth, is of the party as travelling companion. Three of the devoted soldiers of the king, who had belonged to the disbanded body-guard, were admitted into the confidence of Count Fersen, and it was arranged that they were to mount behind the carriage, as some sort of protection.

The king and queen received at their usual hour, on the evening of the 20th of June, those who were accustomed to wait on them before they retired to rest. They dressed themselves in the clothes prepared for their disguise; and when a midnight stillness reigned around left the Tuileries, but not all at once. A lady in a hood had come out from a small door, leading two children—a visitor of some one of the household, no doubt. These pass into the open space before the Tuileries, called the carrousel, and thence into a street where a glass coach is waiting. Another lady comes out, also hooded, and enters the same coach. A stout man now reaches the capacious carriage. One of the party is still wanting—the waiting-maid. She, in a gypsy hat, attended by a servant, is about to join them, when the carriage of La Fayette, with torch-bearers, appears. He has been hastily sent for, upon some report from his aide-de camp. The waiting-maid stands up under the arch, and sees the well-known face. She is herself unobserved, but is somewhat flurried. The fair one and her attendant take the wrong road and cross the Pont Royal to the other side of the Seine. They wander about the long Rue du Bac in great perplexity, but at last make their way over the river again, and find the coach waiting upon the quay. Count Fersen is the royal hackney coachman. He drives furiously off, but they have to go to a distant part to find the travelling carriage. At last they have passed the dark and narrow streets of the city, have reached the boulevard, and at the Porte St. Martin the travelling carriage is waiting. Fersen is again upon the box, with a German coachman, who will be trusty; and after some time he receives the grateful adieux of those for whom he has risked so much, and leaves them to make his own way to Brussels. Another carriage is at Bondy, with boxes and waiting-women. Through the summer night the heavy coach, with six horses, is lumbering on toward Chalons, where it arrives, having found proper relays, about five in the afternoon of the 21st.

At six o'clock in the morning following that midnight when La Fayette has looked round the Tuileries, and can discover nothing wrong, he is roused with the news that the king and royal family are gone. Paris is alarmed, and is quickly in motion; but there is no riot or outrage. The assembly meets, and declares its sitting permanent. A letter has been found addressed by the king to the national assembly, in which he goes through the chief events of the revolution, describes the personal indignities he had undergone, and says that, finding it impossible for him to effect any good or to prevent any evil, he has sought to recover his liberty, and to reach a place of safety for himself and his family. The assembly confirmed an order which had been previously issued by La Fayette, which enjoined all functionaries to arrest the fugitives, and at once assumed the powers of an executive government. The news of the flight of the king reached London on the 25th, when George Rose thus wrote to Wilberforce: "The national assembly has acted in a collected manner, and with prudence in their situation. They have given assurances to the foreign ministers of firmness, continuance of friendship, etc., and have ordered the great seal (we shall be told like our phantom during the regency) to be put to all instruments which require the royal authority." *

The king's route may be easily traced. The heavy carriage, called a "berline," is somewhat remarkable. Escorts of dragoons have been hanging about on the road from early morning; and no one knows what they are waiting for. Suspicion is roused. As the evening draws on, a courier rides through the village of Sainte-Ménehould; and then the lumbering vehicle with its six post-horses rolls in and stops at the post-house. The master of the post has been to Paris. He looks hard into the carriage. He fancies he has seen the lady in the gypsy-hat in some public place. Another face is familiar to him, from the engraved head on the new assignat. He is sure the stout man is the king. The carriage moves on; and this vigilant postmaster, by name Drouet, and a trusty companion, hurry after it upon fleet hackneys. The escort that followed the royal fugitives from Sainte-Ménehould is impeded by the people at Clermont, who have been roused by Drouet. But the village of Varennes is reached by Louis and his family, about four-and-twenty hours after they had been wandering out of the Tuileries through dark ways into a dark future. The small town of Varennes is divided by the River Aire. Relays of horses prepared for the travellers are in the upper town. The couriers can find no horses in the lower town, where the carriage is waiting. For half an hour the wearied and anxious sitters in the "berline" listen with impatience for the sound of horses' feet. Two horsemen have dashed past them over the bridge. Drouet is an old dragoon, and knows something of barricades. He rides into the town, obtains help, and the bridge over the Aire is soon rendered impassable by an overturned cart. At length the carriage drives up, the post-boys having been induced to proceed with their jaded hacks. Passports are demanded by half a dozen national guards, led by the inexorable Drouet. Resistance is vain; and Louis, his queen, his sister, his children, and the gouvernante are handed into the house of the procureur of the town, named Sausse, a grocer. Refreshments are asked for by the king; and he relishes bread and cheese and a bottle of Burgundy. The alarm-bell is rung; the people hurry out of their beds; the house is surrounded. Louis feels confident that a large force will arrive from M. de Bouillé for his deliverance. A squadron of hussars is at hand; but they have received no orders. The night is passed in terrible uncertainty. In the morning national guards are assembled in great numbers, and La Fayette's aide-de-camp gallops into Varennes. It is all over. Even Bouillé flies across the frontier. The "berline" is turned round, and is soon on the road to Paris, with the unfortunate family within, and the couriers bound with ropes upon the box. Three or four thousand men, armed with pikes and muskets, surround the carriage. As the cavalcade slowly went on, the people in the villages uttered reproaches and threats to the king and queen. They bore the insults with that calmness which marked their demeanor through all their subsequent heavy troubles. Two commissioners from the national assembly, Pétion and Barnave, met them on the road; and their interference probably saved the lives of the unhappy family from the rage of barbarous crowds. At seven o'clock in the evening of Saturday the captives re-entered the Tuileries. There was something more terrible than even the clamor of a mob, in the mode of their reception, as they passed through the streets of Paris. An Englishman has described the scene: "Profound silence was recommended to the people on the entrance of the royal family; and it was in general observed. I stood in the Champs Eylsées, on the edge of the road, from three till near eight, and I never saw more tranquillity, or even indifference, on any occasion. An officer passed us about half an hour before the king's arrival, and called out as he passed, 'Chapeau sur tête!' This order was punctually obeyed. In all the

* "Wilberforce Correspondence," vol. i. p. 80.

conversation I heard, not a symptom of pity or sympathy appeared, nor much resentment."* A placard had been everywhere affixed, which, in a few words, prescribed the popular demeanor required by those who in this week of alarm had preserved Paris from anarchy: "Whoever shall applaud the king shall be flogged; whoever shall insult him shall be hanged."† The semblances of a monarchical government were to be maintained a little longer.

The flight of the king was the occasion of an unmistakable demonstration of the contentions that were likely to arise between those who desired to maintain the constitution to which the king had sworn, and the party—a minority in the assembly, but overpowering in the clubs—who sought the abolition of the monarchy, or the deposition of the existing monarch. In the popular temper the hatred of royalty was displayed during the five days of the king's absence from Paris, by pulling down the signs over the shops that indicated the patronage of the court. "*Roi*" was no longer a name to attract customers. There was in Paris an Englishman who had become hateful at home as the expounder of "The Rights of Man." Thomas Paine—a staymaker of Thetford in Norfolk, afterward an exciseman; then a settler in America, who stimulated the revolt of the colonies by his writings; an agent of the Congress, employed in France toward the close of the war; a man of various talents, a powerful but coarse writer, an ingenious mechanic—was, in June, 1791, the guest of Condorcet, the philosophical patrician, who had become an ardent republican. After the peace Paine had been received with some respect in England, and even Burke admitted him to a sort of intimacy. But he hated his native country and its institutions. Intensely vain, he believed that his writings had produced the American Republic; and he fancied that his mission was to establish a republic in France. He asserted that if he had the power he would destroy all the books in existence, which only propagated error, and would reconstruct a new system of ideas and principles, with his own "Rights of Man" as its foundation.‡ In the week of the flight of Louis, Paine wrote in English a proclamation to the French nation, which, being translated, was affixed to all the walls of Paris. It was an invitation to the people to profit by existing circumstances and establish a republic. Dumont perhaps ascribes too much to the influence of such a production, when he says that the audacious hand of Paine sowed the seed which germinated in many heads.§ Many persons of condition, Condorcet among the number, were of opinion that the moment when the king had forfeited the confidence of the nation was favorable to the establishment of a republic. A majority of the assembly were resolved that the disloyalty which had been increased so fearfully by the king's attempt to leave Paris, if not France, should not interfere with the establishment of the constitution. This had now, after a long process, been elaborated into a complete digest of all the principles which were held to be necessary for the happy existence of a form of government so just and so harmonious that it would command the obedience and admiration of all who were to administer it and of all who were to live under it. Dumont has described this constitution as in truth a monster: "It had too much of a republic for a monarchy, and too much of a monarchy for a republic. The king was a *hors d'œuvre*"—a somewhat superfluous dish, such as the anchovy served between the soup and the meat. The populace did not comprehend these refinements; and so, as we have mentioned, on the 17th of July the mobs of St. Antoine filled the Champ de Mars, signing petitions for the deposition of the king; and the once popular mayor hoisted the red flag and dispersed them by sword and bullet. Bailly, La Fayette, and a majority of the assembly, began to fear the Jacobins more than they feared the royalists. They began to see that, by the popular outrages, and the restraints which had been imposed upon the king, he had been driven to despair. They wished to retrace their steps; to make the sovereign a real power in the state instead of a puppet. They found that it was easier to destroy than to re-establish. The popularity which they had acquired as destructives was lost when they began to be conservatives. The forms were, however, to be gone through to establish the anomalous constitution. On the 5th of August the multifarious document was presented to the assembly by a committee, who had been for many months engaged in classifying and revising the various decrees which had been promulgated. On the 3d of September it was presented to the king by sixty members of the assembly; and on the 14th Louis declared his solemn acceptance of what he considered, and not unjustly, his humiliation. "*Vive le Roi*" was again heard in the streets. The assembly is to be dissolved on the 30th of September, and a new body of representatives, whose elections have been going on throughout all France, is to meet on the 1st of October, and to be called the legislative assembly. Seven hundred and forty-five members are to be chosen by primary assemblies, themselves chosen by every man of twenty-five years of age in every canton who had paid direct taxes equal to three days' labor. The electors of the deputies were to be the possessors of a certain income, or the renters of a house of a certain value. No member of the first assembly was eligible to be elected for the second. No member of the legislative assembly was allowed to be a functionary of the executive government. The sittings of the assembly were to be permanent, leaving no power to the king to convoke the body, or to prorogue it. And so some of the best and most moderate men who formed the first states-general are to be replaced by men of provincial reputation, chiefly of the legal profession; and the violent men of the old assembly are to find fit exercise for their powers in the Jacobin clubs.

The legislative assembly quickly arranged into two defined parties—the right side (*côté droit*) and the left side (*côté gauche*), with a fluctuating body known as the centre. The *côté droit* comprised the supporters of the constitution, whose opinions were generally those of the middle classes, and were represented in the club of the Feuillans. The Girondins, or deputies from the department of Gironde, of whom Vergniaud was the most eloquent, with Brissot and Condorcet, two of the Paris deputies, were the types of the more moderate of the *côté gauche*. The extreme men of this left side were in intimate connection with the Jacobin Club, and the club of the Cordeliers; and the mobs of Paris were consequently at their command. Robespierre was the presiding spirit of the Jacobins, as Danton was of the Cordeliers. The extreme men of the assembly were called the Mountain, from their seats on the topmost benches of the *côté gauche*. There is a municipality, too, in Paris, which has more active power, for good or evil, than the assembly. At the elections of November Pétion has been chosen mayor of Paris, in preference to La Fayette; and in that common council, where there is much haranguing, Danton is a leading speaker. But the Mother Society of Friends of the People, sitting in the old hall of the Jacobins, with all the appliances of a parliament—president, secretaries, a tribune for fiery speakers, and large galleries for excited men and women—this terrible society, with its branch societies in every town and village of France, "forms," to use those words of La Fayette which he spoke too late, "a distinct corporation in the middle of the French people, whose power it usurps in subjugating its representatives." Robespierre moved and carried the self-denying ordinance of the first assembly, which prevented its members being re-elected, that he might dominate in another place over thousands of fanatical worshippers of first principles of liberty and equality, who would risk any perils of anarchy and bloodshed for an idea, as he was ready to do out of the purest and most disinterested benevolence.

When the legislative assembly met on the 1st of October, a puerile contest, but not without its significance, ensued between the Constitutionalists and the Republicans. The king should not be addressed as "Sire," or as "Majesty," contended one party; he should not sit in a gilded chair; the members should not be uncovered in his presence. Louis felt that it was intended to affront him, and he determined that the assembly should be opened by his ministers. The republican spirit became moderated, and the Constitutionalists became more assured, for the national guard intimated their resolve that the revolution should go no farther. On the 7th of October the king proceeded to the assembly, and delivered a speech which seemed to give him back the loyalty which he had lost. There must be harmony, he said, between the king and the legislative body; that thus the property and the creed of every man would be protected, and no one would have a pretence for staying away from a country in which the laws should be faithfully executed and the rights of all respected. Confidence returned to the king and queen; and they thought their calamities were over when they went that

* Trail to Romilly, June 27.
† Thiers, "Histoire de la Révolution," livre iv.
‡ Dumont, "Souvenirs," p. 231. § Ibid., p. 226.

night to the opera, and were received with unwonted shouts and even with the tears of those who were melted at seeing a mother, so long wretched, apparently at ease and happy as her little boy sat on her lap and looked upon the people without fear.

In this autumn of 1791, whatever might be the apprehensions among a portion of the British nation of the progress of French doctrines, the prime minister preserved an imperturbable serenity, which he appears to have communicated to the inferior members of the government. The editor of the "Diaries and Letters" of the secretary of the treasury, says, "It is a remarkable feature of this correspondence, that while the revolutionary mania in Paris was disclosing its horrors and crimes more and more, we look in vain to these letters [those of Rose and Pitt] for any intimation of what was going on. There is not a symptom of alarm or indignation, or even astonishment; both writers seem to be wholly intent upon the interior administration of the country, in a calm and undisturbed atmosphere."* Lord Sidmouth, in his old age, was fond of relating an anecdote of the period when, as Mr. Addington, he was speaker of the House of Commons. In September, 1791, Pitt, for the first time, invited Burke to dine with him; Lord Grenville and Addington were the only other guests in Downing Street. "After dinner Burke was earnestly representing the danger which threatened the country from the contagion of French principles, when Pitt said, 'Never fear, Mr. Burke; depend on it we shall go on as we are till the day of judgment.' 'Very likely, sir,' replied Burke, 'it is the day of no judgment that I am afraid of.'"† The internal condition of Great Britain was so essentially prosperous, and the abuses which required a reform were so limited, in comparison of the evils that in France demanded a revolution, that Mr. Pitt might well have looked without serious alarm upon the clubs that sympathized with the French assembly, and upon writers that attempted to spread the doctrines of the Jacobins. Neither would a peace-loving minister, who was at heart a friend to liberty, take any part with the despotic sovereigns of the continent, or with the emigrant princes who were dreaming of conquering and avenging the revolution. On the 24th of August the Emperor of Germany and the King of Prussia had met at the Château de Pilnitz, the summer residence of the Elector of Saxony, who was their host. The Count d'Artois arrived, to urge the intervention of these sovereigns to rescue his brother, the King of France, out of the hands of rebellious subjects, and especially sought to move the emperor in the cause of that emperor's sister, the humiliated queen. Out of these interviews came the famous declaration of Pilnitz, which appealed to the other European powers to make common cause with the emperor and the King of Prussia, and to employ, conjointly with them, "the most efficacious means, proportioned to their forces, for enabling the King of France to strengthen, with the most perfect liberty, the basis of a monarchical government, equally conformable to the rights of sovereigns and the welfare of the French nation." The German courts were not agreed upon that policy of armed intervention which was thus timidly threatened. Prussia was reluctant to adopt the warlike views of Austria: Catherine of Russia and Gustavus of Sweden agreed to raise an army, which Spain was to subsidize; and they sent plenipotentiaries to the emigrant princes at Coblenz. Mr. Pitt wisely kept aloof from counsels in which the timid and the rash appeared equally likely to precipitate a war of opinions. He maintained the truly elevated position of the minister of a country enjoying its own constitutional liberty, which could neither sympathize with the regal despotism that would crush all freedom, nor with the popular violence that would overthrow all order.

There can be no doubt that, about the close of 1790, the King of France was in correspondence with foreign courts, either directly or through the emigrant princes and nobles. But in 1791, after his solemn acceptance of the constitution, brought about by his conviction that his escape from the nets in which he was bound was impossible, he, apparently with sincerity, earnestly desired the emigrants to disarm. His injunctions were treated with contempt, as coming from a prince under durance. The Declaration of Pilnitz had raised a violent sprit of indignation among nearly every class and every party of Frenchmen, against the threat of any interference with their domestic concerns. For a short time the constitution and the monarchy seemed capable of being worked together; but the delusion soon came to an end. The king has an absolute veto, according to the constitution. The orators of the Palais Royal and the mobs of the street knew very early in the revolution what veto meant. Mirabeau advocated the veto. His carriage stopped at a bookseller's door, and a crowd surrounded it, crying out to the great orator, "You are the father of the people—you might save us—if the king has the veto we have no need of the national assembly—we are slaves."* On the 9th of November the legislative assembly decrees that all emigrants shall be "suspect of conspiracy," that is, that they shall be outlawed unless they return before the following New Year's day; that the revenues of the absent French princes should be sequestered; that priests who would not take the oaths should forfeit their pensions, and sustain other penalties. The king to these decrees ought to apply his veto, say the friends of the monarchy. The king's ministers and the assembly argue these matters with fluent pertinacity. The time will come when this question will be settled by a force stronger than words. The king now feels strong enough to refuse his consent to these decrees in their entirety.

While some of the leading emigrants of rank were gathered round the French princes at Coblenz, a large number of the nobility, and of the higher orders of clergy, were living in obscurity in England, many in very painful poverty. The gravestones in some of the suburban churchyards of London used to present the memorials of many a great family who found obscure resting-places in the foreign land which had afforded them the means of a humble existence. In 1791, even after the unsuccessful flight to Varennes, many of these emigrants had still hope and confidence. Charles Butler, in August of that year, having called on Burke, saw him surrounded, as he usually was at that time, by many of the French nobility, and discoursing eloquently on the horrors of the revolution. One of his hearers interrupted him with the ill-timed question, "But when shall we return to France?" "Never," was the reply; "false hopes," continued the orator, "are not the money that I keep in my drawer." "*Coquins!*" exclaimed one. "Yes," said Burke, "they are *coquins*, but they are the most terrible *coquins* that the world has known."†

In the winter of 1791–2, M. de Talleyrand visited London, to make his observations upon the temper of British statesmen, and to dispose the ministry to regard the French constitution without alarm. According to the self-denying decree of the national assembly he was restrained from holding office. But he was no less the agent of the French government. The British cabinet had appeared decided not to depart from its neutrality in the event of war; but it manifested no sympathy with the new order of things. Talleyrand, according to Dumont, who was in his confidence during this visit to England, had a long conference with Lord Grenville; but the secretary of state was dry and laconic. Talleyrand had known Mr. Pitt, who, when he was in France in 1783, was a guest at the house of Talleyrand's uncle, the Archbishop of Rheims; but Mr. Pitt made no allusion to his former acquaintance. Talleyrand went to court. The king paid him little attention, and the queen turned her back upon him. Talleyrand, in spite of the charms of his conversation, did not find a ready admission to the highest society of London, although he had special introductions to Lord Lansdown and other leading Whigs. Amid the reserve of the ministry and the neglect of the court, Talleyrand could expect little success from his irregular mission. He returned to Paris at the beginning of March.

At this period of Talleyrand's return from London, the Girondin party, as we shall have to relate in the next chapter, had acceded to power, with Dumouriez as minister for foreign affairs. It was then determined to send an embassy to London. The difficulty with regard to Talleyrand was still an obstacle to his appointment as plenipotentiary. The title was given to M. Chauvelin, a young negotiator; the power was with Talleyrand, who formed part of a numerous suite that accompanied the ambassador. The party left Paris in two carriages in a fine spring season; several, such as Talleyrand and Dumont, familiar with England; the greater number eager to gratify their curiosity in an unknown country. Garat, a man of let-

* "Diaries, etc., of the Right Hon. George Rose," vol. i. p. 109.
† "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. i. p. 72.

* Dumont, "Souvenirs," p. 108.
† Butler's "Reminiscences"—*Coquin* has a comprehensive application to roguery and beggary.

ters, who afterward acquired a hateful distinction as minister of justice, was one of the most agreeable of this large company. The impressions of England made upon this man, who desired the reputation of a philanthropist and became the apologist of massacre, are pleasantly described. When they arrived at Dover Garat mounted the imperial of the carriage, with Dumont at his side. He adjusted his eye-glass, and exhibited as much excited curiosity as if they had arrived in the moon. He made the most amusing exclamations, upon the small cottages, the small gardens, the neatness that reigned throughout, the beauty of the children, the modest air of the female peasantry, the decent dress of the country people—in a word, this scene of ease and prosperity, which contrasted so strongly with the misery and the rags which they had just seen in the people of Picardy, struck Garat in a singular manner: "Ah, what a pity, what a pity," he exclaimed, "if they set about to revolutionize this fine country! When will France be as happy as England?" * The man of letters, who was preparing to write the history of the French Revolution, might have considered that the comparative happiness of the English peasantry would render such attempt at revolutionizing altogether vain. One of the great causes of the revolution did not here exist—the feudal privileges which had long made the people slaves, and in revenge of which they became savages—the crushing despotism of a government of centralization, which stood in the way of all social improvement. The embassy of Chauvelin and Talleyrand was established in London; but it was coldly received by the court, and almost injuriously by the public. Its members were attacked by the ministerial newspapers, and they committed the imprudence of assiduously cultivating the society of the opposition. The official communications of the embassy and the secretary of state were not of a very agreeable character. Their public reception was anything but flattering. Talleyrand and Chauvelin went to Ranelagh, Dumont being of the party, with five or six others of the ambassador's suite. They saw that they attracted the attention of the gay crowd; but that regard was not complimentary; for as they moved round the ring a free passage was made for them, right and left, as if the people feared to breathe an atmosphere of contagion. They also saw the Duke of Orleans walking alone, shunned even in a more especial manner. Nevertheless, at this period the British government was anxious to preserve its neutrality in the affairs of France: it was cold, but it was not hostile.

The parliament of Great Britain was opened on the 31st of January, 1792. The king's speech was not a speech of alarm, but of unbounded confidence. It declared that the general state of affairs in Europe appeared to promise to his majesty's subjects a continuance of their present tranquillity. "Under these circumstances," said the king, "I am induced to think that some immediate reduction may safely be made in our naval and military establishments." The speech also announced "a continual and progressive improvement in the internal situation of the country." The private correspondence of members of the government clearly shows that the expectation of continued peace, and the boast of internal prosperity, were not used as devices to keep up the spirits of the nation. "Everything looks like peace, on the side of France," writes Lord Grenville in January. "There certainly are some in France who wish the war, but very many more who fear it; and the ruin of the finances is approaching with very rapid strides indeed. What a contrast we shall make with them, when I come to state to you the particulars." † The finances of England and France were scarcely capable of being compared. The disturbance of the ordinary laws of exchange produced by the issue of assignats in 1790—which paper-money was based on the security of the church lands remaining unsold—had rendered the financial condition of France very difficult of contrast with a country whose paper-money was convertible into specie. The financial ruin of France, in the ordinary sense of ruin, was approaching very surely though gradually at the beginning of 1792; but toward the end of the year the excessive issue of assignats, based upon the forfeited property of emigrants, produced a terrible amount of private ruin and misery. Yet the amount of private calamity did not in the least prevent the French revolutionary government from carrying on hostilities with an energy that astonished the statesmen of other countries, who provided the means of war by the ordinary routine of loans and taxes. The mistake which the British government constantly made with regard to France, long after 1792, was to believe that the ruin of her finances necessarily involved the submission of her rulers—"as if credit was necessary to a government of which the principle was rapine; as if Alboin could not turn Italy into a desert till he had negotiated a loan at five per cent; as if the exchequer bills of Attila had been at par." *

On the 17th of February, in a committee of the whole house, Mr. Pitt brought under consideration a general view of the public income and expenditure. No prospect could be more gratifying than the eloquent minister's survey of the resources of the country; no declaration of policy more statesmanlike. He looked forward to the operation of the sinking fund during a period of tranquillity that was likely to endure for some years; he calculated what that fund would amount to in 1808. "There never was a time in the history of the country," he said, "when, from the situation of Europe, we might more reasonably expect fifteen years of peace than we may at the present moment." † He displayed the great increase of revenue. He enlarged upon the causes of that increase, derived from the natural industry and energy of the country; the improvement of every branch of manufacture; the invention of machinery for the abridgment of labor; that continual tendency of capital to increase, whenever it is not obstructed by some public calamity, or by some mistaken and mischievous policy. Such circumstances were naturally connected with the duration of peace; they were connected still more with our internal tranquillity, and with the natural effects of a free but well-regulated government. "It is this union of liberty with law which, by raising a barrier equally firm against the encroachments of power and the violence of popular commotion, affords to property its just security, produces the exertion of genius and labor, the extent and solidity of credit, the circulation and increase of capital; which forms and upholds the national character, and sets in motion all the springs which actuate the great mass of the community through all its various descriptions." Fox complimented his rival upon his eloquence; upon his philosophical view of the principles of government; upon his true and splendid enumeration of the causes of national prosperity. What, indeed, we may now say, could a free nation desire more than such an expositor of its principles, and such a leader in a continued course of greatness and honor? Throughout that session we see William Pitt truly the foremost man of all the world—calm amid the storms which were raging around; in his majestic oratory asserting the grandeur of his country, and vindicating the soundest doctrines of public economy, and the most noble principles of justice for the oppressed. On the 2d of April Wilberforce moved for a committee of the whole house to consider the African slave trade, with a view to a resolution for its immediate abolition. Pitt on this occasion supported his friend in one of the most eloquent speeches on record. "Windham, who has no love for Pitt," writes Wilberforce, "tells me that Fox and Grey, with whom he walked home after the debate, agreed with him in thinking Pitt's speech one of the most extraordinary displays of eloquence they had ever heard. For the last twenty minutes he really seemed to be inspired. He was dilating upon the future prospects of civilizing Africa, a topic which I had suggested to him in the morning." This almost inspired passage of Pitt's oration may scarcely bear the sober examination of those who contend for the difference of races; but there are certainly few things in the whole compass of oratory more magnificent than his retrospect of the early condition of the Britons, as slaves exported to the Roman market, and his reproof of those who contended that Africa was incapable of civilization: "Why might not some Roman senator, reasoning on the principles of some honorable gentlemen, and pointing to British barbarians, have predicted with equal boldness, 'There is a people that will never rise to civilization; there is a people destined never to be free; a people without the understanding necessary for the attainment of useful arts; depressed by the hand of nature below the level of the human species, and created to form a supply of slaves for the rest of the world.' Might not this have been said, in all respects as fairly and as truly of Britain herself, at that period of her history, as it can

* "Souvenirs," p. 298.
† "Court and Cabinets of George III." vol. ii. p. 201.

* Macaulay, "Biography of Pitt."
† "Parliamentary History," vol. xxix. col. 826.

now be said by us of the inhabitants of Africa?" * It was decided that night, by a large majority, that the slave trade should be gradually abolished. Pitt and Fox contended for the immediate abolition.

In this session was carried that great improvement of the law known as Mr. Fox's Libel Bill, by which was established the right of juries to give a general verdict of guilty or not guilty upon the whole matter put in issue upon the indictment. This bill was carried in the House of Commons in the session of 1791, Pitt supporting Fox and Erskine in the necessity of taking some step at least to regulate the practice of the courts on the trial of libels, and render it conformable to the free spirit of the constitution. In the House of Lords the chancellor, Lord Thurlow, moved the postponement of the bill, and it was lost for that session. In the Commons, in 1792, it was again passed, and sent to the Lords. It was again opposed by the chancellor, who was supported by the whole body of the judges—"sad to relate," says Lord Campbell. But the principle was advocated in every stage by Lord Camden, and by Lord Loughborough, and the measure was finally carried on the 11th of June. Lord Thurlow had become troublesome in the ministry of Mr. Pitt, occasionally setting up an independent authority, in which pretension he appears to have reckoned upon the support of the king. On the 14th of May he made an unexpected opposition to a ministerial measure in parliament, and had nearly obtained a majority. Grenville wrote to his brother, "I think the consequences must be decisive in his situation or ours. But it requires some reflection, and some management in the quarter you know." † In that "quarter" there was no hesitation. The king sent a message to the chancellor requiring him to give up the office, but leaving the time to his choice. The great seal was then put in commission. Lord Loughborough, who belonged to the Whig party, was ardently desirous for the seat on the woolsack. He attempted for some time to bring about a coalition between Pitt and Fox, to which Pitt appears to have opposed no insuperable obstacle, though Fox declared that the minister was not sincere. The Whigs were divided between the opinions of Burke and those of Fox on the question of the French Revolution, though many were not indisposed to join Pitt to form "a strong government." Burke thought that "Mr. Fox's coach stops the way," but that there was no doing without him or with him. ‡ The attempts to bring about a coalition failed, as might naturally have been expected—not so much from any insuperable difference of principles between the two great parliamentary leaders at that time, as from the difficulties that were sure to arise out of the conduct and opinions of the extreme men of either party. If Pitt, united with Fox, had adhered to his principle of neutrality in the impending struggle between France and the German powers, Fox might have moderated many of those opinions which appeared to make him the advocate of the excesses of the French Revolution. But the great question of peace or war with the French republic really depended upon the feelings of the majority in parliament; and before the close of the session of 1792 it became pretty evident that the strongest ministry would have real difficulty in preserving England from an interference in this question, which so stirred the passions of the community.

On the 30th of April Mr. Charles Grey gave notice of a motion for reform in the representation of the people—he who as Earl Grey and prime minister forty years afterward carried the Reform Bill. On the 26th of April, 1792, at a general meeting of the society of "The Friends of the People, associated for the purpose of obtaining a Parliamentary Reform," a declaration was agreed to be signed by many members of parliament and other gentlemen; and it was resolved that Mr. Grey and Mr. Erskine be requested to make a motion on the subject in the next session. Mr. Grey accordingly gave notice of his intention in a brief speech. Mr. Pitt at once came forward to declare his opinions on the subject. He had supported reform in former times, when he thought that "if some mode could be adopted by which the people could have any additional security for a continuance of the blessings which they now enjoy, it would be an improvement in the constitution of the country. . . . He would ask all moderate men what were their feelings on this subject at this moment? He believed he could anticipate the answer, 'This is not a time to make hazardous experiments.' Could we forget what lessons had been given to the world within a few years?" Mr. Pitt made some pointed allusions to the declaration of "The Friends of the People," and a heated debate followed, in which Mr. Fox supported Mr. Grey, but intimated his opinion of the impolicy of joining an association for reform. On the 21st of May a royal proclamation was issued against the publication and dispersion of seditious writings. On the 25th an address to the king was proposed, expressing the determination of the Commons to support his majesty in the resolution which he had adopted. Mr. Grey moved an amendment, in which he brought forward Mr. Pitt's former opinions on the subject of reform, described his conduct as that of an apostate, and treated the proclamation and the proposed address as calculated to throw odium upon a society that had been formed with the purest intentions. The proclamation, he said, was intended to separate the Whig party. There were, indeed, many signs that a separation of old political friends was inevitable. In the House of Lords the Prince of Wales, always hitherto associated in politics with Mr. Fox, Mr. Sheridan, and the opposition, spoke, for the first time, on this subject of the king's proclamation. The matter in question was, he said, whether the constitution was or was not to be maintained; whether the wild ideas of theory were to conquer the wholesome maxims of established practice; and whether those laws under which we had flourished for such a series of years were to be subverted by a reform unsanctioned by the people. "I exist," exclaimed his royal highness, "by the love, the friendship, and the benevolence of the people, and their cause I will never forsake as long as I live." *

The proclamation against seditious writings stated that "we have reason to believe that correspondences have been entered into with sundry persons in foreign parts, with a view to forward the criminal and wicked purposes" alluded to. M. Chauvelin, the French minister plenipotentiary, upon the appearance of this proclamation, addressed a note to Lord Grenville, in which he says, "If certain individuals of this country have established a correspondence abroad, tending to excite troubles therein, and if, as the proclamation seems to insinuate, certain Frenchmen have come into their views, that is a proceeding wholly foreign to the French nation, to the legislative body, to the king, and to his ministers; it is a proceeding of which they are entirely ignorant, which militates against every principle of justice, and which, whenever it became known, would be universally condemned in France. Independently of these principles of justice, from which a free people ought never to deviate, is it not evident, from a due consideration of the true interests of the French nation, that she ought to desire the interior tranquillity, the continuance and the force of the constitution, of a country which she already looks upon as her natural ally?" Arguing thus, at considerable length, M. Chauvelin requests that the secretary of state would communicate his note to both houses of parliament previous to their deliberations upon the proposed address. Lord Grenville administered a dignified rebuke to the French ambassador: "The deliberations of the two houses of parliament, as well as the communications which his majesty shall be pleased to make to them, relative to the affairs of the kingdom, are objects absolutely foreign to all diplomatic correspondence, and upon which it is impossible for me to enter into any discussion whatever with the ministers of other courts." It is clear that there could not be any very cordial communication between the French envoy and the English ministers, although the forms of diplomatic courtesy were sedulously preserved. On the 18th of June M. Chauvelin, having previously announced the commencement of hostilities, invites his Britannic majesty, in the name of the king of the French, to use his influence, "to stop, while it is still time, the progress of a confederacy which equally affects the peace, the liberty, and the happiness of Europe." Lord Grenville, coldly answering this impassioned exhortation, says, "The same sentiments which have determined the king not to take part in the internal affairs of France, ought equally to induce him to respect the rights and the independence of other sovereigns, and especially those of the allies; and his majesty has thought that, in the existing circumstances of the war now begun, the intervention of his counsels, or of his good offices, cannot be of use, unless they should be desired by all the parties interested."

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxix. col. 1155.
† "Court of George III.," vol ii. p. 207.
‡ See "Malmesbury's Diary," pp. 418 to 443.

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxix. col. 1517.

The parliament was prorogued on the 16th of June. In his speech on closing the session the king said, "I have seen with great concern the commencement of hostilities in several parts of Europe." The war between Turkey and Russia was at an end. The disciplined armies of Austria had scarcely yet come into conflict with the raw levies of France. But if there were evils to be dreaded from the progress of democratic opinions, there was no less a danger to be apprehended from the daring ambition of absolute monarchs. There was another revolution upon which those who feared anarchy but loved liberty looked without apprehension. In 1791 a great change had been effected in the government of Poland. The tyranny of the nobles had been abolished, with the entire concurrence of the king and the people. A new constitution was established, which provided for an hereditary crown, a legislature consisting of two houses, equality of civil rights, a complete toleration of all religions. This rational system was offensive to the despotic Empress of Russia, and she sent an army into Poland to destroy the new liberties of the country. The King of Poland appealed to his ally, the King of Prussia, to send him that aid which Prussia was bound by treaty to render. The tricky court of Berlin replied that the change in the government of Poland had cancelled the obligation. Such were the allies to whom Great Britain had to look, if she was to take any hostile proceedings against the revolutionary government of France. Some enthusiasts in England thought, in the summer of 1792, that it would be a wise policy for our country to make common cause with France in resisting the despots who were crushing the independence of Poland. Against this scheme Burke was indignant. He applauded the revolution of Poland; he hated that of France. He lamented the fate of Poland; but he would sooner let affairs there take their course than enter "into a confederacy with the horror, turpitude, baseness, and wickedness of the French Revolution."* Things in Poland did take their course. The crimes of monarchy were at hand to make men careful not to exhaust all their indignation against the crimes of democracy.

CHAPTER CLXXXVIII.

Deaths of the emperor and the King of Sweden—The Girondin ministry—French declaration of war against the King of Hungary and Bohemia—The veto—Roland and two other ministers dismissed—Insurrection of the 20th of June—The country in danger proclaimed—Arrival of the Marseillais—Proclamation of the Duke of Brunswick—Insurrection of the 10th of August—Attack on the Tuileries—Royal family removed to the Temple—Longwy taken by the Prussians—The massacres of September.

In March, 1792, two of the crowned heads of Europe who were meditating upon the great question of a war with France were removed by death. Leopold, the emperor, died on the 1st of March. He was succeeded as King of Hungary and Bohemia by his eldest son, Francis II. Gustavus III., King of Sweden, was shot on the 6th of March, at a masked ball, by Ankerstroem, one of the nobles whose privileges he had abrogated in 1789 to establish his own absolute power. He was succeeded by his son, a boy of thirteen years of age. The successor of Leopold was not yet elected emperor, when France declared war against him on the 20th of April. This declaration was the act of the Girondin ministry. The administration which represented the Feuillans, or party of the constitution, of whom Bertrand de Moleville and Narbonne were leading members and political rivals, was broken up by its own differences. The king had now to look to a party of greater power in the assembly, but more likely to precipitate the court into dangerous measures. On the 15th of March General Dumouriez was offered the ministry of foreign affairs. By the 23d a new administration was formed. Clavière was appointed minister of finance; and Roland de Platière was appointed minister of the interior; he, of whom Arthur Young writes, in 1789, as "a gentleman somewhat advanced in life, who has a young and beautiful wife," and who then filled the humble office of inspector of fabrics at Lyons.† Roland has now brought to Paris his beautiful wife, the daughter of an engraver, to aid him in weightier matters than such as he discussed with the English agriculturist. The grave man goes to court in plain black, with strings in his shoes; and the horrified master of the ceremonies points to him, and ejaculates to Dumouriez, "Quoi! no buckles!" "All is lost," said the sarcastic general. Madame Roland, an enthusiastic republican, was admitted to the political meetings of her husband and the men of his party. Dumont says of these committees of ministers and the principal Girondins, at which he was sometimes present and saw Madame Roland, "A woman might appear there somewhat out of place, but she took no part in the discussions. She sat at her own writing-table, busy over letters, but she lost not a word of what was going forward." Madame Roland, he says, "who had an easy and energetic style, was too fond of writing, and engaged her husband in writing unceasingly. It was the ministry of writers."* He conceived that they were too much occupied in laboring to influence the opinions of the moment, not to sacrifice too much to a vulgar policy, instead of rising above the dominion of prejudices. Brissot, equally active in the assembly and in the Jacobins' Club, was the head of a faction sufficiently powerful to make himself feared by the ministry. Brissot had strong prejudices against the king. Clavière had become convinced that the king had pure intentions; and he was detailing, at a meeting at Roland's house, an instance of the knowledge of the constitution which Louis possessed. Brissot and Clavière had angry words; Roland was afraid to be just toward a king whose minister he was. The dispute was made up by the address of Roland's wife.† Such small circumstances indicate the internal influences that bore upon the actions of the ministry. The war with Austria was forced on by Brissot. It was opposed by all except Dumouriez. "Brissot," says Dumont, "was so violent that I have heard him propose to disguise some soldiers as Austrian hussars, who should make a night attack upon some French villages; and, upon receiving this news, he would have made a motion for war, and would have carried an enthusiastic decree."‡ Dumouriez says in his memoirs that, as minister, he endeavored to prevent the war; but that he would have considered the nation cowardly, and unworthy of liberty, if it had longer submitted to the hostile insolence of the court of Vienna. The king was against the war, although he formally proposed to the legislative assembly a declaration of hostilities. The assembly resolved on war the same night. The plan of the campaign was formed by Dumouriez. Its chief object was to advance into the Low Countries, where it was expected that the French armies would be welcomed by a population which disliked the rule of Austria. The first movements were not successful. La Fayette commanded the army of the centre; Rochambeau, the army of the north; two of his officers, Dillon and Biron, were to move forward with divisions, as a feint, while La Fayette made the real advance. The troops under Dillon and Biron were each seized with a panic at the sight of the Austrian troops. La Fayette, hearing of these misfortunes, suspended his own march.

There was a crisis at hand of more importance in the future destinies of France and of Europe than the first failure of the French arms in the advance from the frontier. The possibility of the constitution of 1791 working in times of trial was to be demonstrated. That constitution gave the king an absolute veto upon the acts of the legislature. He had the sole power of nominating his ministers, and of appointing to every civil and military office. He had a large and uncontrolled revenue. That he was subject to popular insult was perhaps in some degree an unavoidable consequence of the anomaly that had been established between the power of the crown and the spirit of the people. A democratic legislature; a monarch, with the power in his person of overturning their decrees, without any reference to ministerial responsibility; a ministry forced upon him by a party in the assembly inclined toward a republic; an army upon the frontier, stimulated by the princes of the blood and a body of noble emigrants, in secret communication with him, and resolved to undo the work of the revolution. The king had too much power of a dangerous nature, and too little power for the preservation of his own authority, in connection with the vast changes which had cut away all the natural props of the monarchy. The Girondin ministry, represented by Roland, were disposed to coerce the king but not

* "Correspondence of Burke," vol. iii. p. 472.
† "Travels in France," 4to, p. 262.

* "Souvenirs sur Mirabeau," pp. 276–278.
† Ibid., p. 284.
‡ Ibid., p. 288.

to adopt the extreme opinions of the Jacobins. Dumouriez, a man of vivacity and pleasure, was not at ease with his former associate of the shoe-strings, who went straight forward to the assertion of his own opinions without intrigue or compromise. The king hesitated about his sanction of a decree of the assembly for the deportation of the priests who had not taken the oath, and of another decree for the formation of a large camp of federates near Paris. Roland, or rather his wife, had drawn up a letter of advice to the king, which he proposed that all the ministers should sign. They declined to do so. Another letter was then drawn up by the enthusiastic lady, which was addressed by Roland to the king in his own name. It demanded, almost in a tone of menace, that the king should give his sanction to the two decrees about which he was deliberating. Dumouriez was asked by the king if he ought to endure this insult; and Dumouriez advised him to dismiss Roland and two other of the ministry. This was on the 13th of June. Roland went to the assembly, and read his letter; and it was declared that the three dismissed ministers had the confidence of the country. The king resolved to sanction the decree for a camp near Paris, but not that for the deportation of the priests; and he prepared a letter to that effect to the assembly, which he asked the remaining ministers to countersign. They refused, and were dismissed. Other ministers were appointed from the party of the Feuillans. They entered upon office on the 17th of June. On the 20th a popular demonstration of the most formidable nature showed where the power resided that would command an interpretation of the constitution according to its own will. Lamartine has truly said, "The first insurrections of the revolution were the spontaneous impulses of the people. . . . Public passion gave the signal, and chance commanded. When the revolution was accomplished, and the constitution had imposed legal order on each party, the insurrections of the people were no longer agitations, but plans. . . . Among the citizens anarchy had disciplined itself, and its disorder was only external, for a secret influence animated and directed it unknown to itself."* In every quarter and section of Paris there were local leaders, who took their direction from the great agitators of the clubs and of the journals.

The 20th of June is the anniversary of the famous day of 1789, when the states-general in the tennis-court swore never to separate. In the Faubourg Saint Antoine, and in the Faubourg Saint Marceau, there are great crowds assembled betimes in the morning. Their purpose ostensibly is to plant a tree of liberty, and to petition the assembly about certain constitutional grievances. They have music; and tricolor streamers on pikes; and dainty emblems with inscriptions, such as a bull's heart pierced through, inscribed "Aristocrat's heart," and a pair of black breeches, with a label intimating that tyrants must tremble at the *sans-culottes*. The mob of armed men and armed women, led by Santerre, the brewer, have reached the Salle de Manège, to the number of eight thousand. They gain admittance, and a petition is read to the assembly, the text of which is, that "blood shall flow, unless the tree of liberty which we are going to plant shall flourish." They defile through the hall, singing "*ça ira*," and shouting "Down with the veto." The crowd had prodigiously increased when the petitioners came out. The tree is planted; and then the king must be visited in his palace. The king is expected to come out, but he does not think proper to appear. The Place de Carrousel and the gardens of the Tuileries are filled with this wild rabble; and at last they are battering the doors of the palace with axes and crowbars. The king goes to the council chamber, where some of the ministers are assembled, and three grenadiers are also there. The rabble are in the adjoining room, when the king orders the door of the council chamber to be opened. "Sire, be not afraid," said a grenadier to the king. "Put your hand upon my heart; it is tranquil," replied the king. He asks the mob what they want. His courage somewhat awes them. They then cry "Remove veto." "This is not the time to do so, nor is this the way to ask it," says the brave Louis. A petition was then read to him by Legendre, a butcher. For four hours did this extraordinary scene continue. The red cap was handed to the king, and he put it on. A drunken man, with a bottle in his hand, offered the king to drink, and he drank "To the nation." Pétion, the mayor of Paris, at last arrived. He had been very slow in coming, and was not very alert when he did come. To his connivance is attributed the disgrace of this outrage; and it is even alleged that the agitators hoped that the king would fall by the hands of the mob. The education of the people in the school of bloodshed was not yet sufficiently advanced for this scheme to be realized. The king at last got out of the hands of the rude crowd, vociferous but not ferocious, though many were intoxicated. They marched through the apartments of the palace. They passed before the queen and her son, who stood behind a table, protected by some grenadiers; they placed a red cap on the little boy's head. The sun has set before the palace is cleared; but no lives have been sacrificed. The firmness of the king has saved him. Mr. Huskisson, in a letter of the 29th of June, pays a just tribute to the deportment of the king: "His admirable presence of mind during this long and painful scene have gained him many friends among the better order of people, and seem to have added much to the affection of the army. His friends only wish that his courage was of a more active nature. In his conduct he seems to be supported by the spirit of a martyr, the tranquillity of a good conscience, the resignation of a Christian; but nothing hitherto shows the enterprising courage and intrepidity of a hero, capable of great and astonishing resolutions, executed with that energy which strikes his enemies with terror, and insures success to his cause."*

General La Fayette, on hearing of the atrocious proceedings of the 20th of June, arrived in Paris from his army, and appeared at the bar of the legislative assembly, to urge an inquiry into the cause of these excesses, and to denounce their instigators. La Fayette was received with honor at the assembly. The Jacobins in their club called for his impeachment. He left Paris in time to preserve his own life, and the Jacobins had only the satisfaction of burning him in effigy. On the frontier there is inaction in the German army and in the French. But events are ripening. On the 11th of July it is resolved by the assembly to proclaim "the country in danger." On the 14th of July there is a festival in the Champs de Mars—another feast of the federation, when the king again takes the national oath. But there are no shouts for the king. The popular idol of this day is the mayor of Paris, Pétion, who had been suspended from his functions by the directory of the department, for his conduct on the 20th of June. "Pétion or death," is the shout at the Feast of the Federation. On the 22d of July there is a civic procession to proclaim "the country in danger." The ominous words are inscribed on an enormous flag which is fixed on the Pont-Neuf, and a similar flag is hoisted on the top of the Hôtel de Ville. Each section is headed by its municipal officer; and he is ready to inscribe the names of those who will go forth to fight for their country. Young men of Paris are going out to do battle against the foreigner. Other young men are marching into Paris from the extreme south of France—how called together no one knows, with what object few can guess. They have travelled six hundred miles from the city of Marseilles, singing that stirring song of the Marseillaise, whose chorus was an expression of the patriotism which exalted and the ferocity which disgraced the revolution.

"Aux armes, citoyens! formez vos bataillons.
Marchons! qu'un sang impur abreuve nos sillons!"

These five hundred tired and travel-stained patriots have entered Paris on the 30th of July, and on that same day are fighting with the national guards. Who has brought these men of the south to Paris; and why are they fighting with the troops who are there to defend the constitution? A few days will show. They began their career in Paris by taking part with a rabble against the sworn defenders of the law. Barbaroux, a fierce republican, who came from Marseilles, had gone out from the city to meet these adventurers, and he was fully competent to give them their instructions in the duty of patriots.

The capital of France was in this state of excitement when a proclamation of the Duke of Brunswick, dated the 25th of July, from Coblenz, arrived, and was immediately printed in the journals. It is impossible to read this declaration without regarding it either as an act of insanity, or an atrocious attempt to render the most violent instruments of the revolution more desperate, and thus to deliver up France, torn to pieces by civil war, an easy prey to those who would

* "Girondins," book xvi.

* "Speeches of Huskisson," vol. i., Introductory Memoir.

partition her as they had partitioned Poland. We must regard it as the madness of the emigrant princes and their besotted followers. The declaration of the Duke of Brunswick, in the name of the emperor and the King of Prussia, disavows any intention to make conquests, or to meddle with the internal government of France; but announces that they intend to deliver the king and the royal family from their captivity, and to enable him to make such convocations as he shall judge proper, and to labor in security for the welfare of his subjects. The national guards are called upon to preserve order till the arrival of the troops of the emperor and the King of Prussia; those who fight against these troops shall be punished as rebels to their king; the members of departments, districts, and municipalities are held responsible, under pain of losing their heads, for all crimes which they shall suffer to take place; if the inhabitants of the towns and villages shall dare to defend themselves against the troops of their imperial and royal majesties, they shall be punished according to the most rigorous rules of war. The inhabitants of Paris are called upon to submit instantly to their king: "to set that prince at full liberty, and to insure to him and to all royal persons that inviolability and respect which are due, by the laws of nature and of nations, to sovereigns; their imperial and royal majesties making personally responsible for all events, on pain of losing their heads, pursuant to military trials, without hopes of pardon, all the members of the national assembly, of the department, of the district, of the municipality, and of the national guards of Paris, justices of peace, and others whom it may concern; and their imperial and royal majesties further declare, on their faith and word of emperor and king, that if the palace of the Tuileries be forced or insulted—if the least violence be offered, the least outrage done to their majesties, the king, the queen, and the royal family—if they be not immediately placed in safety, and set at liberty, they will inflict on those who shall deserve it the most exemplary and ever memorable avenging punishments, by giving up the city of Paris to military execution, and exposing it to total destruction."

There was a Scotch physician of some celebrity, Dr. John Moore, the author of a popular novel, "Zeluco," travelling, in company with the Earl of Lauderdale, to Paris, at the beginning of August, 1792. He saw the peasants dancing on a green plain, without any fear of Austrians or Prussians. He met people in carriages flying from Paris, who seemed to be impressed with a notion that some important event was about to happen; and one person said that a conspiracy would break out on the 9th of the month. Moore and his friend laughed at the notion of a conspiracy so well known beforehand.* There were certainly grounds for apprehension; for Pétion had been, on the 3d of August, at the bar of the assembly, at the head of a deputation of the commune, who demanded the deposition of the king. Louis had sent a message to the assembly, disavowing the proclamation of the Duke of Brunswick, and expressing doubts of its authenticity. The friends of the king were in serious alarm, and were concerting measures for his flight. The court apprehended an attack upon the Tuileries, and were bribing Danton, Santerre, and others of the Jacobin faction, to avert the dreaded insurrection. The decrees of the assembly were wholly in the power of the Girondins, who desired a republic, and of the Mountain, who would not scruple to destroy the monarchy, whatever amount of butchery the attempt might involve. The real hope of the court was that the Duke of Brunswick might be able to reach Paris before any serious outbreak. There were men there who had the absolute command of a fierce multitude, who would do their bidding with terrible promptitude, while the allied troops were slowly advancing toward the French frontier. There was an insurrectional committee ready to strike a blow whenever the time came. The faubourg Saint Marceau, and the faubourg Saint Antoine, and the club of the Cordeliers, were their three centres of action. On the evening of the 9th of August Danton was crying "To arms." The Marseillais were forming their ranks at the entrance of that club of which Danton was the leading mover. The sections assembled, and sent their commissioners to assume the municipal authority at the Hôtel de Ville, and to displace the council. At midnight the tocsin was sounded in every quarter. Drums were beating to arms. The national guards were rushing to the posts of their several departments. The streets were illuminated by order of the municipality. It was a night of terror; but it was more especially terrible to the king and the royal family, who had heard the dreadful note of the tocsin. They were surrounded by faithful servants who were resolved to share their perils. The national guards, who were bound to defend the palace, had assembled very slowly at the beat of the rappel. The protection of the king almost wholly fell upon the Swiss guards. Mandat, a constitutionalist, then commanding the national guard, made the best preparations in his power to resist an attack. He had given orders to the gendarmerie about the Tuileries and at the Hôtel de Ville; which had the sanction of the council that had been superseded in the night by the sections. Mandat was sent for to the Hôtel de Ville as the morning was approaching. He went, and was murdered. There was now no plan of defence for the Tuileries, which, as the sun rose, was surrounded by thousands of insurgents. There were national guards sufficient to have driven back the multitude, if the men had done the duty to which they had been sworn. The king was advised to go into the courts and the gardens of the palace and review these troops. He was received with cries of "Down with the Veto." Battalions left their positions, and joined the assailants in the Place du Carrousel. The assembly had hastily met during the night, and continued their sitting while this hurricane of popular violence was raging around them. They were debating some unimportant law, having no reference to the crisis whose development they were quietly expecting. The king and his family were strongly urged to place themselves under the protection of the assembly. They at last consented; and when he entered the hall, Louis said, "I am come here to prevent a great crime. I believe myself in safety in the midst of you, gentlemen." It was then about nine o'clock.

The royal family were placed in the logographe, a small box used by the reporters. Soon the sound of cannon was heard. No orders were given when the king left the palace. It was known to the leaders of the insurgents that he was gone. The great crime, the murder of the royal family, was averted by their leaving the Tuileries; but a wholesale butchery was to manifest the devotion to liberty and patriotism of the mobs of Paris. All the troops in the courts were received into the interior of the palace. Domestics, male and female, gentlemen of the household, priests, national guards and Swiss guards filled the apartments. The king had told the assembly that he had given orders to the Swiss not to fire. The insurgents had obtained possession of the Cour Royale, and they called to the Swiss at the windows to deliver up the palace. The Swiss manifested no disposition to fire upon them. Some of the most furious of the rabble reached the vestibule. There was a barricade at the foot of the stairs; and when it was attempted to be forced a combat began. The insurgents were driven back. The Swiss, boldly headed by two officers, marched into the court and drove out the crowd. They even penetrated to the Carrousel, and the multitude fled before them. Had they been supported by the gendarmerie the contest might have ended differently. An order had been sent by the king that the Swiss should repair to the assembly. About two hundred marched thither, fired upon by the national guards. The insurgents returned to the attack, obtained possession of the vestibule, rushed up the staircase, which was defended by eighty Swiss against the furious Marseillais and the pikemen of the faubourgs, till not a Swiss on the staircase was left alive. A general massacre of all within the walls, with the exception of the women, then ensued. A large number of the Swiss and national guards, who were in the courts, attempted to make their way to the hall of the assembly, but the Swiss were all picked out and murdered.

By eleven o'clock on that morning of the 10th of August the Tuileries was in the complete possession of the rabble of Paris; the greater number of its inmates slaughtered; all its luxurious furniture and works of art broken to pieces or burned. For sixteen hours the king sat in the logographe; and he and his family witnessed those proceedings of the assembly which accomplished another revolution. There was no constitutional party here now to control the Jacobins and the Girondins. A body of citizens appeared at the bar to demand the deposition of the king. Vergniaud retired, and soon returned with a draft of a decree by which a national convention was to be formed, and the chief of the executive was suspended until the decision of the convention. The decree was put and adopted without discussion. A new ministry was appointed. Roland, Clavière, and

* "Journal of 1792," August 6.

Servan resumed their offices. Danton was chosen minister of justice. The assembly sat till one o'clock in the morning, the royal family continuing in their close box all the time. A lodging was provided for them. The next morning they were brought back to the assembly, to listen to other decrees of their masters. Dr. Moore has described the scene, at which he was present: "From the place in which I sat I could not see the king, but I had a full view of the queen and the rest of the royal family. Her beauty is gone. No wonder. She seemed to listen with an undisturbed air to the speakers. Sometimes she whispered to her sister-in-law, and to Madame de Lamballe; once or twice she stood up, and, leaning forward, surveyed every part of the hall. A person near me remarked that her face indicated rage and the most provoking arrogance. I perceived nothing of that nature; although the turn of the debate, as well as the remarks which were made by some of the members, must have appeared to her highly insolent and provoking. On the whole, her behavior in this trying situation seemed full of propriety and dignified composure." *

It was decided on that day that the king and the royal family should be placed in the Temple—an isolated building surrounded by high walls. On the 13th of August they were removed to this, their prison abode. On the 17th of August Earl Gower, the British ambassador at Paris, was recalled by a letter from Mr. Dundas. A writer of great ability says, "In defiance of every maxim of sound policy, the English ambassador was recalled from France, simply because that country chose to do away with the monarchy, and substitute a republic in its place." † This strong opinion seems scarcely to be borne out by the letter of recall, signed by Mr. Dundas, which is referred to, but not quoted. "Under the present circumstances, as it appears that the exercise of the executive power has been withdrawn from his most Christian majesty, the credential under which your excellency has hitherto acted can be no longer available. And his majesty judges it proper, on this account, as well as most conformable to the principles of neutrality which his majesty has hitherto observed, that you should no longer remain at Paris. It is therefore his majesty's pleasure that you should quit it, and repair to England, as soon as you conveniently can, after procuring the necessary passports. In any conversation which you may have occasion to hold previous to your departure, you will take care to make your language conformable to the sentiments which are now conveyed to you, and you will particularly take every opportunity of expressing that, while his majesty intends strictly to adhere to the principles of neutrality, with respect to the settlement of the internal government of France, he, at the same time, considers it as no deviation from those principles to manifest, by all the means in his power, his solicitude for the personal situation of their most Christian majesties, and their royal family; and he earnestly and anxiously hopes that they will, at least, be secure from any acts of violence, which could not fail to produce one universal sentiment of indignation through every country of Europe." ‡

La Fayette, with his army, was at Sedan, when the assembly, after the 10th of August, sent three commissioners to him with their decrees. La Fayette caused them to be arrested, refused to administer to his troops the new oath which the assembly had sent, and called upon his soldiers to repeat the constitutional oath of obedience to the laws and the king. On the 17th, when the conduct of La Fayette was known in Paris, he was declared a traitor by the assembly, and ordered to be arrested. New commissioners arrived at Sedan. The troops of La Fayette, beloved as he was by them, began to waver; and he thought it prudent to quit his camp, with a few of his officers, and pass into the Austrian Netherlands. The Austrians arrested him and his companions as prisoners of war, and for five years he was confined in a castle in Moravia. The Prussian army continued to advance. On the 22d of August Longwy was taken by them, after a cannonade of a few hours. They blockaded Thionville, and were advancing toward Verdun. Paris was in great alarm; and it was decreed that thirty thousand men should be immediately raised and equipped, and go forth to meet the invader. The patriotic spirit of the people was honorably excited by the orators of the assembly. Let the intrenchments round Paris be completed by the voluntary labor of every citizen. Let a deputation of the members of the assembly go daily to stimulate the laborers and work with them. So spake the fervid eloquence of Vergniaud. But there were other orators who were preparing the ferocious bands whom they swayed for deeds of bloodshed surpassing in atrocity any which had gone before. On the 29th of August, by order of the commune, every citizen was required to be in his house by six o'clock in the evening. The barriers were closed. What was to happen no one knew. At one o'clock in the morning patrols of pikemen were going through the streets, for the purpose of entering every house, under the pretence of searching for arms, but really to carry off every suspected royalist. That night the prisons were filled with hundreds of destined victims.

On the morning of the 2d of September Paris was in great agitation. It was reported that Verdun had been betrayed by treachery into the hands of the Prussians. Some who mixed with the crowd shook their heads, saying that the traitors within Paris were most to be feared. At noon the people were startled by the firing of cannon, and by the peals of the tocsin. Danton, in the morning sitting of the assembly, said that the commissioners of the commune were going to invite the citizens, by solemn proclamation, to go forth to the defence of their country. "The tocsin which is about to sound is not a signal of alarm, it is the signal for attacking the enemies of our country: in order to vanquish them we require audacity, audacity, audacity." The assembly sat again in the evening. Municipal officers came to announce that the people had massacred two hundred priests at the church Des Carmes; that crowds were collected round the prisons, and were about to force the doors. The assembly appointed five of their members to exhort the people to tranquillity. They returned to say that the darkness prevented them seeing what was going on. Many in that assembly knew too well what was going on. Throughout that night of horror, the city which, two hundred and twenty years before, had been polluted by the massacre of St. Bartholomew, at the command of a crowned bigot, in the name of religion, was again polluted by a massacre as frightful, at the command of furious demagogues, in the name of liberty. The priests in the prison of Des Carmes, once a convent, were those who had been sentenced to deportation. They comprised many of the higher clergy. The greater number of the national guards and gendarmerie, who were posted at this prison, were removed by order in the morning. The crowd of assassins, headed by Cerat, a friend of Danton and of Marat, forced the gates. They immediately commenced shooting down the priests in the garden and the cloisters, stabbed them in their cells, or brought them out of the church, one by one, to be murdered. For four hours this terrible work went on, till no victim remained. One hundred and ninety bodies were carried away in carts. At the prison of the Abbaye, after a few murders in the afternoon, a general slaughter took place as night drew on. A tribunal was formed for the pretended trial of the prisoners. The trial consisted of identifying the prisoners by the entries on the prison rolls. That ceremony performed, the president, Maillard, the leader of the women to Versailles on the 5th of October, cried, "To the prison of La Force"—and the man thus condemned to death by a word, well understood, which sealed his fate, was butchered as he passed to the outer court. Thirty-eight Swiss in the prison were put to death without this ceremony. The murderers became tired as the night advanced; but they were again ready for their business in the morning. Billaud de Varennes, one of the functionaries of the municipality, arrived at the Abbaye, and presented to each of the executioners twenty-four livres as his reward. "Think you," said a baker's boy, "that I have only earned twenty-four livres? I have killed more than forty myself." The commune paid the dissatisfied scoundrels their miserable wages. To detail the atrocities which were committed at every prison throughout Paris would be to make our readers as sick at heart as we are in reading of them in the narratives of eye-witnesses. The prison of La Force was the scene of a crime that history cannot shrink from recording. That prison contained the persons belonging to the court whose lives were spared on the 10th of August. Among the ladies there was the Princess de Lamballe, the intimate friend of the queen. When the slaughter of the prisoners had been nearly completed, this beautiful woman was brought before the tribunal, where two members of the commune

* "Journal," August 11.
† Buckle, "History of Civilization," vol. i. p. 440.
‡ "Parliamentary History," vol. xxx. col. 143.

resided. The judges required her to swear love of equality and liberty, and hatred to the king and queen. "I cannot swear the last," she said; "it is not in my heart." She was led to the door. When she saw the heaps of dead she uttered a cry of agony. She was instantly struck down. Her head was placed upon a pike, and was borne in horrid procession to the Temple. By the permission of the commissioners of the commune, the ruffians were allowed to exhibit the head before the windows of the royal apartments. The king saw it; but his presence of mind saved the queen from beholding this terrible spectacle.

Of the origin of these dreadful transactions there can be no doubt. They were not the result of any spontaneous popular movement. They were organized by the commune, acting by their committee of surveillance, and pressed on by Danton and Marat. They were tolerated by the assembly. No attempt was made to repress them by the commanding officers of the national guards. A circular was issued on the 3d of September, in the name of the Commune of Paris, to inform the departments that a portion of the ferocious conspirators detained in the prisons had been put to death by the people—"acts of justice which appeared to them indispensable." The massacre was defended as the subversion of a conspiracy. The massacre, it was maintained, prevented Paris being given up to foreign troops. Dumont, writing to Romilly from Lord Lansdown's seat at Bowood, says: "I walk about half the day in a state of the greatest agitation, from the impossibility of remaining still, with my thoughts fixed upon all the sad events which are flowing from a source whence we had flattered ourselves human happiness was to arise." But he then turns to other thoughts as a counterpoise: that the Parisians "in their last paroxysm murdered the prisoners, because a report had been spread that, at the approach of the Duke of Brunswick, the prisons would be thrown open, and that the prisoners would purchase their pardon by serving their king, and turning against the patriots." To regard these massacres as the spontaneous movement of a people infuriated by the approach of a foreign army, is a belief professed by one of the most recent writers on the French Revolution: "A great cry is uttered, 'The enemy is at Verdun.' Then, seized with the fatal idea that liberty is entering upon its agony; that the torch lifted up by France to illuminate the world is about to be snatched from her, to be extinguished under the hoofs of the Prussian horse; that the revolution has no quarter to expect; that justice is dying, that justice is dead—the spirits of men yield to a black delirium which formalizes itself, oh eternal grief, in these three words of blood, 'To the prisons.'"* Another eloquent Frenchman—as experienced as he from whom we have quoted in the immediate causes of revolutionary action—thus speaks of the September massacres: "After having for a long time cast the blame upon a sudden and irresistible movement of the people, attempts have been made to confine the crime to the smallest possible number of actors. History has no such complaisance; the idea belongs to Marat, the acceptance and responsibility to Danton, the execution to the council of surveillance, accompliceship to many, and dastardly tolerance to almost all. . . . In Marat it was a thirst for blood, the last remedy of a society which he wished to destroy, in order to resuscitate it according to his dream. In the mind of Danton it was a master-stroke of policy; he consented to become the phenomenon of the revolutionary movement. He believed that his deeds, purified by the intention, and by time, would lose their character of ferocity; that his name would become greater when he had quitted the stage; and that he would be regarded as the colossus of the revolution. It has since been said that he saved his country and the revolution by these murders, and that our victories are their excuses. But those who assert this are deceived, as he was. A people who need to be intoxicated with blood to urge them to defend their country, is a nation of villains, and not a nation of heroes. Heroism is the reverse of assassination; and as for the revolution its *prestige* was in its justice and morality; and this massacre sullied it in the eyes of all Europe."†

The massacres of September produced a signal change in the feelings of the British nation toward the French. "How," says Romilly, "could we ever be so deceived in the character of the French nation as to think them capable of liberty? wretches who, after all their professions and boasts about liberty, and patriotism, and courage, and dying, and after taking oath after oath, in the very moment when their country is invaded and an enemy is marching through it unresisted, employ whole days in murdering women, and priests, and prisoners! . . . We might as well think of establishing a republic of tigers in some forest of Africa as of maintaining a free government among such monsters."* Those who had conceived the greatest hopes of the French Revolution—whose confidence in its chief agents had been little diminished by the previous excesses of the mobs of Paris—shrank appalled from the contemplation of the incidents of the 2d of September. Fox writes to Lord Holland, "I had just made up my mind to the events of the 10th of August, when the horrid accounts of the 2d of this month arrived; and I really considered the horrors of that day and night as the most heart-breaking event that ever happened to those who, like me, are fundamentally and unalterably attached to the true cause."† These fearful scenes had, however, their apologists in some of the extreme admirers of revolutionary principles. Writing to his son, Burke adverts to "the abominable palliation of these horrors in our abominable newspaper."‡ He regards the scenes of September as a fresh argument to reprove the government for their apparent indifference to these momentous occurrences: "I know it is the opinion of his majesty's ministers that the new principles may be encouraged, and even triumph over every interior and exterior resistance, and may even overturn other states as they have that of France, without any sort of danger of their extending, in their consequences, to this kingdom."§ Thus he writes to Lord Grenville on the 19th of September, "talking and reasoning as if a perpetual and organized anarchy had been a possible thing."‖ In this September the English ministry were not moved by the admonitions of Burke, or the terrors of the possessors of property, to think of departing from their safe course of neutrality, even though they had recalled the ambassador to the King of France. But, having a strong conviction how the domination of the Jacobins would end, they resolved that the accustomed English hospitality to political fugitives should not be granted to regicides. Lord Grenville's letter to his brother, of the 20th of September, is interesting:¶ "The detail of the late events at Paris is so horrible that I do not like to let my mind dwell upon them; and yet I fear that scene of shocking and savage barbarity is very far from its close. I deliver this day to the imperial and Neapolitan ministers a note, with the formal assurance that in case of the murder of the king or queen, the persons guilty of that crime shall not be allowed any asylum in the king's dominions. Opinions are a little doubtful about the best means of giving effect to this promise, should the case arise. Our lawyers seem clear, and Blackstone expressly asserts that the king may prevent any alien from coming into the kingdom, or remaining there. But this power has so rarely been used that it may, perhaps, be better to have a special act of parliament applying to this case. This, however, relates only to the mode. I imagine everybody will think the thing itself right, and some people seem to hope it may prevent the commission of the crime in question. In this hope I am not very sanguine."

CHAPTER CLXXXIX.

Opening of the French National Convention—The Prussian army enters France—Battle of Valmy—Retreat of the Prussians—Battle of Jemappes—Opening of the British parliament—Disposition of the British government—Aggressive decrees of the French convention—Mr. Pitt's continued desire for non-intervention—Louis XVI. and his family prisoners in the Temple—Louis brought to the bar of the convention—Anxiety for his fate in the British parliament—Political manœuvres of Lord Loughborough—The Whig party broken up, and Loughborough made chancellor—Influence of this negotiation on Mr. Pitt's policy—State of public opinion in England—Trial of Thomas Paine for libel, as the author of the "Rights of Man"—the Alien Bill—Correspondence with Chauvelin—Trial of the King of France—Votes of the convention—Ex-

* Louis Blanc, "Histoire de la Révolution," tome x. p. 4.
† Lamartine, "Girondins," liv. xxiv. c. 22.

* "Memoirs," Letter to Dumont, September 10.
† "Correspondence of Fox," vol. ii. p. 370.
‡ This newspaper was probably the "Morning Chronicle," then the property of James Perry.
§ "Correspondence of Burke," vol. iv. p. 7.
‖ Coleridge, "Friend," Essay I.
¶ "Court, etc., of George III.," vol. ii. p. 217.

ecution of the king—Proceedings of the British parliament—Note on the dagger-scene.

The National Convention held its first sitting on the 22d of September. This body, which had been elected throughout France amid the excitement of a foreign invasion, and chiefly under the influence of the Jacobins and Girondins, was not likely to number many men of those moderate opinions which had been denominated "constitutional." It comprised—with many who were mere provincial adventurers—some of the more distinguished of the two former assemblies; new men of repute in science and letters; magistrates; lawyers—an assembly not wanting in capacity for judicious legislation, if the violent members had not been certain to overpower the peaceable. The leading Jacobins ruled the convention through the mobs of Paris. They were a contemptible minority; but they usurped the power of a majority in consequence of the pusillanimity of those who shrank with horror from their atrocities, but who were afraid to endanger their own popularity by checking the ferocity of the people. Such were the Girondins. Opposed to bloodshed, they tolerated the massacres of September. They had dreams of a pure republican form of government to arise out of this whirlwind of anarchy; and they suffered the Jacobins, who cared only to destroy, to dominate in the convention. The system of the terrorists, such as Marat, was that of inspiring fear in the quiet and industrious portions of the community, and they especially sought to strike terror into all who clung, however doubtfully, to monarchical institutions. The first act of the convention was to decree the abolition of royalty. The proposition was a surprise to the Girondins, but they accepted it, not to be behind the Jacobins. On the 22d of September France was declared to be a republic.

On this day, when the final blow was given to that power which for centuries in France had been deemed identical with the state, the convention received the news of a conflict at Valmy, where the old troops of the monarchy, mixed with the raw levies of the revolution, came into conflict with the trained veterans of a military despotism, and stopped the advance of the invaders. The Prussians had met with little impediment in their march toward Paris. They entered France on the 30th of July. Longwy had been taken at the end of August, and Verdun capitulated on the 2d of September. There was now no fortified place to arrest their advance to the capital. But there was ground through which the Prussians must march, which would form a strong point of defence—the wooded ridge of the Argonne forest. Dumouriez put his finger on this spot on the map, and exclaimed, "This is the Thermopylæ of France." He outgeneralled the Duke of Brunswick. On the 4th of September, by a rapid movement in the very face of the enemy, the bold and adroit Frenchman had occupied the main passes of the forest, and had taken up a station of great strength at Grandpér. The weather was extremely wet. The country was flooded. The invading army was without food, and the peasantry were hostile. Nevertheless Dumouriez had his own troubles; and not the least was that some of his troops shrunk from facing the legions that Frederick the Great had led to victory. But by exhortation and menace he inspired the timid with some ardor, and his recruits were rallied at the cry of "*Vive la patrie!*" For many days there was a constant struggle to force these passes. The French held their ground. At length, on the 19th, Kellermann, who had seen service, and who attained high command in the wars of Napoleon, arrived with fifteen thousand men, and on the 20th fought that battle known as the cannonade of Valmy. This was the first battle of the revolution, and it was of sufficient importance to confer upon Kellermann his title of Duc de Valmy after he had fought many battles of the empire. In that conflict Goethe was serving in the German army, with the contingent of Weimar. There also, on the side of the revolutionists, was the son of the Duke of Orleans, who will be king of the French long after his father has lost his head as the despised Egalité. The battle lasted twelve hours. After this event some extraordinary negotiations went on between the French and Prussian headquarters; and on the 30th of September the Duke of Brunswick broke up his camp and commenced a retreat. It is now known that a secret agreement was concluded between the duke and Dumouriez, by which it was determined that the Prussians, having given up Longwy and Verdun, should retreat unmolested, assurances having been required that the royal family of France should be saved, and an effort be made to restore the constitutional monarchy. Danton was a party to this negotiation. He desired to free France from the Prussian invaders; but he was powerless, certainly unwilling, to perform the conditions for which the King of Prussia had in decency stipulated. Dumouriez was cautious not to promise too much, but simply to raise hopes that he had no ability to fulfil. The loss of the invaders by disease was very great. Their disgrace was irreparable.

The army which had entered France was composed of thirty-four thousand Prussians, ten thousand Austrians, and eight thousand French emigrants. This force appeared to the European powers more than sufficient to march to Paris and restore the monarchy. The British government was entirely in ignorance of the true cause which produced the retreat. Lord Grenville writes on the 11th of October to the Marquis of Buckingham, "We are all much disappointed with the result of the great expectations that had been formed from the Duke of Brunswick's campaign. According to the best accounts I can get of a business involved in almost inextricable mystery, the flux, which had got into his camp, was the true cause of his retreat."* The extravagance of "the great expectations that had been formed" may be collected from a letter of Addington: "Verdun is taken—that we are sure of, and the Duke of Brunswick will soon strike a stroke which, as Lord Chatham said, will resound through the universe." The sanguine speaker then quotes some lines, beginning "France shall perish;" and holds, with Burke, that "the bulk of the nation will, like madmen, be cured when they have been subdued."† The resolution of the English government not to join the coalition against France has been ascribed as a reason for the King of Prussia not following up the bold resolves of the Duke of Brunswick's proclamation. Another reason has been alleged: that the disappointment of the hope of a rapid march to Paris determined the rapacious Prussian monarch to return home, that he might look after a proper share in the partition of Poland. The predominant selfishness and jealousies of the two heads of the coalition were at this time a sufficient reason for the ministry of Mr. Pitt taking no part in their policy. "I bless God," says Lord Grenville, "that we had the wit to keep ourselves out of the glorious enterprise of the combined armies; and that we were not tempted by the hope of sharing the spoils in the division of France, nor by the prospect of crushing all democratical principles all over the world at one blow."‡ Burke was, of course, indignant at this result of a French invasion: "The united military glory of Europe has suffered a stain never to be effaced."§ Fox, as might have been expected, was in raptures: "No public event, not excepting Saratoga and Yorktown, ever happened that gave me so much delight. . . . The defeat of great armies of invaders always gives me the greatest satisfaction in reading history, from Xerxes' time downward."‖

While the armies of the coalition were retreating from the Meuse, the Austrian army, under the Archduke Albert, was besieging Lille. On the 29th of September the trenches were opened against the ramparted city, which had so stoutly resisted the assaults of Marlborough and Eugene. For a week was Lille bombarded. There was a garrison of ten thousand ardent republicans, and a population that was not terrified while their poor dwellings were in flames. Lille holds out. Dumouriez is approaching. The Austrians raise the siege on the 7th of October, and France sings another song of triumph. The French then become the invaders. A hundred thousand men, of whom Dumouriez has the chief command, enter Flanders. On the 6th of November was fought the battle of Jemappes. The cannonade of Valmy, as the name expresses, was scarcely to be called a battle, for the armies cannonaded each other from opposite heights divided by a river, and never came to close action. Jemappes was the scene of a terrific struggle. Of the composition of the French army there are discordant accounts. Lamartine represents the cavalry as consisting of old soldiers, but says that the mass was composed of volunteers, inexperienced in manœuvre. Bonaparte at St. Helena said that the republic was not saved by the recruits and volunteers, but by the old troops of the monarchy. At any rate there was enthusiasm opposed to disciplined steadiness, and novel tactics

* "Court, etc., of George III.," vol. ii. p. 219.
† "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. i. p. 95.
‡ "Court, etc., of George III.," p. 222.
§ "Correspondence of Burke," vol. iv. p. 20.
‖ "Correspondence of Fox," vol. ii. p. 372.

were matched against established routine. The Austrians were beaten, although the loss on the side of the French was more severe than that of their enemy. In this battle Louis Philippe gained those laurels which were still fresh when he was chosen to fill the throne from which the other branch of the Bourbons was ejected. Dumouriez was soon in possession of all the important fortresses of the Low Countries, the Austrians retreating before him. On the 30th of November he was in Antwerp. The consequence of this occupation was the opening of the Scheldt to the ships of all nations, in defiance of the treaty of Münster, by which the navigation of that river was closed against the people of the Low Countries. The French arms were equally successful against the Sardinian government, and Savoy was then annexed to the French republic as the department of Mont Blanc.

The session of parliament was opened by proclamation on the 13th of December. The term fixed for the opening had been anticipated by three weeks. In the king's speech it was stated that the industry employed to excite discontent on various pretexts has appeared to proceed from a design for the subversion of all order and government; "and this design has evidently been pursued in connection and concert with persons in foreign countries." His majesty went on to say that he had observed a strict neutrality in the present war on the continent, and had uniformly abstained from any interference with regard to the internal affairs of France; but that the indications of an intention to excite disturbances in other countries, to disregard the rights of neutral nations, and to pursue views of conquest and aggrandizement, had rendered it necessary to look to means of internal defence, and to take steps for augmenting the naval and military forces. "These exertions are necessary in the present state of affairs, and are best calculated both to maintain internal tranquillity and to render a firm and temperate conduct effectual for preserving the blessings of peace." There was an animated debate on the address; but Mr. Pitt was not present, having accepted the office of lord warden of the cinque ports, and waiting his re-election. It has been assumed by some, although the word "peace" was mentioned in the royal speech, that immediate war was the only thought of the government, as it was clearly the principle upon which Burke would have acted. But the proximate cause of the outbreak of that tremendous war with France which, with a very brief interval, lasted from 1793 to 1815, is a matter of historical interest, upon which opinions are still divided. The action of the English government may, however, be traced step by step. Five weeks before the meeting of parliament Lord Grenville wrote to his brother, with reference to the position of the states of Europe as regarded France, "We shall do nothing;" and he even looks to "the repeal of taxes" as one of the surest means of "keeping the country quiet."* On the 13th of November Mr. Pitt, writing to the Marquis of Stafford, says, "Perhaps some opening may arise which may enable us to contribute to the termination of the war between different powers in Europe, leaving France, which I believe is the best way, to arrange its own internal affairs as it can."† Of seditious movements Grenville, in the middle of November, is of opinion as to what his brother mentions "of overt acts," that "those things are all much exaggerated, where they are not wholly groundless. . . . It is not unnatural, nor is it an unfavorable symptom, that people who are thoroughly frightened, as the body of landed gentlemen in this country are, should exaggerate these stories as they pass from one mouth to another."‡ The alarm of others as well as the landed gentlemen, who were "thoroughly frightened" at the existence of violent democratic opinions in our own country, however exaggerated was the supposed prevalence of these opinions, left the government a very insufficient freedom of will for the maintenance of that idea of neutrality which Mr. Pitt clung to, almost against hope. It has been most truly said, "He was a lover of peace and freedom, driven by a stress against which it was hardly possible for any will or intellect to struggle, out of the course to which his inclinations pointed, and for which his abilities and acquirements fitted him, and forced into a policy repugnant to his feelings and unsuited to his talents."§

The proceedings of the French convention with regard to other governments were almost sufficient to have diverted any British minister from his policy of neutrality, at the time when Pitt was still of opinion that it was best to leave France "to arrange its own internal affairs as it can." On the 19th of November the national convention, immediately on the excitement produced by the victory of Jemappes, passed a decree, in the name of the French nation, declaring that they would grant succor and fraternity to every people who desire to obtain liberty. Mr. Pitt, looking back in 1800 upon the events which had led to the war, adverting to this decree of the republicans, says, "They had, by all their language, as well as by their example, shown what they understood to be freedom. They had sealed their principles by the deposition of their sovereign: they had applied them to England by inviting and encouraging the addresses of seditious and traitorous societies."* At the end of November delegates from the English "Society for Constitutional Information" appeared at the bar of the French convention, and said, "After the example given by France, revolutions will become easy." The president of the convention replied in a style of grandiloquence: "The shades of Hampden and Sydney hover over your heads: and the moment without doubt approaches when the French will bring congratulations to the national convention of Great Britain. Generous republicans! your appearance among us prepares a subject for history." In the subsequent correspondence between M. Chauvelin and Lord Grenville it was affirmed that "the French nation absolutely reject the idea of that false interpretation of the decree of the 19th of November, by which it might be supposed that the French republic should favor insurrections, or excite disturbance in any neutral or friendly country whatever." But the acts of the French convention were opposed to its professions. They had unquestionably the notion of extending their principles by force. On the 15th of December, 1792, they issued a decree which required the French generals to proclaim, wherever they marched, the abolition of all existing feudal and manorial rights; to declare the sovereignty of the people and the suppression of all existing authorities; to convoke the people for the establishment of a provisional government; and to place all public property under the safeguard of the French republic. The French armies were then marching into Holland, a country at peace with France. This outrageous decree proclaimed that those who would not accept liberty and equality, and would attempt to preserve princes or privileged orders, should not be entitled to the distinction which France had justly established between government and people, and ought to be treated according to the rigor of war and conquest. With this disposition to foreign aggression, it is not surprising that Lord Grenville, in his correspondence with M. Chauvelin, remonstrates against the opening of the Scheldt, and says, "This government, adhering to the maxims which it has followed for more than a century, will never see with indifference that France shall make herself, either directly or indirectly, sovereign of the Low Countries, or general arbitress of the rights and liberties of Europe. If France is really desirous of maintaining friendship and peace with England, she must show herself disposed to renounce her views of aggression and aggrandizement, and to confine herself within her own territory, without insulting other governments, without disturbing their tranquillity, without violating their rights."† This firm but not hostile language is employed by the English secretary of state, on the 31st of December; but on the 29th of that month—as the world was first apprised by Mr. Pitt himself in 1800—his views were still eminently pacific. The King of France had been accused at the bar of the convention, had made his defence by counsel, and Europe was waiting in alarm for the almost inevitable sentence of those who were thirsting for his blood, when the prime minister of this country, in answer to an application from Russia, stated to that power "the line of conduct to be followed previous to the commencement of hostilities, and with a view if possible to avert them." The answer to Russia was communicated to Prussia. This line of conduct, wholly opposed to a principle of interference, even at this moment of fearful suspense, was thus defined: "It appears on the whole, subject, however, to future consideration and discussion with the other powers, that the most advisable step to be taken would be

* "Court, etc., of George III.," vol. ii. p. 224.
† "Diaries, etc., of George Rose," p. 115.
‡ "Court of George III.," vol. ii. p. 228.
§ Macaulay, "Biography of Pitt."

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxxiv. col. 1307.
† Ibid., col. 255.

that sufficient explanation should be had with the powers at war with France, in order to enable those not hitherto engaged in the war to propose to that country terms of peace. That these terms should be the withdrawing their armies within the limits of the French territory; the abandoning their conquests; the rescinding any acts injurious to the sovereignty or rights or any other nation; and the giving, in some unequivocal manner, a pledge of their intention no longer to foment troubles, or to excite disturbances against other governments. In return for these stipulations, the different powers of Europe, who should be parties to this measure, might engage to abandon all measures or views of hostility against France, or interference in their internal affairs, and to maintain a correspondence and intercourse of amity with the existing powers in that country, with whom such a treaty may be concluded. If, on the result of this proposal so made by the powers acting in concert, these terms should not be accepted by France, or being accepted should not be satisfactorily performed, the different powers might then engage themselves to each other to enter into active measures for the purpose of obtaining the ends in view; and it may be to be considered whether, in such case, they might not reasonably look to some indemnity for the expenses and hazards to which they would necessarily be exposed." * Mr. Pitt, after he had read this document, asked, "whether it is possible to conceive any measure to be adopted in the situation in which we then stood, which could more evidently demonstrate our desire, after repeated provocations, to preserve peace, on any terms consistent with our safety; or whether any sentiment could now be suggested which would have more plainly marked our moderation, forbearance, and sincerity." Mr. Fox, on that occasion, asked, "whether if this paper had been communicated to Paris at the end of the year 1792, instead of Petersburg, it would not have been productive of most seasonable benefits to mankind; and, informing the French in time of the means by which they might have secured the mediation of Great Britain, have not only avoided the rupture with this country, but have also restored general peace to the continent?" Mr. Wilberforce was aware of the existence of this communication. He writes, in 1801, "I never was so earnest with Mr. Pitt on any other occasion as I was in my entreaties before the war broke out, that he would declare openly in the House of Commons that he had been, and then was, negotiating this treaty." † We may perhaps be able to discover that there were complications of party at home, which had a material influence on Mr. Pitt's policy, at the precise time when, individually, he was clinging to the principle of non-intervention. But it will be necessary, before touching upon this question, to take a brief retrospect of the progress of the French Revolution from the period of the decree of the 22d of September, by which France became a republic.

The king and his family were close prisoners in the Temple from the 13th of August. Their apartments were in the gloomy tower of this ancient house of the Templars. The furniture was scanty, the accommodations mean and wretched. The garden, in which they were allowed to walk at stated times, attended by guards, was rank with vegetation, and not in the trim state represented in French engravings. At first the royal family were not treated very harshly, though they were watched by brutal jailers, and had no communication with the outer world. All the ladies of the court had been dismissed. They had no personal attendants, with the exception of Cléry, who acted as the king's valet. He was a republican, but became touched with pity for the sorrows of the captives, and was a faithful friend to the unhappy monarch. After the legislative assembly was dissolved, the convention permitted the commune to make the position of the patient Louis and the proud Marie-Antoinette as miserable as vulgar tyranny could render it. At the end of September six municipal officers had entered the tower in which the king and the queen, their two children, and the king's sister, had supped together, and read an order of the commune which decreed that the king should have no further intercourse with his family. They were separated in an agony of grief, and the king was told the next morning that he must not expect even to see his children again. That night the queen passed in unavailing lamentation. But she had taken her resolution. She refused all food, declaring that she would perish with hunger if the commune persisted in separating her from her husband. The order of separation was then partially revoked. Louis and his family were allowed to meet three times a day at their meals; but a municipal guard was always present, and prevented any confidential words from passing between them. They were forbidden to speak low or in a foreign language. As the crisis approached which was contemplated as the final blow to royalty, precautions, rendered wholly unnecessary by the religious principles and the calm temper of the king, were taken by the commune to prevent any attempt at self-destruction. Every cutting instrument was taken away from the prisoners. The queen and princesses could no longer repair the small stock of clothing with which they were provided. They were deprived of pen, ink, and paper. The little boy could no longer be taught by his father to write. Persecuted as they were, the king showed no impatience under his captivity. The queen was not without hope that the pity which she had inspired in two of the officers of the commune might lead to some measures for the escape of herself and those she loved from the fate which seemed impending over them.

The proceedings of the convention were regularly published in the newspapers of Paris, whose contents were bawled out by the hawkers under the windows of the temple. Cléry could thus obtain some vague information, which he communicated to Louis. On the 6th of November a report was made to the convention by an extraordinary committee "on the crimes of the late king." On the 7th a committee of legislation also reported on the question whether Louis can be tried for the crimes which he is charged with having committed on the constitutional throne, and by whom must he be tried. The report concluded by proposing, as the basis of a decree, that Louis could be tried, and that he should be tried by the national convention. This question was debated through the month of November, some maintaining the inviolability of the king; others pitying him; but scarcely one daring to defend him; for the belief was general that he was the cause of the invasion of France. It was decreed that the trial should proceed; and on the 6th of December a committee was appointed to prepare an act of impeachment against Louis Capet. It was then resolved that he should be brought to the bar of the convention to hear this document read, and to answer questions which should be put to him by the president. He was then to be remanded, and, after being finally heard, the convention would pronounce on his fate, by calling on each member separately for his vote, which should be given openly at the tribune. On the 11th of December the king was brought to the convention in the carriage of Chambon, the mayor of Paris. He was there allowed a seat. The impeachment was read; the questions, many of them very vague, were answered with precision by the king wherever they were capable of an answer. He was not always candid; but the principle of English law that an accused person should not be called upon to criminate himself will be his justification with us. He asked for counsel, and after some debate the request was granted. There was an interval of fifteen days before the king again appeared at the bar of the convention. The amount of commiseration which Louis was likely to receive from his judges was sufficiently manifested by a decree of the 15th of December, that he should only see his children, and that the children should not see their mother or their aunt till his final examination. This was to isolate the poor king from all his family, for he would not separate the children from their mother.

Lord Malmesbury enters in his diary of the 22d of December, "Fox carried me home; he expressed great horror at the *décret* of the 15th December, issued by the national convention." The feelings of men of all parties in the British parliament as to the probable issue of the trial of Louis XVI. had been strongly expressed in proceedings on the 20th of December. On the 15th a motion of Mr. Fox for an address to the king to send a minister to Paris to treat with those persons who exercise provisionally the functions of executive government in France, had been rejected without a division, after a debate in which the passions of those who took very different views of the French Revolution had been called forth in a way which showed how unlikely was the question of war or peace to be treated with calmness. But there was little hesitation, five days later, as to the expression of an unanimous opinion of the public sentiment of England on the situation of the King of France and of his family. Mr. Sheridan said "there was not one man of any description or

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxxiv. col. 1314.
† "Life of Wilberforce," vol. ii. p. 3.

party who did not deprecate, and who would not deplore, the fate of those persecuted and unfortunate victims, should the apprehended catastrophe take place." He desired some expression of opinion that might avert the calamity that seemed impending, by producing an influence on the public mind of France. Mr. Burke held such an expression to be useless. "The king was in the custody of assassins, who were both his accusers and his judges, and his destruction was inevitable." Mr. Fox asked whether some mode could not be proposed for obtaining an unanimous vote of both houses, conveying the unanimous opinion of the country? Mr. Pitt moved that there be laid on the table a copy of the instructions of the 17th of August, signifying to Earl Gower that he should quit Paris. That document was presented on the 21st, when Mr. Pitt said that he had at first thought that the best mode in which the sense of that house could be expressed would be by a vote, which might reach the whole of Europe, and whose influence might extend to France; but he had since doubted whether a strong and indignant expression of opinion might not hurry on the commission of the very crime which it was the intention of that house to exert their influence to prevent. He thought it would be a better mode simply to allow the paper to remain on the table of the house. That paper, our readers will have seen, expressed an earnest and anxious hope that the royal family would be secure from any acts of violence.* Windham, Fox, Sheridan, and Burke expressed their concurrence in the proposal; and no one was more hearty than Fox in "condemning, from the beginning to the end, the proceedings against the unfortunate King of France." But this expression of the unanimous feeling of the British parliament evinced no determination on the one side, no apprehension on the other, that war would be inevitable if the dreaded event took place—"that dreadful and final consummation which could not fail to excite universal horror and indignation"—to use the words in which Mr. Pitt expressed this general opinion. But horror and indignation at acts affecting the domestic condition of another nation are no reasons for going to war. An armament was proposed; but an increase of the navy did not necessarily imply war; and Fox declared that he was not willing that we should negotiate unarmed.

On the 26th of December an Alien Bill was read a third time in the House of Lords. On that occasion Lord Loughborough, who, in February, 1792, was opposed to the ministry of Mr. Pitt, as he had been systematically opposed since the defeat of the coalition, expressed himself in those terms of extreme violence against the contagion of French principles, which assumed that domestic insurrection, supported by foreign aid, was an evil to be averted even by stronger measures than this bill for the regulation of aliens. Lord Loughborough, in May, was ardently laboring to promote an union in administration between Pitt and Fox, in the hope that through this union he might obtain the great seal. That negotiation failed.† The intriguing and ambitious lawyer was now laboring, with equal ardor, to reach the same crowning glory of his professional life, by inducing a large number of the Whigs, and other remnants of the coalition ministry, to separate from Fox, and support the administration of Pitt, assuming that the minister would be induced to depart from his system of non-intervention in the affairs of France, and at once adopt the war policy which Burke had advocated with such persevering vehemence. That policy would involve stringent measures against "the disaffected," under which convenient term the alarmists comprehended all those who advocated parliamentary reform, and who did not believe that improvement was identical with revolution. The course of Lord Loughborough's political manœuvres has been made tolerably clear by the revelations of recent years. On the 20th of December we find the Duke of Portland, who was regarded as the head of the Whig party, decidedly against Lord Loughborough taking the great seal.‡ This was a sufficient intimation that the time was not yet ripe for Loughborough carrying over a large section of the opposition to the support of the government. On the 21st, on the second reading of the Alien Bill, the Duke of Portland, although supporting that special measure, evinced no intention of giving a general support to the ministry of Mr. Pitt. On the 22d it was stated, at a meeting of that portion of the Whigs who had adopted the opinions of Burke, that the duke was of opinion that it was not yet time to break with Fox; but Loughborough said that such conduct, inasmuch as they were considered to belong to the Portland party, involved all in the unpopularity and disgrace attending Fox's principles. Burke said that the Duke of Portland was the instrument of Fox's schemes, or rather of Fox's abettors. Burke added, what was clearly a gross injustice to his old friend, that those abettors had made Fox believe that a government like ours was not a proper one for great talents to display themselves in, and that they had thus made him approve the French Revolution.* On the 23d Loughbourgh and his friends looked over the Red Book, and found that they could reckon upon a hundred and seven members of the House of Commons, and upon forty peers, who would concur in their way of thinking and unite in a representation to the Duke of Portland, which would accomplish the desired separation from Fox and the few Whigs that he continued to influence.† Still the duke hesitated to declare himself, "from predilection and tenderness to Fox." On the 27th Loughborough wrote to Malmesbury a bitter letter of complaint: "The Duke of Portland hesitates whether he shall withdraw his countenance from a party formed by Lord Lansdowne, Fox, and Grey, under the auspices of Chauvelin."‡ On the 1st of January Loughborough was "eager for a further éclaircissement with the duke, and for laying the whole before the public." Malmesbury urged him to wait till after the recess. On the 10th, Loughborough showed Malmesbury a letter he had received from Dundas, pressing him to decide as to taking the great seal, "saying that he and Pitt had abstained renewing the subject for some time past, under the plea that there were still hopes of having the Duke of Portland; that this was now considered to be at an end."§ The astute politician was still disposed to wait till he could bring over the Duke of Portland. On the 14th Loughborough saw Dundas, and told him that if he then took the seals he could only expect that forty or fifty members would join the government, and as many, now with the government, would probably go into opposition. On the 20th Loughborough had an interview of an hour and a half with Pitt; and he reported to Malmesbury that war was a decided measure; that Pitt saw it was inevitable; and that the sooner it was begun the better, that we might possess ourselves of the French islands; that the nation was disposed for war; that we were in much greater forwardness than the French; that he had two millions in hand.‖ Very shortly after this interview Lord Loughborough had secured the adhesion of the Duke of Portland; and the reward was the great seal, which the king delivered to him on the 28th of January. If it be necessary to seek any other immediate cause for the war than the conviction of a political necessity arising out of the inevitable circumstances of the time, may we not believe that Mr. Pitt ceased to struggle with his own pacific inclinations when he saw that a warlike policy would give him a greater majority in parliament than any minister had previously commanded? On the 14th of January he had not this assurance in the position which Lord Loughborough held with the war party of the Whigs. On the 20th of January Lord Loughborough, in that interview of an hour and a half, was no doubt secure of his position, and came away with the news that "war was a decided measure." That Loughborough influenced the decision can scarcely be doubted. The king had forgiven the shifty lawyer's conduct on the regency question, when he went further than any man in the advocacy of the absolute right of the Prince of Wales to take the regal authority without restrictions. Loughborough had during a little year turned from an admirer of the French National Assembly to be the most zealous of anti-Jacobins, and had thus made his peace at St. James's.

The vast majority which Pitt acquired by the accession of the Whigs who seceded from Fox was supported by the greater portion of the higher and middle classes, who had an extravagant dread of the possible progress of French principles, and not a sufficient dread of the certain evils of a contest that would entail the most fearful sacrifices upon the humbler classes, and thus produce real discontent in the place of theoretical disaffection. A very short time before this the English ministers, although sufficiently alive to the danger of ex-

* *Ante*, p. 980. † Ibid., p. 976.
‡ Malmesbury, "Diaries," etc., vol. ii. p. 447.

* Malmesbury, vol. ii. p. 448. † Ibid., p. 450. ‡ Ibid., p. 457.
§ Ibid., p. 466. In the history of such transactions, exact dates are important. Lord Campbell gives the 4th as the date when Loughborough showed this letter. ‖ Ibid., p. 470.

treme democratic opinions, saw their best safety in the improvement of the condition of the mass of the people. Lord Grenville, at no more distant period than the 7th of November, wrote, in fraternal confidence, these remarkable words: "All my ambition is that I may at some time hereafter, when I am freed from all active concern in such a scene as this is, have the inexpressible satisfaction of being able to look back upon it, and to tell myself that I have contributed to keep my own country at least a little longer from sharing in all the evils of every sort that surround us. I am more and more convinced that this can only be done by keeping wholly and entirely aloof, and by watching much at home, but doing very little indeed; endeavoring to nurse up in the country a real determination to stand by the constitution when it is attacked, as it most infallibly will be if these things go on; and, above all, trying to make the situation of the lower orders among us as good as it can be made." * It must have been perfectly clear to a minister as sagacious and experienced as Mr. Pitt that the remarkable prosperity which had been built up during a peace of ten years would receive a severe shock from the cost of war—that "the situation of the lower orders" would be materially deteriorated by the pressure of taxation and the interruption of industry. But Mr. Pitt thought that the contest would be soon decided; that revolutionary France would quickly exhaust her resources for war; that the opinions of the revolution were only dangerous when they were "armed opinions." In the retrospect of the origin of the war which he took in 1800, when he maintained that he had labored to the last "to preserve peace on any terms consistent with our safety," he confessed that the government had been too slow in anticipating the danger which was to be apprehended from France: "We might even then have seen, what facts have since but too incontestably proved, that nothing but vigorous and open hostility can afford complete and adequate security against revolutionary principles, while they retain a proportion of power sufficient to furnish the means of war." It was revolutionary principles in arms for conquest and rapine that statesmen dreaded. The terror of domestic revolution, through the contagion of revolutionary principles extending beyond a small band of obscure republican enthusiasts, was a nightmare that only disturbed the sleep of alarmists—the "thoroughly frightened," who talked as familiarly of "fire, famine, and slaughter," "as maids of thirteen do of puppy-dogs." These mistook "the meetings and idle rant of such sedition as shrank appalled from the sight of a constable, for the dire murmuring and strange consternation which precedes the storm or earthquake of national discord. . . . . The panic of property had been struck in the first instance for party purposes; and when it became general its propagators caught it themselves, and ended in believing their own lie—even as the bulls in Borodale are said sometimes to run mad with the echo of their own bellowing." †

The state of public opinion in England, at the period immediately preceding the commencement of the war, may be traced in the proceedings of "associations in support of the constitution," and in counter resolutions of societies such as those which Burke denounced in 1790. These clubs, really insignificant in themselves, were raised into importance by the exaggerated alarm of the "friends of established law and peaceable society," and the inopportune enthusiasm of the advocates of parliamentary reform. At a meeting of "gentlemen at the Crown and Anchor in the Strand, November 20th, 1792, John Reeves, Esq. in the chair," the danger was set forth "to which the public peace and order are exposed by the circulation of mischievous opinions, founded upon plausible but false reasoning." This circulation of dangerous doctrines was alleged to be mainly carried on by the industry of clubs and societies; and these opinions were held to be conveyed in the terms, "the Rights of man—Liberty and Equality—no King—no Parliament." On the 29th of November "The London Corresponding Society" published an address, denouncing "the artifices of a late aristocratic association;" declaring that "whoever shall attribute to us the expressions of no king—no parliament, or any design of invading the property of other men, is guilty of a wilful, an impudent, and a malicious falsehood;" but adding, "we admit and we declare that we are friends to civil liberty, and therefore to natural equality, both of which we consider as the rights of man." "The Society for Constitutional Information," on the 14th of December, resolved that it disclaimed the idea of making any change by violence and public commotion; "but that it trusts to the good sense of the people, when they shall be fully enlightened on the subject, to procure, without disturbing the public tranquillity, an effectual and permanent reform." "The Society of the Friends of the People," at a meeting on the 15th of December, at which Samuel Whitbread took the chair, held themselves bound to persevere in their endeavors to accomplish, through the known channels of the constitution, an effectual reform in the construction of the House of Commons; but remonstrating against the endeavors "to confound the idea of a reform in parliament with that of disaffection to the established constitution of this kingdom, as if a real representation of the Commons were incompatible with the security of a limited monarchy; as if the crown were not safe with an honest unbiassed House of Commons; or as if the idea of such reform had been at all times reprobated, as it now is, by those who occupy the highest station of profit and confidence under the crown." * At this period of political heat the trial of Thomas Paine, upon a prosecution for libel in publishing "The Rights of Man," took place on the 18th of December. "No one," says Lord Campbell, "could justly complain of it as an infringement of public liberty." The eloquent defence of Erskine did not influence the decision of the jury, who returned a verdict of guilty, even without waiting for the attorney-general to reply. This great advocate maintained as the basis of the liberty of the press, "that every man not intending to mislead, but seeking to enlighten others with what his own reason and conscience, however erroneously, have dictated to him as a truth, may address himself to the universal reason of a whole nation, either upon the subject of government in general or upon that of our own particular country." But the argument was too broad for those excited times. The clamor against the republican had already condemned his book, in some respects very justly.

At the time of this trial Paine was a member of the National Convention of France, and he took occasion to write an insolent letter to the attorney-general, in which he says, "The duty I am now engaged in is of too much importance to permit me to trouble myself about your prosecution. . . . . The time, sir, is becoming too serious to play with court prosecutions and sport with national rights. The terrible examples that have taken place here upon men who, less than a year ago, thought themselves as secure as any prosecuting judge, jury, or attorney-general can now do in England, ought to have some weight with men in your situation." The attorney-general read this letter to prove the authorship of the "Rights of Man," therein avowed by Paine; but it was quite clear that language such as this would insure the conviction of this furious democrat, who thus threatened with the perils of the lamp-post and the guillotine those who were discharging their constitutional functions. Still less would a jury bear the scurrilous allusions to "Mr. Guelph and his profligate sons." The king was at this time almost universally popular. The mistakes of the early years of his reign, when he sought to govern by secret influence and favoritism, had been forgotten. The odium attached to his pertinacity in the American war had been chiefly confined to statesmen, who addressed themselves to the reason and justice of the few rather than to the passions of the many. The coalition had been distasteful to the people; and the young minister chosen by the king had fully vindicated the choice. The example of the court had produced a considerable reformation in the manners of the higher classes; open profligacy was a bar to royal favor. The simple tastes of the king; his domestic piety and decorum; his habitual attention to the best pursuits of a country gentleman in his love of agriculture; his unrestrained intercourse with his subjects on public occasions; even his garrulity and familiar curiosity, made him really an object of affectionate attachment to the great bulk of the people. They did not believe him to be a great king, but they knew him to be a good king, as far as they could judge of royal attributes. His narrow views upon large political questions, such as that of the admission of Roman Catholics to civil offices, were a recommendation to the majority. They probably had no very exalted opinion of his understanding; which, however, was far more acute

* "Court, etc. of George III.," vol. ii. p. 224.
† Coleridge, "Friend," Essay I.

* For these various resolutions, etc., see "Annual Register," 1793, pp. *155 to *170.

than it has been the fashion to regard it in very recent years. They laughed at the ribaldry of Peter Pindar; but they were not convinced by it that their king was a simpleton because he was exhibited at Whitbread's brewery exclaiming, "What's this? hæ, hæ! what's that? what's this? what's that?" or as hunting with "Parson Young," and when a fatal accident occurred to his reverend friend, ejaculating, "What, what? Young dead? Take him up, and put him home to bed;" or learning from the widow of Salthill the way to catch a mouse in a trap baited with toasted cheese; or taking shelter in a farm-kitchen, and making the discovery how the apple got into the dumpling. These were not the things to abate one jot of the king's popularity—perhaps they increased it. The sneer of Paine at the "capacity of Mr. Guelph" fell harmless. The king had courage and common-sense—qualities perhaps more important to a constitutional sovereign than great intellectual refinement. The nation clung to him as representing the principles most antagonistic to French philosophy.

The Alien Bill, which had been read a third time in the House of Lords, was read a second time in the House of Commons on the 28th of December. On that occasion Burke "mentioned the circumstance of three thousand daggers having been bespoke at Birmingham by an Englishman, of which seventy had been delivered. It was not ascertained how many of these were to be exported, and how many were intended for home consumption." The parliamentary history then adds, "Here Mr. Burke drew out a dagger which he had kept concealed, and with much vehemence of action threw it on the floor." The orator, pointing to the dagger, said, "This is what you are to gain with an alliance with France; wherever their principles are introduced their practice must follow."* The Alien Bill, after much debate, was passed on the 4th of January. On the 7th of that month M. Chauvelin, styling himself "minister plenipotentiary from the French Republic," addressed a note to Lord Grenville, remonstrating against this bill as a violation of the treaty of commerce, by which the subjects of the two nations had liberty to come and go freely and securely without license or passport. He says, "It is thus that the British government has first chosen to break a treaty to which England owes a great part of its actual prosperity, burthensome to France." Lord Grenville returned the note, stating that M. Chauvelin had therein assumed a character which is not acknowledged; he being in "no otherwise accredited to the king than in the name of his most Christian majesty." In a letter of the 9th of January Lord Grenville stated, as he had stated in a private conversation of the 29th of November, that "he would not decline receiving non-official communications, which, without deciding the question either of the acknowledgment of the new government in France, or of receiving a minister accredited by her, might offer the means of removing the misunderstanding which already manifested itself between the two countries." On the 13th M. Chauvelin informed Lord Grenville that the executive council, "to discard every reproach of having stopped, by the mere want of formality, a negotiation on the success of which the tranquillity of two great nations is depending, have taken the resolution of sending letters of credence to Citizen Chauvelin, which would furnish him the means of treating in all the severity of diplomatic forms." He then enters into the various points of difference, and thus concludes: "If the explanations of France appear insufficient, and if we are still obliged to hear a haughty language; if hostile preparations are continued in the English ports; after having exhausted every means to preserve peace, we will prepare for war." Lord Grenville, still protesting against the unofficial form of the notifications, answers that "a threat of declaring war against England, because she thinks proper to augment her forces, as well as a declaration of breaking a solemn treaty, because England has adopted, for her own security, precautions of the same nature as those which are already established in France,† could neither of them be considered in any other light than that of new offences, which, while they subsisted, would preclude all negotiation." On the 17th of January M. Chauvelin required to be informed whether his Britannic majesty would receive his letters of credence; and on the 20th Lord Grenville replied, "I am to inform you that his majesty does not think fit, under the present circumstances, to receive those letters:" and he added that, "after what has just passed in France," M. Chauvelin must return, as a private person, to the general mass of foreigners in England. On the 17th of January a majority of the National Convention had pronounced for the death of the King of France. "What had just passed" in France was followed up on the 21st by the execution of Louis; and on the 24th M. Chauvelin was ordered, by direction of the king in council, to retire from this country within eight days.

We have to take up the thread of a painful narrative, from the time when the king went back to the Temple, after having appeared at the bar of the convention on the 11th of December. He named two persons as his counsel—Target and Tronchet. Target had a cowardly dread of accepting the offer, and his place was taken by the venerable Malesherbes, who volunteered his services to the president of the convention, saying that he had been twice called to the councils of Louis, when to serve him was an object of ambition; and that he owed him the same service when it might be considered dangerous. With Malesherbes and Tronchet, Desèze was associated. There was no impediment offered to their free consultations with the king; and a fortnight was spent in preparations for the defence. On the 26th of December the king again appeared at the bar of the convention. Desèze conducted the defence. His arguments were logical, but he was unequal to the task of moving an assembly that was swayed more by passion and sentiment than by reason. He said, "History will sit in judgment on your judgment, and the judgment of history will be the judgment of ages." His will, which the suffering king made before this conclusion of a pretended trial the issue of which was pre-determined, is sufficient to fix the judgment of history as to the personal character of this kind-hearted king. In this solemn document, written on the 25th of December, he says, "I recommend my son, if he has the misfortune to become king, to remember that he owes himself to the happiness of his fellow-citizens; to forget all hatred and resentment, and especially that which relates to the misfortunes and sorrows I now undergo." It was with perfect consistency that Louis declared, in the few words that he addressed to the convention after his counsel had spoken, that his greatest grief was that he should have been accused of wishing to shed the blood of his people—"I, who have exposed myself in order to avert the shedding of one drop of their blood." For many days there were stormy discussions in the convention, on propositions made by those who were afraid to declare Louis not guilty, but who wished to save him without compromising themselves. One proposed that the convention should decide on the guilt of Louis, but refer to the primary assemblies the question of his death or his exile. The principal Girondins, speaking through their great orator, Vergniaud, proposed that the judgment which should be pronounced upon Louis, whether that of guilty or not guilty, should be submitted to the ratification of the people. It was at length decided that three questions should be determined by the vote at the tribune of each member, on the *appel nominal*—the call by name. Upon the first question put on the 15th of January, "Is Louis Capet guilty of conspiracy against the liberty of the nation, and of attempts against the general security of the state," six hundred and eighty-three members replied, "Yes, Louis is guilty." On the second question, "Shall the decision of the convention be submitted to the ratification of the people," two hundred and eighty-one voted for the appeal; four hundred and twenty-three against it. The third question, "What shall be the sentence?" was to be decided on the morrow. The convention during the whole of that day had been occupied with various preliminary discussions, especially upon a proposition that two thirds of the votes should be necessary to constitute a majority. This proposition was rejected. It was eight o'clock in the evening before the voting commenced. The fearful ceremony which every member had to go through in the presence of a blood-thirsty audience in the galleries, and a furious mob without doors, was continued through the night, and was renewed the next day. The greater number of the Girondins, including Vergniaud, joined the Mountain, in voting for the sentence of death. The one prince of the blood, who had laid down his title to become a member of the convention, voted for death.* The one

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxx. col. 189. See note to this chapter.

† The system of passports, introduced during the Revolution, was rigidly applied to British subjects, in contravention of the treaty of commerce.

* There are some interesting details of this crowning infamy of

Englishman who had been elected a deputy, Thomas Paine, voted for imprisonment, and banishment at the peace. It was late at night before the votes were counted. Three hundred and eighty-seven were for death without any condition; three hundred and thirty-four were for imprisonment on conditional death. Vergniaud, as president, declared the sentence. On the 19th the question was put, "Shall the execution of the sentence of Louis Capet be deferred?" For the suspension of the sentence there were three hundred and ten members; for its immediate execution there were three hundred and eighty. On the 20th of January the decision of the convention was officially communicated to Louis. He requested a delay of three days to prepare himself to appear before his Maker; he requested that he should have a priest, whose name he wrote down; he requested to see his family without witnesses, and that they might be allowed to leave France. The convention refused the respite. They granted the priest, and the permission to see his family, which permission the brutal commune refused to have carried out, causing them to be watched through a glass-door. They "authorized the executive council to reply to Louis, that the nation, always magnanimous and always just, would consider the situation of his family." We spare our readers the heart-rending details of the parting of the king with his wife, his son and daughter, and his sister. The priest that Louis had chosen was the Abbé Edgeworth. He attended the king to the scaffold; and as the knife of the guillotine was about to fall, exclaimed, "Son of St. Louis, ascend to heaven." This tragedy was completed at ten o'clock of the morning of the 21st of January.

On the 28th of January a message was delivered to parliament, in which the king stated the indispensable necessity of a further augmentation of forces by sea and land, the correspondence between Lord Grenville and M. Chauvelin having been at the same time presented. Mr. Pitt moved an address of thanks, of which the following passages appear to have shut the door to any further negotiation with the existing government of France:

"To offer to his majesty our heartfelt condolence on the atrocious act lately perpetrated at Paris, which must be viewed by every nation in Europe as an outrage on religion, justice, and humanity; and as a striking and dreadful example of the effect of principles which lead to the violation of the most sacred duties, and are utterly subversive of the peace and order of all civil society.

"To assure his majesty that it is impossible for us not to be sensible of the views of aggrandizement and ambition, which, in violation of repeated and solemn professions, have been openly manifested on the part of France, and which are connected with the propagation of principles incompatible with the existence of all just and regular government; that, under the present circumstances, we consider a vigorous and effectual opposition to these views as essential to the security of everything which is most dear and valuable to us as a nation, and to the future tranquillity and safety of all other countries."

NOTE ON THE DAGGER-SCENE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Lord Eldon, then Sir John Scott, in a letter to his brother of the 17th of January, says, "You would hear of the dagger which Burke exhibited in the House of Commons. I have got the pattern specimen of that order, which I shall keep as a great curiosity." In a note to Twiss's Life of Lord Eldon, the inheritor of his title says, "On Lord Chancellor Eldon's death I found with his papers the dagger which, from conversations with him in the latter years of his life, I had understood to be the one thrown down by Burke in the House of Commons." But it appears that there were two specimens of this Birmingham manufacture, one of which was in the possession of Sir Charles Montolieu Lamb, the son of Sir James Bland Burgess, who was at that period under-secretary of state for the foreign department. The dagger-scene was the subject of a famous caricature by Gillray; and so characteristic a likeness of Burke was never produced as in this sketch.

This dagger-scene was in some respects a matter-of-fact affair—elevated into an approach to sublimity by the imagination of the orator, and, like many other sublime actions, treading close upon the ridiculous. It certainly, upon the face of the thing, does appear a proper subject for caricature, when the man upon whom the eyes of all Europe were fixed—who at that moment exercised more influence over public opinion than any speaker or writer who ever existed—a grave man well-stricken in years—should draw out a dagger from his pocket, and cast it upon the floor of the House of Commons. The occurrence has been called "a stroke of oratorical acting;" but it appears, from the circumstantial account by Sir Charles Lamb, that Burke's possession of the dagger was an accidental occurrence, and that the "acting" was at any rate unpremeditated. This dagger, "a foot long in the blade, and about five inches in the handle, of coarse workmanship, and might serve either as a dagger or a pike-head," according to Sir Charles Lamb, "was sent to a manufacturer at Birmingham, as a pattern, with an order to make a large quantity like it. At that time the order seemed so suspicious that, instead of executing it, he came to London and called on my father at the secretary of state's office, to inform him of it, and ask his advice; and he left the pattern with him. Just after, Mr. Burke called, on his way to the House of Commons, and upon my father mentioning the thing to him, borrowed the dagger, to show in the house. They walked down to the house together; and when Mr. Burke had made his speech, my father took the dagger again, and kept it as a curiosity."

CHAPTER CXC.

Retrospect of Indian affairs from 1785—Lord Cornwallis governor-general—Declaratory Bill—War with Tippoo—Retreat of Cornwallis in 1790—Capture of Seringapatam in 1791—Peace with Tippoo—The French West India Islands—Retrospect of discoveries in the Pacific—Otaheite—New Zealand—New South Wales—Canada—Military and naval establishments of Great Britain—France declares war.

It is desirable at this point, when our country was about to enter upon a war which developed events of unexampled interest, to take a brief view of some circumstances which may explain her position, without interruption to the progress of the general narrative of her history.

Let us first take up the thread of Indian affairs at the point at which we left them at the close of the administration of Hastings in 1785.

The India Bill of Mr. Pitt, while it gave the governor-general of Calcutta supreme authority over the other two presidencies, restricted him from commencing hostilities against any native prince, or from taking certain proceedings likely to lead to hostilities, without the express permission of the Court of Directors. In 1786 Lord Cornwallis was appointed governor-general; and he having objected that the limited powers of that officer prevented his efficiency, a measure was carried which gave greater authority to the governor-general to act, in cases of emergency, without the concurrence of the Supreme Council of Calcutta. For the first year and a half of Lord Cornwallis's administration he was enabled to give his uninterrupted attention to administrative improvements, in matters of finance especially. At the end of 1787 his tranquillity was somewhat disturbed. He writes, "The great warlike preparations of Tippoo, and the reports transmitted me by Sir Arch. Campbell that he meditated an attack upon me, and that he would be assisted by the French, made me tremble for my plans of economy and reform. The storm is, however, blown over."* At this period the governor-general was not very well prepared for warlike operations. The appearance of the native troops, he said, gave him the greatest satisfaction; but "the company's European troops are such miserable wretches that I am ashamed to acknowledge them for countrymen: out of the six battalions I do not think that I could complete one that would be fit for service." In the temporary apprehension of a war with France in 1787 the British government desired to send four regiments to India in the company's ships. The alarm soon came to an end; but the government at home did not think it safe to leave the defence of India solely to sepoys and to the company's inefficient European troops. The Board of Control resolved, therefore, to send out the

---

Egalité, in the journal of her life during the Revolution, by Mrs. Elliott, who had the misfortune of being the mistress of two of the most profligate men of Europe, the Prince of Wales and the Duke of Orleans. When this lady urged the duke to vote for the deliverance of his cousin, the king, he said sneeringly, "Certainly, and for my own death." He subsequently said, "he thought the king had been guilty by forfeiting his word to the nation, yet nothing should induce him to vote against him" on the final question of his sentence. After the execution of Louis, Mrs. Elliott said to the duke, "You, monseigneur, will die, like the poor king, on the scaffold." The duke replied, "The king has been tried, and he is no more. I could not prevent his death. . . . . I could not avoid doing what I have done. I am, perhaps, more to be pitied than you can form an idea of. I am more a slave of faction than anybody in France. But from this instant let us drop the subject."—pp. 117-118-127.

* Cornwallis's "Correspondence," vol. i. p. 316.

four regiments at the charge of the company for transport and maintenance; and the company as stoutly refused to bear the charge. Mr. Pitt, on the 25th of February, 1788, brought in a bill "for removing any doubt respecting the power of the commissioners for the affairs of India, to direct that the expense of raising, transporting, and maintaining such troops as may be judged necessary for the security of the British territories and possessions in the East Indies, should be defrayed out of the revenues arising from the said territories and possessions." This proposition gave rise to animated debates in both houses. It was contended that there would be an end to the East India Company and all their property if such a bill were passed. Mr. Fox declared that the Declaratory Bill was "an insidious attempt to assume the same powers that his bill would have given to his Board of Commissioners, but in a manner less open and much more dangerous to the constitution." The real bearing of the question was expressed in a pleasantry of Sir James Johnstone: "The present dispute was a matrimonial quarrel between Lord Control and Lady Leadenhall. He considered himself as a justice of peace before whom the parties had come to make up their differences; he was always disposed to side against power, and should give in favor of the lady. He saw no reason why Lord Control should be allowed to rob Lady Leadenhall of her pin-money." * The bill was passed.

At the beginning of February, 1790, Earl Cornwallis wrote to his brother, the bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, "The unprovoked attack which Tippoo has made upon our ally the Rajah of Travancore has, much against my inclination, forced us into a war. . . . It is a melancholy task to write this, and to see all the effects of my economy, and the regulation of the finances which cost me so much labor, destroyed in a few months." † On the 29th of December, 1789, Tippoo had stormed the lines of our ally. No one of the native princes was so formidable as Tippoo. His dominions of Mysore were very extensive, and were fully populated by Hindoos and Mohammedans. Many places were strongly fortified. His cavalry were those that had swept the Carnatic in 1780 as "a whirlwind;" his artillery was formidable, consisting of heavy ordnance drawn by elephants. To assist in carrying on the contest against this unscrupulous despot, Cornwallis concluded alliances with the Peishwa of the Mahrattas and the Nizam of the Deccan. General Meadows commanded the British army in the Carnatic, and General Abercrombie the army formed in the presidency of Bengal. Tippoo was compelled to return to his capital of Seringapatam; but nothing decisive against his power was effected in 1790. On the 29th of January, 1791, Lord Cornwallis assumed the command of the army, and moved from Vellout toward Vellore, with the intention of penetrating to the heart of Tippoo's dominions. On the 5th of March he invested Bangalore, about two hundred miles from Madras. On the march thither some shameful acts of pillage had been committed, which, in a general order, Lord Cornwallis described as "shocking and disgraceful outrages," as "scenes of horror, which, if they should be suffered to continue, must defeat all our hopes of success, and blast the British name with infamy." They were repressed by prompt measures of severity toward the marauders. Bangalore was taken by storm on the 21st of March. The army then moved forward, and on the 13th of May took up a position at Arikera on the banks of the Caveri, within nine miles of Seringapatam. Having crossed the river, Cornwallis attacked Tippoo on the 15th, and obtained a victory, driving the Mysoreans to seek refuge under the guns of their capital. The city was within view; but Cornwallis was not strong enough to besiege it. The expected contingent of the Mahrattas had not arrived. Abercrombie was at Periapatam, with ample stores of provisions; while the army of Cornwallis was suffering severe privations. They could not effect a junction, although Cornwallis, in the hope of doing so, had moved up the Caveri to Caniambaddy. In a private letter to his brother, the governor-general describes the causes of the retreat which he was now compelled to make: "I wish to tell you that my health has not suffered, although my spirits are almost worn out, and that if I cannot soon overcome Tippoo I think the plagues and the mortifications of this most difficult war will overcome me. You will have heard that after beating Tippoo's army, and driving him into the island of Seringapatam, I was obliged—by the famine which prevailed among our followers, and especially the bullock-drivers, by the sudden and astonishing mortality among our cattle, owing to the scarcity of forage and a contagious distemper which unhappily attacked them when they were too weak to resist it, and by the unexpected obstacles to my forming a junction with General Abercrombie, in time to attempt the enterprise before the rising of the river—to destroy my battering guns and to relinquish the attack of Seringapatam until the conclusion of the rains. Had the numerous Mahratta army, which joined me on the 26th of May unexpectedly and without my having received the smallest previous notice, arrived a fortnight sooner, our success would have been complete, and that event which Mr. Francis and Mr. Hippesley seem so much to apprehend—the destruction of Tippoo's power—would have actually taken place. It is, however, much crippled; and if he should not propose during the present rains such terms as the Allies can reasonably accept, I trust we shall take such precautions as will render our next move to Seringapatam effectual." *

The next move to Seringapatam was effectual. Reinforcements had been sent out from England; and during the autumn all the lines of communication for another march upon the capital of Tippoo had been opened. Some of the strong hill forts, especially Severndroog and Octradroog, had been stormed and taken by the troops under General Meadows. On the 25th of January Cornwallis, with 22,000 men, had united his force to the troops of the Nizam and the Mahrattas, and commenced his march from Severndroog. On the 5th of February he encamped about six miles northward of Seringapatam. The Mysorean army was encamped under its walls. It amounted to 5000 horse and 40,000 foot. The city was defended by three strong lines of works and redoubts, in which 300 pieces of artillery were planted. Cornwallis reconnoitred these lines on the morning of the 6th, and determined to storm them that night, with his own army, without communicating his plan to his allies. At eight o'clock the British moved in three columns to the attack, one column being led by Cornwallis himself. The moon was shining brilliantly; but the sun of the next day was declining before the firing ceased, and the whole line of forts to the north of the Caveri were in possession of the British forces. Tippoo retired within the walls of his capital. Preparations for the siege went vigorously on; but negotiations for peace were at the same time proceeding. The British commander, assured of his triumph, demanded that Tippoo should cede the half of his dominions; should pay a sum amounting to £3,000,000; should release all his prisoners; and should deliver his two sons as hostages. The sultan assembled his officers in the great mosque, and adjured them, by the sacred contents of the Koran, whether he should accept these hard terms. They all held that no reliance could be placed upon the troops, and that submission was inevitable. On the 23d of February the preliminaries of peace were signed; and on the 25th the two sons of Tippoo were surrendered to Lord Cornwallis. Mr. Ross, the editor of the Cornwallis correspondence, says that he had often heard the details of the scene from his father, General Ross, who was present: "The coolness and self-possession of the two boys, the eldest only ten years old, were most striking; and the more than paternal kindness of Lord Cornwallis not only impressed his own European and native attendants with admiration, but produced in the minds of Tippoo's Vakeels, and the other Mysorean spectators, feelings of regard which were never effaced." The definitive treaty of peace was signed on the 19th of March. The ceded territories were divided in equal portions between the company, the Nizam, and the Mahrattas. On the 4th of May Cornwallis wrote to his brother, "Our peace will no doubt be very popular in England. I see every day more reason to be satisfied with it. No termination of the war could, in my opinion, have been attended with more solid advantages to our interest; and the deference which was paid to us on the occasion, both by friends and enemies, has placed the British name and consequence in a light never before known in India." †

The subjection of Tippoo was most opportune. In all probability Cornwallis, who was blamed by some for not insisting upon harder terms, anticipated the probability that the French Revolution would involve England in war, and therefore he made peace while it was

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxvii. col. 109.
† Cornwallis's "Correspondence," vol. i. p. 494.

* "Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 98. † Ibid., p. 166.

in his power. When the war broke out he hurried to Madras. But his presence was unnecessary. Pondicherry had already been taken by Sir John Brathwaite; and the French had no longer a footing in India. The agents of the republic were nevertheless active, but they were unable, for several years, to move "Citizen Tippoo" into a course of open hostility.

In the decisive interview with Lord Loughborough, on the 20th of January, 1793, Mr. Pitt said that the sooner the war was begun the better, "that we might possess ourselves of the French islands." The French islands offered a paltry prize to be gained by such a tremendous risk. The West India islands in the possession of the French since the peace of 1783 were, Tobago, a small territory with an unhealthy climate; St. Lucia, even more unhealthy; Martinique, an important possession; and Guadaloupe and its dependencies. The great island of Hispaniola, or San Domingo, partly French and partly Spanish, was not a colony with which any nation would have been glad to meddle in its then disturbed condition. The imports into the island from France are stated to have amounted in 1789 to three millions sterling, and its exports to six millions, this commerce employing three hundred thousand tons of shipping and thirty thousand seamen.* An insurrection of the slaves took place in 1791, the seeds of which were sown by the French Revolution. The French planters and Creoles had talked of liberty and equality, and put on the tricolored cockade. They scorned the mulattoes, who, in 1790, engaged in a fruitless revolt. The negroes rose against their masters in August, 1791. This fair country went through scenes of bloody insurrection, and was plunged into a terrible anarchy, which worked itself, in course of time, under the leadership of remarkable men of the despised race, into a black republic. The massacres of 1791 were the impulses of vengeance for long suffering. They were urged in the British parliament as a reason for maintaining the slave trade; and the insurrection, which had become more formidable as it proceeded, created alarm even among the English abolitionists.†

At this time, when the approaching war with France led the government of Mr. Pitt to look to the necessity of defending our own colonial possessions, and to the hope of adding to their number by naval enterprises, there was little solicitude about those vast regions in the Pacific which the Spaniards and Portuguese had left undiscovered, but on which the standard of England was planted early in the reign of George III. The results of the voyages of discovery of Byron, Wallis, Carteret, and Cook were feebly and imperfectly followed up. Any system of colonization that could be permanently useful was not thought of. In most cases no system was attempted. The regions of unbounded extent and inexhaustible wealth which were nominally attached to the British crown derived small advantage from British civilization. The condition of the Australian possessions, seventy years ago, as contrasted with their present greatness, is one of the marvels of our history, which it is impossible to contemplate without patriotic emotion—without a feeling of the mighty destinies that were involved in the divine protection of the Anglo-Saxon race—in the growth of a community which, having built up its own civilization upon principles of rational liberty, went forth "to make new nations" of freemen, who would have ties of consanguinity, speaking the same language, and bound together by the same principles of government as the parent state. Continents and islands, compared with which, in extent of territory, Britain is but a speck in the ocean, have thus been conquered in the noblest of victories, the victories of peace. But the last generation little understood the value of the great nations they were founding. They had a dim sense of some material advantage that might be derived from the displacement of aborigines of the lowest type of savage life, but a dread of the ferocity of higher races, that in their fierce barbarism appeared incapable of being amalgamated with European habits and modes of thought.

The discoveries which have been attended with political and social consequences of which it is difficult to speak without apparent exaggeration, were originally impelled by the pure ardor of scientific inquiry. In August, 1768, Lieutenant James Cook was sent out in the ship Endeavor, by order of the British government, and at the request of the Royal Society, to find an appropriate spot in the South Seas to make observations upon the expected transit of Venus over the sun's disk, in June, 1769. Otaheite, the chief island of the Pacific, had been discovered by Wallis in 1767, and had been called "King George the Third's Island." Bougainville, a French navigator, had visited it before the time when Cook established an observatory for the transit on the northern cape of the island. The observations were made; and during a residence of three months the naturalists who had accompanied the expedition investigated the productions of the country, rich with the cocoa-nut, the sugar-cane, and the banana, and especially with the bread-fruit tree—that wonderful gift of heaven to a fertile climate, which might enable a happy race to subsist without all the manifold labors that are requisite to produce bread from corn. The natives, it was said, laughed when they were told of our tedious processes of ploughing, sowing, harrowing, reaping, threshing, grinding, and baking.* Cook, when he left Otaheite, discovered the group which he called "Society Islands," in honor of the learned body at whose instance he was sent out. But in that his first voyage he explored the coasts of a country which had been discovered by Tasman, a Dutch navigator, in 1642. From that time to 1769 no one had landed upon those two islands, now so familiar to us as New Zealand. Long neglected, this fine country had no regular settlement till 1840, when it became an accredited colony of the British government—a land henceforth to be inhabited by a great offshoot of the Anglo-Saxon stock, with all the manifold blessings of the religion, the knowledge, the industry of our own nation, whose process of civilization, under Roman colonizers, was far less rapid. The New Zealander himself, thirty years ago a clever cannibal, has already been absorbed into British citizenship by the all-dominant superiority of higher intellect and purer morals. But this great good has been accomplished by treating the New Zealander as an accountable being, with rights not to be taken from him by the rapacity of conquest. He has been dealt with as the proprietor of the soil; and the territory of the settlers has been purchased and not seized. The New Zealanders, by far the highest in capacity of the barbarous tribes, have, in their brief colonization of twenty years, manifested the possibility of raising a native race to an appreciation of the value of what constitutes civilization, by imparting to them the blessings on which we pride ourselves as Christians and freemen.

The Dutchmen had discovered New Holland, but they left it unexplored. Cook minutely surveyed the eastern coast, which he called New South Wales. The naturalists of the expedition, Mr. Joseph Banks and Dr. Solander, found many curious plants in an inlet of this coast, which they denominated "Botany Bay." What a word of terror was "Botany Bay," when, in 1792, there were only sixty-seven free settlers in New South Wales. When the American colonies became independent, and even before their independence, they refused to receive "those unfortunate individuals who were convicted of such smaller felonies as are too frequent in a country where, from the freedom of the government, no strict police can be established."† There was a very summary remedy for the higher offences, such as stealing in a dwelling-house above the value of five shillings—death. The capital-punishment system grew somewhat odious, and the system of the hulks was more generally adopted. At last it was recollected that Captain Cook had found a convenient place to which criminals, not worthy of Tyburn, might be banished; and so, from 1787 to 1792, about five thousand convicts had been sent to New South Wales and Norfolk Island. In the first years of the colony these wretched creatures were literally slaves—employed in clearing woods to gain a spot for cultivation; half starved—with no hope of escape, with the sea before them, and a boundless waste behind. The "Botany Bay Eclogues" of Southey, written in 1794, open with this lament of a female convict:

> "Once more to daily toil, once more to wear
> The livery of shame, once more to search
> With miserable task this savage shore."

Contrast the felon of Sydney Cove with the prosperous merchants and artisans of Sydney; contrast the miserable outcast flying for his life to the deserts of the kangaroo, with the flock-master beckoning his thousands of sheep on the fertile plains which he calls his own; contrast England paying millions for the transport of cou-

* Speech of Mr. Baillie, "Parliamentary History," vol. xxix. col. 1073.
† "Wilberforce Correspondence," vol. i. p. 89.

* Boswell's Johnson, May 7, 1773.
† Sinclair, "History of the Revenue," vol. ii. p. 102.

victs, with England receiving new impulses to her industry from the Australian gold fields. The most extravagant dreams in 1793 of the believers in the probable results of commercial and colonizing enterprise never could picture any change approaching that gradual result of British energy, "which converted a transmarine jail into one of the greatest communities of free men on the earth." *

The very remote possibility of founding a great empire in Australia when the flag of England was first hoisted on the shores of Sydney Cove in 1788, could offer no prospect of compensation for the loss of our American colonies. Canada, at the time when war with France was imminent, was not wholly to be relied upon for loyalty to her conquerors, with her mixed French population, and with her proximity to the United States, whose people, if not her government, were rather too much enamored of the ideal liberty of the French Republic to open their eyes to its aggressions. Britain must rely upon herself alone. She would persist in submitting to hard bargains with mercenary despotisms to make them fight for their own existence; but she would mainly have to depend upon her own right arm. Her military establishment was not equal to any sudden emergency. "It certainly was impolitic," says Sir John Sinclair, "reducing the peace establishment of this country so low as it was in 1792, when from the state of France it was evident that all Europe was likely to get into a convulsed state." † The military expenditure of that year was under two millions. The expected rupture with Spain in 1790 and with Russia in 1791 had occasioned great activity in the English dockyards; and an improved plan of providing imperishable stores in the magazines had enabled ships to be quickly equipped for service. The British fleet, at the commencement of 1793, included 115 ships of the line, carrying 8718 guns. The ships of the French line were 76, carrying 6002 guns.‡ The British navy, at the commencement of 1793, comprised 411 vessels of all rates, of which only 135 were in commission. § "At no previous period had France possessed so powerful a navy," says Mr. James. The English fleet was not so readily manned as the French fleet. The appeals to republican enthusiasm to fit out privateers were more stimulating than the sober addresses to the loyalty of our mercantile classes. On the 31st of December the French minister of marine addressed a letter to the friends of liberty in the seaports: "The government of England is arming. . . . The king and his parliament intend to make war against us. Will the English republicans suffer it? Already these free men show their discontent, and the repugnance which they have to bear arms against their brothers the French. Well! we will fly to their succor; we will make a descent on the island; we will lodge there fifty thousand caps of liberty; we will plant there the sacred tree; and we will stretch out our arms to our republican brethren. The tyranny of their government shall soon be destroyed." M. Chauvelin returned to Paris with the same wild notions of the amount of disaffection. He judged, as foreigners are too apt to judge, that our freedom of writing and speaking—the safety-valves of the political machine—indicated violence and revolt. The war was probably inevitable, but the French convention took the initiative in declaring war. On the 11th of February a message from the king was delivered to the two houses, in which it was stated that "the assembly now exercising the powers of government in France have, without previous notice, directed acts of hostility to be committed against the persons and property of his majesty's subjects, in breach of the law of nations, and of the most positive stipulations of treaty; and have since, on the most groundless pretensions, declared war against his majesty and the United Provinces."

CHAPTER CXCI.

Resolutions proposed by Mr. Fox against war with France—Commercial distress—Parliamentary reform opposed by Mr. Pitt—Traitorous Correspondence Bill—Pitt, Burke, Fox—The diversity of their views of England's policy—Sanguine expectations of warlike success—Dumouriez in Holland—Battle of Neerwinden—Defection of Dumouriez—Measures of the Jacobins—Revolutionary Tribunal—Committee of Public Salvation—Excessive prices of commodities in Paris—Produced by the depreciation of assignats—Plunder of the shops—Law of maximum—Forced levy of troops—La Vendée in insurrection—Mr. Fox's motion for peace—Insurrection against the Girondin deputies—Their arrest and flight—Assassination of Marat by Charlotte Corday—Note on the French Revolutionary Calendar.

THE opposition of Mr. Fox to the war with France, supported as he was by only a small band of his friends, was consistent and unremitting. He moved an amendment to the address on the king's message respecting the declaration of war, and was defeated without a division. He proposed, a week after this royal message had been delivered, a series of resolutions, the object of which was to declare that it was not for the honor or interest of Great Britain to make war upon France, on account of the internal circumstances of that country; that the complaints against the conduct of the French government were not sufficient to justify war in the first instance without having attempted to obtain redress by negotiation; that the pretended grounds of the war with France, the security of Europe, and the rights of independent nations, had been disregarded in the case of Poland; that no engagements ought to be entered into with other powers which might prevent Great Britain making a separate peace. After an acrimonious debate, Mr. Fox's motion was rejected by an overwhelming majority, only forty-four members supporting the resolutions. Again and again Fox advocated negotiations for peace with those, whoever they were, who had the government of France in their hands. "Why," he said, "was every man in England to be a sufferer because the people of France were in confusion? . . . Let them ask every man in the kingdom who had any commercial dealings, whether the accounts he received from all parts of the kingdom did not call for a conclusion to this war." * The embarrassments in trade had been so serious, from whatever cause, that parliament had sanctioned an issue of five millions in exchequer bills, to be advanced by commissioners, in loans to commercial firms who could give security for repayment. The demand for peace, upon the plea that war produced distress and privation to the bulk of the people, was thus met by Burke, in one of his most virulent personal attacks upon Fox: "The ground of a political war is, of all things, that which the poor laborer and manufacturer are the least capable of conceiving. This sort of people know in general that they must suffer by war. It is a matter to which they are sufficiently competent, because it is a matter of feeling. The *causes* of a war are not matters of feeling, but of reason and foresight, and often of remote considerations, and of a very great combination of circumstances, which *they* are utterly incapable of comprehending; and, indeed, it is not every man in the higher classes who is altogether equal to it." † According to this doctrine the war with the French republican government was "a political war," of the justice or expediency of which only the initiated in the mysteries of statesmanship were competent to form an opinion. The bulk of the people might feel the consequences of such a war, but they had no capacity for the investigation of its causes, and had therefore only to confide and suffer. Pitt, proud and confident as he was, made no attempt to measure this war by the calculating foresight only of official wisdom. He was driven into the war, undoubtedly against his wishes, by the violence of popular opinion rather than by the calculations of his own statesmanship. He did not claim an infallibility which regarded with contempt the general tone of public feeling. He carried the greater portion of the industrial community with him in his resistance to extreme democratic principles, by describing with a rhetoric that could not exaggerate the reality, the cruelties and oppressions perpetrated in France under the names of Liberty and Equality. He defended his own abandonment of the cause of parliamentary reform by dwelling upon the consequences of extended suffrage in France. In the great debate on Mr. Grey's motion for reform, previous to which petitions had been read praying for universal suffrage, Mr. Pitt said, "In what is called the government of the multitude, they are not the many who govern the few, but the few who govern the many. It is a species of tyranny which adds insult to the wretchedness of its subjects, by styling its own arbitrary decrees the voice of the people, and sanctioning its acts of oppression and cruelty under the pretence of the

* "Quarterly Review," vol. cvii. p. 1.
† "History of the Revenue," vol. ii. p. 195.
‡ James's "Naval History," vol. i. p. 91.
§ See tables to James's "History," No. 1.

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxx., Debate of the 18th of June.
† "Conduct of the Minority."

national will. . . . The question is, whether you will abide by your constitution, or hazard a change, with all that dreadful train of consequences with which we have seen it attended in a neighboring kingdom?" * The fanaticism of the republicans who ruled France has been compared to that of the Mussulmans, "who, with the Koran in one hand and the sword in the other, went forth conquering and converting." The fiery zeal of the higher and middle classes of England has been compared to that of the Crusaders, "who raised the cry of *Deus vult* at Clermont." † The watchword of "King and Constitution" was, on one side of the Channel, as potent as the war-whoop of "Liberty and Equality" on the other side. There was no great "reason and foresight" required to plunge each nation into a conflict of twenty years.

The passions that were involved in this political war impelled the alarmists to call for such stringent measures of precaution and coercion as Great Britain had not witnessed since the days of the exiled Stuarts. The chancellor, Lord Loughborough, was ready with a "Traitorous Correspondence Bill," drawn by the attorney-general, Sir John Scott, and introduced by him to the House of Commons on the 15th of March. They considered the law of Edward III. against adhering to the king's enemies as insufficient to prevent the French being supplied with arms and stores, and they made it high treason even to enter into an agreement for supplying them. They called for the penalties of treason against those who should invest capital in the French funds or in the purchase of lands in France. Forfeiture and corruption of blood were not to follow a conviction; but, on the other hand, the evidence of two witnesses, and the further protections secured to the accused by the statutes of William and Anne, were to be set aside. The arbitrary tendencies of the lord chancellor and his attorney-general could not be more strongly exhibited than in the proposition that a man might be hanged, drawn, and quartered, upon the evidence of one witness, without being furnished with a copy of the indictment against him, and without the privilege of being defended by counsel. The bill passed the House of Commons in spite of the opposition of Fox, Sheridan, and Erskine; but in the House of Lords this attempt to take from the accused the means of defence, under the appearance of lenity, was modified. The penalties of the law of treason and its protections remained as before. This definition of treasonable acts was very widely extended. The minister who had never sanctioned any act of the executive, or any proposal of the legislature, of an unconstitutional or arbitrary tendency was now to become identified with measures such as Englishmen regarded as belonging to past generations of oppression. The minister who had built his reputation upon his financial prudence was to lay a load of debt upon his country that even now seems fabulous.

Mr. Pitt began this tremendous contest by undervaluing the power of a nation whose government, if government it could be called, was one of factions without a common head, each contending for supremacy; of a nation that had lost every ordinary source of strength—settled laws, established property, natural leaders, public credit. Obscure men, such as Jourdan, who had carried a pack from fair to fair, were commanding the French armies. Men taken from the ranks, it was held, could know nothing of strategy, and could have no authority over their fellows. In despising their origin and training, it was forgotten that the passion for equality gave them a more powerful influence in the French armies than was ever wielded by the titled marshals of the old monarchy. The English minister sent the king's second son, whose military experience had been limited to a field-day in Hyde Park, to terrify the raw levies of the republic with two regiments of guards, and with a contingent of Hanoverians and Hessians, all disciplined upon the most approved principles of "the bookish theorick." Mr. Pitt knew that Austria and Prussia hated each other—would act upon no common agreement for large and disinterested purposes in the conduct of the French war. He knew that Russia and Prussia were intent upon aggressions as hateful and as dangerous as the pretensions of the French republicans; that not until they were gorged with the spoils of Poland would they seriously direct their thoughts to the common dangers of established governments; but that meanwhile they would let the war take the languid course of a coalition without a presiding mind to direct it to salutary ends, or to arrest the selfish schèmes which some indulged of territorial aggrandizement. And yet Mr. Pitt had no doubt that the expedition which he sent to Holland in March under the Duke of York, and his armaments against the West India islands, constituted that vigorous prosecution of the war which he promised when he brought forward his budget; and he could not comprehend why Mr. Fox had no confidence in numerous foreign alliances, saying that "he dreaded our being led into dangerous engagements for the prosecution of the most unjustifiable purposes." It soon became manifest that the war was not carried on with that vigor on the part of the allies which alone could insure success; that purposes wholly unjustifiable interfered with that unanimity which justice and disinterestedness alone could inspire. In a very few months it was found out that there was a new element in this contest, in dealing with which historical experience was no guide. In October, 1793, Burke acknowledged that a state of things had arisen, "of which, in its totality, if history furnishes any examples at all, they are very remote and feeble." Who, he says, could have imagined new and unlooked-for combinations and modifications of political matters, in which property should, through the whole of a vast kingdom, lose all its importance and even its influence; who could have thought that a formidable revolution in a great empire should have been made by men of letters who would become the sovereign rulers; that atheism could produce one of the most violently operative principles of fanaticism; that administrative bodies in a state of the utmost confusion, and of but a momentary duration, should be able to govern the country and its armies with an authority which the most settled senates and the most respected monarchs scarcely had in the same degree? "This, for one, I confess I did not foresee," says Burke, and he gives the reason of his own shortsightedness as the apology for others: "I believe very few were able to enter into the effects of mere *terror*. . . . For four years we have seen loans made, treasuries supplied, and armies levied and maintained, more numerous than France ever showed in the field, by *the effects of fear alone*." * The experience had come, in less than a year of warfare, which was to be more instructive than "history or books of speculation," but not for encouragement or warning, till the passions had cooled down which prevented its instruction teaching us what to do and what to forbear doing.

Nevertheless, in this condition of "new and unlooked-for combinations and modifications of political matters," it would be presumptuous to affirm that either of the extreme principles advocated on the one hand by Burke and on the other hand by Fox would have led eventually to happier results than the middle policy pursued by Pitt. The French Revolution was permitted by the Supreme Arbiter of human affairs to run its course of savage crime, of wild anarchy, of crushing despotism, of insatiate ambition, of aspirations for universal empire, to be arrested at last in its mad career by the necessity of all nations combining for their common safety. They might have successfully combined at an earlier period to prevent the aggressions of the republic, had they possessed the wisdom to have left France to choose what form of government it pleased. They roused the republicans of every faction to almost superhuman efforts of resistance, when they believed that a king would be again forced on them; that their noblesse would be brought back with all their privileges and immunities; that the confiscated properties would return to their old possessors; that France itself would be dismembered of some of its fairest provinces. It was the day-dream of Burke to do all these impossible things, except to partition France. He would restore the monarchy—he would restore the church—he would restore the aristocracy—he would have no peace with regicides—he would have "a long war" to bring back the France before 1789. To him the Constitutionalists were as odious as the Jacobins; La Fayette and Marat were equal in villainy. These desires were not fulfilled; the revolution brought its tardy wisdom as well as its instant terror. Europe had not to groan for another century under the leaden sway of unmitigated absolutism; England had not to rush upon untried theories to supersede her constitutional freedom. Pitt had no monarchical enthusiasm to oppose to republican fanaticism. He would treat with any government in France that he considered stable; he would fight those whom Lord Auckland, in his memorial to the states-general,

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxx. col. 902. Debate of May 7.
† Macaulay, "Life of Pitt."

* "Policy of the Allies." The words in italics are so in the original.

denounced as "*miserables*," in the belief that their reign would be very short; that exhausted France would soon lie at his feet; that a solid peace would be concluded with some responsible form of power when the revolutionary conflagration had burned out. The Jacobins dreaded the policy of Pitt more than the idealities of Burke. They called Burke "a madman"—they called Pitt "a monster." The style in which "that Orestes of the British Parliament, the madman Burke, that insolent Lord Grenville, or that plotter Pitt," were spoken of in the French convention was this: "They have misrepresented the independence of the French nation. They have invariably represented us as robbers and cannibals. Soon shall they be laid prostrate before the statue of liberty, from which they shall rise only to mount the scaffold that awaits them, and to expiate by their death the evils in which they have involved the human race." * Fox, on the contrary, from his original sympathy with the new order of things during the existence of the states-general, from his exultation upon the repulse of the allies from the French frontier, from his constant abhorrence of the war in which Great Britain was engaged, was in France held to be wedded to the whole course of the revolution as firmly as Paine was wedded. There is a curious anecdote illustrative of this French feeling in the journal of Mrs. Elliott. She was arrested, and carried before the Comité de Surveillance, a letter addressed to Mr. Fox having been found in her possession. At that sitting Vergniaud interposed in her behalf. "I don't see why this woman should have been arrested because a letter directed to Mr. Fox was found in her house. Had it been directed to the monster Pitt you could have done no more. Mr. Fox is our friend; he is the friend of a free nation, he loves our revolution, and we have it under his own handwriting." Fox carried his party-feeling too far; but he did good service to his country by his dogged resistance to the measures of Pitt. He, with a few others, saved us from the full swing of rampant Toryism, in those days when fear was hardening the hearts of men in these isles, and driving them into measures which, without some check such as Fox, Grey, Sheridan, Erskine, interposed, might have resulted in despotism or in civil war. Madame de Staël has said, with an impartiality which history should endeavor to emulate, "However advantageous it might have been to England that Mr. Pitt should have been the head of the state in the most dangerous crisis in which that country ever found itself, it was not the less so that a mind as enlarged as that of Mr. Fox should have maintained principles in spite of circumstances, and have known how to preserve the household gods of the friends of liberty in the midst of the conflagration." †

A wise political teacher has justly described the delusion under which the majority in parliament and in the country labored at the beginning of 1793: "It is a memorable example of the intoxication of men and of their governors that at the commencement of this war the bare idea of the possibility of its failure would have been rejected with indignation and scorn." ‡ With the exception of the brilliant successes of our own navy we shall have to pursue a narrative of a series of disasters which culminated at Austerlitz, and which carried Pitt, broken-hearted, to his grave. The sanguine views of those who expected that a volcano could be extinguished by a fire-engine were never more strongly exhibited than in a speech of Lord Loughborough, at a period when the English Guards, having landed in Holland, had assisted in the relief of Williamstadt, and thus in some degree influenced the movements of Dumouriez, which we shall have presently to relate. On the third reading of the Traitorous Correspondence Bill on the 22d of April, Lord Lauderdale had expressed a doubt whether nineteen hundred men, sent out under the command of the Duke of York, had saved Holland, or driven the French from the Austrian Netherlands. Lord Loughborough, in his reply, was extravagant in his appreciation of the consequences which had already attended the warlike operations of the British government. "To the promptitude in sending out those few troops under the able command of an illustrious personage, was to be ascribed that Holland was saved; that the French were defeated and driven back; that all Europe, from Petersburg to Naples, was delivered from the plunder, the confiscation, the rapine, the murder, the destruction of order, morality, and religion, with which it was threatened by the prevalence of French arms and French principles." *

Dumouriez had entered Antwerp in triumph on the 30th of November, 1792. He moved with his army on the 17th of February, 1793, to carry the war into Holland. During his occupation of Belgium the French convention had sent commissioners into that country, of whose tyrannical conduct Dumouriez bitterly complained in a letter which he addressed to the president of the convention on the 12th of March: "We have oppressed the Belgians by every species of vexation; have violated the sacred rights of their liberty, and have imprudently insulted their religious opinions." He exposed the pretended union of several parts of Belgium to France: "The union of Hainault to the republic was effected by sabres and muskets, and that of Brussels by a handful of men who could exist in trouble only, and by a few sanguinary men assembled to intimidate the citizens." Marat denounced the moderation and equity of Dumouriez as "crimes against the revolution;" and he was accused of aspiring to the title of Duke of Brabant, or to the stadtholdership. The victor at Jemappes was hated by the party of the Mountain, and he knew that if they gained the ascendency his destruction was inevitable. Danton, however, was his friend, and the Jacobins suspended their avowal of hostility till a more convenient season. Dumouriez marched into Holland, and soon obtained possession of Breda, Klundert, and Gertruydenburg. But he was brought to a stand at Williamstadt, which was occupied by a Dutch garrison who had not been corrupted, and by the English detachment of guards. The generals who were second in command to Dumouriez had sustained severe reverses while he had marched into Holland. In a proclamation to the French nation he says, "I made myself master of three strong places, and was ready to penetrate into the middle of Holland, when I learned the disaster of Aix-la-Chapelle, the raising of the siege of Maestricht, and the sad retreat of the army. By this army I was loudly summoned; I abandoned my conquests to fly to its succor." On the 16th of March the Prince of Cobourg, commanding the Imperialists, was in position at Neerwinden; and upon the arrival of Dumouriez the small river of the Geete only separated the two armies. The river was crossed by the French on the 18th. In their attack upon the Austrians they were defeated with a loss of four thousand men, and were compelled to return to their former position. The hour of misfortune had now arrived, and with the French convention the certain remedy for defeat was the guillotine for the unhappy commander—*pour encourager les autres*. Dumouriez knew what was in reserve for him when, on the 2d of April, six commissioners arrived in his camp to summon him to the bar of the convention. He refused to obey, and ordered his Germans to take the commissioners as their prisoners, but to do them no harm. They were sent to Tournay, to be kept as hostages for the safety of the royal family. Dumouriez had been in secret communication with the Austrian General Mack; and an agreement had been come to that the French army should evacuate Belgium; that the allied armies should not invade France; but that Dumouriez should march upon Paris, to overthrow the Jacobins and to restore the constitutional monarchy. On the day when the French commissioners had failed in their arrest of Dumouriez, he addressed a proclamation to the French nation, in which he said, "Frenchmen! we have a rallying-point which can stifle the monster of anarchy; 'tis the constitution we swore to maintain in 1789, '90, and '91; it is the work of a free people, and we shall remain free."

* Quoted by Burke, from the speech of Citizen Lasource, in the "Moniteur" of 17th March. "Parliamentary History," vol. xxx. col. 614.

† "Considérations sur les principaux événements de la Révolution Française," 1818.

‡ Mackintosh, "Reasons against the French War"—Miscellaneous Works, vol. iii. p. 180.

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxx. col. 739. The "*few* troops" become a great army in the narrative of Sir A. Alison. Under the date of April 20th, 1793, he says, "A corps, consisting of twenty thousand English, was embarked, and landed in Holland, under the command of the Duke of York." According to the statements of the secretary at war, the total number of the effective forces of the kingdom at the commencement of hostilities was 22,000; and, deducting those employed in foreign settlements, the land forces did not amount to more than 9000 effective men. During the first year of the campaign 10,000 additional men had been raised. This enabled the government gradually to send reinforcements to the Duke of York; but with 9000 disposable troops in the early part of 1793, Mr. Pitt would have had some difficulty in embarking 20,000 for Holland in April. (See "Parliamentary History," vol. xxx. col. 1248, and col. 1330.)

On the 4th he was to complete his arrangements with the Prince of Cobourg, near Condé. Although in great danger of being seized by some volunteers he accomplished his purpose; and a proclamation of the prince was agreed upon, and published, in which the alliance with the French general for the purpose of establishing a constitutional king was avowed. When Dumouriez returned to his army on the 5th, escorted by a body of imperial cavalry, he learned that his artillery had left the camp, and that large bodies of troops had marched to General Dampierre at Valenciennes. The chances of restoring France to any system which should combine order with liberty was at an end for one generation. Dumouriez lived an exile in England till 1823. In the proclamation of the Prince of Cobourg, issued on the 5th of April, he stated that he was seconding the beneficent intentions of General Dumouriez to restore to France its constitutional monarch, with the means of rectifying such experienced abuses as may exist; and he declared, on his word of honor, that he should enter the French territory without any view of making conquests, and that if any strong place should fall into his hands he should regard it as a sacred deposit. After the failure of Dumouriez's project a congress was held at Antwerp, attended by the representatives of Austria, Prussia, and Great Britain; and then the Prince of Cobourg issued a second proclamation, in which he revoked his former declaration, and announced that he should prosecute the war with the utmost vigor. The Jacobins, now almost supreme, had for three weeks or more been preparing to resist any invasion of the French territory, or any attempt to give France back a king, constitutional or absolute, with a terrible energy of which the world had seen no previous example, in its daring or its atrocity. "The utmost vigor" of the Prince of Cobourg was that of a rocket in comparison with a thunderbolt.

On the 10th of March the convention passed a decree for the establishment of an extraordinary criminal tribunal, without appeal, for the trial of all traitors, conspirators, and counter-revolutionists. This was the terrible revolutionary tribunal, composed of five judges who were to be bound by no forms of procedure, and of a permanent jury. These jurymen were to satisfy themselves as to facts in any way that they could, and to vote audibly in the presence of a Paris mob. To direct the proceedings of this awful tribunal, from whose decrees there was no appeal, a public accuser was appointed. Fouquier Tinville filled this office with an excess of zeal that permitted none of the ordinary weaknesses of humanity in judge or jury to interfere with the sacred duty of giving to the guillotine its daily food. He had only one remedy for the cure of lukewarmness toward the revolution—death. He was in so great a hurry to do his work that identity of person was sometimes unnecessary when an accused stood before him. Two women of the same name having been arrested he settled the accounts of both, for fear of a mistake. You are idle, he would say, to his officers—I want two or three hundred every decade.* Over the revolutionary tribunal presided the *Comité de Salut Public*, which was instituted at the end of March. Consisting only of nine members, it will have all those appliances of despotism at its command which cannot be so well managed by that discordant body the convention, of which assembly a very large party, the Girondins, are utterly sick of the system which has been growing into irresistible strength since they winked at the September massacres and equivocated with the murder of the king. If the *Comité de Salut Public* has its centralizing functions, extending to all matters civil and military, the local agencies for carrying on the system of terror are not less efficient. In every township of France there is a *Comité Révolutionnaire*, each consisting of twelve stanch patriots, chosen by universal suffrage; and of these committees there are forty-four thousand, all busy in making domiciliary visits, arresting and examining the suspected, giving certificates of good citizenship—*Cartes de Civisme*—and filling the prisons with victims for the Moloch of liberty. There is much to do in this mad world of France in which all the ordinary relations of social life are overthrown. The whole state machinery is out of gear, and nevertheless it must work. Oiling the wheels and cranks will be useless, so they must be moved by main strength. "The effects of fear alone" will do a great deal. But fear will not give the people food, when the interruption of commercial dealings, by the utter want of confidence between seller and buyer, keeps food out of the markets. In 1792 Paris had been provisioned with grain and flour, not in the ordinary course of demand and supply, but by the municipality. The loss to the government upon this year's transactions was enormous. In February, 1793, it was reported to the convention that the price of bread must either be raised by the municipality, or an extraordinary tax must be levied, to keep down the price of bread. The convention granted the tax, to be levied upon an ascending scale upon property, movable and immovable. The municipality, however, could not keep down prices, even by buying in the dearest market and selling in the cheapest. The farmers kept their grain in their barns; the merchants kept their sugar in their warehouses; the soap-boilers made no stock to supply the retailers. They did not like the coin in which they were to be paid in exchange for their commodities. When the national assembly and the national convention had declared the domains of the church and the estates of the emigrants to be public property, they put into circulation a new species of paper money, estimated upon the supposed value of that property, denominated *assignats*, the holders of them being assignees of so much of the property thus represented. Lands and houses might be bought, and were largely bought, by the holders of assignats, but they were not otherwise convertible. As a necessary consequence the value of this paper-money fluctuated according to the belief in the permanency of the revolution; and in the same way the purchasers of the confiscated property became fewer and fewer when the hope of a constitutional monarchy had passed away, and France was governed in a great degree by the Jacobin clubs. But the more decided was the depreciation of the assignats the more unlimited was their issue by the convention. As an inevitable consequence the nominal price of every article of subsistence and household necessity was prodigiously increased. Sugar, coffee, candles, soap, were doubled in price. The wages of labor remained stationary; for there was a superabundance of labor through the general interruption to production and exchange. The washerwomen of Paris go to the convention to say that soap is so dear that their trade will be at an end. We want soap and bread, cry the poor *blanchisseuses* of the Seine. Commissioners of the sections superintend the distribution of loaves to those who can pay. Furious women surround the grocers' shops, demanding sugar. The terrified grocers roll their sugar-hogsheads into the streets, and the citizenesses weigh it out at twenty-two sous a pound. Some paid; some helped themselves without paying; and the pallid shopkeepers helplessly looked on; for had not Marat, the friend of the people, said in his journal of the 25th of February that there would be an end of high prices if a few shops were pillaged, and a few shopkeepers hanged at their own doors? The shopkeepers, however, brought out their stores when their price was tendered in metallic currency. The convention had its strong remedy against the unpatriotic *bourgeoisie*. It decreed that whoever exchanged gold or silver for a higher amount in assignats than their nominal value, and whoever stipulated for a different price of commodities if paid in paper or in specie, should be subjected to six years' imprisonment. The final step in this direction was to fix a maximum of price upon all agricultural produce and upon all merchandise. The system was extended from Paris to the departments, with the certain results of the ruin and misery which follow every violation of economical laws. And yet amid this total derangement of the ordinary principles of social intercourse, the people lost no faith in their republic. They were stirred up to the belief that their miseries were not the result of natural causes, but were produced by the intrigues of the aristocrats, aided by the gold of Pitt. Marat, who had excited the plunder of the shops, was in vain denounced by a small majority in the convention, who foresaw the quick approach of the reign of anarchy and bloodshed. The Mountain was gradually deriving new strength from the hunger and violence of the populace. "The people can do no wrong," said Robespierre. Danton, who had manifested many indications of disgust at the proceedings of the extreme democratic faction, was carried away by their ascendency, and supported the establishment of the revolutionary tribunal. Its scaffolds were quickly set up. Sansculottism soon became supreme. Misery fell upon all classes, and especially upon those who depended upon the wages of industry. But every Parisian, rich or poor, trembled and obeyed; and the provinces, for the greater part, did the same, for Paris ruled France. Most Frenchmen were ready to defend their country against the foreigner, and to maintain

* See Note on the Revolutionary Calendar.

any form of revolutionary government, however oppressive, in preference to the restoration of the ancient order of things which had been destroyed. Their fanaticism was stimulated by arts not wholly unlike the delusion practised upon the Kaffir tribes in 1857, who were persuaded by their chief to destroy their cattle and corn, that, rendered desperate by want, they might rush to a war which would sweep the British colonists from the land. The assignats and the law of maximum produced the same desperation in France. The Jacobin leaders knew perfectly well what would be the consequences of their insane decrees. They traded on the despair of the people.

"The Jacobin Revolution," wrote Burke, "is carried on by men of no rank, of no consideration; of wild savage minds, full of levity, arrogance, and presumption; without morals, without probity, without prudence. What have they then to supply their innumerable defects, and to make them terrible even to the firmest minds? One thing, and one thing only—but that thing is worth a thousand—they have energy."* This energy was put forth in the formation of revolutionary committees, which were to reject all the ordinary principles of justice and mercy, and in desperate conflicts with those natural laws by which the exchanges of mankind are regulated. But the greater the domestic miseries of France, the readier were its population to turn from peaceful pursuits to the excitement of war. The convention, on the 10th of March, decreed a forced levy of three hundred thousand men. This decree few dared to disobey, and many submitted to it without reluctance, and even with patriotic ardor. There was a remarkable exception in the district of La Vendée, in which singular country an insurrectionary spirit was developed in the population, when their priests were ejected and the king had perished on the scaffold. When the peasantry were about to be dragged from their homes to serve in the armies of the revolution, this spirit broke out into open violence against the republican authorities. In La Vendée the zeal of loyalty and religion came into open conflict with the passions excited under the names of the Rights of Man and the Age of Reason.

In the British Parliament on the 17th of June, Mr. Fox proposed an elaborate address to the crown, the object of which was to make it the most earnest and solemn request of the Commons that his majesty would employ the earliest measures for the re-establishment of peace with France. The proposition was rejected by the very large majority that the ministry now commanded. In the course of his speech Mr. Fox contended, in answer to the question which had been often asked, "Whether we were to treat with France in its present state," that we ought to treat, and ultimately must treat, with whoever had the government in their hands, with him or them, be he or they whom they might. "Good God," cried the orator, "what was there in their proceedings that made us look for an established government among them? . . . Let them suffer the penalties of their own injustice; let them suffer the miseries arising from their own confusion. Why were the people of England to suffer because the people of France were unjust?" The reply of Mr. Pitt was not easy to controvert. "Where is our security for the performance of a treaty, where we have neither the good faith of a nation nor the responsibility of a monarch? The moment that the mob of Paris becomes under the influence of a new leader, mature deliberations are reversed, the most solemn engagements are retracted, our free will is altogether controlled by force . . . Should we treat with Marat, before we had finished the negotiation he might again have descended to the dregs of the people from whom he sprung, and have given place to a more desperate villain."† At this precise point of time it was no figure of speech for Mr. Pitt to refer to Marat as the representative of the executive power in France. "Let us consider," said Mr. Burke in the same debate, "the possibility of negotiation." The minister Le Brun is in jail. The minister Clavière is not to be found. "Would you have recourse to Roland? Why, he is not only in jail, but also his wife along with him, who is said to be the real minister. . . . Brissot is likewise in jail, bearing a repetition of that sort of misfortune to which it is hoped that habit may reconcile him. Pay your addresses to Egalité, and you will find him in his dungeon at Marseilles. There then only remains my celebrated friend, the mild and merciful Marat."

The Girondins, on whose authority in the convention rested the only hope of a stable government in France—a government not founded upon the supremacy of the rabble—had fallen, never to rise again, on the 2d of June. They then became wanderers in the provinces, or prisoners in the dungeons of Paris. They had relied upon their patriotic eloquence and their republican virtue. They would hold no communion with the movers of insurrection and massacre; and they found the terrible earnestness of ignorant ruffianism too strong for respectable philosophy. Their majority in the convention availed them nothing; for that assembly had come into open conflict with the physical force of Paris, hounded on by the Jacobin Club, when the idol of the populace, Marat, was sent for trial before the revolutionary tribunal. As more prudent men than the Girondins might have expected, the sanguinary demagogue was acquitted; and he was carried—as a successful candidate was formerly chaired in England—upon the shoulders of the mob, to the hall of the convention, amid the cry of "Death to the Girondins." Robespierre, between whom and Marat there was mutual hatred, saw that in giving his support to this "friend of the people," whose mode of testifying his friendship was to excite to plunder and butchery, he was using an instrument for the destruction of the only party that had the confidence of the middle classes. He denounced the Girondins in the convention as men who had wished to save the tyrant Louis, and had conspired with the traitor Dumouriez. The Commune of Paris had obtained a power which was opposed to all steady government, and the Girondins tried to bring them under the control of a commission of twelve, appointed by the convention. The mob was roused to that fury which never waits to inquire and to reflect, when victims are pointed out for its vengeance. On the 31st of May the mob declared itself in a state of permanent insurrection—a phrase which indicated that the ordinary operations of justice were suspended, in the same way that martial law supersedes the accustomed course of legal authority. On the 2d of June the convention was surrounded by an armed force, whose decrees were to be pronounced by a hundred pieces of artillery. Resistance was in vain. Twenty-two of the Girondin leaders were conducted to prison. Many of their friends escaped to the provinces. Some who had fled from the guillotine died by their own hands. The political existence of the party was at an end.

For the most odious of the assassins of the anarchical republic there was the vengeance of assassination also in store. The story of Charlotte Corday has been told by Lamartine with a power of picturesque narrative which few have equalled. The naked facts can only be related by ourselves. In the city of Caen resided, in 1793, a granddaughter of the great tragic poet, Corneille. She was an enthusiast, devoted to those ideas of the new philosophy which she had derived from her father, and from the secret study of Rousseau in the convent in which she had passed her girlhood. Some of the proscribed Girondins had come to reside in Normandy; and from their eloquent invectives against the terrorists who were degrading the cause of the revolution by their crimes, she derived, in common with her neighbors, a hatred of Marat as the personification of all that was atrocious in the rulers of the populace. Pétion, Barbaroux, with many others of the fugitive deputies called up this disgust toward the ruling faction of Paris, by their oratory and their proclamations. Formidable bands of young men enrolled themselves to march to Paris, in order to rescue liberty from the assaults of anarchy. Among the number of these volunteers was one who aspired to Charlotte's love, but with a timid reserve. Her enthusiasm suggested that she had a higher call of duty than the indulgence of a feeling suited to more tranquil times. She felt that if the ferocity which now guided the revolution was not arrested her province and the neighboring districts now in insurrection would become the scene of the most terrible carnage. She took her resolution. If Marat should fall there might be hope for the republic. She travelled to Paris, which she entered on the 11th of July. With some difficulty she obtained admission to the mean lodging of Marat, on the evening of the 13th. She found him in a bath, and there she slew him. When examined she said that she saw civil war ready to devastate France; that she deemed Marat to be the chief cause of the public calamities; and that she sacrificed her life in taking his to save her country. Her execution quickly followed. The wretch whom she had murdered was decreed a public funeral in the Pantheon. Danton pronounced his eulogy as "the divine Marat."

* "Policy of the Allies."
† "Parliamentary History," vol. xxx. col. 994–1018.

NOTE ON THE FRENCH REVOLUTIONARY CALENDAR.

In reading the French historians of the period from the declaration of the republic in 1792 to the end of 1805, we find the dates of events not given according to the common calendar, but according to the most puzzling of all systems of chronology, the republican calendar adopted by the convention. In our own history we give the dates, thus found in French writers, according to the Gregorian calendar; but it may be useful here to present a complete view of the revolutionary calendar; which view we adopt, with some abridgment, from "The English Cyclopædia of Arts and Sciences."

The convention decreed, on the 24th of November, 1793, that the common era should be abolished in all civil affairs; that the new French era should commence from the foundation of the republic—namely, on the 22d of September, 1792, on the day of the true autumnal equinox, when the sun entered Libra at 9^h 18^m 30^s in the morning, according to the meridian of Paris; that each year should begin at the midnight of the day on which the true autumnal equinox falls; and that the first year of the French republic had begun on the midnight of the 22d of September, and terminated on the midnight between the 21st and 22d of September, 1793. To produce a correspondence between the seasons and the civil year, it was decreed that the fourth year of the republic should be the first sextile, or leap-year; that a sixth complementary day should be added to it, and that it should terminate the first Franciade; that the sextile or leap-year, which they called an olympic year, should take place every four years, and should mark the close of each Franciade; that the first, second, and third centurial years—namely, 100, 200, and 300—of the republic should be common, and that the fourth centurial year—namely, 400—should be sextile; and that this should be the case every fourth century until the 40th, which should terminate with a common year. The year was divided into twelve months of thirty days each, with five additional days at the end, which were celebrated as festivals, and which obtained the name of "Sansculottides." Instead of the months being divided into weeks they consisted of three parts, called decades, of ten days each. It is, however, to be observed that the French republicans rarely adopted the decades in dating their letters, or in conversation, but used the number of the day of each month of their calendar. The republican calendar was first used on the 26th of November, 1793, and was discontinued on the 31st of December, 1805, when the Gregorian was resumed.

The decrees of the national convention, which fixed the new mode of reckoning, were both vague and insufficient. A French work, "Concordance des Calendriers Républicaine et Grégorien," par L. Rondonneau, puts every day of every year opposite to its day of the Gregorian calendar. It is to actual usage that we must appeal to know what the decrees do not prescribe—namely, the position of the leap-years. The following list, made from the work above mentioned, must be used as a correction of the usual accounts, in which the position of the leap-years is not sufficiently regarded:

		Sept.			Sept.
An I.	begins	22, 1792	Sext. IX.	begins	23, 1800
II.	"	22, 1793	X.	"	23, 1801
Sext. III.	"	22, 1794	Sext. XI.	"	23, 1802
IV.	"	23, 1795	An XII.	"	24, 1803
V.	"	22, 1796	XIII.	"	23, 1804
VI.	"	22, 1797	XIV.	"	23, 1805
Sext. VII.	"	22, 1798	ended 31 December, 1805.		
VIII.	"	23, 1799			

When the Gregorian year is not leap-year, the beginnings of the months are as follows, according as the republican year begins on September 22d, 23d, or 24th:

1	Vendémiaire	is	Sept.	22, 23, 24	1 Jan.	is Niv.	12, 11, 10
1	Brumaire	is	Oct.	22, 23, 24	1 Feb.	is Pluv.	13, 12, 11
1	Frimaire	is	Nov.	21, 22, 23	1 March	is Vent.	11, 10, 9
1	Nivose	is	Dec.	21, 22, 23	1 April	is Germ.	12, 11, 10
1	Pluviose	is	Jan.	20, 21, 22	1 May	is Flor.	12, 11, 10
1	Ventose	is	Feb.	19, 20, 21	1 June	is Prair.	13, 12, 11
1	Germinal	is	March	21, 22, 23	1 July	is Messid.	13, 12, 11
1	Floréal	is	April	20, 21, 22	1 Aug.	is Thermid.	14, 13, 12
1	Prairial	is	May	20, 21, 22	1 Sept.	is Fructid.	15, 14, 13
1	Messidor	is	June	19, 20, 21	1 Oct.	is Vendém.	10, 9, 8
1	Thermidor	is	July	19, 20, 21	1 Nov.	is Brum.	11, 10, 9
1	Fructidor	is	Aug.	18, 19, 20	1 Dec.	is Frim.	11, 10, 9

But when the Gregorian year is leap-year the beginnings of the months are as follows, according as the republican year begins on September 22d, 23d, or 24th:

1	Vendém.	is	Sept.	22, 23, 24	1 Jan.	is Niv.	12, 11, 10
1	Brum.	is	Oct.	22, 23, 24	1 Feb.	is Vent.	13, 12, 11
1	Frim.	is	Nov.	21, 22, 23	1 March	is Pluv.	12, 11, 10
1	Niv.	is	Dec.	21, 22, 23	1 April	is Germ.	13, 12, 11
1	Pluv.	is	Jan.	20, 21, 22	1 May	is Flor.	13, 12, 11
1	Vent.	is	Feb.	19, 20, 21	1 June	is Frair.	14, 13, 12
1	Germ.	is	March	20, 21, 22	1 July	is Messid.	14, 13 12
1	Flor.	is	April	19, 20, 21	1 Aug.	is Thermid.	15, 14, 13
1	Prair.	is	May	19, 20, 21	1 Sept.	is Fructid.	16, 15, 14
1	Messid.	is	June	18, 19, 20	1 Oct.	is Vendém.	11, 10, 9
1	Thermid.	is	July	18, 19, 20	1 Nov.	is Brum.	12, 11, 10
1	Fructid.	is	Aug.	17, 18, 19	1 Dec.	is Frim.	12, 11, 10

For instance, what is 14 Floréal, An XII.? The republican year begins September 24th, 1803, so Floréal falls in 1804, which is Gregorian leap-year. Look at the third table, and when the year begins September 24th the 1st of Floréal is April 21st; consequently the 14th is May 4th, 1804. Again, what is June 17th, 1800, in the French calendar? The year is not Gregorian leap-year; and An VIII. contains it, which begins September 23d. Look in the second table, and in such a year it appears that June 1st is the 12th of Prairial; therefore June 17th is Prairial 28th.

CHAPTER CXCII.

Campaign of 1793—Valenciennes and Condé taken by the allies—Mayence surrendered to Prussia—Duke of York besieges Dunkirk—The siege raised—Insurrection at Lyon against the convention—Siege and surrender of Lyon to the republican armies—Doom of the city—Toulon—The Royalists negotiate with Lord Hood, admiral of the fleet off Toulon—The French fleet and harbor surrendered to the combined forces—Declaration of the British government—Toulon besieged by republican armies—Napoleon Bonaparte—His plan for taking Toulon—Evacuation of Toulon—Destruction of the French fleet and arsenals—Energy and atrocities of the Jacobin government—War in La Vendée—The British aid to the Vendeans comes too late.

At the close of the session of parliament on the 21st of June there was an exulting notice in the king's speech of "the rapid and signal successes which, in an early period of the campaign, have attended the operations of the combined armies." The successes, at that moment, were scarcely of a nature to call for such congratulation. After the defection of Dumouriez, General Dampierre was appointed to the command of the republican army on the Flemish frontier. The allied army, under the Prince of Cobourg, took no advantage of the alarm produced among the French forces when the commander who had defended the Argonne, and won the battle of Jemappes, went over to their enemies. There was a month of inactivity while a congress was deliberating at Antwerp upon the plan of a campaign. In the entrenched camp of Famars, which covered Valenciennes, Dampierre received reinforcements. He thought himself strong enough on the 8th of May to make an attack on the extended lines of the allies. On this day, the English Guards, under the Duke of York, were first brought into action; and their bravery contributed much to the result of the engagement. The French were driven back to their camp with a severe loss, and General Dampierre was killed. On the 23d the camp of Famars was attacked and carried by the allies; and the French fell back to the camp of Cæsar, leaving Valenciennes uncovered. The siege of that city commenced on the 14th of June, the besieging forces being commanded by the Duke of York. A fierce bombardment went on till the 28th of July, when the garrison capitulated, and were allowed to retire to France, on condition of not again serving against the allies. Their arms were turned against their fellow-countrymen in La Vendée. Condé also capitulated in July. On the Rhine the forces of Prussia had defeated the French in several considerable actions. The great success was the surrender of Mayence to the King of Prussia, after a protracted siege, on the 22d of July; the garrison of twenty thousand men being allowed to retire to France upon the same condition as the garrison of Valenciennes. The King of Prussia, having thus secured the safety of his own frontier, left the allies to pursue their course without any further effectual co-operation. He sent the greater part of his army to occupy Dantzic and Thorn, upon which he had seized as his spoil in the new partition of Poland.

After the surrender of Valenciennes and the surrender of Condé, there was no fortified place sufficiently strong to have arrested the march of the allied armies to Paris had a vigorous and united policy been resolved upon. At the beginning of August the republicans were driven from their stronghold, the camp of Cæsar, to a position behind the Scarpe, in front of Arras. But there was little vigor among the allies, and there was less union. The combined armies separated. The Austrians, with forty-five thousand men, commenced the siege of Quesnoy, which fortress they took. The British, and their Hanoverian contingents, under the command of the Duke of York, marched to attack Dunkirk, and were joined by a detachment of Austrians. This movement, for an object as selfish as the policy of Prussia, was dictated by the ministry of Mr. Pitt, under the miserable traditional desire to maintain our maritime ascendency by the possession or the destruction of this French naval entrepôt. The duke had thirty-seven thousand men under his command. On the 18th of August an engagement took place at Lincelles, and the

brave Guards carried a strong redoubt. Dutch troops also advanced against Dunkirk. Great preparations had been made in England for this enterprise. Eleven battalions were sent from the Thames, with a bombarding flotilla; but they arrived too late. The besieging army had not only failed of assistance from home, but in their encampment near the sandy shore they were exposed to the fire of the enemy's gunboats. While they were preparing for active operations during three weeks the French, by the energetic direction of Carnot, who had brought the military affairs of the republic under the control of one powerful will, had rapidly marched from the Moselle, and finally compelled the Duke of York to raise the siege. The covering army of the Austrians was defeated on the 8th of September, by the French general Houchard, near Hondscoote. The garrison of Dunkirk made a sally on the besiegers at the same time. The Duke of York was placed in a position of imminent danger; and he resolved, on that night of the 8th, to withdraw from his lines, abandoning his heavy artillery and ammunition. The king's son, who possessed the bravery of his family, and was not altogether deficient in the rarer qualities of a commander, was not to be blamed for this reverse. The French General Houchard was submitted to a more terrible criticism than the reproaches of the journalists who libelled the Duke of York. The convention put their general to death because he had not been vigilant enough to prevent the retreat of the English. In the affair of Dunkirk the Duke of York manifested a generous forbearance toward those who were chiefly to blame. Lord Malmesbury, on his way to Berlin, saw the duke on the 6th of December, who said his army was ill provided, and he condemned the whole measure of Dunkirk, and separation of the armies. "On my hinting," says Lord Malmesbury, "a possibility, or rather a certainty, that Grey would make Dunkirk the first object on the opening of the session, the duke said he trusted none of *his* friends would be so over-zealous as to defend him at the expense of others. . . . He should be very sorry indeed that any blame should be thrown on any particular measure, or any particular minister, as it certainly would go to censure the principle of the war and produce the worst consequences." * On the first night of the session (January 21st, 1794) Mr. Fox did defend the Duke of York, and did blame the minister. He wished to know who was the wise man who planned the expedition and advised the division of the combined forces in Flanders? He exclaimed, "What must have been the feelings of a gallant British prince, who, through dangers and difficulties, had approached the sea, the natural dominion of his country, and expected to find the whole coast a fortress for him, at beholding his troops destroyed by the gunboats of the enemy commanding the shore." Fox did point at the "particular minister" whom he held accountable for this and other miscarriages: "The chancellor of the exchequer possesses great talents and great eloquence; and the long period during which he has had the opportunity of displaying these talents in office has no doubt added to the number of his admirers; but he must now pick from the very lowest class of his flatterers before he can collect thirty men around his own table who will tell him that he is a great war minister." †

The failures in the north of France were compensated in the view of the British government by great events in the south. Lord Grenville wrote to his brother on the 15th September, lamenting that the bad accounts overbalance the good in Flanders. But, he adds, "I am much mistaken in my speculation if the business at Toulon is not decisive of the war. Only let your own mind follow up all the consequences of that event, and you will, I believe, agree with me that the expression I have used is not too sanguine." ‡ The English secretary of state beheld the outbreak of civil war when the Girondins had been proscribed by the Jacobins; and as the probable end of a civil war he anticipated the restoration of the monarchy. In the same letter, in which he rejoices over "the business at Toulon," he says, "we have news that the people of Lyon have defeated Dubois Crancé. . . . The next month or six weeks will be an anxious period, and big with events." Lyon, Toulon, La Vendée, during that autumn, were the scenes of some of the most stirring and terrible events in modern history. We were not content to look on. We did little good, if not positive harm, by our interference. The British government was far too weak effectually to control the issues of the fearful struggle between the factions of the revolution. Grenville saw this: "We have nothing like force enough for all the objects that present themselves, and you know my settled aversion to undertaking little points of detail; some of which might succeed, but the result of the whole must be to cut to pieces the small force we have, without adequate success." *

Lyon, the great manufacturing city of the Rhone and the Saone, in 1793 contained a population among which were to be found all the extreme opinions engendered by the revolution. There were ultra-royalists, constitutional royalists, moderate republicans, and republicans that went to such lengths in the assertion of anarchical doctrines that even Marat accused them of being paid by the foreign enemy. The party of the Girondins was the most numerous; that of the Jacobins the most daring. There dwelt in Lyon a Piedmontese named Chalier, who had been a considerable traveller, and had noted the oppressions of mankind under despotic governments. Upon the breaking out of the revolution he went to Paris; became associated with Robespierre; and returned to Lyon to denounce, in the Central Club of that city, not only kings and nobles, but all the possessors of property, in whom the prophecy was to be fulfilled, "The wealthy shall be despoiled, and the poor shall be enriched." Chalier and his brother clubbists sent for a guillotine from Paris, issued lists of the proscribed, and having obtained the control of the municipal authority, enforced their sweeping orders for the arrest and imprisonment of suspected persons. At length the terrorists, with their revolutionary tribunal, roused the citizens of Lyon to resistance. A battle between the partisans of Chalier and the sections of the city took place, which ended in the defeat of the municipal tyranny, and the triumph of the Girondins, at the very time when their leaders had fallen in Paris. Lyon, however, did not fear to oppose the dominant party in the convention. Chalier, the disciple of that party, was condemned to death, and died by his own guillotine. From this time the city of Lyon was marked by the Jacobins for destruction, as the seat of counter-revolutionary opinions. The city refused to accept the new constitution decreed by the convention, and in August was in open revolt, with republican armies gathering on every side. At the beginning of August Lyon was surrounded by a great force under the command of Kellermann, who had been ordered to leave the defence of the frontiers to meet this more pressing danger. The men of Lyon had chosen for their leader the Count de Précy, who had been colonel of a regiment, and had fought for the throne on the memorable 10th of August. He was a brave and skilful commander, and so directed the armed resistance of the Lyonnese that for two months they defended the beleaguered city amid all the horrors of a bombardment. The fiercest assaults of the infuriated besiegers were met by the desperate sallies of the starving besieged. Public edifices, workshops and warehouses, mansions and hovels, were choking the narrow streets with their blazing ruins. Shelter and sustenance were at an end; when De Précy and three thousand resolute followers went forth to cut their way through the republican lines, leaving Lyon to its fate. The greater number of this band perished. De Précy was one of the few who escaped. On the 8th of October the troops of the convention entered the town. Kellermann, whose views were too merciful for the Jacobin rulers of France, had been superseded by Dubois-Crancé, and his authority was merged, after the surrender of the city, in the superior power of Couthon and the other commissioners of the authorities in Paris. The doom of Lyon was pronounced by Barère, of whom it has been said, "He tasted blood, and felt no loathing; he tasted it again, and liked it well. Cruelty became with him, first a habit, then a passion, at last a madness." † This clever and odious man, whose character is implied in his nickname, "The Anacreon of the guillotine," thus pronounced the doom of the great manufacturing emporium, with its hundred and fifty thousand inhabitants: "Let the plough pass over Lyon. Let her name cease to exist. The rebels are conquered; but are they all exterminated? No weakness; no mercy. Let every one be smitten." The convention issued its decree; Collot d'Herbois and Fouché went forth to execute it. Couthon had not slain

* Malmesbury, "Diaries and Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 17.
† "Parliamentary History," col. 1268–1271.
‡ "Court and Cabinets of George III.," vol. ii. p. 242.

* "Court and Cabinets," etc., vol. ii. p. 244, Letter of October 11th.
† Macaulay in "Edinburgh Review," vol. lxxix. p. 279.

enough men nor destroyed enough property. He had traversed the city with a silver hammer in his hand, and when he struck a door, saying, "Rebellious house, I strike you in the name of the law," the mansion was quickly gutted and its walls overthrown. But he had not sent twenty victims daily to the scaffold, by the sentence of a revolutionary tribunal. He had not dragged batches of prisoners from their dungeons and destroyed them at once by volleys of musketry and grape-shot. This was the work of the proconsuls, one of whom, Collot d'Herbois, apologizes to the convention for his tardiness: "We go on demolishing with the fire of artillery, and with the explosion of mines, as fast as possible. But you must be sensible that, with a population of 150,000, these processes find many obstacles. The popular axe cuts off twenty heads a day, and still the conspirators are not daunted. The prisons are choked with them. We have erected a commission as prompt in its operations as the conscience of true republicans trying traitors can be. Sixty-four of these were shot yesterday on the spot where they had fired on the patriots. Two hundred and thirty are to fall this day in the ditches, where their execrable works had vomited death on the republican army." Fouché, his colleague, disclaimed any participation in these acts. He said to the late Earl Stanhope, in 1815, in speaking of a German memoir of him which referred to the sanguinary scenes of Lyon, "I went there to save the inhabitants, all of whom would otherwise have been murdered by Collot d'Herbois." His name, with that of his colleague, was appended to some of the letters of this period; but he denied the authenticity of his signature.* A letter written by Fouché in March, 1794, after Collot d'Herbois had quitted Lyon in the previous December, unless it be a forgery, is sufficient evidence of his guilt. "There still remain some accomplices of the Lyonnese revolt. We are about to hurl the thunderbolt at them." † Six thousand had perished by the knife and the bullet after the surrender of the city. The few wretches who crept out of their hiding-places after five months were reserved for the tender mercies of the virtuous Fouché.

Marseilles had preceded Lyon in an insurrection against the Jacobin tyranny. But the revolt had been suppressed by General Carteaux; and those who had escaped the jail and the scaffold had fled to Toulon. In that great seaport there was deep discontent, and a monarchical spirit was rising into avowed hatred of the excesses of the republic. The fleet in Toulon harbor partook of this spirit, and its commander, Admiral Trogoff, was opposed to the course of the revolution. In the middle of August Admiral Lord Hood was off Toulon, with twenty-one sail of the line and several frigates and sloops. A Spanish fleet was on its passage from Cadiz to join Lord Hood. The French fleet in Toulon consisted of seventeen sail of the line, with frigates and corvettes, besides others fitting and repairing. On the 23d of August two commissioners from Toulon came off to Lord Hood's flag-ship, to propose the surrender of the port and shipping to the British. They represented themselves to be charged with full powers from the sections of the mouths of the Rhone to negotiate, with a view to the restoration of peace and the re-establishment of a monarchical government, under the son of Louis XVI., according to the constitution as accepted by their late sovereign in 1789. Lord Hood issued a proclamation in which he promised that if the people should declare openly in favor of a monarchical government, and should put him in possession of the harbor, they should receive all the succor which he could afford, and that upon the return of peace the fleet should be restored to France. In a second proclamation he referred to the solemn declaration of the commissioners, and stated that he should take possession of Toulon, as a deposit for Louis XVII. until peace should be re-established in France. After some delay, occasioned by the opposition of the French admiral St. Julien, a stanch republican, who was supported by the crews of seven ships, the British marines and the Spanish forces that had now arrived took possession of the forts of Toulon. The French fleet removed into the inner harbor, and the British and Spanish fleets occupied the outer harbor. St. Julien and his adherents were permitted to leave the ships, and escape into the interior. The revolt of Toulon was met by the same vigor of the Jacobin rulers as they had manifested in the bombardment of Lyon, and the same principle of terror was called into action. Barère exclaimed in the convention, "The corpses of the rebellious Lyonnese, floated down the Rhone, will teach the perfidious citizens of Toulon the fate which awaits them." The besieging army of Lyon was free to march against the revolted seaport; General Carteaux moved from the subdued Marseille with his troops; another force advanced from Nice. In a few weeks a great French army was gathered round the walls of Toulon; animated by one spirit and led by daring officers. The garrison of Toulon at the end of October was in number about seventeen thousand, consisting of a mixed force of French royalists, Piedmontese, Neapolitans, and Spaniards, with little more than two thousand British. In the British fleet was a post-captain, Horatio Nelson, who, in a letter to his wife, described the surrender of Toulon and its fleet, without firing a shot, as such an event as history cannot produce its equal.* Nelson was dispatched in his swift-sailing ship, the Agamemnon, to procure from Naples the aid of Neapolitan troops, four thousand of whom finally joined the allied forces under the temporary command of Lord Mulgrave.

The political responsibilities of the British commanders at Toulon were of a very difficult and delicate nature. Lord Mulgrave, in his place in parliament, stated that he had refused to be present at the hoisting the white flag in Toulon, as requested by the principal magistrate. The constitution of 1789, he said, was adopted in the stipulation between the people of Toulon and us, for the purpose of quieting the fears of all descriptions of persons, and of removing all apprehension of the restoration either of the ancient or the modern despotism. Lord Mulgrave's description of the political opinions of the people of this great seaport may be received as, in all probability, a tolerably correct view of the general state of public opinion in the provincial towns of France. The inhabitants of Toulon understood nothing of the terms of the constitution for which they had stipulated: "Some felt such detestation and horror of the old despotism —her bastiles, lettres de cachet, etc.—that they were ready to undergo every extremity rather than submit to it; while others, conceiving that they had adopted the ancient system, wondered at the continuation of the modern authorities—the sections, tribunes, magistrates, etc.—when they had agreed to the restoration of monarchy, with all its appendages of nobility, orders, and priesthood." † The French before the revolution had lost all political life; they had no practical acquaintance with the working of political institutions; and it is not therefore surprising that when the revolution came they did not understand it. A constitutional monarchy was for them an anomaly. In a monarchy they saw only a return to the ancient despotism. A republic based upon law and order seemed to them an impossibility. They had a republic of anarchical tyranny, before which the greater number trembled. But there was no sound public opinion to lead to the middle path of safety. The British government timidly appealed to the monarchical spirit, and as timidly professed a respect for the spirit of freedom. Lord Grenville was exceedingly solicitous about the precise terms of a declaration, published by order of the king, on the 29th of October, 1793.‡ It was written in French, and was especially addressed to the "well-disposed part of the people of France." It said, "His majesty by no means disputes the right of France to reform its laws. It never would have been his wish to employ the influence of external force with respect to the particular forms of government to be established in an independent country. Neither has he now that wish, except in so far as such interference is become essential to the security and repose of other powers." His majesty called upon the people of France, therefore, "to join the standard of an hereditary monarchy; not for the purpose of deciding, in this moment of disorder, calamity, and public danger, on all the modifications of which this form of government may hereafter be susceptible, but in order to unite themselves once more under the empire of law, of morality, and of religion." The rhetorician on the seashore, trying to make his voice heard above the roar of the angry waves, is but a faint type of Lord Grenville preaching of "external peace, domestic tranquillity, a real and genuine liberty,"

* Lord Brougham, "Statesmen," 3d series, p. 46, 8vo edit., and note by Earl Stanhope, p. 125.

† See Louis Blanc's "Histoire de la Révolution," tome x. p. 185.

* "Inedited Letters of Lord Nelson," communicated to "The London Review," conducted by Charles Mackay.

† "Parliamentary History," vol. xxxi. col. 250, Debate April 10th, 1794.

‡ See "Court and Cabinets of George III.," vol. ii. p. 246.

o a people of whom one of their countrymen has written the charac-
er in words of deep significance: "Was there ever any nation on
he face of the earth so full of contrasts, and so extreme in all its
ctions; more swayed by sensations, less by principles; led there-
ore always to do either worse or better than was expected of it,
ometimes below the common level of humanity, sometimes greatly
bove it; a people so unalterable in its leading instincts that its like-
ess may still be recognized in descriptions written two or three
housand years ago, but at the same time so mutable in its daily
houghts as to become a spectacle and an amazement to itself, and to
e as much surprised as the rest of the world at the sight of what it
as done!" *

The man was at Toulon who was fully to develop the leading at-
ribute of the French people—"apt for all things, but excelling only
n war; adoring chance, force, success, splendor, and noise, more
han true glory." † In the French army was an officer of artillery,
Napoleon Bonaparte. He was twenty-four years of age; had been
ducated at the military school at Paris; had been a lieutenant of
rtillery in his seventeenth year; early in 1793 had fought for the
onvention against Paoli in his native Corsica; had left the island
with his mother and sisters in May of that year; had spent a short
ime at Marseilles, where he had written a pamphlet exhorting the
evolting Marseillese to obey the convention; and in September had
ttained the rank of lieutenant-colonel of artillery, and had joined
he besieging army before Toulon. He has himself described the
eneral, Carteaux, under whom he was appointed to serve, as a man
tterly incompetent. The artillery officer had a plan for conducting
he attack upon Toulon, which he finally submitted to a council of
war, when Carteaux had been replaced by a more able commander,
Dugommier. The success of this plan compelled the British to evac-
uate the city, and gave to the young officer a reputation which
finally carried him, step by step, to be the arbiter of the destinies of
Europe; and, beginning his career as a soldier of liberty, to be the
greatest foe of liberty that ever appeared in the world.

The engineering operations of the French appear not to have at
first impressed Lord Hood and Lord Mulgrave with an adequate
sense of their possible consequences. Lord Mulgrave wrote home
that Toulon was in a state of comfortable security; when the be-
sieging army under Carteaux was taking up its positions. Toward
the end of November the plan of the enemy to attack the outer
works which commanded the harbor, instead of making a general
assault upon the town, was sufficiently developed, by the opening of
a battery near the fort of Malbosquet, one of the most important of
the forts in the occupation of the allies. This was the mode of
attack projected by Bonaparte. The fortifications of Toulon on the
land-side were below the posts of the besieging army on the amphi-
theatre of hills which surrounded the town. If batteries could be
brought to bear on these fortifications from the higher ground, they
might be taken by assault, and then the inner and outer harbor
would be at the mercy of the besiegers, and the town must be evac-
uated. The fire of the French upon Malbosquet was so annoying
that on the 30th of November the garrison made a sortie with two
thousand three hundred troops of various nations, of which three
hundred only were British. The sortie was ineffectual. The allied
troops, commanded by Sir David Dundas (Lord Mulgrave having
gone home), were repulsed by a much stronger body of the republi-
cans; and General O'Hara, the commander of the garrison, was
wounded and taken prisoner. On the 13th of December Lord Hood
sent home a dispatch in which he says, "Nothing very material has
happened since the 30th of last month, except that the enemy has
made approaches nearer to us by some new erected batteries."
These nearer approaches were something very material, whose con-
sequences were soon to be determined. In a week after his dispatch
of the 13th Lord Hood writes, "It is my duty to acquaint you that
I have been obliged to evacuate Toulon." On the 17th of Decem-
ber, after a continued bombardment during twenty-four hours, the
French forced the line of defence in two of its most essential points;
and now, to use Lord Hood's words, "the enemy commanded the
town and ships by their shot and shells." The evacuation was deter-
mined upon by a council of war held the same day; and it was also
resolved that the French ships which were fitted for sea should sail
out with the English fleet, and that those which remained in the har-
bor, as well as the magazines and arsenal, should be destroyed. On
the 18th the troops had been all withdrawn from the forts, and were
concentrated in the town, ready to embark when the signal should be
given for the most awful conflagration that naval warfare had ever
presented. Sir Sidney Smith volunteered to conduct the terrible
work of destruction. On the evening of the 18th the Vulcan fireship
was towed into the inner harbor, and placed across the tier of the
men-of-war. Preparations had previously been made for burning
the arsenal and the storehouses. At ten o'clock a rocket flew up;
and then the trains were fired that consigned the stores of this great
naval depôt to the flames; and the fire-ship went among the men-of-
war and the frigates at their anchorage, and they were quickly burn-
ing to the water's edge, amid the explosion of powder-magazines
which threatened to involve the destroyers themselves in the general
havoc. "The concussion of air," says Sir Sidney Smith, "and the
shower of falling timber on fire, was such as nearly to destroy the
whole of us." Napoleon at St. Helena described the conflagration
at Toulon as a sublime and unique spectacle. But that night pre-
sented a scene of horror far more impressive than the grandeur of
the illumination which threw its red light afar upon sea and moun-
tain. The quays of Toulon were crowded with terrified multitudes
of both sexes, earnestly imploring a refuge in the allied fleet from
the dreaded vengeance of the triumphant republicans. Many of the
more prominent of the monarchical party had been previously re-
ceived on board the British and Spanish ships which were about to
move into the roads off Toulon; but there was a helpless band of
fugitives left behind, who, having found a temporary abiding-place,
knew that the vengeance which they had escaped at Marseille and
Lyon would follow them here. Some crowded with desperate haste
into boats which they found upon the beach, and were swamped.
Others dashed into the sea, hoping to be picked up by the ships'
crews. Sir Sidney Smith lingered in the harbor—amid the bewilder-
ing glare and smoke, the tempest of scorching ashes, even the fire of
the republican batteries upon the port—till his own retreat had be-
come difficult, in the endeavor to rescue all who cried to him for
succor. In a debate in parliament it was asserted that the command-
ers were much to blame in not having made dispositions for securing
and bringing away the miserable inhabitants; and that, although a
considerable number had embarked, that number was small, when
compared with the wretches that were left behind.* On the con-
trary, it was officially asserted that every one was taken from the
town on its evacuation that felt disposed to go. † The naval histo-
rian of Great Britain says, "Those who recollect the massacres that
stained republican France will be gratified to learn that 14,877 men,
women, and children, of the loyal Toulonese received an asylum on
board the ships of the British." ‡ The refugees of Toulon, accord-
ing to Lamartine, were conveyed to Leghorn, and established them-
selves in Tuscany. Lamartine paints the horrors of that night, and
the difficulties of the attempt to carry away the terrified multitudes.
But he does not distort historical facts, to gratify that hatred of Eng-
land which seems, in some instances, to be engendered by her hospi-
tality. Another historian of the revolution says, "A party of fugi-
tives had found an asylum on board the Spanish and Neapolitan
vessels, where they were treated with a generous sympathy. The
English themselves, although less anxious (*quoique moins empressés*),
received *a certain number*, and the English government allowed
them some support." § Those "sentiments of humanity," which
M. L. Blanc eulogizes in the Spanish admiral, Langara, appear to
have had some place in the heart of the English admiral. Lord
Hood, in his dispatch of the 20th of December, writes, "It is a very
comfortable satisfaction to me that several thousands of the meritori-
ous inhabitants of Toulon were sheltered in his majesty's ships."
Those were sedulously cared for who claimed protection as be-
ing most compromised. Mr. Fox, in the debate on the evacuation
of Toulon, said, if we took away all those who were desirous of
coming away, we had the less to lament our failure; but he added,
that the numerous executions that followed tended to throw a doubt
upon this statement. The executions were indeed numerous. Barère
had expressed the temper of the French convention toward Toulon:

† Tocqueville, "France before the Revolution," p. 384. ‡ Ibid.

* "Parliamentary History," April 10th, 1794, vol. xxxi. col. 243.
† Ibid., col. 246. ‡ James's "Naval History," vol. i. p. 156.
§ Louis Blanc, "Histoire de la Révolution," tom. x. p. 101.

"The conquest won by the Mountain over the Brissotines must be commemorated by a mark set on the place where Toulon once stood. The national thunder must crush the house of every trader in that town." The Committee of Public Safety had sent thither its commissioners, Barras, Fréron, and the younger Robespierre. According to some accounts these ministers of vengeance slew thousands by their fusillades. According to other accounts the number of victims did not exceed a hundred and fifty or two hundred.* The letters of Fréron himself, if not forgeries, contradict the apologists of republican massacres. On the 24th of December, five days after Toulon had been evacuated by the allies, he writes to the committee in Paris that he had secured twelve thousand laborers to raze to the ground the buildings of the town; and he adds, "Each day I accomplish the fall of two hundred heads; and already eight hundred Toulonese have been shot."

The capture and destruction of a large portion of the French fleet at Toulon was of considerable service to Great Britain in the naval war. But, like many other successes, it may be doubted whether the moral injury did not overbalance the material advantage. Burke, before the events of the 18th of December, "heard with infinite sorrow that in taking the King of France's fleet in trust, we instantly unrigged and dismasted the ships. . . . These ships are now so circumstanced that if we are forced to evacuate Toulon, they must fall into the hands of the enemy or be burned by ourselves. I know this is by some considered as a fine thing for us. But the Athenians ought not to be better than the English, or Mr. Pitt less virtuous than Aristides."† This reasoning was too subtle for the parliament or the people to comprehend it. Great Britain was at war with France; and therefore it was good for Great Britain to have destroyed fifteen vessels of war at Toulon, and to have brought away seventeen. When Aristides would not listen to the project of burning the Lacedæmonian fleet, he said that nothing could be more advantageous to the state or less honorable. The parallel does not hold in all its circumstances. The destruction of the Lacedæmonian fleet would have been an act of treachery to confederates. No one denied the advantage of crippling the Toulon fleet, and few could see any injustice in despoiling an enemy, whose language was, "May England be ruined! May England be annihilated! Such ought to be the concluding article of every revolutionary decree of the National Convention of France."‡

In the debate on the address, when parliament was opened on the 21st of January, 1794, Mr. Fox took a retrospect of the events of the preceding seven months. He said that when the session closed in June, there were parties existing in France of equal strength. The Girondins occupied Lyon, Bordeaux, and other places; the royalists possessed La Vendée. The convention not only quelled all internal insurrections, but defeated their foreign enemies. What, he asked, is the inference? "That there is no probability, nor even possibility, of overthrowing the Jacobin government of France in another campaign, nor in another after that." The minority in both houses constantly alleged against Mr. Pitt that the establishment of monarchy in France was the object which he wished to effectuate. They might have reproached him more justly that, if he really had this object at heart, he lost the only real opportunity of giving an energetic support to the loyal and religious spirit which had been awakened in a portion of France, and had neglected thus to oppose a definite principle to the ferocious domination of the Jacobin government. It has been said of Mr. Pitt by one who, looking calmly upon the past, is not carried away by any anti-democratic prejudices, "If it was impossible to preserve peace he should have adopted the only policy which could lead to victory. He should have proclaimed a holy war for religion, morality, property, order, public law, and should have thus opposed to the Jacobins an energy equal to their own."§ In March, 1793, the people of Brittany and La Vendée rushed into such a holy war; and during the whole of that year they were fighting with an energy which at one time appeared not unlikely to hurl back the Jacobin tyranny to its chosen seat of Paris, and give the provinces a chance of escape from the reign of terror which had established itself after the fall of the Girondins. The efforts of the poor Vendeans are in vain. The provinces look on and tremble while the guillotine does its work in the south of France; while the Queen Marie Antoinette—sent before the revolutionary tribunal, on the motion of Barère, who calls the daughter of Maria Theresa "the Austrian woman"—is dragged to the scaffold on the 10th of October; while Vergniaud, the young and eloquent, and twenty-one other Girondin deputies, are put to death on the same day, the 31st of October; while the enthusiastic Madame Roland, and Bailly, once so venerated as a patriot, and the Duke of Orleans, whose fate nobody deplores, are executed early in November; while the Goddess of Reason, personated by a harlot of the opera, is inaugurated at Notre Dame. Surely the outraged humanities and decencies of life will not long endure these horrors. They will be endured; and they will go on from bad to worse. Terror calls out its levy-en-masse to defend the republic from all internal and external enemies. Wherever there is a foe on the frontier the conscripts are hurled against him. Wherever insurrection against the Mountain shows its head, legions march to put it down. Jourdan drives the Prince of Cobourg over the Sambre on the 16th of October. The Vendeans are annihilated at Mans and Savenay in the middle of December. The Jacobin government is successful in all its military operations. Success throws a veil over its crimes; and the French learn to believe that Barère was speaking very reasonably when he exclaimed, "The vessel of the revolution can float into port only on waves of blood."

The exciting and romantic incidents of the war in La Vendée are familiar to most persons, in the charming memoirs of the Marchioness de La Rochejaquelein. She has presented to us, in her simple and touching descriptions, the picture of a community almost wholly different from any other French population at the time of the revolution. La Vendée, known also as *Le Pays du Bocage*—a tract of about a hundred and fifty miles square, on the southern bank and at the mouth of the Loire—was for the most part a sequestered district, with few towns—a pastoral district, where the resident proprietors lived without pomp or luxury, keeping up an affectionate intercourse with the peasantry; and where the curés and their flocks had no differences of opinion, and the philosophy of the revolution had not come to disturb the old piety and its traditional superstitions. This state of tranquillity was interrupted by the harsh measures of the republican authorities, before the death of the king. The murmurs of the people became loud against their oppressors. "The unhappy peasants, wounded in everything that was dear to them—subjected to a yoke which the happiness they had formerly enjoyed made them feel still heavier—revolted at last. . . . The insurrection began, from the impulse of the moment, without plan, without concert, and almost without hopes."* It broke out at La Florent in Anjou, where the young men made a forcible resistance to the commissioners who were superintending the ballot for the levy of troops. Jaques Cathelineau, a hawker of woollens, put himself at the head of his countrymen, who were all accustomed to field-sports, and some familiar with the use of arms. Their numbers soon amounted to a thousand; but after several successful encounters with the republican troops they suddenly dispersed; for Easter was at hand, and they must keep the sacred festival in their own homes. But the Vendeans were soon again in the field, many under the command of M. de Charette, who became the principal chief of the district of Bas Poitou. Another leader, the most popular of the insurgents, was young Henri de la Rochejaquelein, who said to his ten thousand followers, "Follow me when I advance against the enemy; kill me when I turn my back upon them; revenge me, if they bring me down." M. de Lescure, the first husband of the fair historian of La Vendée, was equally beloved. There were other chiefs who held commands, some of whom had served in the army. But the discipline of the insurgents was very imperfect, and their organization still more loose. It was an army of partisans, who fought well, but had little effectual concert in their operations.

To trace the course of civil war in La Vendée would exceed the limits of this history, and would be a departure from its objects. After various successes against the republicans, the contest assumed the most formidable dimensions. Cathelineau was appointed to the chief command of the insurgents, but was soon after killed. General Westermann was dispatched by the convention, with orders to

* Thiers, tom. vi. p. 146; Louis Blanc, tom. x. p. 103.
† "Policy of the Allies."
‡ Speech of Barère, September 21st, 1793.
§ Macaulay, "Life of Pitt."

* "Memoirs of the Marchioness de la Rochejaquelein," English translation, p. 53.

lay waste and burn the whole district. The royalists attacked Westermann at Chatillon, and his defeat was followed by fearful massacres of the republicans in revenge of their vindictive acts. The whole country was in the agonies of an internecine conflict. During the summer the English government offered assistance through an emigrant from Brittany, M. de Tinteniac, who brought dispatches from Mr. Dundas. The ignorance of the English, in all that related to the position of the Vendeans, is described as complete; and M. de Tinteniac, although he stated that the English government appeared disposed to assist, and that all seemed ready for a landing on the coast of France, could not help suspecting its lukewarmness, on account of "the conduct of the English ministry toward the emigrants." The Vendean chiefs proposed a place of landing for a British force, and promised to join with fifty thousand men. For months the Vendeans thought that the promised help would come. The war went on without any assistance from the ministry of Mr. Pitt. It was probably out of his power to render any effectual aid, with a number of other objects in hand, each requiring a few thousand men. We did not make war, as Carnot made war, by throwing a great force upon one point. The convention sent two hundred thousand men into La Vendée, with orders that the whole inhabitants should be exterminated without regard to age or sex, the woods in which they sheltered cut down, the habitations given to the flames. Terrible was the resistance to these sanguinary decrees. Some of the Vendean chiefs, such as M. de Lescure and Henri de la Rochejaquelein, were humane; others, such as Charette, repaid cruelty by cruelty. The Vendeans obtained a victory over Kleber, at Chollet, in September; but another battle was fought on the same ground, when the overwhelming forces of the republic drove the insurgents to the low country on the bank of the Loire. M. de Bonchamps, one of the most efficient commanders, was mortally wounded at Chollet. M. de Lescure had been previously wounded, and met a lingering death. Henri de la Rochejaquelein was now elected to the chief command. The passage of the Loire into Brittany, where the people invited the fugitives to come over and join their fates to theirs, has been described by the Marchioness de la Rochejaquelein with a power which an eye-witness could only attain. She paints the heights of St. Florent forming a semi-circular boundary to a vast level strand reaching to the wide Loire; eighty thousand people crowded in the valley; soldiers, women, children, aged, wounded, flying from destruction; the burning villages behind; another multitude on the opposite shore. There were five thousand republican prisoners with the Vendean army. It was proposed to shoot them. The wounded De Lescure interfered, and they were spared. But another spirit soon came over this devoted royalist almost in his dying hours. He was carried with the army in a carriage. On his way "somebody came and read to him from a newspaper the details of the queen's death. He cried out, 'Ah! the monsters have then killed her! I fought to deliver her! If I live it will be to revenge her. No more quarter.' This idea never quitted him." * The details of that murder, if truly told, would excuse this outburst. The long imprisonment in the Temple; the brutal separation of the mother from her son; her removal to the dens of the Conciergerie; her mock trial and exposure to the obscene insults of the judges of the infamous tribunal; her lofty contempt; her pious fortitude—these were indeed details to move even a merciful leader of a royalist insurrection to think only of revenge. De Lescure died, but his words were not forgotten. Then came a series of battles in which no quarter was given on either side. The harassed fugitives again tried to repass the Loire, reduced in number to ten thousand survivors. The final destruction of "the Catholic army" soon closed that first great struggle of the Vendeans. The brave Henri de la Rochejaquelein was killed. The horrible proceedings of the Jacobin Proconsul Carrier at Nantes—his *noyades*, in which boat-loads of victims were sunk daily by this exulting ruffian—these formed the climax of the horrors of the royalist war. The details of these tragedies are heart-sickening. "Cruel is the panther of the woods, the she-bear bereaved of her whelps; but there is in man a hatred crueller than that." †

While all these struggles in La Vendée, heroic but hopeless, were proceeding during that eventful year, the British government, having twice been in communication with the royalists, at length roused itself to make an effort for their assistance. At the moment when the Vendeans had recrossed the Loire, unable to maintain their position in Brittany, an expedition under the command of Lord Moira, with eight English battalions and ten thousand Hanoverians and emigrants, was dispatched to their assistance. There was no signal from the shore. The help had come too late.

* "Memoirs," p. 312. † Carlyle, book v. chap. 4.

CHAPTER CXCIII.

The Reign of Terror in France—Sentence upon Muir and Palmer in Scotland—Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act—Trials for high treason of Hardy, Tooke, and Thelwall—Invasion threatened—National defence—State of the navy—Howe's naval victory of the first of June—French decree of no quarter for Englishmen and Hanoverians—Jacobinism recognizes the Supreme Being—The fall of Robespierre—Rottenness of the coalition against France—Successes of the French—Recall of the Duke of York from the command of the British forces—Holland lost—Remnant of the British army leaves the continent—Poland finally enslaved when Kosciusko fell—Corsica—Siege of Bastia.

On the opening of the session of parliament in January, 1794, the Earl of Mornington (afterward Marquis Wellesley) delivered a most remarkable speech, in which he traced the whole course of the French Revolution, contending that it was impossible to make peace with those who directed the government of France. His eloquent peroration was in some degree prophetic of the vicissitudes that the then possessors of revolutionary authority might be expected to undergo. Would a great nation rely upon her own sword, or intrust the whole frame of her laws, her liberties, and her religion, "to whatever may be the accidental caprice of any new band of malefactors, who, in the last convulsions of their exhausted country, may be destined to drag the present tyrants to their own scaffolds, to seize their lawless power, to emulate the depravity of their example, and to rival the enormity of their crimes?" * Assuredly the revolution was then steadily pursuing the process of "eating its own children." The Girondins had all vanished—some by the scaffold, some by starvation, some by poison. Other chiefs of rival factions were about to follow. On the 24th of March the Hébertistes were guillotined. On the 3d of April the Dantonists were guillotined. Hébert—the most filthy of writers, the most violent of insurrectionists—and a strange assortment of his disciples were condemned for their love of blood. Danton and Camille Desmoulins, who had grown sick of revolutionary horrors, stood equally in the way of Robespierre, and were condemned for their moderation. The notabilities of the revolution fall in quick succession; but the guillotine knows no distinction of persons. It sweeps all opinions into its sack. It takes without any nicety of selection the widow of Hébert; the widow of Camille Desmoulins; the Princess Elizabeth, the admirable sister of Louis; the Duchess de Grammont, and the Duchess du Chatelet; famous members of the constituent assembly, D'Espremenil, Chapelier, and Thourot; Malesherbes, the generous defender of the king, with his daughter and granddaughter. For republicans and royalists, for rich and poor, for either sex, for bedridden fourscore, and for blooming sixteen, the revolutionary tribunal has its infallible prescription. The prisons of Paris are full—not of violators of the laws for the protection of person and property, but of *suspects*. The prisons must be emptied. In these pleasant months of April and May, when the orange blossoms are smelling sweetly in the Tuileries gardens, the dread machine is doing its daily work upon batches of a dozen or a score; and women sit upon its steps and knit—the "Tricoteuses of Robespierre," who were paid to assist in the "national fêtes"—the priestesses of the sacrifices, during those two months, of five hundred and twenty-seven select victims out of seven thousand prisoners.

These things were not done in a corner. Englishmen heard and read of the atrocities of the Reign of Terror—probably presented to them with some exaggeration. At this season the English government chose to believe that revolutionary principles had an especial attraction for some portion of the people of this country. Obscure quarters of London were swarming with emigrant nobility and clergy—learning to labor at some calling, or earning their bread by teaching their language. Delicately nurtured women were mantua-makers

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxx. col. 1213.

in garrets in the dingy regions of St. Pancras. There might be a few stern believers in equality who would rejoice to see the great ones of the earth humbled in the dust; but even these might have been softened in beholding how cheerfully adversity was borne—in many cases how piously. What Englishmen heard of the course of revolution abroad—its murders, its confiscations, its interruptions of all industry, its conscriptions—what they saw of the privations and humiliations of those who had taken refuge where they might at least be safe from lawless violence—these things were not calculated to make them desirous of such organic changes as would substitute a sanguinary despotism for a limited monarchy, a national convention for a House of Commons, and a revolutionary tribunal for a British jury. Nevertheless, this was the dreaded danger, to proclaim which Burke first rang his alarm-bell. According to the belief of the great parliamentary majority, the advocates of reform were the high-priests of anarchy. Pitt did not hold such extreme views. He said, as he had a right to say, that it was a dangerous time for any constitutional change. But he was carried along with the current; and he practically identified himself with the passions of the time, when he sanctioned the arbitrary attempts to punish reformers as conspirators.

The disposition of the British government was exhibited in a very striking manner in the parliamentary proceedings arising out of the sentences passed by the courts of Scotland upon Thomas Muir and Thomas Fysshe Palmer. We are told by the biographer of Lord Eldon that "the revolutionary poison, distributed by the French republicans, had now begun to operate extensively. A time therefore was considered by the government to have arrived when the safety of the state required prosecutions, which should involve heavier consequences than those attaching under the English law to mere sedition. The first experiments were made in Scotland." * These first experiments were certainly not greatly to the honor of those who, in the sister kingdom, contrived to inflict the punishment of fourteen years' transportation upon Muir, a young advocate at the Scotch bar, and seven years' transportation upon Palmer, an English clergyman, for an offence which in England would have amounted only to a misdemeanor, if a jury could have been found in England to convict the accused. They were agitators for reform in the representation of the people. The lord justice clerk Braxfield summed up violently against Muir; and, says Lord Campbell, "hardly attempted to conceal that the corpus delicti was the advocacy of parliamentary reform." This specimen of a past time asked, what right had the rabble, who had been petitioning parliament, to representation? The landed interest alone has a right to be represented. In passing sentence upon Muir it was proclaimed that by the Roman law, which is held to be the Scotch common law, transportation was among the mildest of penalties; that death was the proper punishment of sedition—death by the gallows or by exposure to wild beasts, as the merciful judge set forth in Latin quotations. In a most learned and able speech in the House of Commons, where these arbitrary proceedings formed the subject of several debates, Mr. Adam maintained that the offence with which these persons were charged in their indictments was what the law of Scotland termed leasing-making—that is, uttering words, or publishing matter, tending to breed discord between the king and his people; and that the punishment of transportation could not, by the same law, be inflicted for the crime of leasing-making. The lord advocate contended that he had indicted them under the common law, and that the judges in Scotland had a discretionary power of punishing by transportation what in England was known as sedition. This law officer had the indiscretion to say that Mr. Adam having talked of assimilating the law of Scotland to the law of England, and of calling the attention of the Scotch judges to the milder punishments of England for the same offence, "he saw no reason for this; on the contrary he saw many strong reasons for bringing the law of England up to that of Scotland." The indignation of Mr. Fox was withering. "If that day should ever arrive which the lord advocate seems so anxiously to wish for—if the tyrannical laws of Scotland should ever be introduced in opposition to the humane laws of England, it would then be high time for my honorable friends and myself to settle our affairs, and retire to some happier clime, where we might at least enjoy those rights which are given to man, and which his nature tells him he has a right to demand." Mr. Pitt had on this occasion, as in many other instances, to endure the reproach of departing from the principles he once professed, in now sanctioning the execution of the sentences upon these men; "whose offence," said Mr. Adam, "might perhaps be traced to the doctrines formerly inculcated by some of those who now held distinguished situations in the cabinet." *

On the 12th of May a message from the king was delivered to the House of Commons by Mr. Secretary Dundas, in which it was stated that upon information of seditious practices carried on by certain societies in London, their books and papers had been seized; and that his majesty had ordered them to be laid before the house. A committee of secrecy was appointed by ballot to examine these papers, and on the 16th they presented their first report. The societies whose papers were thus examined were "The Society for Constitutional Information" and "The London Corresponding Society." † On the presentation of the report, Mr. Pitt dwelled upon the various allegations of the committee; and particularly upon their conclusion that a convention was contemplated, which might take upon itself the character of a general representative of the people; a convention evidently designed, said Mr. Pitt, "to exercise legislative and judicial capacities, to overturn the established system of government, and wrest from the parliament that power which the people and the constitution had lodged in their hands." He then moved "That leave be given to bring in a bill to empower his majesty to secure and detain such persons as his majesty shall suspect are conspiring against his person and government." The proposed measure was a suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act; ‡ and its necessity was grounded upon the recital of the bill, "that a treacherous and detestable conspiracy had been formed for subverting the existing laws and constitution, and for introducing the system of anarchy and confusion which had lately prevailed in France." It was opposed strenuously by the usual small minority, but was rapidly carried through the Commons; and was passed at three o'clock on Sunday morning, the 18th. On the 23d it passed the House of Lords. On the 19th, after examinations before the Privy Council, six persons were committed to the Tower, charged with high-treason; among whom were the Rev. Jeremiah Joyce, private secretary to Earl Stanhope, Horne Tooke, and John Thelwall. The state trials arising out of these arrests, and of the arrests of others also charged with the highest offence known to the law, are among the most interesting proceedings in our constitutional history. Five months were employed by the government in preparation for the arraignment of thirteen persons to be charged with "compassing the death of our lord the king." This resort to the law of constructive treason can scarcely now find a defender, except a remnant be left of the alarmists who regarded the long struggle against popular rights as the saving of the monarchy. Most men agree with the eminent lawyer who now holds the highest office under the crown, that if the ministerial measure had succeeded, "all political agitation must have been extinguished in England; as there would have been a precedent for holding that the effort to carry a measure by influencing public opinion through the means openly resorted to in our days is a compassing of the death of the sovereign. The only chance of escaping servitude would have been civil war." §

The grand jury of Middlesex having found an indictment against twelve persons for high treason, and a special commission having been appointed for their trials, this memorable proceeding commenced at the Session House, in the Old Bailey, on the 28th of October, with the trial of Thomas Hardy. One who was among the twelve accused has described this crisis with some pomp of words which sounds like exaggeration, but which is scarcely an overstrained estimate of the popular feeling. Thomas Holcroft says, "Perhaps this country never witnessed a moment more portentous. The hearts and countenances of men seemed pregnant with doubt and terror. They waited, in something like a stupor of amazement, for the fearful sentence on which their deliverance or their destruction seemed to depend. Never surely was the public mind more profoundly agitated. The whole power of government was directed against Thomas Hardy;

* Twiss, "Life of Lord Eldon," vol. i. p. 230.

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxx. col. 1490 to 1576.

† See *ante*, p. 986.

‡ See vol. iv. p. 565.

§ Lord Campbell, "Lives of the Lord Chancellors," vol. vi. p. 470.

in his fate seemed involved the fate of the nation."* Erskine and Gibbs were assigned as counsel for the prisoner. Sir John Scott, attorney-general, opened the case for the prosecution in a speech of nine hours. He maintained that the evidence would establish the fact of a conspiracy to depose the king, which, in point of law, is an overt act of compassing his death ; that this overt act was included in the still wider design of subverting the entire monarchy, and substituting a commonwealth, which was the real object aimed at, under color of a full and fair representation of the people ; that the convention which the persons thus charged conspired to establish, was a convention to alter the whole form of the sovereign power of this country, by vesting in a body formed upon universal suffrage and the rights of man, all the legislative and executive government of the country ; and contemplating the destruction of the regal office in the constitution of the state was an overt act of high treason. The evidence to establish this statement occupied five days, from an early hour of each morning till midnight. "In the annals of English criminal jurisprudence there had not yet been an instance of a trial for high treason that had not been finished in a single day," says Lord Campbell. This evidence embraced copious extracts of the voluminous publications issued by the reforming societies—resolutions and speeches all over the country—toasts at public dinners—a vast variety of matters which Erskine, in his reply, described as not the peculiar transactions of the prisoners, but of immense bodies of the king's subjects in various parts of the kingdom, assembled without the smallest reserve. "Not a syllable have we heard read," said he, "in the week's imprisonment that we have suffered, that we had not all of us read for months and months before the prosecution was heard of."† This reply of the great advocate occupied seven hours in the delivery. No one, even at this distance of time, can read it without emotion ; for assuredly in the whole compass of forensic eloquence is not to be found a nobler display of impressive reasoning, of constitutional learning, of earnestness in the assertion of the great principles of liberty, of fearlessness in the exposure of the tendencies toward arbitrary government. Men must then have acknowledged the force of the great truth which he uttered, as we now regard it from the historical point of view, when he said, "We are in a crisis of our affairs which, putting justice out of the question, calls in sound policy for the greatest prudence and moderation. At a time when other nations are disposed to subvert their establishments, let it be our wisdom to make the subject feel the practical benefits of our own ; let us seek to bring good out of evil ; the distracted inhabitants of the world will fly to us for sanctuary, driven out of their countries from the dreadful consequences of not attending to seasonable reforms in government, victims to the folly of suffering corruptions to continue, till the whole fabric of society is dissolved and tumbles into ruin. Landing upon our shores, they will feel the blessing of security, and they will discover in what it consists ; they will read this trial, and their hearts will palpitate at your decision ; they will say to one another, and their voices will reach to the ends of the earth, May the constitution of England endure forever—the sacred and yet remaining sanctuary for the oppressed." This confident anticipation of their verdict was not too bold. Although the House of Commons had made an *ex parte* declaration of guilt in the recital to the act for suspending the Habeas Corpus—although "the protesting Commons was itself the accuser, and acted as a solicitor to prepare the very briefs for the prosecution"‡—the orator's belief was fully realized. After nine days' close confinement the jury returned a verdict of not guilty.

The advisers of the crown now desperately resolved to cast the die for another chance of success. Upon the same charge, and with the same evidence, John Horne Tooke was arraigned. He took much of the conduct of the defence into his own hands, by cross-examining the witnesses for the prosecution. His coolness and readiness, his repartees and quaint questions, appeared to betoken a levity inconsistent with his serious position on a trial for life or death. But he had the discretion to leave the speech for his defence in the hands of Erskine. It was bolder and more confident than the speech for Hardy. Mr. Pitt was examined by Tooke as a witness for the defence, and he was subjected to a life-enduring mortification in having to say that he "did not recollect" having been present at a meeting of delegates previous to one of his motions in parliament on the subject of reform. There were others who did recollect. The trial of Tooke lasted three days. The jury, without retiring, returned a verdict of not guilty. A third prisoner was put to the bar, John Thelwall. He was also defended by Erskine ; and the same verdict of not guilty was returned upon the third day. The service which Erskine rendered to his country, by his wonderful efforts on these trials, has been estimated by one of the most eminent of the orators of our own age : "If there be yet among us the power of freely discussing the acts of our rulers ; if there be yet the privilege of meeting for the promotion of needful reforms ; if he who desires wholesome changes in our constitution be still recognized as a patriot, and not doomed to die the death of a traitor ; let us acknowledge with gratitude that to this great man, under Heaven, we owe this felicity of the times."* Lord Campbell affirms that Lord Loughborough was a principal adviser of these trials ; and he adds a remarkable anecdote : "To the credit of George III., when the whole subject was understood by him, he rejoiced in the acquittals, and laying all the blame on the chancellor, he said, 'You have got us into the wrong box, my lord, you have got us into the wrong box. Constructive treason won't do, my lord, constructive treason won't do.'"†

A sagacious observer of the public temper of this period—one who had lost all his original enthusiasm for the French Revolution, and dreaded that the French would "preserve nothing of civilized life but its vices"—writes in October, "There are many persons here who wish a total overthrow of our constitution, and many more who desire great changes in it." Romilly thus separates the smaller class of republicans from the larger class of reformers. There was a far more numerous class than either of these—"the majority of the nation," who are "most ardent zealots for maintaining our constitution as it is, and disposed to think the reform of the most palpable abuse, which has been of long continuance, as a species of sacrilege."‡ We may be sure therefore that to "the majority of the nation" the determination of the government to resist every species of innovation offered no ground for alarm or solicitude. They thought there were greater dangers than abridgment of public liberty. Nevertheless, the confiding Englishman who believed himself free, at a time when the political spy was everywhere dodging his footsteps, had no desire again to look upon heads on Temple Bar, and was not sorry when Hardy, the shoemaker, and Parson Horne, and Thelwall, the lecturer, and nine other men of various grades in society, returned to their homes. Whatever might have been the general apathy, this was, indeed, a period of real danger—a period in which the rashness of impracticable theorists and the terrors of party lawgivers might have plunged the country into a contest which would have ended in anarchy or despotism. But the quiescent state of the bulk of the people was their safety. The rallying cry of liberty at the beginning of the reign of George III. was no longer heard, but the principle was not dead. There is a noble passage in Erskine's speech for Hardy, the truth of which is as fresh now as on the day of its utterance, and whose value may even be better estimated at the present day, after the experience of the last quarter of a century : "In reviewing the history of this highly-favored island, it is most beautiful, and at the same time highly encouraging, to observe by what an extraordinary concurrence of circumstances, under the superintendence of a benevolent Providence, the liberties of our country have been established. Amid the convulsions arising from the maddest ambition and injustice, and while the state was alternately departing from its poise, on one side and on the other, the great rights of mankind were insensibly taking root and flourishing. Though sometimes monarchy threatened to lay them prostrate, though aristocracy occasionally undermined them, and democracy, in her turn, rashly trampled on them, yet they have ever come safely round at last. This awful and sublime contemplation should teach us to bear with one another, when our opinions do not quite coincide ; extracting

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 180.
† "Erskine's Speeches," vol. iii. p. 393.
‡ Speech on the Trial of Horne Tooke, "Erskine's Speeches," vol. iv. p. 7.

* Lord Brougham, "Statesmen."
† "Lives of the Lord Chancellors," vol. vi. p. 267. Lord Campbell has no reference to an authority for this anecdote.
‡ "Memoirs of Sir S. Romilly," Letter ciii.

final harmony from the inevitable differences which ever did, and ever must, exist among men." *

From the commencement of the war the spirit of reform in England was abundantly neutralized by the spirit of patriotism. The French government at the beginning of 1794 threatened invasion. The English government not only increased the regular forces, but advocated the formation of bodies of volunteers in every county. On the 17th of April an act was passed, "for encouraging and disciplining such corps or companies of men as shall voluntarily enroll themselves, for the defence of their counties, towns, or coasts, or for the general defence of the kingdom, during the present war." This arming of the people was principally confined to corps of yeomanry cavalry. Lord Grenville, writing to his brother, says, "I think the natural defence of this country against an enemy once landed, is by the immense irregular cavalry that might be collected and formed round small bodies of disciplined horse. This, of course, does not exclude the necessity of some infantry to oppose the enemy in front."† Lord Grenville's notions of national defence seem to have been as crude as the plans of the ministry for carrying on the war abroad. In the naval administration there was less to be deplored. A great writer has said, "The English navy no mismanagement could ruin. But during a long period whatever mismanagement could do was done."‡ A great naval commander, on the contrary, says of the period at which he first joined the service (June 1793), "The energy of the government kept pace with the patriotism of the nation. That fearful system of naval jobbery, which unhappily characterized the subsequent progress of the war, crowding the seas with worthless vessels, purchased into the service in exchange for borough influence, had not as yet begun to thwart the unity of purpose and action."§ A system different to that of the present time seems to have been then pursued. "Dockyards in those days were secondary objects. At Sheerness the people lived like rabbits in a warren, in old hulks, hauled up high and dry; yet everything was well done, and the supervision perfect. . . . The service now seems to savor too much of the dockyard, and too little of the seaman. Formerly, both officers and men had to lend a hand in everything; and few were the operations which, unaided by artificers, they could not perfectly accomplish."‖ There was no false economy in the supply of means for manning the navy; although the want of men was sensibly felt. The number of 85,000 seamen and marines, voted by parliament for the year, could only be obtained by the wretched system of impressment. Heavy guns, known as carronades, were being gradually introduced in a few ships of the line. Invention was busy in the arts of war as well as in those of peace. The French had invented the telegraph; and they had applied the hitherto useless balloon to observations of the nature of a country, and the position of an enemy. Steam navigation for warlike purposes had even been dreamed of. Experiments upon the application of the steam-engine to the propulsion of mercantile vessels had been tried, at great cost, and with small results. It is stated that Fulton had, in 1793, submitted some drawings of an apparatus for steam-navigation to Lord Stanhope. This ingenious nobleman, as ardent as a projector as he was violent as a politician, in 1794 believed in the immediate practicability of that extraordinary application of mechanical power which, half a century afterward, was to revolutionize the entire system of naval warfare. He thus writes to Wilberforce: "I know, and in a few weeks shall prove, that ships of any size, and for certain reasons the larger the better, may be navigated in any narrow or other sea, without sails, though occasionally with, but so as to go without wind, and even directly against both wind and waves." The earl did construct such a paddle vessel, but its speed did not go beyond three miles an hour. Nevertheless, he saw with remarkable clearness the final results of what he terms a "stupendous fact;" that it would "render all the existing navies of the world—that is, military navies—no better than lumber. For what can ships do that are dependent upon wind and weather, against fleets wholly independent of either? Therefore the boasted superiority of the English navy is no more. We must have a new one."¶

The old-fashioned naval battles of the war of the French Revolution, when adverse winds baffled many an attempt to bring an enemy to action; when admirals manœuvred for days to get the weather-gage, if they came in sight of their adversary; when "a short range was ever the chosen distance"*—these yard-arm to yard-arm contests may seem of inferior importance to those who may hereafter have to read of a great sea-fight between fleets of screw-steamers, armed with rifled-cannon whose range is estimated by miles. But they can never be without their interest to a nation whose "home is on the deep"—whose safety will be insecure when its young men read with indifference of the victories achieved by Howe and Jervis and Duncan and Nelson. In the first ten years of these momentous wars the signal triumphs of the British fleets were the counterbalance to the long series of disasters and mistakes in the employment of the British armies. The earliest in the series of great naval victories was that of Earl Howe, on the first of June. The veteran who had been a midshipman under Anson in 1740 was in command of the channel fleet in 1794, waiting at Portsmouth for intelligence from his cruisers that the Brest fleet had put to sea. That fleet was declared by the French journalists to be the most formidable that had ever anchored in Brest harbor; and they proclaimed that "all burn with desire to fight the enemies of their country to the very banks of the Thames, and under the walls of London." The French convention had sent its commissioner, Jean Bon St. André, to watch over the movements of its admiral, Villaret Joyeuse, and to remind the crews of a decree which he had himself proposed to the convention, that every officer should be adjudged a traitor who struck his colors to a superior force, until his ship was in danger of sinking before the crew could be saved. Admiral Howe sailed from St. Helen's, on the 2d of May, with thirty-four sail of the line, of which eight were detached to protect two convoys of merchant-vessels clear of the Channel. The French fleet had also to look out for a convoy expected to be returning from the United States and the West India Islands. With twenty-six sail of the line, and five frigates, Lord Howe cruised for many days off Ushant, in foggy weather. At last it was ascertained that the Brest fleet had left the harbor. It was not descried till the 28th of May. In the number of line of battle ships the French were equal to the English; in size, and in the weight of metal and the number of men, they were superior. On the evening of the 28th there was a partial engagement, in which the English 74, the Audacious, was so shattered as to be obliged to separate and make for Plymouth; and the Révolutionnaire, a French ship of 110 guns, was towed into Rochefort, both ships having been separated from their respective fleets. There was much firing between the English van and the French rear on the following day. On the 30th and 31st inst. a heavy fog prevented any decisive movement. On the morning of the 1st of June the sky was bright, and the French were seen under easy sail, in order of battle. Then began one of the most desperate actions in our maritime records. The close fighting lasted little more than an hour, when the French admiral, who had been engaged with Howe's own ship, the Queen Charlotte, crowded off, followed by all who could carry sail, leaving half his dismasted fleet behind him. French historians, not satisfied with the tribute which the British admiral paid to the "customary resolution" of his enemy,† detail this battle with the grossest exaggerations, and adopt the falsehoods long since exploded. "The French had only twenty-six ships, while their enemies had thirty-six," says Thiers.‡ He glances, without contradicting it, at the narrative which Carlyle describes as "the fable of Le Vengeur,"§ which fable Lamartine boldly repeats. Surrounded by three enemy's ships, the historian of the Girondins says, she still fought. The English kept clear of her as of a body whose last convulsions might be dangerous. The crew carried the pride of the flag even to suicide *en masse*; obstinately refusing all quarter, waiting while the water, from minute to minute, was increasing in the hold, until they gradually submerged; continuing to fire till the last gun was covered with the waves; and then going down with the ship amid cries of *Vive la République*. The fable was exposed in 1802 by Mr. W. S. Rose; but it having been repeated by English writers, Admiral Griffiths came forward in 1838 to declare that the whole story was a ridiculous piece of nonsense; that

* "Erskine's Speeches," vol. iii. p. 347.
† "Court, etc., of George III.," vol. ii. p. 255.
‡ Macaulay, "Life of Pitt."
§ Earl of Dundonald, "Autobiography of a Seaman," vol. i. p. 53.
‖ Ibid., p. 60. ¶ "Wilberforce Correspondence," vol. i. p. 109.

* James's "Naval History."
† Howe's Dispatch, June 2.
‡ "Histoire de la Révolution," tom. vi. p. 78, ed. 1846, Paris.
§ Carlyle, in 2d edit.

at the moment when the Vengeur sank the action had ceased some time; that a hundred and twenty-seven of her crew were prisoners on board the Culloden (of which ship Admiral Griffiths was then fourth lieutenant), besides about a hundred in the Alfred, the Vengeur having been taken possession of by the boats of those ships, and the British ensign hoisted. "Seven ships," says Lord Howe in his dispatch, "remained in our possession; one of which, however, sank before the adequate assistance could be given to her crew; but many were saved." Lamartine tells us that "the victorious shipwreck of the Vengeur became one of the popular songs of the country." The whole story was an invention of Barère. "It may be regarded as Barère's masterpiece—the largest, most inspiring piece of *blague* manufactured, for some centuries, by any man or nation."* The French lost their seven ships of the line, but their convoy from America arrived safely in port. The battle of the first of June was useful to us beyond its immediate results. It gave confidence to the nation. But it was a lesson to our rulers not to believe too implicitly that at sea we were so infinitely superior to any enemy; that inexperienced captains and impressed crews were invincible. Seven ships were taken, but the others that had been dismasted were suffered to escape. It was afterward said that if Nelson had been in the place of Howe the probability is that the French would not have saved a single ship. The biographer of Howe, Sir John Barrow, asks, "What could Lord Nelson or any other commander effect if his whole plan was deranged by the bad qualities of his ships, and the inexperience and incapacity of many of their commanders?" The parliament and the people were satisfied with the results of the first of June. Mr. Dundas especially pointed out "the national humanity" that had been evinced in saving the lives of drowning enemies; and he said, "Let any man contrast this conduct with the decree of another nation, the object of which was that no quarter should be shown."† Five days before the first of June the National Convention, upon the motion of Barère, had thus resolved: "The National Convention decrees that no Englishman or Hanoverian shall be made prisoner."

The system of terror of the theory of which this odious decree was the exponent was approaching its termination. Fortunately for the honor of the French soldiers the decree was for them only a theory. No respect was paid to the order of the convention. The army of France in Holland must have been ashamed of their government, when the Duke of York, in his general orders of the 7th of June, announced this decree to the troops under him, reminding them that "mercy to the vanquished is the brightest gem in a soldier's character," and exhorting them "not to suffer their resentment to lead them to any precipitate act of cruelty, which may sully the reputation they have acquired in the world." He truly said, "In all the wars which from the earliest times have existed between the English and French nations, they have been accustomed to consider each other in the light of generous as well as brave enemies."‡ The system of terror was coming to an end. But in France it was not a theory as long as Robespierre was the real ruler of the unhappy country. In the months of June and July fifteen hundred and seven persons were condemned by the revolutionary tribunal, and were carted every day to the guillotine—every day, with the exception during these two months of five décadi, the décadi being the public holiday substituted for Sunday. In July the décadi fell on the 8th; and the suspension for twenty-four hours of the work of blood was compensated by the execution of sixty-seven on the 7th and sixty on the 9th. The work went on, although the convention had deposed the Goddess of Reason and decreed "the existence of the Supreme Being." Robespierre, on the first décadi of June the 8th, officiated as high priest to this newly-discovered divinity of the revolution. On that wonderful fête day the sound of cannon summoned the people to the garden of the Tuileries. Beautiful processions of mothers with bouquets of roses, maidens with baskets of flowers, and of citizens with branches of oak, spoke of joy and love, such as should celebrate the festival of the Author of Nature! A mound has been raised, on which as many members of the convention stand as can be crowded round four pasteboard mawkins, of hideous aspect, representing Atheism, Egotism, Discord, Ambition. Robespierre, in a sky-blue coat, takes a torch from the hand of David the painter, who prepared this Mystery, and he sets fire to the turpentine-anointed images. As they blaze and crumble into ashes a figure slowly rises out of the trap-door of the mound. It is the statue of Wisdom. Unhappily the face of Wisdom appeared entirely blackened by the flame, which was regarded as a sinister omen."* Other processions succeeded; and the people sang a hymn to the Eternal, composed for the occasion; and there were discoursings and embracings most touching to hear and to see. "The instrument of punishment had disappeared under a covering of rich hangings."† Two days after this festival, which was to be the herald of gladness for all the earth, it was decreed in the convention that the revolutionary tribunal should be divided into four tribunals, so as to do its work more expeditiously. The rich hangings were taked down. The "instrument of punishment" shows its face again without any false shame. The Tricoteuses again sit upon its steps, and the passing red-caps speak out the name of their faithful servant, with a gratitude that scorns the euphemism of modern republicans.

Robespierre, after this miserable extravaganza of the festival of the Supreme Being had been performed, kept aloof from the convention and from the Committee of Public Safety. In his House of Lords, the Jacobin Club, he placed his chief reliance to carry him through the dangers that were gathering around him. During this term of his absence from the immediate direction of affairs, the guillotine was working at its most furious rate; and it has been surmised that he was therefore not directly responsible for the executions of that horrible period. His two ferocious colleagues, Couthon and St. Just, were in full activity, and were in constant communication with him. The triumvirate worked together, and happily they fell together. Other members of the Committee of Public Safety began to tremble or their own lives. Rumors were afloat that lists of the proscribed had been seen whose destruction was to prepare the way for the rule of a supreme dictator, when he had dealt with the convention *en coupe réglée*—as a forest marked out in patches to be cut down in succession. On the 26th of July Robespierre entered the hall of the convention. The speech which he delivered from the tribune, calling in the old terms for vengeance upon traitors, was received with no applause; and a motion that the speech should be printed having been passed, was after a violent debate rescinded. It is decidedly a crisis. Robespierre in the evening seeks the solace of his Jacobin Club, where there is no mutiny; and his myrmidons shout for revolt against convention and Committee of Public Safety. That night, members of the convention begin to fear that they shall meet no more. But they do meet. Insurrection has not yet organized itself. St. Just begins to read a report, Robespierre standing by. He is interrupted by many voices. Tallien draws a dagger, exclaiming, "If the convention dare not strike the tyrant, I dare." Loud rise the shouts of fury against the tyrant—against the triumvirs. The president rings his bell in vain, while Robespierre cries, "Will you hear me, president of assassins?" "Decree of accusation" is roared out on all sides. Robespierre and his brother Augustin, Couthon, St. Just, Lebas—are decreed. But the struggle is not yet over. The municipality will resist the convention. The accused are sent off to prison; but the jailers have orders not to admit any brought in custody. They are taken to the town hall. Paris is in tumult through the afternoon and night. The convention have decreed Robespierre and his adherents out of law. They have given the command of troops to Barras, who goes forth to encounter the troops of the municipality under Henriot. They stand face to face in the Place de Grève. "Hear the decree of the convention," is the voice on one side—"Robespierre and all rebels out of law." The lighted matches are now applied to the loaded cannon. The armed men of each party unite to uphold the decree. Henriot rushes into the Hôtel de Ville to say all is lost. Robespierre puts a pistol in his mouth, and blows off his under jaw. Henriot and Augustin Robespierre throw themselves out of the window. St. Just, Couthon, Lebas, think of suicide, but attempt it not, or fail in the attempt. At four in the afternoon of the 28th of July, Robespierre, his jaw bound up, his mangled brother lying beside him, with Henriot in the same wretched condition, are carried on a tumbril to the guillotine, other tumbrils following with other condemned. From the time when the dictator attempted self-destruction he spake no word. He opens his eyes as he is lifted upon the scaffold, and looks for an instant on the bloody

* Carlyle, in 2d edit.
† "Parliamentary History," June 13.
‡ "Annual Register," 1794, "State Papers," p. 168.

* Louis Blanc, tom. x. p. 457. † Ibid., p. 454.

knife. The executioner's work is done, and Paris sends forth its universal shout of joy.

The character of Robespierre is one of the unsolved problems of history. His crimes are upon the surface; his motives are not so manifest. Coleridge, in 1795, anticipated the substance of a great deal that has been written about him: "Robespierre possessed a glowing ardor that still remembered the end, and a cool ferocity that never either overlooked or scrupled the means. What that end was is not known; that it was a wicked one has by no means been proved."* Most persons—however some may be bewildered by the manifold speculations afloat in the world as to the objects which he proposed to himself in his difficult career—will agree that, if "he was, beyond most men that ever lived, hateful, selfish, unprincipled, cruel, unscrupulous," it may also be affirmed "that he was not the worst of the Jacobin group." †

The vicissitudes of parties in France were no interruption to the success of the French armies. After the fall of Robespierre Lord Cornwallis very justly described this remarkable state of things: "The French, although they have neither security of person nor property, although the streets of Paris and all their principal towns are daily streaming with blood, and their government, if such it can be called, is the most tyrannical and cruel that ever existed, still carry on the war with a vigor and energy that is scarcely to be conceived; and when one set of butchers are themselves slaughtered at Paris, the army pays the same deference to their murderers as they had before done to the villains whose heads they had cut off."‡ To understand this apparent anomaly, it must not be forgotten that the French army was directed by one prevailing mind, that of Carnot; and that it had one great idea to fight for, the liberty and independence of the country. The armies of the coalition were distracted by the rivalries and jealousies of sovereigns and generals. The incapacity of the leaders was as notorious as the selfishness of the crowned heads who appointed them.

Before the close of 1793 the rottenness of the coalition against France was understood by the English government—understood, but still sought to be remedied by golden props. Lord Malmesbury is sent upon a special mission to Berlin. It was in vain that Lord Grenville desired the ambassador to say to his Prussian majesty that the King of England "never will submit to purchase by a subsidy that assistance to which he is entitled by treaty."§ It was in vain that he was instructed "that the utmost jealousy prevails between the two courts of Vienna and Berlin." The English cabinet was divided in opinion. Loughborough was "for giving a large subsidy to the King of Prussia, but Pitt and Grenville think otherwise."‖ Lord Malmesbury at Berlin found that "the necessity of pecuniary relief was still the constant theme of the Prussian ministers." And so at last a treaty was signed, by which his Prussian majesty agreed, upon 300,000*l.* being paid as a subsidy, to furnish an army of sixty-two thousand men, under a Prussian commander-in-chief, at the further rate of 50,000*l.* per month; 1*l.* 12*s.* per head for bread and forage each month during the term of its service; and 100,000*l.* when the army was to return home. The dispatches of Lord Malmesbury detail, at wearisome length, the progress of these pitiful bargains. The same system was pursued by Austria. Mr. Thomas Grenville is negotiating with the court of Vienna. They had required, "as indispensable conditions, that their loan must be completely satisfied in England to enable them to answer the demands of this year, and that they must receive from England a considerable subsidy for next campaign, if it is expected that they should act vigorously in the prosecution of the war."¶ Mr. Grenville wrote that it was his confident belief that if the English cabinet expected to purchase energy and activity at this dear rate from the government of the emperor, the experiment would fail. "There is no soul in the bodies of these men." He was perfectly right. We want no key beyond the rapacity and heartlessness of the Prussian and Austrian governments to explain the series of calamities which befell the allied armies in the campaign of 1794. The military details have little interest for the general reader of the present day. The Duke of York defeated Pichegru on the 10th of May. Charleroi, besieged by the French, had been relieved by the hereditary Prince of Orange on the 14th of May, after a severe battle, when the enemy was driven across the Sambre. Jourdan, having given some offence to the Committee of Public Safety, had left the army, and was again a shopkeeper at Limoges. He was summoned from his obscurity to take the command of the army of the Moselle. The choice of Carnot was amply justified. After defeating the Austrian general at Arlon he captured Charleroi on the 25th of June; and on the 29th won the battle of Fleurus—the greatest victory of the revolutionary arms before the career of Napoleon. This battle decided the fate of the Netherlands. His operations were a succession of triumphs over the Austrians, and led to the necessity of the Duke of York retreating from Tournay and Oudenarde upon Antwerp. There was little chance now of preserving Holland. Confident supporters of Mr. Pitt's policy began to despair. One of these supporters, Lord Mornington, saw very clearly what would be the probable result. In a letter to Mr. Addington, on the 27th of July, he says, "I am full of despondency upon the subject of the war. I think it is too probable Holland will fall." Then, he thought that the resources of France would receive an enormous accession from this conquest; that the fleets of Denmark and Sweden would join hers; that she would add the plunder of the Netherlands and of all the countries on the banks of the Rhine; that Switzerland and Italy would be at her mercy. "I expect," he says, "to see the whole of this realized, having, after a good deal of reflection, entirely renounced all confidence in our allies, and all hopes of any internal convulsion in France."* The successes of the French may also in a great degree be attributed to the extraordinary military capacity of the men who were leaders of her troops, even in that early period of the great war. In the army under Jourdan were serving Moreau, Bernadotte, Kleber, Ney, and Soult. They had one purpose—to make the republic victorious. They had the certainty that the humblest in the army might rise to the highest command if he successfully performed his duty—for success was a test of merit, however imperfect and occasionally unjust was the criterion. The British army, with some exceptions, presented a deplorable contrast; and there was no cordiality between the British commander-in-chief and the Austrian generals. Lord Cornwallis was sent out to arrange a system of co-operation that might remove these jealousies. It was thought by the British government not unlikely that the Austrian government might intrust the general command to one so experienced as Cornwallis himself; and that the Duke of York might be persuaded to retire from a post for which he was manifestly incompetent. The letters of Lord Cornwallis show the progress of these negotiations, which were utterly fruitless. Mr. Windham went out to smooth the difficulties in the way of the Duke of York's resignation, to which difficulties he appears too readily to have yielded. These might have ultimately been overcome; but nothing could counteract what Windham describes as "the dreadful duplicity of the Austrians, and the unfeeling and unprincipled indifference with which they sacrifice the greatest public interests to their private emoluments and animosities."† The king, however, stood in the way of the desire of his cabinet that Lord Cornwallis should have the command of the allied armies. He objected to the supercession of his son by an Englishman. He would not object to the command being intrusted to General Clairfait.‡ Cornwallis was unwilling to be placed in a position of such delicacy; but he saw the necessity of a change by which the public good might be consulted instead of private feelings, even those of royalty. At last the necessity became so obvious that, although there was an end to the notion of appointing Cornwallis to the command, Mr. Dundas informed him on the 27th of November that "Mr. Pitt wrote a very long and dutiful letter, but at the same time a very honest and firm one, to the king, stating the necessity of putting an end to the Duke of York's command of the army on the continent." His royal highness was on that day requested to return home. §

The previous disasters of the army under the command of the duke had been very serious. When Windham was at the British headquarters, at Bois-le-Duc, on the 13th of September, he saw that the army of 30,000 British, Hessians, and Hanoverians, was left to act

* "The Friend," Essay xii.
† Lord Brougham, "Statesmen"—Robespierre.
‡ "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 267.
§ "Diaries, etc., of the Earl of Malmesbury," vol. ii. p. 3.
‖ Ibid., p. 5. ¶ "Court, etc., of George III.," vol. ii. p. 262.

* "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. i. p. 123.
† "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 234.
‡ Ibid., p. 263. § Ibid., p. 276.

at ..., without any hope of co-operation, against an enemy who ... aced an immediate attack with an army of 50,000. He blamed himself for not having pressed the resignation of the duke with greater pertinacity; for he could not but wish, "when strong immediate interest forces away every other consideration, that a person of more experience and authority had the command, first to decide whether the battle ought to be fought, and then to conduct the fighting it."* Bois-le-Duc was surrendered by the Dutch after a brief siege. The Duke of York then moved to cover Nimeguen, the possession of which by the French would facilitate their advance into Holland. He was attacked on the 19th of October, and again on the 27th, and compelled to withdraw. Nimeguen was surrendered very shortly after this retreat. Maestricht also surrendered to Kleber. The road into Holland was opened to the republicans. The command of the army, now wretchedly reduced in number, was left to a Hanoverian nobleman, Count Walmoden. The winter had set in with severity. The Hanoverian general appears to have believed that in winter an army could do nothing but rest in its quarters. Pichegru, the French commander, thought otherwise. He crossed the River Waal on the ice in the middle of December. Then the British troops, 8000 in number, who were commanded by General Dundas under Walmoden, made a desperate attack upon the French, and drove them back over the Waal. But the bravery of our troops was exerted in vain. They were suffering great privations from a wretchedly managed commissariat; and when Pichegru again crossed the Waal with an immense army, there was no chance but that of a speedy retreat to save the remnant of the British. After terrible losses from a pursuing enemy, and from the inclement weather, two or three thousand of our countrymen fought their way to the mouth of the Elbe, and embarked at Bremen for England. Holland was lost.

"Wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together." France was alive, and dangerous. Poland was prostrate —"the sick man" of that time; and the eagles were at hand to hasten the death, and divide the carcase. But there was an awakening before the death. When Poland, in 1792, saw her liberal constitution put down by the armies of Russia, and had called in vain upon Prussia to support her in a resistance to aggression.† The national spirit of independence was embodied under Prince Poniatowski, and Kosciusko showed his countrymen that a great leader would not be wanting if the prospect of deliverance was sufficiently clear for a protracted conflict. The oppressors were too powerful. Russia appropriated a large share of the sick man's possessions, and chucked a smaller share to Prussia. Poniatowski, Kosciusko, and many others who had fought against Russia, left their country. In 1794 the time appeared favorable for another attempt at independence. In the north of Poland there was an insurrection. An army was quickly organized. Kosciusko returned to Poland, and was appointed the leader of his countrymen. He published a manifesto against the Russians, and obtained a signal victory on the 4th of April. The people at Warsaw then rose, and expelled the Russians from their city. Aid from all sides came to the patriotic cause. Kosciusko was advancing to meet the Russian intruders, when Frederic William of Prussia, having received his pay from England for effectual assistance in the war against France, turned his thoughts to a more advantageous prospect than a hearty and honest fulfilment of his engagements would have afforded. He advanced into Poland at the head of forty thousand men, and was boldly met by Kosciusko with a force not one third of that number. Kosciusko was obliged to retreat toward Warsaw; but he effectually covered that capital for two months. Austria now considered it expedient to take a hand in this royal game, which promised great gains to those who made their stakes in time. While she was bargaining for loans and subsidies with England, and leaving the Duke of York to bear the brunt of the French attacks in the Netherlands, she marched an army into Little Poland. On the 10th of October, in an unsuccessful battle against the Russians under Suwaroff, Kosciusko was wounded. As he fell he exclaimed, "*Finis Poloniæ.*" The struggle was continued for a little while, and then Warsaw capitulated; after Suwaroff had put to the sword twenty thousand wretched inhabitants of the suburb of Praga—a massacre as horrid as that of Ismail, which, four years before, had signalized the triumph of this semi-barbarian.

There was one achievement of this year, memorable as an example of British daring, though it was a success without any permanent advantages. At the commencement of the French revolution the island of Corsica had been recognized as a department of France. But Paoli, who had been many years an exile from his country, returned, and finally organized a revolt against the French authorities. He entered into communication with Lord Hood, after the evacuation of Toulon; and it was determined that the republican occupiers of Fiorenzo should be besieged. Troops were landed; and the French, being unable to maintain the post, concentrated their forces at Bastia. The British general, Dundas, thought the place too strong to be taken without a reinforcement. Horatio Nelson, one of Lord Hood's captains, said he would be ready to attack it with five hundred men, and the crew of his own ship, the Agamemnon. With his usual firm reliance upon the bravery and endurance of his sailors, and unbounded confidence in his own powers, Nelson effected for his admiral the reduction of this strong place without the help of General Dundas, taking the command of the soldiers, seamen, and marines. Four thousand troops capitulated to a force not exceeding twelve hundred men. Corsica, for a short period, was annexed to Great Britain. The people had a free constitution offered to them, and they testified their desire to be under British protection. It was an union of very short duration, for it had no natural principles of cohesion. Corsica very soon came again under the dominion of France; and certainly this island, with its fierce and ignorant population, was not a possession that would have been easy to retain under a system of regulated liberty, even if it had been worth retaining for any higher object than the assertion of national pride.

CHAPTER CXCIV.

Accessions to the ministry—Opening of the session—Mr. Canning—Opposition to the address—Mr. Wilberforce—Acquittal of Warren Hastings—Marriage of the Prince of Wales—Session closed—Expedition to Quiberon—Insurrections in Paris—Revolt of the sections suppressed by Bonaparte—Opening of parliament—Attack upon the king—Coercive policy of the government—Dread of Mr. Fox of approaching absolutism—Bonaparte chief of the army of Italy—Territorial divisions of Italy—Bonaparte's first Italian campaign—Austrian successes in Germany—Lord Malmesbury negotiates for peace at Paris—Death of the Empress Catherine II.—Retirement of Washington—French fleet in Bantry Bay.

Before the meeting of parliament on the 30th of December, 1794, the ministry of Mr. Pitt had received some important accessions from that section of the Whig party which had already given him their support in debates and in divisions. The Duke of Portland was appointed third secretary of state; Mr. Windham, secretary at war; and Earl Spencer, first lord of the admiralty. Earl Fitzwilliam went to Ireland as lord lieutenant, in December, but he was recalled in the following March.

Whatever was the amount of national gloom at the prospect of the war, there was one man who never lost heart or hope. The royal speech on the 30th of December was the anticipation of the sentiments which William Pitt would again and again utter in majestic periods, to which his disciples would listen with unfeigned admiration. Disappointments and reverses were acknowledged, but security was only to be found in firmness and perseverance. Everything showed the rapid decay of the enemy's resources, and the instability of every part of their system. The United Provinces had entered into negotiations for peace, but no established government could derive real security from such negotiations. Forces were to be augmented; large additional burdens were to be imposed; and operations for another campaign were to be concerted with such of the powers of Europe as were impressed with the same sense of the necessity for vigor and exertion.

In the House of Commons, on that 30th of December, the speeches of two of the members excited more attention than even the stately harangue of the prime minister himself. George Canning, who had taken his seat in the previous session, seconded the motion for the address. He had spoken three times during the session which pre-

* "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 268.
† *Ante*, p. 977.

ceded, and had been reproved for a slight exercise of his sarcastic power, being described by Sir Philip Francis as "the young gentleman who had just escaped from his school and his classics, and was not yet conversant in the laws and constitution of his country." Sheridan had somewhat rashly proclaimed to the house at the end of 1792, when Mr. Jenkinson (afterward Earl of Liverpool) made his first speech on the side of the government, that his own party was about to receive a great accession in the companion and friend of the young orator who had then distinguished himself. Canning disappointed the hopes of Sheridan, and became the most devoted as well as the most able supporter of Pitt. Of his adhesion to the great minister's policy, there is a wild story told by Sir Walter Scott: "Canning's conversion from popular opinions was strangely brought round. While he was studying in the Temple, and rather entertaining revolutionary opinions, Godwin sent to say that he was coming to breakfast with him, to speak on a subject of the highest importance. Canning knew little of him, but received his visit, and learned to his astonishment that, in expectation of a new order of things, the English Jacobins designed to place him, Canning, at the head of their revolution. He was much struck, and asked time to think what course he should take; and having thought the matter over, he went to Mr. Pitt, and made the anti-Jacobin confession of faith." Scott tells this story upon the authority of Sir W. Knighton.* A more improbable story was never told. That Godwin, a man of ripe age, singularly cautious in his actions, however bold were his political theories, studiously keeping aloof from all the societies of that troubled time, should have made this extraordinary proposal to a lad whose abilities might have been exhibited in some British forum, but were only known to the general world by his clever papers in "The Microcosm;"† moreover that Pitt should at once have gladly snatched the young democrat out of the dangerous embraces of the English Jacobins, to become his own bosom friend and companion in power—this is indeed a pretty romance, but one which we may leave for any historical value to the adornment of an eloquent biographer.‡ Canning's uncompromising speech on the 30th of December, 1794, for a vigorous continuance of the war, excited the admiration of the ministerial party, but it had an effect little anticipated by the minister. It called up Wilberforce to move an amendment to the address—Wilberforce, the warmest and most disinterested friend of Pitt. The conscientious man had a hard struggle to bring his mind to oppose the statesman whom he loved and revered. But he became convinced that his duty lay in recommending an attempt to negotiate with the French republic for peace on equitable terms. Pitt felt this difference very acutely. "There were but two events in the public life of Mr. Pitt which were able to disturb his sleep—the mutiny at the Nore, and the first open opposition of Mr. Wilberforce."§ The natures of the two friends were too genial to allow of a permanent rupture. Pitt showed no resentment. The more violent of the ministerial party looked upon the unexpected opposition as something not much short of treason. "When I first went to the levee," says Wilberforce, "after moving my amendment, the king cut me." But Wilberforce was not shaken by the taunts of the warlike party in the government, or by the frowns of the sovereign. He subsequently brought forward a specific motion to recommend overtures for peace, which, of course, was rejected by a large majority. He argued with Pitt, in the old confidence of friendship, that he was under a delusion in his abiding belief that "the French were in a gulf of bankruptcy, and that he could almost calculate the time by which their resources would be consumed." At Wilberforce's own table a clever Frenchman had said, "I should like to know who was chancellor of the exchequer to Attila."‖

During this session the resistance to the policy of the government was very ineffectual. The Habeas Corpus Suspension Act was continued. A loan of four millions to the emperor was voted. The trial of Warren Hastings, which had dragged on for seven years, then came to an end, the lord chancellor declaring him, upon the votes of the peers, to be acquitted of all the charges of impeachment brought against him.

The great domestic event of the year was the marriage of the Prince of Wales—an event whose unhappy consequences were not to be measured solely by the miseries and disgraces of the ill-assorted pair themselves. Lord Malmesbury—who was about to return home from his mission at Berlin, where he had unsuccessfully struggled against the selfish dishonor of the Prussian court—was commanded by George III. to proceed to Brunswick, to demand the Princess Caroline in marriage for the Prince of Wales. The diary of Lord Malmesbury is indeed a most instructive revelation of the dangers that might have been expected from an alliance forced on for state reasons—an alliance between a reckless voluptuary, anxious only to have his debts paid by the nation on the occasion of his marriage, and a giddy, coarse, ill-educated woman, who was dazzled with the glittering prospect of quitting a petty principality to intermarry with the heir-apparent of one of the most splendid of European crowns. Lord Malmesbury had his instructions from the king himself, "with no discretionary power to give advice or information to his majesty or the government on the principal subject of this mission." He saw the princess, "vastly happy with her future expectations." A messenger from England "brings the prince's picture, and a letter from him to me, urging me vehemently to set out with the Princess Caroline immediately." The Duke of Brunswick told the ambassador that his daughter was not silly—(*Elle n'est pas bête*)—but that she wanted judgment—had been brought up severely, which was quite necessary. The father saw the trouble that was in store—"he dreaded the prince's habits." The poor princess said to Malmesbury, "I am determined never to appear jealous. I know the prince is *leger*, and am prepared on this point." The sagacious ambassador very soon perceived the impending danger. He regretted the apparent facility of the princess's character—her want of reflection and *substance*—"with a steady man she would do vastly well, but with one of a different description there were great risks." He came to the conclusion that "she has no governing powers, although her mind is physically strong." Malmesbury did his duty in offering her advice and sometimes remonstrance—especially "on the toilette, on cleanliness, and on delicacy in speaking"—strange subjects of discussion with a lady who might be Queen of England. The destined bride and the ambassador set out at last for the court of St. James's. On the 5th of April their arrival was notified to the king and the Prince of Wales. The princess was introduced to the prince, who came alone to receive her. She attempted to kneel, as she was instructed. "He raised her gracefully enough, and embraced her; said barely one word; turned round; retired to a distant part of the apartment, and, calling me to him, said, 'Harris, I am not well; pray get me a glass of brandy.'" Harris recommended a glass of water, and the prince, exclaiming "No," with an oath, rushed away to the queen. Well might Caroline of Brunswick be "in a state of astonishment," and inquire, "Is the prince always like that?" The marriage took place on the 8th. Parliament voted a large income, but determined that out of this income the prince's debts should be paid without a separate grant.*

On the prorogation of parliament on the 27th of June, the royal speech expressed a hope, derived from "the internal situation of the enemy," "that the present circumstances of France may, in their effects, hasten the return of such a state of order and regular government as may be capable of maintaining the accustomed relations of amity and peace with other powers." Fox interpreted this sentence as indicating the views of that party in the cabinet who could anticipate no "state of order and regular government" but in the return of the Bourbons to power. He describes these expressions as "that foolish paragraph in the king's speech at the prorogation, in which they made him foretell the restoration of monarchy in France."† There were "other powers" whose prudence or whose fears led them to preserve or to seek "amity and peace" with the republic. The United States had preserved peace both with France and England, chiefly through the firmness and moderation of Washington. Prussia had made peace with France on the 5th of April. Spain, at this very time, was negotiating for peace, and a treaty was ratified in less

* "Diary," April 17th, 1828.

† Published in 1787, in which year Canning, at the age of seventeen and a half, was entered at Christchurch, Oxford.

‡ See Robert Bell's "Life of Canning," p. 85.

§ "Life of Wilberforce," vol. ii. p. 71.

‖ Ibid., p. 92. Macaulay has paraphrased the Frenchman's *mot*. See *ante*, p. 975.

* See Malmesbury's "Diary," etc., vol. iii. p. 147 to p. 210.

† "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 119.

than a month after this prorogation of parliament. But on the very day that the royal speech pointed, as Fox believed, to a return to the old order of things as the only security for peace, a landing of emigrants and British marines was effected in Brittany for the purpose of assisting a projected insurrection of the Chouan royalists. Its results were most disastrous. This unfortunate expedition, it is affirmed, "was known to be peculiarly the measure of the Burke part of the cabinet, and to have been undertaken on the sole responsibility of their ministerial organ, Mr. Windham." * A pacification with the Vendéan chiefs had been effected by the commissioners of the convention on the 12th of February, 1795. There was still a smouldering fire of disaffection; and Puisaye, an agent of the French princes, led the warlike members of the English cabinet to believe that the whole country could be again roused, if the means were afforded of landing a body of emigrant volunteers, and of supplying arms to the peasantry. A squadron of nine ships of war, under the command of Sir John Borlase Warren, convoyed fifty transports, having on board the royalists and their stores. On the 27th of June they landed near Carnac. On the 3d of July they occupied the peninsula of Quiberon. The emissaries of the royalists again stirred up a civil war throughout Brittany. Charette, Stofflet, and other insurgent chiefs, who had submitted in February, resumed their arms. But Hoche was at hand with fourteen thousand men. He made a night attack upon Fort Penthièvre, poured his thousands into the peninsula, and by daybreak he was driving the wretched emigrants into the sea, or taking them prisoners, to be doomed to death as traitors to the republic. The Comte d'Artois came with another expedition. He looked upon La Vendée, and consulted his safety by a return to England. On the 8th of June, the unhappy son of Louis XVI. had died a prisoner in the Temple, in the twelfth year of his age. Physicians who examined the body declared that his death was caused by scrofulous disease. The poor boy had been subjected to the most shameful treatment, even when the Jacobin reign of terror was at an end. He was confined in a small room, was left without change of linen, was devoured by vermin. His uncle Monsieur was now Louis XVIII. But neither of the uncles of the child who is registered in the annals of France as Louis XVII. could have revived such a feeling of royalism as the continued existence of this suffering prisoner of the Temple might have commanded—if the spirit of royalism, indeed, had not been almost extinct, and incapable of being revived by any rallying cry. The daughter of Louis XVI., who was called by Napoleon "the only man of the family," was released from her confinement, after the death of her brother.

The chaos of the French Revolution was slowly resolving itself into something like order. After the fall of Robespierre there was a progressive reaction against the system of terror of which he had been the most conspicuous mover. The instruments of bloodshed, before whom all France had trembled, were now to live in dread, not only of a loss of power, but of retributive justice. In May, 1795, Fouquier Tinville, and fifteen of the old revolutionary tribunal, were brought before a new revolutionary tribunal, were condemned to death, and were executed. The charge against Fouquier Tinville was specially that of causing the destruction, under the guise of trial, of a countless number of French of all ages and of both sexes, by inventing schemes of conspiracies.† But the reaction against the Jacobins too often involved as much injustice and cruelty as had marked their supremacy. The struggle against the power of the convention by the sansculottes of Paris crying for bread, and led on by a remnant of the chiefs of the days of terror, broke out in three insurrections. The first was that of the twelfth of Germinal (April 1), which was put down by Pichegru without bloodshed—by the mere boom of unshotted cannon. The second revolt was that of the first of Prairial (May 20). The cry now is, "Bread and Constitution." Saint Antoine pours out its citizenesses into the hall of the convention. Its citizens murder one of the deputies, Férand. Sixty of the old deputies of the Mountain retain their seats in the hall, all others having gone away to look for safety. The purged assembly now decrees whatever sansculottism demands. But the Jacobin deputies and their rabble are soon swept out by charge of bayonet; and the guillotine, suicide, and deportation leave the convention for a little while in quiet. Its business is now to make a new constitution. Sièyes has his plans ready for a constitution far less democratic than that of 1793. There is to be a money qualification for electors; there are to be two chambers; two thirds of the existing convention must be re-elected; there is to be a directory of five members. It was determined to submit this new constitution for the acceptance of the people in their primary assemblies on the 6th of September. As might have been anticipated, a violent opposition, especially to that portion of the scheme which gave the citizens only the privilege of electing one third of the new representatives, broke out. The constitution was accepted by a very large majority of the people, and it was declared to be the fundamental law of the state. The sections of Paris were, however, in a ferment. The convention saw that a third revolt was at hand. It had five or six thousand troops for its defence, and Menou had their command, as general-in-chief of the army of the interior. On the 4th of October Menou is sent to disarm the section Lepelletier which is sitting with loaded guns in a convent in the Rue Vivienne. He proceeds to enforce their obedience with his artillery and his battalions, demanding the surrender of their arms. He returns to the convention to say that he has summoned Lepelletier in vain; the section has shown too formidable an array. Some more determined leader must be found. Barras is named to the command in the place of Menou; but Barras is only to be a vicarial commander. There was a young man known to Barras as having done good service at Toulon, but who had been unemployed for some time, had been suspected as an adherent of Robespierre, and was now in very straitened circumstances. He was the man for a dash at the insurgents, whose numbers had increased to forty or fifty thousand after the retreat of Menou. These insurgents were of all classes of the discontented—Jacobins and royalists, republicans and constitutional monarchists, the starving and the restless. Napoleon Bonaparte was placed at the head of the troops of the line, as second in command to Barras. He had hesitated about accepting this command, as any less scrupulous man might have hesitated when he was selected to war against his fellow-citizens as against a foreign enemy. But having chosen his course, he lost no time in adopting the means of success. Murat, then an officer of cavalry, was dispatched by Bonaparte that night to bring away from Sablons the cannon which had been deposited there during the insurrection of May, when the national guards wished to show their fidelity to the convention. The section Lepelletier had also dispatched its officers to bring away the cannon. Murat was beforehand with them, and arrived early in the morning of the 5th at the Tuileries with the park of artillery. Bonaparte distributed his cannon and his troops at every point where the convention was open to attack. The section Lepelletier was joined by other sections. Generals were chosen. A plan of attack upon the Tuileries was arranged. Bonaparte ordered that no aggressive movement should be made, but that his troops should remain on the defensive. The members of the convention took their seats, arms having been provided, which they were themselves to use in case of attack. The day wore on till half-past four, all the streets surrounding the Tuileries being filled with the troops of the sections. The insurrectionary columns then moved up the Rue St. Honoré and along the quays, and when they came where Bonaparte's men were posted, instead of dispersing, as they were summoned to do, they discharged their muskets. The young general of the convention thought the time was at last come for decisive action. A great body of insurgents had taken up a commanding position on the steps leading to the church of St. Roch. Bonaparte opened a heavy fire of grape-shot upon them, and they were quickly dislodged. He brought his cannon into the street of St. Honoré, and swept it with his *mitraille* from one end to the other. The insurgents fled from this quarter, but at other points of the city the same contest was going on between disciplined troops, most skilfully disposed, and a rash multitude without efficient leaders. Bonaparte, says Thiers, "showed a merciless energy, and fired upon the population of Paris as upon Austrian battalions." The captive at St. Helena himself said, "It is false that we fired first with blank shot; it had been a waste of life to do that." At six o'clock all was over, and the victorious general of the convention fired his cannon loaded with powder only, to terrify those who had still a wish to fight. The fortunes of Bonaparte were in the ascendent, and from that day the history of Europe becomes in a great degree merged in the history of one man. The time is not yet ripe

* Moore, "Life of Sheridan," p. 522.
† See *ante*, p. 994.

for the supreme power of this man. There will be an executive, composed of five directors, council of ancients, council of five hundred. The French people will feel that the days of anarchy and insurrection are over—that the volcano of the revolution is burned out. But other nations will feel, for twenty years, that the strong arm of military power, which has striven with and conquered the spirit of revolt in Paris, will become an organized ambition, as dangerous to the repose of the world as the outbreaks of that democracy against which kings vainly confederated.

The session of parliament was opened on the 29th of October, under very inauspicious circumstances. On the 26th a general meeting of the London Corresponding Society was held in St. George's Fields, when some bold speeches were addressed to a vast multitude. Provisions at this period were excessively dear. The same privations that moved the people of Paris to assail the convention with "Bread and the Constitution" moved the people of London to assail the king on his way to parliament with cries of "Bread! bread! Peace! peace!" One of the windows of the state carriage was broken by a stone or by a shot from an air-gun. The king manifested his wonted courage, amid the groans and hisses of an excited mob. An address to his majesty was voted in both houses before the royal speech was taken into consideration. The government, as was for many years its policy, whenever popular discontent assumed the form of violence and outrage, was ready with its measures of coercion. In the House of Lords, Lord Grenville brought in a bill "for the safety and preservation of his majesty's person and government against treasonable and seditious practices and attempts." In the House of Commons Mr. Pitt brought in a bill "for the more effectually preventing seditious meetings and assemblies." The Treasonable Attempts Bill was an extension of the provisions of the statute of Edward III., as to compassing and imagining the death of the king, by connecting that compassing and imagining with the publication of any printing or writing. The parliamentary opposition to the bill was as strong as to that against seditious meetings. The one measure still forms part of our code of law, the other was totally unfitted for any permanent condition of constitutional liberty. By this second bill, every public meeting for the purpose of preparing any petition or remonstrance, or for deliberating upon any grievance in Church or State, was forbidden to be held, except under certain regulations, by which the individuals calling the meeting could be identified: it further gave power to any justice of the peace to disperse the meeting, if the language of the speakers was calculated to bring the government into contempt; and if twelve persons remained together one hour after being so ordered to disperse, the offenders were to be adjudged felons, without benefit of clergy. The public reprobation of these measures was expressed in the most unequivocal manner. The indignation of Mr. Fox carried him beyond the verge of discretion, however just and courageous we may now consider the words which he uttered: "If ministers were determined, by means of the corrupt influence which they possessed in the two Houses of Parliament, to pass the bills in direct opposition to the declared sense of a great majority of the nation, and they should be put in force with all their rigorous provisions, if his opinion were asked by the people as to their obedience, he should tell them it was no longer a question of moral obligation and duty, but of prudence." Mr. Pitt expressed his horror and disgust at the words of Mr. Fox, which, he said, openly advised an appeal to the sword. Mr. Fox declared that he would not retract one word of what he had said: "Strong measures require strong words." The country had never been more agitated than at this crisis. Pitt expected "a civil broil," and said, "If I were to resign, my head would be off in six months."* The bills passed. There was no civil broil. But it was very long before Englishmen could cease to feel that they had lost some portion of the freedom which their ancestors had won. It was no merely rhetorical art that led Fox to declare himself so strongly against these enactments. He expressed his deliberate conviction in a letter to Lord Holland: "There appears to me no chance at present but between an absolute surrender of the liberties of the people and a vigorous exertion, attended, I admit, with considerable hazard, at a time like the present. My view of things is, I own, very gloomy; and I am convinced that in a very few years the government will become completely absolute, or that confusion will arise of a nature almost as much to be deprecated as despotism itself."* With a prolonged suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, with an attorney-general who boasted that "in the last two years there had been more prosecutions for libels than in any twenty years before,"† with a new law to attach the penalty of treason to certain libels, and a new law to give one magistrate the power of dispersing any assembly, under the penalty of death to those who demurred to his will, we can scarcely think that the view of things taken by Mr. Fox was too gloomy, or that his resistance was unpatriotic and factious. In a review of "Gifford's Life of Pitt," written by Mr. Canning, in 1810, remarkable as much for its ability as its moderation, there is the following defence of, or rather apology for, these measures: "In other times, indeed, we should have condemned the coercive policy of Mr. Pitt. That policy is always to be judged of as being intended for a *crisis*; and, whatever may be thought of its merits, there can be no doubt that, on the one hand, the proselyting dexterity which characterized the prevailing spirit of the French Revolution, and, on the other, the general agitation or disquietude of the popular mind in our own country, concurred to form at that period a moral crisis of a very peculiar nature."‡ We have no more right to assume that Pitt was resolved upon establishing a despotism than that Fox desired to witness the overthrow of the monarchy.

In the year 1796 the military operations in Germany and Italy were carried on upon a scale which had not been witnessed since the days of Marlborough. The French Directory had resolved to attack the forces of the emperor upon two points at one and the same time. The command of the army of the Sambre and the Meuse was given to Jourdan; the command of the army of the Rhine and Moselle was given to Moreau. At the end of November, 1795, the army of Italy had obtained some successes under Schérer, but his defeat of the Austrians had not been followed up in a manner to satisfy the Directory. During the winter the pale, thin, reserved Corsican who had cannonaded the sections into submission remained in Paris, raised out of his poverty into what was then termed good society by the democrats who had grown luxurious, but which society Burke, in one of his fiercest moods, describes as "a set of abandoned wretches, squandering in insolent riot the spoils of their bleeding country."§ In the saloons of Barras and of Madame Tallien, Bonaparte met Josephine Beauharnois, the widow of the Viscount Beauharnois, who had taken the side of the revolutionists, but was guillotined in the days of terror. The young general was married to Josephine in March. But his duties as chief of the army of Paris and his devotion to an amiable and attractive woman did not divert his thoughts from objects of high import. He had devised a plan for the invasion of Italy, which he submitted to Carnot, then one of the Directory. To obtain a permanent footing beyond the Alps; to hold the small Italian provinces in sovereignty or in subjection; perhaps to conquer the whole territory, and to make one subject people in that land of antique glory—this was the traditional policy of France, and any scheme for its realization was now peculiarly acceptable to the French government. Bonaparte was appointed chief of the army in Italy, and on the 27th of March he entered upon his command at Nice.

Before we proceed to relate the events of this campaign, we must very briefly notice the territorial divisions of Italy at the period when the French republic was established in 1792, and its political condition at the beginning of 1796. The kingdom of Sardinia—consisting of Savoy, Nice, Piedmont, and the island of Sardinia—was under Victor Amadeus III. This prince had joined the coalition against France, and Savoy and Nice, lying convenient to the revolutionists, were very soon seized. But he continued to resist, although little able to struggle against his dangerous neighbor. The republic of Genoa was neutral, but an anti-Gallican party had given offence to the Directory, and the Genoese oligarchy were not likely to be treated with kindness. The Grand Duchy of Tuscany, under Ferdinand III., had recognized the French Republic at an early period. The small republic of Lucca was independent of Tuscany. The States of the

* "Life of Wilberforce," vol. ii. p. 114.

* "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 124.
† "Parliamentary History," vol. xxxii. col. 488.
‡ "Quarterly Review," vol. iv. p. 230.
§ "Regicide Peace," Letter III.

Church, under Pope Pius VI., were so wretchedly administered—the people were so servile and degraded—that the anathemas of the sovereign pontiff against the revolution were not likely to divert the French armies from plundering Rome and devastating the provinces. The kingdom of Naples, including Sicily, was under Ferdinand IV., a weak Bourbon prince, married to the sister of Marie Antoinette. The Duchy of Modena was governed by Ercole Renaldo, a descendant of the house of Este. The Duchy of Parma was ruled by a Spanish prince, Don Ferdinand. The two Duchies of Milan and Mantua, forming Lombardy, were under the Emperor of Germany, Francis II. The Republic of Venice had declared against France in 1793, but had subsequently adopted a neutral policy, and had compelled the head of the French Bourbon family to quit Verona. Such were the various Italian States to which the French armies carried their promises and their threats—whose people they harassed with confiscations, and deluded with the prospect of Italian unity and freedom.

The French army was posted on the Riviera, west of Genoa. It numbered about 40,000 men, who were in a very wretched condition, badly clothed, without pay. Bonaparte brought them a little money, but he also brought something more efficient even than money—the principle that war should support war, and that whatever was wanting should be supplied by the people with whom they came to fraternize. He had able generals and an active staff—Massena, Augereau, Serurier, Berthier. Opposed to the French were the Austrian General Beaulieu, with 30,000 men, and the Austro-Sardinian force of 22,000 men, under Colli. Bonaparte was received by the army with little enthusiasm, but the French troops soon recognized a general to their mind—"You are ill-fed and almost naked; the government owes you much, but can do nothing for you. I will lead you into the most fertile plains of the world—to grand towns and wealthy provinces, where you will find glory and riches."* On the 12th of April Bonaparte attacked the Austrian centre, consisting of 10,000 men under D'Argenteau, and routing them at Montenotte, cut off the communication between Beaulieu and Colli. He defeated in succession these two generals. The King of Sardinia was terrified, and demanded an armistice which the French general agreed to conclude upon being put in possession of the fortresses of Coni, Ceva, and Tortona, the keys of Piedmont. The court of Turin also sent ambassadors to Paris to negotiate a peace, which was signed on the 15th of May upon the humiliating conditions of resigning to France eight frontier fortresses till a general peace, and confirming to France the possession of Savoy and Nice in perpetuity. General Beaulieu now gave up Piedmont as lost, crossed the Po, and applied himself to the defence of the Austrian possessions in Lombardy. The French followed him, and compelled his army to retire to the Adda. On the 9th of May the French were before Lodi. The famous passage of the bridge was accomplished by a rapid and daring movement, which set at naught the twenty pieces of cannon by which it was defended. Beaulieu retreated beyond the Mincio, and the French entered Milan on the 15th of May. There was now a little spare time to gather some of the spoils of five weeks' fighting. The eulogistic historian, Thiers, tells us that the exactions of Bonaparte were indispensable. He levied a contribution of twenty million francs on the Milanese. He granted an armistice to the Duke of Modena upon the payment of ten millions. Salicette, the commissioner of the Directory, and their politic general robbed the Monte di Pietà of Milan of the valuables deposited there as pledges for money lent. These measures were very grievous to the tender heart of Bonaparte, "for they retarded the march of public spirit," says M. Thiers. He sent millions to the Directory, much of which was intercepted in its way into the public coffers. He had always ample means for corrupting those in the employ of the Italian governments. It is only justice to say that a very small share of the Italian spoils went into Bonaparte's own pocket. The exactions of the French led to resistance among the oppressed people of Milan and of Pavia. In Pavia there was a serious revolt, and some of the French were killed. Bonaparte hurried there with a sufficient force, broke down the gates with cannon, and gave the city up to pillage—"for three hours," says M. Thiers; for twenty-four hours, say more reliable authorities. "There were only a thousand men," writes the candid historian, "and this small number could cause no serious disasters in a town so considerable as Pavia." No doubt these thousand brigands did their spiriting gently—the very Claude Duvals of robbers. Ladies would gladly yield their jewels to the polite strangers, and would accept their caresses as a signal honor. Bonaparte, after the sack of Pavia, sent his cavalry into the neighboring country, who sabred a large number of the revolted peasantry. A novel species of contribution was now insisted upon, as the French armies marched from city to city, and dictated the terms upon which their forbearance might be purchased. It was not sufficient that the Duke of Parma should obtain an armistice by large money payments and supplies of horses and stores, but he must give twenty of his choicest paintings to be sent to Paris. The Duke of Modena had to purchase a temporary respite of the seizure of his dominions, by contributing not only millions of livres, but treasures of art which no money could buy. Bonaparte thus early saw his way to flatter the national vanity of the French, by gathering for the Parisians those works of genius which lost half their interest when taken away from the lands which had produced them, and from the people who inherited them. Send me artists and scholars, wrote Bonaparte to the Directory, to assist me in choosing from the galleries, museums, libraries, and churches of Italy, the best paintings, sculptures, and manuscripts for our *Musée* of the Louvre.

The Austrian general, Beaulieu, having arranged for the defence of Mantua, retreated into the mountains of the Tyrol. His army had temporarily occupied the Venetian town of Peschiera, which occupation was an excuse for Bonaparte seizing the place upon its being abandoned by Beaulieu, and subsequently for demanding admittance to the Venetian city of Verona, thus treating Venice as a hostile power. He then turned his arms against the Pope, who was terrified into an armistice, which was bought by money contributions, and by precious works of art and rare manuscripts. Tuscany was at peace with the French. But the warehouses of Leghorn were full of English merchandise, and thither Bonaparte rapidly marched, seized all the goods belonging to "the enemies of the republic" who had fled to their ships, and levied a contribution of five millions of francs upon the native merchants as the permission for them to keep the other property which had been intrusted to them by English and Portuguese houses. In these odious transactions Bonaparte was the instrument of the Directory, and he sometimes remonstrated against the impolicy of their violence and rapacity, but never against the iniquity. The Austrian government superseded Beaulieu, and sent a gallant veteran, Wurmser, to take the chief command of a new army in Italy. With the old traditional strategical mistake of dividing their forces, while the young French general invariably concentrated all his power for attack or defence, the Austrians moved toward Mantua in two separate divisions. Bonaparte attacked and routed the army under General Quosdanowich, and the army under General Wurmser.

But the Austrians were not yet disposed to give up the great struggle. The French main army under Bonaparte was weakened by the necessity of maintaining divisions to blockade Mantua, to occupy Verona and Legnano, and to guard some of the passes of the Tyrol. Another Austrian army of sixty thousand men advanced in two divisions, one under General Alvinzy, the other under General Davidowich. On the 12th of November Bonaparte attacked Alvinzy at Caldiero, but he sustained very heavy loss, and was compelled to retire into Verona. He wrote a desponding letter to the directory; but that mood was not of long duration. He was one of that order of minds who "out of the nettle, danger, can pluck the flower, safety." On the night of the 14th he marched in silence out of Verona, as if retreating. He moved rapidly by the right bank of the Adige, which he crossed at Ronco, where he had made a temporary bridge. He was now in a marshy tract, between the Adige and the Alpone, which river it was necessary to cross before he could reach Villanova, where the Austrian baggage and stores were stationed, in the rear of Alvinzy's army. One of the causeways of the morass led to the bridge of Arcole. Three times the passage of this bridge was obstinately contested on the 15th of November, Bonaparte himself leading his grenadiers in one of the desperate attempts to contend against the Austrian batteries. For three days this battle of Arcole, the most severe of the Italian war, went on. The third day concluded the terrible conflict, when Alvinzy retreated toward Vicenza. Bona-

* Thiers, "Revolution," livre xxxiii.

parte had prevented the junction of the two Austrian armies. The battle of Arcole made a profound impression upon Europe. It ought to have shown the continental powers where their safety lay. It should have taught them a lesson which they too often forgot in a long series of fruitless endeavors: "Matched against a competitor of such extraordinary activity, it was incumbent on them to lay aside the embarrassments of ancient forms and ancient prejudices, and to gird up the skirts of their luxurious and effeminate magnificence." *

The combined operations upon the Rhine of the French generals, Jourdan and Moreau, were not favorable to the republic. The Archduke Charles encountered Jourdan when he had crossed the Rhine in June, and had advanced to Lahn. The French army was driven back, and recrossed the Rhine. Moreau carried his army over the Rhine at Strasbourg, and defeated the Austrian General Latour. The archduke fell back to the Danube. Jourdan, reassured by the operations of Moreau, again advanced toward Bohemia. The archduke fought a battle with Moreau, crossed the Danube, and drove back Jourdan in a series of well-concerted attacks. Moreau, separated by a long interval from Jourdan, and exposed to the assaults of the archduke on his front, and to those of Latour on his rear, ascended the Danube, and accomplished his retreat through the Black Forest. This celebrated movement saved his army from an imminent danger. After fighting several battles, Moreau finally reached Strasbourg. The wonderful success of Bonaparte in Italy is partly to be attributed to the contempt in which he held the orders of the Directory. The plan of the German campaign was laid down in Paris, and hence its failure.

The successes of the Austrians in Germany appeared to the English government more important than the career of Bonaparte in Italy. Lord Grenville thought in September that if Moreau were "dispatched, and that quickly, there will be time and means to make Bonaparte suffer severely for his late advanced move." Our situation, he considered, was very much improved.† The moment was deemed favorable to open negotiations with the French Directory for peace, although some previous overtures had been contemptuously received. Lord Malmesbury was appointed as plenipotentiary on the part of his Britannic majesty, and he arrived in Paris on the 22d of October. Burke held that any attempt to negotiate for "a regicide peace" was a disgrace and a humiliation for England. He wrote under the full influence of his own enthusiasm, and of the passions of the emigrants by whom he was surrounded. M. Thiers, half a century after 1796, when national prejudices ought to have been softened down by historical truth, adopts as insolent a tone in relating the progress of this negotiation as if the mantle of Barras had descended upon his shoulders. Pitt, he says, demanded passports for an envoy to be sent on the part of Great Britain. Pitt had no real wish for peace; he only wanted to satisfy public opinion; he knew that his terms would not be accepted, but to obtain sixty thousand militia and fifteen thousand sailors, he would pretend that he had done all he could for peace—"*son possible pour traiter.*" Without the hope of obtaining peace, he made an advance toward the Directory. Thus M. Thiers repeats, in almost the same words, the mean insinuations with which the directory announced to the Council of Five Hundred the proposal of Great Britain to negotiate. He adds, "This surprising step of the most implacable enemy of our republic was a glory for her. The English aristocracy was thus *reduced* to demand peace from the regicide republic." ‡ The historian of "the Revolution" has taken as little pains to look at the authentic relations of this episode of diplomacy as he has taken to understand the family name of the negotiator chosen by Pitt, when he calls him "*Lord Malmesbury, autrefois Sir Harry.*" §

For nearly four years the condition of France, as exhibited in the appearance of the country, had been as little known to the English as Japan. Lord Malmesbury had his eyes open, and Mr. Talbot, a gentleman connected with the embassy, has left a very interesting account of what he observed. Many of the houses on the road from Calais to Paris were shut up; very few of the churches appeared to be open, but the land throughout was in a state of high cultivation, though there were comparatively few men at work. The farmers had become wealthy proprietors, by receiving depreciated assignats for their produce, and buying estates—national domains—with that paper money, at the sum which it represented. In Paris the streets were crowded, the shops tolerably well supplied, the theatres well attended, some private carriages, and a great number of public vehicles: "All this," says the sensible attaché, "brought to my reflection how very difficult a matter it must be to destroy a great country." *

It would be tedious to follow the course of this negotiation. Lord Malmesbury arrived at Paris on the 22d of October; he left Paris on the 21st of December. The points of difference between the two governments were too serious to be overcome by any anxiety of the prime minister of Great Britain for peace, even if the French Directory, rendered more warlike than ever by the successes of Bonaparte, could have regarded the real welfare of France more than its false glories. Lord Malmesbury required, as a *sine quâ non*, that the Netherlands should not be annexed to France. M. Delacroix, the French minister for foreign affairs, held that the banks of the Rhine were the natural limits of France. It was in vain to diplomatize. Mr. Pitt had to call upon his country for new sacrifices, and the French Directory had to send new armies to seize the means of subsistence in the lands which Bonaparte was revolutionizing.

At a period of less public excitement than was occasioned by other events which marked the close of the year 1796, the death of Catharine II., Empress of Russia, on the 10th of November, and the retirement of Washington from the presidency of the United States, in December, would have been fruitful sources of political speculation. The sudden decease of Catharine, who for thirty-six years had been the autocrat of all the Russias, was in some degree a triumph for the French republic; and that event probably decided the Directory in suddenly breaking off the negotiation for peace with England. She was preparing to take part in the coalition against France. Her successor, Paul, was inclining to the French interests. The retirement of Washington interrupted the continuance of that system of neutrality by which he had preserved the American republic from the dangers attendant upon the extreme opinions of the federalist and the democratic parties—the one disposed, however timidly, to take part with England in the great European crisis; the other, of which Jefferson was the head, manifesting hostility to the mother-country and favor to France, in a manner that savored more of evil passions than of wise statesmanship. Washington regarded with alarm the societies, modelled upon the Jacobin clubs, which had sprung up in the United States; and his expression of this feeling produced in the democratic party a violent hostility to the treaty which had been concluded under his auspices with Great Britain in 1795. Washington's retirement was preceded by manifestations of party spirit against the policy of the great founder and preserver of the republic. Had his nature been different—had his ambition been less under the control of his virtue—he might have taken up the sword, and, sweeping away his enemies, have raised himself to supreme power upon the ruins of his country's liberty. He retired to his estate of Mount Vernon, to pass the rest of his days as a private citizen. At this period the young conqueror of Italy was meditating upon plans of rising to what some would deem the pinnacle of human greatness. His scheme of glory was accomplished. He founded a military despotism. Washington's scheme of glory was also realized. He had been a ruler of free men—ruling by the power of law. He laid down his authority when he had done the work to which he was called, most happy in this, that ambition of a selfish order could never be justified by his example.

On the 17th of December, two days before Lord Malmesbury left Paris, an expedition went out from Brest, consisting of seventeen sail of the line and thirteen frigates. Its destination was Ireland, with an army of twenty thousand men, under the command of Hoche, who had succeeded in the pacification of La Vendée. A great storm dispersed this formidable fleet. A portion of the squadron entered Bantry Bay on the 24th of December. It consisted of seven sail of the line and ten smaller vessels. The general who was to advance with the troops into the interior—who was to support the disaffected, and revolutionize the government—had been separated

* Canning, in "Quarterly Review," vol. iv. p. 253.
† "Court and Cabinets of George III.," vol. iii. p. 351.
‡ Thiers, livre xxxiv.
§ Sir James *Harris* was raised to the peerage as Earl of Malmesbury.

* "Court, etc., of George III.," vol. iii. p. 355.

from the rest of the armament. The officers who were with the troops in Bantry Bay were desirous to effect a landing. The admiral refused to comply with their requisition, and sailed back to Brest. The other divisions of the French fleet also sought to return. Several ships were captured, and others reached the French ports in a shattered condition. Some among our statesmen knew the danger, if such a landing as that contemplated by the Directory had been effected. Lord Mornington wrote, in September, "My great fear is a blow in Ireland, before sufficient preparation has been made for our defence in that most vulnerable, and at the same time mortal, part."* Lord Malmesbury, in the middle of November, gave an intimation to Lord Grenville that an expedition was meditated against Ireland; that the troops were encouraged to embark by the most exaggerated reports of the temper of the country. Loyal Irishmen were grateful that "the goodness of Providence to us has exhibited a second armada." But even loyal men inquired why the coast had been left wholly unprotected by our fleet for seventeen days; why Admiral Colpoys could not follow the French fleet, for want of water and provisions; why Lord Bridport was lying at Spithead, not even ready for sea, instead of being off Ushant?"†

CHAPTER CXCV.

Landing of French in Pembrokeshire—Commercial distrust—Run upon the banks—Suspension of cash payments by the Bank of England—Extension of the national industry—War with Spain—Battle of St. Vincent—Nelson boards and takes two ships—Discontent in the navy—Mutiny at Spithead—Mutiny at the Nore—Proceedings in parliament—Negotiations at Lisle for peace—Bonaparte's triumphs in Italy—Revolution at Paris of the eighteenth Fructidor—End of the negotiations at Lisle—The "Anti-Jacobin."

The public expectation of a peace, as the result of the negotiations at Paris, passed into an apprehension of an invasion by France, for which the Directory had been making preparations while these negotiations were lingering on. The descent upon Ireland failed, as we have seen. But the fact that a large fleet could cross the Channel from Brest, and a portion of the armament prepare to land on the southwest coast of Cork, shook the national confidence in the power of our navy to protect our shores. On Saturday, the 25th of February, the secretary of state informed the Lord Mayor of London that four French ships had appeared in the Bristol Channel, and had anchored in the harbor of Ilfracombe; that on the 23d about twelve hundred men had been landed on the east coast of Pembrokeshire; and that a strong force having been collected by the lord lieutenant of the county, the invaders had surrendered at discretion. This absurd enterprise, although the ready spirit of our countrymen furnished a great cause for exultation, was also calculated to produce additional alarm by showing how accessible were these islands to an invading army, whether large or small. The popular fears took the usual course of producing commercial distrust. The currency of the country was in a condition that was likely to render a general panic and a wide-spread ruin almost unavoidable. The circulation of the kingdom mainly rested upon the notes of the Bank of England, and upon the bills of about two hundred and thirty country banks. Both these were payable to the bearer on demand. From the beginning of the year there had been an extraordinary run upon the northern banks, and many of them had been compelled to postpone payment in gold, till, as the banks of Newcastle announced, "they could obtain a supply adequate to the occasion." The expectations of the country bankers rested upon the assistance to be rendered by the Bank of England, through the agency of the London bankers. This pressure upon the Bank of England had been progressively increasing for weeks, and it was becoming doubled, day by day, in the third week of February. But there was another large seeker for accommodation, the chancellor of the exchequer, who, as far back as January, 1795, had been told by the bank directors that it was their wish "that he would arrange his finances for the year in such a manner as not to depend on any further assistance from them." Thus the prudent banker always addresses the sanguine private speculator. Mr. Pitt was a speculator upon the greatest scale. He speculated upon having the means always at hand for loans and subsidies to our allies. Another loan to the Emperor of Germany "would go nigh to ruin the country," said the directors of the bank. Ireland, at the beginning of 1797, required, under her separate treasury, financial assistance, and Mr. Pitt asked it of the Bank of England. On the 9th of February he was informed by the governor that "a further advance of a million and a half as a loan to Ireland would threaten ruin to the bank, and most probably bring the directors to shut up their doors."

On Saturday evening, the 25th of February, the chancellor of the exchequer, having one afternoon's relief from parliamentary duties—perhaps finding some solace for his public anxieties in a mode of producing pleasant thoughts which his real friends deplored—was startled by a message from the directors of the Bank of England that they could pay in specie no longer. So low was their stock of bullion that, it is stated, they had been compelled to pay their notes in sixpences. Pitt at once roused himself to meet the emergency. A messenger was sent to the king at Windsor, and on Sunday morning his majesty was presiding at a council, at which eight members of the cabinet were present. On that Sunday night Wilberforce writes to Lord Muncaster, "Elliot has just been with me to inform me that the bank is to stop payment, by command of government, to-morrow morning." He records in his diary that the cabinet were very averse to take upon themselves the responsibility of the measure; that the chancellor said, "No—this will never do."* Lord Campbell states that the chancellor held that the order forbidding the bank to make any further payments in cash, "although contrary to law, would be in accordance with the constitution." Lord Loughborough concluded that as in this case, if the executive government abstained from interfering, the opinion of parliament could not be taken till irremediable evils were brought upon the nation, the executive government was bound to interfere.† The order in council was notified to the bank on the Sunday night. On the Monday morning the directors of the bank published the order, with a notification that the general concerns of the bank were in the most affluent and prosperous condition, and that they would continue their usual discounts, paying in bank-notes. There was a great meeting at noon of merchants at the Mansion House, when an unanimous resolution was passed, that "we will not refuse to receive bank-notes in payment of any sum of money to be paid to us, and will use our utmost endeavors to make all our payments in the same manner." The stocks immediately rose. A weight was suddenly taken off the springs of industry. There was no lack of a due supply of provisions for the capital, as Wilberforce apprehended might be the case. There were no riots; and the prophecy of Lord Auckland that "this was the beginning of the throat-cutting" was altogether a delusion. There was no fever in the state resulting from this stimulant. But a chronic malady was induced which lasted during a generation—a malady which defied every attempt at cure till the principle of a convertible paper currency was again firmly established. Of the lasting effects of this measure, which was only intended to be temporary, the government of 1797 could have had no conception. For twenty-four years bank-paper stood in the place of gold, and ministerial financiers were hardy enough to maintain that bank-paper was as good as gold. The benefits and evils of this measure have probably been each exaggerated. It is not clear that the industry of the country was thus chiefly stimulated to the gain of the capitalist. It is not clear that prices were in consequence raised, to the loss of the laborer. It is not clear that we could not have carried on the war without inconvertible paper. It is not clear that the inconvertible paper added hundreds of millions to the national debt. One thing is clear—that Mr. Pitt was relieved from an immediate difficulty, and had not to contemplate a national bankruptcy, in addition to the other perils of the great contest with France.

The measures that ministers carried through parliament, in consequence of this suspension of cash payments, were of a nature to continue the restriction upon the issue of specie without absolutely making bank-notes a legal tender. But as bank-notes were to be received in payment for every branch of the revenue, and as the tender of bank-

* "Life of Sidmouth," vol. ii. p. 474.
† Ibid., p. 181.

* "Life of Wilberforce," vol. ii. p. 194.
† Lord Campbell, "Chancellors," vol. vi. p. 277.

notes in payment of demand would protect the person of the debtor from legal process, the transition from gold to paper soon became speedy and certain. For all purposes of retail trade the guinea was quickly supplanted by the twenty-shilling note—a currency first resorted to by the Bank of England on the 4th of March. The door was now opened to a most extensive system of forgery, which the fear of conviction and of punishment without mercy was wholly inefficient to repress. By reports of committees of both houses, the solvency of the Bank of England was perfectly established ; and the demand for a circulating capital proportioned to the political engagements of the government, and the expenditure by the people upon national improvements and the extension of profitable industry, was adequately shown. Contracted as the circulation had been during the years of war, there was no suspension of great public works. In the four years preceding the war the inclosure bills passed were a hundred and thirty-eight. In the four years of the war their number was two hundred and eighty-three. In the first of these periods the sums authorized to be borrowed under bills for navigation and canals was nearly two millions and a half. In the second period they amounted to nearly seven millions and a half. This was profitable expenditure. By facilitating the commercial intercourse of the country it gave an impulse to those manufacturing enterprises which had now begun to assume some of those proportions which were vast in comparison with their former magnitude. It is to be noted that the exports were actually one third more in 1796 than the average of the years of peace previous to 1792. These were circumstances that contributed to foster the delusion that a state of war was favorable to the extension of British commerce—that the nation flourished because it was at war. The industry of the nation was developed in spite of the war, at a period when scientific invention and discovery had rendered the labor of man of tenfold efficiency. The expenditure of Mr. Pitt during the first four years of the war, in loans and subsidies, in remittances abroad for the payment of British troops or foreign troops in British pay, were sufficient to account for a considerable portion of the drain of specie. But that expenditure could be doubled and quadrupled before the war was at an end, without the nation sinking under the load. The industry of the people was the mine of wealth which could sustain an outlay the most extravagant, without any real disturbance of the national credit. In the speech from the throne on the 2d of November of this year, the king said, "During the period of hostilities, and under the unavoidable pressure of accumulated burdens, our revenue has continued highly productive, our national industry has been extended, and our commerce has surpassed its former limits." The French Directory interpreted this as a declaration that Great Britain exulted in the war as the great source of her prosperity. In a proclamation of the president, La Réveillière Lépaux, he says, "If the King of England has told the truth, what a terrible lesson is this for you, ye other powers of Europe ! Of what description is that power which is interested in your discords, which derives an interest from your calamities, which prospers by your distress, and which fattens on the tears, the blood, and the spoil of other nations ?"

It was on the 6th of October, 1796, that war against Great Britain was declared by Spain. Three great naval powers were now combined to resist that maritime ascendency of England which the French regarded as the despotism of the seas. We have seen how a powerful French fleet crossed the Channel in December, and was only prevented by adverse weather from making a descent upon Ireland. There was a Dutch fleet in the Texel, which was ready to unite with France in any joint project for the invasion of our shores. There was a fleet in Carthagena—the grand Spanish fleet—numbering twenty-seven sail of the line and ten frigates, whose admiral was prepared on the first favorable opportunity to sail forth, and, by effecting a junction with the French and Dutch, form an invincible armada, to overpower any fleet that Great Britain might have in the narrow seas. On the 1st of February this fleet sailed from Carthagena, its first destination being Cadiz. Sir John Jervis, with ten sail of the line, was stationed off Cape St. Vincent ; and he was joined on the 6th of February by five sail of the line, detached from the Channel fleet. On the morning of the 13th Commodore Nelson also joined in the Minerve frigate, having at the mouth of the Straits of Gibraltar fallen in with the Spanish fleet. Nelson was ordered to shift his broad pennant to the Captain. On the evening of that day, it having been ascertained that the Spanish fleet was not more than four or five leagues distant, signals were made for the British fleet to prepare for battle, and to keep in close order. During that night the signal guns of the Spaniards told of their near approach. The morning of the 14th was dark, and for several hours a fog concealed the relative strength of each fleet. The Spaniards had been told that the English had only nine sail of the line, and they were confident of an easy victory. As the fog cleared off fifteen sail were seen advancing in two close lines, purposing to cut off a portion of the Spanish fleet that had been allowed to separate from the main body. Jervis could now ascertain the exact numerical force with which he would have to fight. In his dispatch he says, "By carrying a press of sail, I was fortunate in getting in with the enemy's fleet at half-past eleven o'clock, before it had time to connect and form a regular order of battle." There was no hesitation about superiority of numbers. "I felt myself justified in departing from the regular system," he writes. If "the regular system" was that a British admiral should not engage a greatly superior force, that system was wisely abandoned on this eventful 14th of February. The real inequality consisted, not in the fact that twenty-five sail of the line were opposed to fifteen, not that some of these twenty-five were of enormous bulk and corresponding weight of metal, but that the fifteen ships were manned by able seamen, while the twenty-five were incumbered with pressed landsmen and newly-levied soldiers. The determination of the British admiral to disregard the numerical superiority of the enemy was worthy of all praise. But there was one under his command to whom it became the habit of his life to depart from "the regular system"—to think nothing impossible to high courage and sound judgment. Nelson, on this day, as on subsequent occasions, saw that an implicit regard to the orders of his superior officer would prevent the accomplishment of a great object. The signal was given to tack. He saw that by disobeying the signal he could prevent a junction between some of the separated ships which were manœuvring for that purpose. He instantly wore, and was consequently brought into action with seven of the largest vessels of the Spanish fleet. Captain Troubridge, in the Culloden, joined Nelson, and these two for nearly an hour sustained the unequal fire—unequal indeed, if skill and discipline were not always a match for unwieldy and ill-directed strength. The Blenheim and the Excellent came up to the support of the Captain and the Culloden. Collingwood commanded the Excellent. He describes how he succored his friend in this perilous conflict : "Making all sail, passing between our line and the enemy, we came up with the San Nicolas, of 80 guns, which happened at that time to be abreast of the San Josef, of 112 guns. We did not touch sides, but you could not have put a bodkin between us, so that our shot passed through both ships, and in attempting to extricate themselves they got on board each other. My good friend, the commodore, had been long engaged with those ships, and I came happily to his relief, for he was dreadfully mauled." * Nelson's ship was almost wholly disabled. Her fore-topmast had fallen over her side ; her wheel was struck away. The Culloden was crippled ; the Blenheim was far ahead. Nelson, at a distance of twenty yards, was firing upon the San Nicolas, of 80 guns, which returned the fire with great spirit. He suddenly ordered the helm of the Captain to be put a-starboard. The two ships were hooked together, and Nelson gave the order to board The rest of this wonderful story has been told by himself. He describes the alacrity of the soldiers of the 69th regiment, who were among the foremost in this service ; his direction to the commander of the Captain not to leave, and the exploit of his late first lieutenant, Captain Berry, in being the first to jump into the enemy's mizzen-chains, "supported from our sprit-sail-yard, which hooked in the mizzen rigging." He thus continues : "A soldier of the 69th regiment having broke the upper quarter-gallery window, I jumped in myself, and was followed by others as fast as possible. I found the cabin doors fastened, and some Spanish officers fired their pistols ; but, having broke open the doors, the soldiers fired, and the Spanish brigadier fell, as retreating to the quarter-deck. I pushed immediately onward for the quarter-deck, where I found Captain Berry in possession of the poop, and the Spanish ensign hauling down. I passed with my people and Lieutenant Pearson, on the larboard gangway, to the forecastle, where I met two or three Spanish officers,

* Collingwood's "Correspondence," p. 30.

prisoners to my seamen: they delivered me their swords." But the Spanish admiral's ship, the San Josef, of 112 guns, opened a fire of small arms upon the San Nicolas from the stern gallery. The daring determination was now taken to board this first-rate, which was done in an instant, Captain Berry assisting Nelson into the main-chains. "At this moment a Spanish officer looked over the quarter-deck rail, and said they surrendered. From this most welcome intelligence, it was not long before I was on the quarter-deck, where the Spanish captain, with a bow, presented me his sword, and said the admiral was dying of his wounds. I asked him, on his honor, if the ship was surrendered. He declared she was; on which I gave him my hand, and desired him to call on his officers and ship's company, and tell them of it; which he did: and, on the quarter-deck of a Spanish first-rate, extravagant as the story may seem, did I receive the swords of vanquished Spaniards; which, as I received, I gave to William Fearney, one of my bargemen; who put them, with the greatest *sang froid*, under his arm."

The battle of St. Vincent was concluded, without that complete destruction of an enemy's fleet, or the surrender of the greater number of ships, such as marked other successes before the close of the war. The two most remarkable trophies of victory were the two ships that were taken, as it were, by Nelson's own hand. Sir John Jervis, on the quarter-deck, embraced the commodore (who, before the events of the 14th of February were known, had been promoted to the rank of rear-admiral); but Nelson's name is not found in his commander's dispatches. On a previous occasion, when little public notice was taken of his exploits, he said, "I will have a Gazette of my own some day." Two other ships were captured; but the Spanish admiral was enabled to sail away without a renewal of the action. Many of the British ships were so injured in their masts and rigging as to be incapable of pursuing the victory to any greater material advantage. Three thousand prisoners were taken in the four prizes. The reward of Sir John Jervis was an earldom. Nelson was made a Knight of the Bath.

The news of the battle of St. Vincent arrived in London on the 3d of March. That evening the thanks of the House of Commons were voted to Admiral Jervis, to his captains and officers, and to the crews of the respective ships for their gallant behavior. It was well for these crews that they were actively engaged, after the victory, in the chase or blockade of the enemy. It was well that the commander of the Mediterranean fleet knew how to put down a dissatisfied spirit by firmness; for the crews of Lord St. Vincent, in the enthusiasm of glory, had not forgotten grievances of which the British navy had to complain. In stations at home and in the Channel there was a spirit of discontent which somewhat disturbed the repose of the official mind, but which excited no desire to remove the causes of dissatisfaction. At the end of March Lord Bridport, with fifteen sail of the line, had returned to Spithead from a cruise off Brest. Previous to his cruise the seamen at Portsmouth had addressed petitions to Lord Howe, praying for an increase of wages. These petitions bore no signatures, and appeared to have been mostly written by one person. They were sent to the admiralty, after Lord Howe had caused inquiries to be made as to the temper of the fleet; which inquiries, being answered by the officers in command at Portsmouth, could furnish no better solution of the complaints than that they did not express the real mind of the crews, but were to be attributed to the evil designs of some mischievous enemy of the government. The correspondence was duly tied up and labelled; the admiralty had more pressing business than that of redressing the crying wrongs of a hundred thousand seamen.

On the 15th of April Lord Bridport, who had taken the command of the Channel fleet, made the signal to prepare for sea. The sailors of his flag-ship, the Royal George, instead of weighing anchor, ran up the shrouds and gave three cheers. The shouts were echoed from every ship in the fleet lying at Spithead. Those cheers, so often the prelude of victory, were sounds well calculated to strike terror into the heart of the boldest captain. They were the signals of mutiny. The mutiny of a single ship might be suppressed; but the general mutiny of a fleet—where was that peril to end? On board those ships there were officers beloved by their crews, who had some consideration for their comforts and some respect for their feelings—officers who did not resort to the lash for every petty offence, and who could make their men believe them to be in earnest without accompanying every command with a volley of oaths. There were others whose tyranny was as disgusting as it was subversive of every just principle of discipline—who governed by fear alone, regarding the sailor as a being not capable of a milder rule than the negro of a slave plantation. The wrongs of the naval service were essentially connected with the wicked system of impressment—a system which the legislators of that day might well believe essential to the very existence of our naval power, when we have been told again and again in very recent times that the exercise of impressment "is considered by every officer of experience as essentially necessary for the manning of the fleet, and of vital importance to the British navy."* Impressment in 1797 filled the ships with men who had suffered grievous injustice—who were torn from peaceful occupations because they had once served at sea, or carried off from more lucrative employment in merchant vessels, to be subjected to the severe punishments, the small pay, the bad provisions, the neglect in sickness, all the manifold frauds of the purser, and all the neglects of the Victualling Office. There was the temptation of prize-money, at a time when there was little respect for private property in the operations of warfare; but the distribution of prize-money was so grossly unequal that the capture even of a Spanish galleon was more an occasion of envy than of satisfaction to the common sailor. The seamen of our day have no such wrongs to complain of. Impressment has died out; the use of the lash is so restricted that the man who does his duty has no fear of being the victim of a petty officer's caprice; pay is not disproportionate to the rate of wages in other occupations; food is ample. In almost every particular the seaman of 1797 was ill-treated. The belief of the admiralty was the popular belief—that

"Jack dances and sings and is always content,"

knew nothing of the value of money, and could put up with every hardship if he had plenty of grog. Little did the statesmen of England think that the easy fool who, as Dibdin painted him,

"Pays his score,
With spirit on shore,
And that's all the use of a guinea,"

was the man to strike for wages. What would have been a strike in a factory was a mutiny in a fleet—a terrible danger far more formidable than an economic mistake.

In the sixteen men-of-war lying at Spithead, although the commands of the admiral to put to sea were set at naught — although every officer saw that his power of compelling obedience was gone—not a hand was raised in offence, not a voice was heard of disrespect. A new power had suddenly arisen, greater than that of admiral or captains—the authority of thirty-two delegates. In Lord Howe's cabin these chosen men held their deliberations, each ship sending two invested with full powers. On the 17th an oath was administered to every man in the fleet to uphold the common cause in which they were engaged. Two petitions were drawn up, one to the House of Commons and one to the admiralty, which were signed by these delegates. Never were just demands set forth with more temper and discretion. But although the consciousness of power did not display itself in angry words, there was evidence of a settled determination which might have awful results. On the fore-yard-arms of every ship ropes were reeved, ready for the execution of summary punishment upon any deserter from their cause. Officers whose oppressions had exceeded the ordinary bounds were sent on shore, to tell their tale of the rough justice that had overtaken them. The wages of seamen, as these petitioners truly alleged, had been settled by parliament in the reign of Charles II., and remained unaltered. The House of Commons was requested to revise these regulations. The pay and pensions of the army had been increased, while the seamen continued neglected. To the lords of the admiralty the petitioners further alleged the grievance which sailors endured in receiving only fourteen ounces to the pound in the provisions served out to them. The two ounces were retained as the perquisite of the purser, who received no other pay. They had short quantities in every article served out by measure. Their food was bad. The necessaries supplied to the sick were embezzled. When they had completed the duty of their ship after their return from sea, they claimed the opportunity to taste the sweets of liberty on shore. If a man was

* Lord Campbell, "Quarterly Review," vol. xxxvii. p. 399.

wounded in action they required that his pay should be continued until he was cured and discharged. The crisis was too serious to allow of hesitation on the part of the naval authorities. The Board of Admiralty assembled at Portsmouth, and gave an immediate answer, promising to recommend to his majesty to propose to parliament an immediate increase of the wages of seamen in certain proportions, and to redress the grievance of withholding pay from seamen wounded in action. The other allegations of the petition remained unnoticed, and the seamen reiterated their demands, declaring that until an act of parliament was passed, and pardon granted to them, they would not lift an anchor. Three admirals went on board the Queen Charlotte, and had a conference with the delegates. One gave way to passion, seized a delegate by the collar, swore he would hang them all, and narrowly escaped with his own life. Then was hoisted the terrible signal of the red flag—the pirates' signal, which implied that no quarter would be given. After two or three days' suspense, Lord Bridport came on board his flag-ship, and promised complete redress and full pardon. Meanwhile no official notice had been taken of these proceedings by the ministry or the parliament, and the seamen were persuaded that they were betrayed. For a fortnight a silence which was considered politic, but which was truly dangerous, had been maintained, and the mutiny again broke out on the 7th of May. Blood was then shed, and for another week the country was held in terror. It was time to act vigorously. A bill was rapidly carried through both houses for an increase of pay and allowance to the seamen and marines. On the 14th Lord Howe, with the act of parliament in his hand and the king's proclamation of pardon, met the delegates at Portsmouth. The presence of this veteran, the hero of the 1st of June, touched the hearts of the delegates. The bloody flag was struck. Subordination was wholly restored, and on the 17th the fleet put to sea. The example of tranquillity at Spithead was sufficient to quell a similar mutiny at Plymouth.

But the danger was not yet overpast—the greatest danger, perhaps, that England had encountered since the Spanish Armada sailed into the Channel, and the guns of the Dutch told of their presence in the Medway. On the 22d of May, after some previous symptoms of disaffection, that revolt broke out which is known in history as the Mutiny at the Nore. On that day the crews took possession of the ships, elected delegates, and prepared petitions that in their demands went far beyond those of the previous mutineers. The redress of grievances alleged by the fleet at Spithead applied to the whole British navy. The mutineers at the Nore repeated these complaints as if they had not been redressed, and assumed an attitude which made conciliation impossible. Some of their demands might be just, others were wholly extravagant. The delegates of the fleet at Spithead had said in their first petition, "We agree in opinion that we should suffer double the hardships we have hitherto experienced before we would suffer the crown of England to be in the least imposed upon by any power in the world." Very different was the view of their duty taken by the crews of four men-of-war and a sloop, who had deserted from the fleet blockading the Texel under Admiral Duncan, and had sailed to join the mutineers at the Nore. Duncan called his own ship's crew together, and among many other earnest words said, "It has often been my pride with you to look into the Texel, and see a foe which dreaded coming out to meet us: my pride is now humbled indeed." But the brave commander maintained his blockade with those who were faithful to him. At the Nore the acts of the fleet were as those of a foreign enemy. The delegates had chosen a daring man as their president—Richard Parker—who signed the demands of his associates as if he were invested with supreme powers. Conferences between the lords of the admiralty and the delegates had no result beyond embittering the dispute. The red flag was hoisted. The mutineers moored their ships in a line across the river, and intercepted every merchant vessel. Pitt had his sleep broken, but he took the most decisive mode to sleep securely in future. He brought in bills to provide for the more effectual punishment of those who should excite mutiny and sedition in the navy, and to prevent all communication with the ships that should remain in a state of mutiny. The bills were quickly passed, amid some party opposition, to which the patriotic conduct of Sheridan was a signal exception. The mutineers quickly discovered that the government was too strong for them, that they had not the support of the other fleets, and that they were not united among themselves. On the 9th of June two of the ships concerned in the mutiny abandoned the fleet, and were fired upon by those remaining at the Nore. On the 13th five more vessels left the insurgents, and took refuge under the batteries of Sheerness. On the 15th all the ships at anchor struck the red flag. Obedience was soon completely re-established. Parker and the more prominent of his associates were found guilty, after a solemn trial. Parker had been a small shopkeeper in Scotland, was confined for debt in Perth jail when he accepted the parochial bounty of thirty pounds to volunteer into the navy, had served two years, and was promoted to be a petty officer, but was disrated and turned before the mast about three months before the mutiny broke out. He was executed on board the Sandwich on the 30th of June.

The alarm inspired by these mutinies may be gathered from the expressions of public men. Sheridan said in the House of Commons, "If there was, indeed, a rot in the wooden walls of Old England, our decay could not be very distant." Lord Mornington could see no way out of these troubles. "How discipline and subordination are ever again to be restored, on any permanent basis, surpasses my understanding to conceive." * On the 9th of May Lord Cornwallis wrote, "Unless the business of the fleet can be speedily adjusted, a few days must place a French army in Ireland." The alarm of the moneyed and commercial interests was sufficiently expressed by the fall in the funds. Throughout the four years of war, indeed, the price of stocks may be taken as the index of public confidence. In January, 1793, the three per cents were at 79; in January, 1796, they were at 67; in January, 1797, they were at 57; and in April, May, and June, of that year, they had fallen to 47. The crisis was indeed alarming. Public bodies, including the common council of London, called for the dismission of the king's ministers as the most likely means of securing a speedy and permanent peace. Lord Grenville wrote to his brother at the end of April, "The panic here is so disgraceful that the country will not allow us to do them justice." He thought how pleasant it were for the nation "to be quiet and suffer themselves to be saved." He looks at "the good people of England" from a point of view which sees much, but does not see all, and which sees many things "through a glass darkly." There is truth in what he says, but not the whole truth: "To desire war without reflection, to be unreasonably elated with success, to be still more unreasonably depressed by difficulties, and to call out for peace with an impatience which makes suitable terms unattainable, are the established maxims and the regular progress of the popular mind in this country." † Pitt, with all his sanguine hopes of success in a prolonged resistance to France, had far more respect for "the popular mind in this country" than the cold and haughty Grenville. There was a war party in the cabinet and a pacific party. Pitt, encouraged by his attached disciple Canning, was resolved to brave the hostility of Grenville, Windham, and the war party, and once more to open negotiations for peace with France. Lord Malmesbury, after the mutiny in the fleet had been suppressed, was again appointed to conduct negotiations, with the assurance from Pitt that "he would stifle every feeling of pride to the utmost to produce the desired results." ‡ Malmesbury met the plenipotentiaries of the French Republic at Lisle in the beginning of July. On the 9th of July, the great seer, who would have again raised his voice to cry "No peace with regicide," ceased to live. On the 14th Canning wrote to his friend Ellis, who formed one of the suite of this embassy, "I ought to tell you something of what has been passing here since you left us. There is but one event, but that is an event for the world—Burke is dead. . . . It is of a piece with the peddling sense of these days, that it should be determined to be imprudent for the House of Commons to vote him a monument. He is the man that will mark this age, marked as it is in itself by events, to all times." §

The British government, in entering upon the negotiations at Lisle, was not embarrassed, as in the previous negotiations at Paris, by its engagements with other powers. Our sole ally was Portugal. The

* "Court and Cabinets of George III.," vol. ii. p. 373.
† Ibid., p. 376.
‡ Malmesbury's "Diaries and Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 355.
§ Ibid., vol. iii. p. 383.

court of Vienna, under the pressure of the victorious arms of Bonaparte, had on the 18th of April signed at Leoben the preliminaries of peace with the French Republic. At the beginning of the year Mantua, continuing to hold out against its besiegers, Alvinzi advanced to its relief with a new Austrian army of fifty thousand men. He crossed the Adige, and having attacked the French general, Joubert, compelled him to retreat to Rivoli. Bonaparte, who had waited at Verona till he had ascertained the direction in which the Austrian general would advance, now moved with his wonted rapidity to the aid of Joubert. The battle of Rivoli began on the morning of the 14th of January. The Austrians fought with a determination which rendered the issue for a long time doubtful. Rivoli was taken by the Austrians, and retaken by the French, twice in that day of carnage. A judicious movement of Alvinzi on the left of Rivoli might have changed the fortunes of that field, but the effort was an hour too late. The Austrians, said Bonaparte, did not sufficiently calculate the value of time. Alvinzi retired to the Tyrol, pursued by the victorious republicans. Meanwhile Provera had marched to the relief of Mantua. On the field of Rivoli Bonaparte heard that this Austrian general was before the place on the 15th. He at once took his resolution. He left Joubert to pursue the fugitive troops of Alvinzi, and by a march of thirty-five miles in twenty-four hours was engaged with Provera on the morning of the 16th, and compelled him to surrender with five thousand men. Mantua capitulated on the 2d of February. Bonaparte treated his aged antagonist, Wurmser, who had gallantly defended Mantua, with a delicacy almost chivalrous. In the interval between the surrender of Provera and the fall of Mantua, Bonaparte had marched into the Papal States, and when within forty miles of Rome had granted peace to the terrified pope. Another Austrian army had been collected under the Archduke Charles, against which the French marched in three divisions. Bonaparte advanced on the 10th of March to encounter the archduke, who had formed his line of defence on the Tagliamento. Bernadotte joined him with twenty thousand men from the army of the Rhine. On the 16th of March the French forced their way across the Tagliamento, the Austrians retreating before them. The retreat of the archduke continued through March, as if it were a predetermined plan of operations to draw the French on to the hereditary states of the emperor, where a battle might be fought with advantage, while Hungarians and Tyrolese and Venetians were gathering round the invaders. Bonaparte on the 31st of March wrote to the Archduke Charles, to implore him to induce the emperor to listen to the terms of peace which the French Directory had offered. The archduke returned for answer that he would communicate with Vienna. Bonaparte continued to advance, and on the 2d of April defeated the Archduke at Neumarkt. Alarm and despondency now prevailed in the imperial counsels, instead of a determination to hazard a battle under the walls of Vienna. A suspension of arms proposed by the emperor was agreed to on the 7th of April. The preliminaries of peace were signed at Leoben on the 18th. The interval in the greater operations of the Italian campaign gave the indefatigable general of the French the opportunity of avenging himself upon the republic of Venice, which, of all the Italian states, had displayed the greatest disinclination to fraternize with France. When Bonaparte was supposed to be in danger in the Austrian provinces, the hatred of the Venetians displayed itself in acts of cruelty and outrage toward the French who remained among them, particularly at Verona. On the 3d of May Bonaparte issued a manifesto declaring war against the Venetian Republic. The French troops overran all the Venetian territory; took a signal vengeance on the Veronese; finally entered Venice on the 16th of May, and put an end to that famous government which had maintained its independence and its power during centuries of change. The last and greatest convulsion of Europe made the Queen of the Adriatic first a prize to a revolutionary democracy, and then the slave of an unteachable absolutism.

Such was the position of Europe when Lord Malmesbury opened his negotiation at Lisle. As the French Directory was then constituted, there was a partial disposition to meet with an equal sincerity the evident desire of the British government to put an end to this desolating conflict. The demands first put forth by the French plenipotentiaries were extravagant—that Great Britain should relinquish all her conquests, whether of French, Dutch, or Spanish possessions, and that France should retain all she had acquired by the war. It was the opinion of the British negotiators that these demands would be gradually reduced, that Carnot and Barthelemi, two of the five directors who were decidedly advocates for peace, would win over Barras, and that the majority would be disposed to accept the conditions resolved upon by the British government—namely, to give up all the conquests made from France, and to retain the Spanish possession of Trinidad, and the Dutch possessions of Ceylon and the Cape of Good Hope. Lord Malmesbury had a channel of private information which he could trust, and he wrote to Lord Grenville on the 25th of July, "The fate of the negotiation will depend much less on what passes in our conferences here than on what may happen very shortly in Paris."* Another revolutionary crisis was approaching. Barras, Reubell, and La Réveillière Lépaux were preparing to eject Carnot and Barthelemi, and to purge the two legislative councils of members who were suspected of royalist designs, and of those who, without desiring the restoration of the monarchy, were opposed to the venality and abuse of power by the majority of the directors. Bonaparte was cognizant of the dangers of the Triumviri—Barras, Reubell, and Lépaux—and was ready to support them by his soldiery. The military arm, which was soon to supersede every other authority in France, was now to be the instrument of accomplishing one of those acts of violence with which we have become familiar under the name of a *coup d'état*. General Augereau was sent by Bonaparte to Paris to do the bidding of the majority of the directors. On the morning of the 4th of September, Augereau surrounded the Tuileries with troops, and arrested about sixty members of the legislative councils, with orders also to arrest Carnot and Barthelemi. Carnot escaped, but his brother director, the members of the councils who had been seized, and many journalists and other writers, were banished to Guiana. Among the number was Pichegru. This was the revolution of the eighteenth Fructidor. It was decisive as to the issue of the negotiations at Lisle. Lord Malmesbury wrote to Mr. Pitt on the 9th of September, "The violent revolution which has taken place at Paris has overset all our hopes and defeated all our reckonings. I consider it as the most unlucky event that could have happened. We were certainly very near obtaining the great object of our wishes, and I fear we are now more driven out to sea again than ever."† Mr. Pitt was inclined "to believe and hope that the party now predominant will think the enjoyment of their triumph more likely to be both complete and secure in peace than in war."‡ He was grievously mistaken. New plenipotentiaries were sent by the Directory to Lisle. They required that Great Britain should surrender all the conquests she had made, not only the colonies taken from France but from her allies, without any equivalent; intimating that if this peremptory condition was not acceded to Lord Malmesbury must depart in twenty-four hours. When Malmesbury said that he had no powers which would enable him to accede to such a proposal, he was insolently answered, "Then go and fetch them." The embassy quitted Lille on the 18th of September. Truly did Canning write to a friend, "It was not any question of terms, of giving up this or retaining that. It was a settled determination to get rid of the chance of peace on the part of the three scoundrelly directors that put an end to the negotiation."§

During these conferences no one was more sanguine than Canning. In his position of under secretary for foreign affairs he labored incessantly, in concert with Pitt and Malmesbury, to neutralize the opposition made by some members of the cabinet to a pacific policy. His disappointment was proportionately bitter. He started the "Anti-Jacobin," the first number of which appeared on the 20th of November, 1797. William Gifford and John Hookham Frere were his principal coadjutors. It came, with new armory, to fight the battle which Burke had fought for seven years. A pacification with France appearing hopeless, it came to denounce the principles and the policy of her government with a determined hatred. To make the literary eulogists of French triumphs odious, and the sentimental declaimers against social wrongs ridiculous, was to be accomplished by witty personalities rather than by impassioned eloquence. Amid much that is scurrilous and much that is dull, the "Anti-Jacobin" sent forth brilliant satire; not in the vain endeavor to "cut

* "Diaries and Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 406.
† Ibid., p. 520. ‡ Ibid., p. 532.
§ Malmesbury's "Diaries and Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 570.

blocks with a razor," but to pierce through the sensitive skins of the poetical enthusiasts who still clung to their first hopes of a regenerated world that should arise out of the darkness of the French revolution. The somewhat profane parody of the *Benedicite*, with which this remarkable publication was wound up after seven months' existence, is a sort of catalogue of the public instructors that Canning and his friends had gibbeted either in fear or in contempt.* It was awkward when the more illustrious of their victims became converts to Anti-Jacobinism, and had long to endure the reproach of being apostates from the cause of freedom. They were all huddled together, the men of genius and the hack journalists—those whose names have lived and those who are forgotten—in one common invocation to join in the praise of "the Sovereign Priest" among "the Anointed Five" of the Directory—"Lépaux, whom atheists worship"—"Couriers and Stars"—"Morning Chronicle and Morning Post"—"five wandering bards" led by "Coleridge and Southey"—"Priestley and Wakefield"—"Thelwall, and ye that lecture as ye go"—"each Jacobin, or fool, or knave"—

"All creeping creatures, venomous and low,
Paine, Williams, Godwin, Holcroft, praise Lépaux."

CHAPTER CXCVI.

Preliminaries of Leoben—Transfer of Venice to Austria—Peace of Campo Formio—Victory of Admiral Duncan off Camperdown—Bonaparte arrives in Paris—Is appointed to the command of the army of England—Preparations for invasion—The scheme postponed—An expedition to Egypt prepared at Toulon—Nelson appointed to command a squadron in the Mediterranean—The expedition sails—Malta seized—Bonaparte lands at Alexandria—Nelson had returned to Naples—Alexandria taken by assault—Battle of the Pyramids—The French at Cairo—Nelson returns to Alexandria—The battle of the Nile—Rejoicings in England, and new hopes—An income-tax first imposed—Volunteers—Ireland.

England has to bear many unjust reproaches when her children are not "kind and natural." Byron reproaches his country with the humiliation of Venice:

"Thy lot
Is shameful to the nations—most of all,
Albion, to thee."

Albion in 1814 left Venice to the tender mercies of Austria; but it was the French Republic that in 1797 betrayed the sister republic into the hands of the emperor, as the bribe to the preliminaries of Leoben and the peace of Campo Formio. The history of nations exhibits no example of greater baseness than this act of Bonaparte—for it was his sole act, contrary to the instructions of the Directory. By a treaty with the democratic party in Venice, made on the 16th of May, the French had abolished the ancient oligarchical government, had filled the city with troops, had exacted contributions in money, in ships, and in works of art. They carried off the famous horses of St. Mark, to be placed on the triumphal arch of the Tuileries. These were common proceedings. Bonaparte during the summer was negotiating with the cabinet of Vienna for exchanges of territories and for transfers of populations, in a spirit quite as despotic as that of the absolute governments which had partitioned Poland. He had stirred up the revolutionary party in the Venetian states to insurrection, on the assurance that he would establish a democratic republic. The Doge, and the Council of Ten, and the Senate had fallen, to give place to an executive body chosen by the suffrages of the people. Venice, after these changes, believed that the republic, as newly modelled, was under the protection of France, whose mission was to bestow liberty upon the nations. On the 26th of May Bonaparte wrote to the municipality of the city, "In every circumstance I shall do what lies in my power to give you proof of my desire to consolidate your liberties, and to see unhappy Italy at length assume the place to which it is entitled in the theatre of the world, free and independent of all strangers." Six weeks before this declaration he had agreed in the secret preliminaries of Leoben to cede Venice to the emperor. After the eighteenth Fructidor, Bonaparte was instructed by the Directory not to cede Venice to the emperor; and Bonaparte returned for answer that if that was their resolve, peace was impracticable. He was determined that a peace should be made, and he gave very sufficient reasons for making it at any sacrifice of principle. The reasons were such as he repeated to the secretary of the French legation at Venice, after the peace had been concluded: "Never has France adopted the maxim of making war for the sake of other nations: I should like to see the principle of philosophy or morality which should command us to sacrifice forty thousand Frenchmen." He wished that the declaimers who raved about the establishment of republics everywhere "would make a winter campaign." The Austrian plenipotentiary, Cobentzel, with three assistant negotiators, according to a story which is in agreement with Bonaparte's melodramatic propensities, were terrified, by a display of well-timed passion, into the terms proposed by the French. On the 16th of October a final conference took place at Udine. The four Austrian negotiators sat on one side of a long table; Bonaparte sat alone on the other side. They had agreed that France should have Flanders and the line of the Rhine, the islands of Corfu, Zante and Cephalonia, and the Venetian districts of Albania, that the emperor should have Dalmatia, Istria, and the other Venetian territory as far as the Adige and the Po, with the city of Venice. Lombardy was to form part of the Cisalpine Republic, which Bonaparte had organized, and which was also to include the Duchy of Reggio and other small Italian states. The great point in dispute was whether Mantua should belong to this republic or to the emperor. Cobentzel maintained that as the emperor had consented to give up Mayence, he ought to retain Mantua; and in a lengthened argument he hinted that a negotiator was forgetful of his duty when he sought to sacrifice the repose of his country to his military ambition. A costly tea-service, presented to Cobentzel by the Empress Catharine, was upon a stand near Bonaparte. He took the tray in his hands, saying, "If to keep Mantua is your ultimatum, war is declared; but mind you in three months I will break your monarchy in pieces, as I now break this porcelain," dashing the service upon the floor. He was a great actor, and needed not the future lessons of Talma.* The peace of Campo Formio was concluded the next day. Among the reasons for peace with Austria which the conqueror of Italy assigned to the Directory was this: "The war with England will open to us a new field for active operations more vast and splendid." On the day when the signature of the treaty of Campo Formio was known at Paris, the Directory created an army to be called "The army of England," and appointed Bonaparte to its command. In a proclamation signed by Lépaux it was announced that "the army of England is about to dictate peace in London, and there, republicans, you shall find your auxiliaries. . . . Conducted by the hero who has so long led you in the path of victory, you will be followed by the applause of every just and virtuous mind." Parliamentary reformers, artisans reduced to wretchedness by the war, Irish bearing the chain of a court fed by their blood—these, according to the Directory, were to fraternize with the hero of Italy. He had given the world a noble evidence of his aspirations for the liberty and happiness of revolutionized states, when he delivered Venice, bound hand and foot, to be trodden upon by Austria.

There was something of bravado in the threat of the Directory to make an immediate descent upon England or upon Ireland; for their means of invasion had been signally crippled by the great victory over the Dutch fleet, on the 11th of October, off Camperdown. Admiral Duncan had been half a century in the navy when he fought this battle. He had sustained the deep mortification of having been deserted by the greater portion of his fleet, and left in his own ship, the Venerable, in company only with the Adamant, to keep up the blockade of the Texel. By making repeated signals, as if to a fleet in the offing, he deceived the Dutch as to the real amount of his force. When the mutiny was suppressed ships gradually joined him. But at the beginning of October the Venerable, and other vessels which had suffered from heavy gales, and were in want of stores, put into Yarmouth Roads, leaving the Dutch to be watched by a small squadron of observation. The fleet had been busied for several days in victualling and refitting, when early in the morning of the 9th a lugger appeared at the back of Yarmouth sands and gave the

* "Anti-Jacobin," vol. ii. p. 635.

* Bourienne, the secretary of Bonaparte, denies the truth of this story. Thiers gives it without any qualification.

signal for an enemy. Before noon Duncan was at sea with eleven sail of the line. He directed his course straight across to his old station. He was joined by three ships; and on the 11th he got sight of the squadron of observation, with signals flying for an enemy to leeward. In less than an hour he came up with the enemy. The land between Egmont and Camperdown was about nine miles to leeward. Duncan took the bold resolve to pass through the Dutch line, and thus to place himself between the enemy and their own shores, to which they were fast approaching. Soon after noon every ship of the British fleet had broken the enemy's line and was hotly engaged. The coast was covered for miles with thousands of spectators. Duncan's ship, the Venerable, was engaged for three hours with the Vryheid, the flag-ship of Admiral De Winter. The brave Dutchman did not strike till all his masts had gone overboard and half his crew were killed or wounded. Admiral Onslow was engaged in a similar close fight with the Dutch vice-admiral, who did not yield till he was equally crippled. By four in the afternoon the victory was clearly decided. But during the fight the British squadron had drifted so near the land as to be only in five fathoms water. It required the greatest exertion to prevent the ships from getting into the shallows; and this necessity favored the escape of some of the Dutchmen. Eight ships of the line, two of fifty-six guns, and two frigates were captured. The carnage on both sides was very great. The Dutch fired at the hulls of our ships, instead of at the masts and rigging, which was the practice of the French and Spaniards; and this mode of assault involved a severe loss of our men. The prizes with difficulty reached the English shores, with tottering masts and hulls full of shot-holes. Duncan made sail to the Nore, where the presence of a triumphant fleet excited feelings in many official visitors very different from those with which the mutinous fleet of the previous June had been regarded. Mr. Addington, the speaker, went on board the Venerable, conversed with De Winter and the other Dutch admiral who were prisoners, admired the noble stature and manly bearing of Duncan, and visited the wounded in their hammocks. "We hope, sir," said some of the brave fellows to the speaker, "we have now made atonement for our late offence."*

The conqueror of Italy arrived in Paris on the 5th of December. He had a difficult part to play. He despised the Directory, who were jealous and afraid of him. His policy was to be quiet. To make a dash at supreme power was as yet too hazardous. He was received with all the magnificence of those theatrical displays which had been so attractive during the horrors of the revolution, when on the 10th of December he presented the treaty of Campo Formio to the directors at their palace of the Luxembourg. His demeanor was modest and unassuming. Barras extolled him beyond all the heroes of the antique world, and invited him to proceed upon a new career of glory—to hoist the tricolored flag on the Tower of London. Bonaparte accepted the command of the army of England. The Directory were in earnest in their hostility to the persevering enemy whose desire for peace they had rudely repelled. To an absolute government, as that of the French Republic then was in reality, no measure, however injurious to its own subjects, stands in the way of its political calculations. English merchandise could not be kept out of France, however severe were the penalties against its introduction. On the 4th of January, throughout the whole French territory, domiciliary visits were made for the purpose of seizing the woven fabrics and the hardware that English industry could produce cheaply, and which no custom-house vigilance could keep out. Bonaparte made a few rapid visits to the ports bordering the British Channel, saw their arsenals and their gun-boats; and appeared to take a great interest in the mighty preparations which the Directory believed would place England at their feet. Bonaparte took a more sober view of the difficulties of the enterprise. On his return from his journey to the coast he said to Bourienne, "It would be too great a risk; I will not run it. I will not sport thus with the fate of France."

The winter passed away, the spring came on, and still the cry of invasion was echoed in every port from Antwerp to Toulon; and Frenchmen asked impatiently when the great attempt would be made. On the 20th of April a royal message was delivered to parliament, that "from various advices received by his majesty it appears that the preparations for the embarkation of troops and warlike stores are carried on with considerable and increasing activity in the ports of France, Flanders, and Holland, with the avowed design of attempting the invasion of his majesty's dominions." On this occasion Sheridan expressed his own feelings and the feelings of the country in a burst of patriotism which soared far above party objects: "It is not glory the French seek for: they are already gorged with it: it is not territory they grasp at; they are already incumbered with the extent they have acquired. What, then, is their object? They come for what they really want; they come for ships, for commerce, for credit, and for capital. They come for the sinews, the bones, the marrow, the very heart's blood of Britain." Sheridan at the same time declared that his political enmity to his majesty's present ministers was irreconcilable; that his attachment to his right honorable friend (Fox) and to his political principles was unaltered and unalterable. Fox, some months previous, had seceded from parliament. There was no general secession of the Whig party; but in a letter to Lord Holland, Fox expressed his strong dislike to attend again himself.* In a subsequent letter he says, "A seceder I will be till I see a very different state of things from the present: and indeed if they were to alter more materially than can be expected, it would be with more reluctance than I can describe, or than is perhaps reasonable, that I should return to politics."† As the head of a great party he had lost his power. Whether he was wise or true to his duty as a patriot to retire at a season of such danger to his pleasant studies at St. Anne's Hill may be doubtful. It is delightful, however, to contemplate a great orator and a man of the world so easily surrendering the excitements of his former life; reading the Iliad; writing of Prior, and Ariosto, and Dryden, and La Fontaine; going through Lucretius regularly, and taking up Chaucer upon his nephew's suggestion. It is pleasant to see how literature can fill up an aching void, however created.

The "avowed design" of the invasion of our country was a feint. Bonaparte had persuaded the Directory to agree to an enterprise which, if successful, would be more permanently injurious to England than a landing in Kent and a march upon London, with the certainty that the country could not be held, and that not an invader would return to exhibit his booty. The vast preparations in the ports of the Mediterranean for a great enterprise were given out by the French government to be in connection with the armaments in the ports of the Channel. Large bodies of troops were collected at Toulon, at Genoa, at Ajaccio, at Civita Vecchia; and this army was called the left wing of the army of England. Bonaparte had with great difficulty persuaded the Directory to postpone their scheme for the invasion of the British Islands, and to permit him to embark an army for Egypt, the possession of which country, he maintained, would open to France the commerce of the East, and prepare the way for the conquest of India. Having subdued Egypt he would return before another winter to plant the tricolor on the Tower of London. In April Bonaparte was appointed General-in-Chief of the Army of the East. The secret had been well kept. The means of furnishing this armament had been supplied by the appropriation of three millions of treasure which had been seized at Berne, and by forced contributions levied at Genoa and at Rome. The French government, at the beginning of January, had stirred up the democratic party in some of the Swiss cantons, and had sent their troops to attack those cantons which resisted the demand of the fraternizing French republicans that the ancient constitution of the republic of Switzerland should be abolished, and a republic created after the new model. The internal dissensions in some of the cantons favored this attempt to introduce the theories of liberty and equality in this ancient stronghold of freedom. The principal object of the French commander was plunder. After a brave resistance on the part of the Bernese, Berne was entered by the French on the 5th of March. Bonaparte was very quickly in communication with the French commissioners, directing them how to forward the spoil of the Bernese treasury to Toulon. At Rome, which the French army had entered at the end of January, with a preconcerted determination to overturn the papal government, the pillage, conducted under the orders of the superior officers, was more unsparing than that which followed the entrance of Alaric, when at the hour of midnight "the inhabitants were awakened by the tremendous sound of the Gothic trumpet." Unlike the king of

* "Life of Sidmouth," vol. i. p. 194.

* "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 144. † Ibid., p. 246.

the Goths, Massena, who commanded the French, did not massacre the people; unlike Alaric also in this, that while the barbarian exhorted his troops "to respect the churches of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul as holy and inviolable sanctuaries,"* the French carried off the priestly vestments, the sacred vessels, and the famous altar-pieces of modern Rome, little of such spoils being reserved for public uses, but sold to the Jews who followed the camp. Some of the francs and piastres that the Jews paid for the supply of their melting-pots found their way to Napoleon at Toulon. A larger portion went into the bags of Massena and his rapacious staff.

The French fleet under Admiral Brueys was in the harbor of Toulon, ready to sail upon its secret destination. Something different from the invasion of England was in contemplation; for on board the admiral's ship, l'Orient, were a hundred literary men and artists, mathematicians and naturalists, who were certainly not required to enlighten the French upon the native productions or the antiquities of the British Isles. Bonaparte arrived at Toulon on the 9th of May, and issued one of his grandiloquent proclamations to his troops. The armament consisted of thirteen ships of the line, many frigates and corvettes, and four hundred transports. The army which it was to carry to some unknown shore consisted of forty thousand men. On the 19th of May this formidable expedition left the great French harbor of the Mediterranean. On the day when Bonaparte arrived at Toulon, Nelson had sailed from Gibraltar, with three seventy-fours, four frigates, and a sloop, to watch the movements of the enemy. Since the most daring of British naval commanders had fought in the battle of St. Vincent he had lost an arm in an unsuccessful attack upon the island of Teneriffe. For some time his spirit was depressed, and he thought that a left-handed admiral could never again be useful. He had lost also his right eye, and was severely wounded in his body. But he had not lost that indomitable spirit which rose superior to wounds and weakness of constitution. He rested some time at home; and then, early in 1798, sailed in the Vanguard to join the fleet under Lord St. Vincent. The admiralty had suggested, and Lord St. Vincent had previously determined, that a detachment of the squadron blockading the Spanish fleet should sail to the Mediterranean, under the command of Nelson. The seniors of the fleet were offended at this preference of a junior officer; and men of routine at home shrugged their shoulders, and feared, with the cold Lord Grenville, that Nelson "will do something *too* desperate."† He was not stinted in his means, being finally reinforced with ten of the best ships of St. Vincent's fleet.

The first operation of Bonaparte was the seizure of Malta. His fleet was in sight of the island on the 9th of June. He had other weapons than his cannon for the reduction of a place deemed impregnable. The Order of St. John of Jerusalem had held the real sovereignty of the island since 1530. These Knights of Malta, powerful at sea, had formed one of the bulwarks of Christendom against the Ottomans. They had gradually lost their warlike prowess, as well as their religious austerity; and Malta, protected by its fortifications, became the seat of luxury for this last of the monastic military orders, whose occupation was gone. Bonaparte had confiscated their property in Italy, and he had sent a skilful agent to the island to sow dissensions among the knights, and thus to prepare the way for the fall of the community. There were many French knights among them, to whom the principal military commands had been intrusted by the grand master, a weak German. Bonaparte, on the 9th of June, sent a demand to the grand master, that his whole fleet should be permitted to enter the great harbor for the purpose of taking in water. The reply was that, according to the rules of the order, only two ships, or at most four, could be allowed to enter the port at one time. The answer was interpreted as equivalent to a declaration of hostility; and Bonaparte issued orders that the army should disembark the next morning on the coasts of the island wherever a landing could be effected. The island was taken almost without opposition, the French knights declaring that they would not fight against their countrymen. On the 13th of June the French were put in possession of La Valletta and the surrounding forts. Bonaparte made all sorts of promises of compensation to the recreant knights, which the Directory were not very careful to keep. He landed to examine his prize, when General Caffarelli, who accompanied him, said, "We are very lucky that there was somebody in the place to open the doors for us." Leaving a garrison to occupy the new possession, the French sailed away on the 20th, with all the gold and silver of the treasury, and all the plate of the churches and religious houses. "The essential point now," says Thiers, "was not to encounter the English fleet; nevertheless, he adds, "nobody was afraid of the encounter." Nelson was at Naples on the day when Bonaparte quitted Malta. He immediately sailed. On the 22d, at night, the two fleets crossed each other's track unperceived, between Cape Mesurata and the mouth of the Adriatic. The frigates of the British fleet had been separated from the main body, and thus Nelson had no certain intelligence. His sagacity made him conjecture that the destination of the armament was Egypt. He made the most direct course to Alexandria, which he reached on the 28th. No enemy was there, and no tidings could be obtained of them. On the morning of the 1st of July Admiral Brueys was off the same port, and learned that Nelson had sailed away in search of him. Bonaparte demanded that he should be landed at some distance from Alexandria, for preparations appeared for the defence of the ancient city. As he and several thousand troops who followed him reached the shore in boats, a vessel appeared in sight, and the cry went forth that it was an English sail. "Fortune," he exclaimed, "dost thou abandon me? Give me only five days!" A French frigate was the cause of the momentary alarm. Nelson had returned to Sicily.

The Sultan was at peace with France; a French minister was at Constantinople. Such trifling formalities in the laws of nations were little respected by the man who told his soldiers that "the genius of Liberty having rendered the republic the arbiter of Europe, had assigned to her the same power over the seas and over the most distant nations."* Four thousand of the French army were landed, and marched in three columns to the attack of Alexandria. It was quickly taken by assault. Bonaparte announced that he came neither to ravage the country nor to question the authority of the Grand Seignior, but to put down the domination of the Mamlooks, who tyrannized over the people by the authority of the beys. He proclaimed to the population of Egypt, in magnificent language, that he caused to be translated into Arabic, that he came not to destroy their religion. We Frenchmen are true Mussulmans. Have not we destroyed the pope, who called upon Europe to make war upon Mussulmans? Have not we destroyed the Knights of Malta, because these madmen believed that God had called them to make war upon Mussulmans?‡ Leaving a garrison of three thousand men in Alexandria, the main army commenced its march to Cairo. Bonaparte was anxious to arrive there before the periodical inundation of the Nile. The fleet of Brueys remained at anchor in the road of Aboukir. Bonaparte chose the shorter route to Cairo, through the desert of Damanhour, leading thirty thousand men—to each of whom he had promised to grant seven acres of fertile land in the conquered territories—through plains of sand without a drop of water. They murmured, and almost mutinied, but they endured, and at length reached the banks of the Nile, at Rahmameh, where a flotilla, laden with provisions, baggage, and artillery, awaited them. The Mamlooks, with Mourad Bey at their head, were around the French. The invaders had to fight with enemies who came upon them in detachments, gave a fierce assault, and then fled. As they approached the great Pyramids of Jizeh they found an enemy more formidable than these scattered bands. Mourad Bey was encamped with twelve thousand Mamlooks and eight thousand mounted Bedouins, on the west bank of the Nile, and opposite Cairo. The French looked upon the great entrepôt, where the soldiers expected to find the gorgeous palaces and the rich bazaars of which some had read in Galland's "Arabian Nights," whose tales they had recounted to their comrades on their dreary march under a burning sun. They had to sustain the attack of Mourad Bey and his Mamlooks, who came upon them with the fury of a tempest. In the East Bonaparte was ever in his altitudes; and he now pointed to the Pyramids, and exclaimed to his soldiers, "Forty centuries look down upon you." The chief attack of the Mamlooks was upon a square which Desaix commanded. In spite of the desperate courage of this formidable cavalry, the steadiness of the disciplined soldiery of the army of Italy repelled every assault;

* See Gibbon, A.D. 410, chap. xxxi.
† "Court, etc., of George III.," vol. ii. p. 406.

* Proclamation at Toulon. † Thiers, livre xxxix.

and after a tremendous loss Mourad Bey retreated toward Upper Egypt. His intrenched camp was forced, amid a fearful carnage. The conquerors had no difficulty in obtaining possession of Cairo. Ibrahim Bey evacuated the city, which on the 25th of July Bonaparte entered. His policy now was to conciliate the people instead of oppressing them. He addressed himself to the principal sheiks, and obtained from them a declaration in favor of the French. It went forth with the same authority among the Mussulmans as a brief of the pope addressed to Roman Catholics. In the grand mosque a litany was sung to the glory of "the Favorite of Victory, who at the head of the valiant of the West has destroyed the infantry and the horse of the Mamlooks." A few weeks later "the Favorite of Victory" was seated in the grand mosque at the Feast of the Prophets, sitting cross-legged as he repeated the words of the Koran, and edifying the sacred college by his piety.*

From the beginning to the end of July Mr. Pitt was waiting with anxious expectation for news from the Mediterranean. During this suspense he wrote to the speaker that he "could not be quite sure of keeping any engagement he might make." It was not till the 26th of September that the English government knew the actual result of the toils and disappointments to which Nelson had been subjected. When it was known in England that he had been to Egypt and had returned to Sicily, the journalists talked of naval mismanagement; and worn-out captains who were hanging about the admiralty asking for employ marvelled at the rashness of Lord St. Vincent in sending so young a commander upon so great an enterprise. The Neapolitan ministry, dreading to offend the French Directory, refused Nelson the supplies of provisions and water which he required before he again started in pursuit of the fleet which "Cæsar and his fortune bare at once." Sir William Hamilton was our minister at Naples; his wife was the favorite of the Queen of Naples, and one of the most attractive of the ladies of that luxurious court. Nelson had a slight acquaintance with Lady Hamilton; and upon his representations of the urgent necessity for victualling his fleet, secret instructions were given that he should be supplied with all he required. In 1805 Nelson requested Mr. Rose to urge upon Mr. Pitt the claims of Lady Hamilton upon the national gratitude, because "it was through her interposition exclusively he obtained provisions and water for the English ships at Syracuse, in the summer of 1798; by which he was enabled to return to Egypt in quest of the enemy's fleet; to which therefore the success of his brilliant action of the Nile was owing, as he must otherwise have gone down to Gibraltar to refit, and the enemy would have escaped."† On the 25th of July Nelson sailed from Syracuse. It was three days before he gained any intelligence of the French fleet, and he then learned that they had been seen about four weeks before, steering to the S.E. from Candia. He was again convinced that their destination was Egypt, and he made all sail for Alexandria. On the 1st of August he beheld the tricolored flag flying upon its walls. His anxiety was at an end. For a week he had scarcely taken food or slept. The signal was made for the enemy's fleet; and he now ordered dinner to be served, and when his officers rose to prepare for battle, he exclaimed that before the morrow his fate would be a peerage or Westminster Abbey.

The fleet of Admiral Brueys was at anchor in the Bay of Aboukir. The transports and other small vessels were within the harbor. Bonaparte told O'Meara that he had sent an officer from Cairo with peremptory orders that Brueys should enter the harbor, but that the officer was killed by the Arabs on the way.‡ Brueys had taken measures to ascertain the practicability of entering the harbor with his larger ships, and had found that the depth of water was insufficient. He was unwilling to sail away to Corfu—as Bonaparte affirmed that he had ordered him to do, if to enter the harbor were impracticable—until he knew that the army was securely established at Cairo. The French admiral moored his fleet in what he judged the best position; a position described by Nelson himself as "a strong line of battle for defending the entrance of the bay (of shoals), flanked by numerous gun-boats, four frigates, and a battery of guns and mortars."§ The French ships were placed "at a distance from each other of about a hundred and sixty yards, with the van-ship close to a shoal in the north-west, and the whole of the line just outside a four-fathom sand bank; so that an enemy, it was considered, could not turn either flank."* Nelson, with the rapidity of genius, at once grasped his plan of attack. Where there was room for a French ship to swing there was room for an English ship to anchor. He would place half his ships on the inner side of the French line, and half on the outer side. The number of ships in the two fleets was nearly equal, but four of the French were of larger size. At three o'clock in the afternoon the British squadron was approaching the bay, with a manifest intention of giving battle. Admiral Brueys had thought that the attack would be deferred to the next morning. Nelson had no intention of permitting the enemy to weigh anchor, and get to sea in the darkness. By six o'clock Nelson's line was formed, without any precise regard to the succession of the vessels according to established forms. The shoal at the western extremity of the bay was rounded by eleven of the British squadron. The Goliath led the way, and when her commander, Foley, reached the enemy's van, he steered between the outermost ship and the shoal. The Zealous (Captain Hood) instantly followed. At twenty minutes past six the two van-ships of the French opened their fire upon these vessels, but they were soon disabled. Four other British ships also took their stations inside the French line. Nelson, in the Vanguard, followed by five of his seventy-fours, anchored on the outer side of the enemy. Nine of the French fleet were thus placed between the two fires of eleven of the British ships. The Leander had not been engaged, having been occupied in the endeavor to assist the Culloden, which, coming up after dark, ran aground.

Before the sun went down the shore was crowded with the people of the country gazing upon this terrible conflict. When darkness fell, the flashes of the guns faintly indicated the positions of the contending fleets. Each British ship was ordered to carry four lanterns at her mizzen-peak, and these were lighted at seven o'clock. Each ship also went into action with the white ensign of St. George, of which the red cross in the centre rendered it easily distinguishable in the darkest night at sea. But there was another illumination, more awful than the flashes of two thousand cannon, which was that night to strike unwonted dismay into the bravest of the combatants of either nation. Five of the French ships had surrendered. The Vanguard had been engaged with the Spartiate and the Aquilon. Her loss was severe. A splinter had struck Nelson on the head, cutting a large piece of the flesh and skin from his forehead, which fell over his remaining eye. He was carried down to the cockpit, and the effusion of blood being very great, his wound was held to be dangerous, if not mortal, by the anxious shipmates around him. He was carried where his men were also carried, without regard to rank, to be tended by the busy surgeons. These left their wounded, to bestow their care upon the first man of the fleet. "No," said Nelson, "I will take my turn with my brave fellows." Sidney, in the field of Zutphen, taking the cup of water from his lips to give to the dying soldier, with the memorable words, "This man's necessity is more than mine," was a parallel example of heroism. The admiral did wait his turn; and meanwhile, in the belief that his career was ended, called to his chaplain to deliver a last token of affection to his wife. The wound was found to be superficial. He was carried to his cabin, and left alone, amid the din of the battle. Suddenly the cry was heard that l'Orient, the French flag-ship of 120 guns, was on fire. Nelson groped his way to the deck, to the astonishment of the crew, who heard their beloved commander giving his orders that the boats should be lowered to proceed to the help of the burning vessel. The Bellerophon had been overpowered by the weight of metal of l'Orient and had lost her masts. The Swiftsure had also been engaged with this formidable vessel. Both had maintained an unremitting fire upon the French flag-ship. Admiral Brueys had fallen, and had died the death of a brave man on his deck. The ship was in flames; at ten o'clock she blew up, the conflagration having lasted for nearly an hour. When the explosion came there was an awful silence. For ten minutes not a gun was fired on either side. The instinct of self-preservation, as well as the sudden awe on this sublime event, produced this pause in the battle. Some of the French, endeavoring to get out of the vicinity of the burning wreck, had slipped their cables. The nearest of the English took every precau-

* Thiers, livre xxxix. (August, 1798.)
† Rose, "Diaries," etc., vol. i. p. 254.
‡ "Voice from St. Helena," vol. ii.; Diary, May 16.
§ "Gazette," October 2.

* James, "Naval History," vol. ii. p. 142.

tion to prevent the combustible materials doing them injury. The shock of the explosion shook the Alexander, Swiftsure, and Orion to their kelsons, and materially injured them. None of our ships, however, took fire. About seventy only of the crew of l'Orient were saved by the English boats. The battle was resumed by the French ship, the Franklin, and it went on, at intervals, till daybreak. The contest was sustained by four French line-of-battle ships and four of the English. Finally two of the French line-of-battle ships and two frigates escaped. Of thirteen sail of the line, nine were taken, two were burned. Of the British about nine hundred men were killed and wounded. No accurate account was obtained of the French loss. The estimate which represented that loss at five thousand was evidently exaggerated. About three thousand French prisoners were sent on shore. Kleber, the French general, wrote to Napoleon, "The English have had the disinterestedness to restore everything to their prisoners."

After the victory of the Nile Nelson returned to Naples. He required rest; and in the ease and luxury, the flattery and the honors which there awaited him, he forgot his quiet home, and after a time was involved in public acts which reflect discredit upon his previous spotless name. At Palermo Lord Cochrane had opportunities of conversation with him. He says, "To one of his frequent injunctions, 'Never mind manœuvres, always go at them,' I subsequently had reason to consider myself indebted for successful attacks under apparently difficult circumstances." Cochrane considered Nelson "an embodiment of dashing courage, which would not take much trouble to circumvent an enemy, but being confronted with one would regard victory so much a matter of course as hardly to deem the chance of defeat worth consideration." * This opinion is borne out by a letter which Nelson wrote to his old friend, Admiral Locker, from Palermo: "It is you who always said, 'Lay a Frenchman close and you will beat him;' and my only merit in my profession is being a good scholar." † Nelson was himself a master who made many good scholars.

M. Thiers, having described the great naval battle of Aboukir with tolerable fairness, admits that it was the most disastrous that the French navy had yet experienced—one from which the most fatal military consequences might be apprehended. The news of the disaster caused a momentary despair in the French army. Bonaparte received the intelligence with calmness. "Well," he exclaimed, "we must die here; or go forth, great, as were the ancients." He wrote to Kleber, "We must do great things;" and Kleber replied, "Yes, we must do great things; I prepare my faculties." It would have been fortunate for the fame of Bonaparte if he had abstained from doing some of "the great things" which he accomplished while he remained in the East.

The victory of Nelson formed the great subject of congratulation in the royal speech, when the session was opened on the 20th of November. "By this great and brilliant victory an enterprise of which the injustice, perfidy, and extravagance had fixed the attention of the world, and was peculiarly directed against some of the most valuable interests of the British empire, has, in the first instance, been turned to the confusion of its authors." Out of this victory new hopes were to arise—vain hopes which statesmen formed in the enthusiasm of success: "The blow thus given to the power and influence of France has afforded an opening, which, if improved by suitable exertions on the part of other powers, may lead to the general deliverance of Europe." What the king said from his throne, men "in the secret" had previously whispered in confidence to their friends: "It seems quite certain," writes Mr. Addington, "that the war on the continent will be renewed; and I have no doubt that Prussia will concur in the prosecution of it. Lord Nelson has electrified Europe." Magnificent were the anticipations of the sanguine speaker. The Swiss were to throw off their yoke; Prussia would keep France at bay on the Rhine. The Emperor Paul would recover Mentz and Manheim. The Austrians, in conjunction with the King of Naples, would be sufficient for the deliverance of Italy. Holland, the Netherlands, Brabant, even France herself, would surely not remain inactive.* These prodigious anticipations lead one to remember a certain Arabian story of a man who, calculating in his day-dream the vast profits he was to acquire by turning again and again the capital he had expended upon articles of glass, kicked over the tray upon which his store was placed. The waking Alnaschar cried out and said, "All this is the result of my pride;" and he slapped his face and tore his clothes. A bitter reproach against England—in many respects an unjust reproach—had been embodied in the exaggerations of one who justified the extravagances of poetical imagery, as "the product of his own seething imagination, and therefore impregnated with that pleasurable exaltation which is experienced in all energetic exertion of intellectual power." † England at the end of 1796 was thus painted:

> "Abandoned of Heaven! mad avarice thy guide,
> At cowardly distance, yet kindling with pride,
> 'Mid thy herds and thy corn-fields secure thou hast stood,
> And joined the wild yelling of famine and blood."

The reproach was more pithily expressed by the French in ascribing every hostile movement of Europe to "the gold of Pitt." Five years of fatal experience had, in 1798, shown how hollow were the alliances that were bought. The system was to be renewed again and again. On the 29th of December, 1798, a treaty of alliance was concluded between Great Britain and Russia. Russia was, of course, to be subsidized. The vein of gold was far from being exhausted, however vigorously it had been worked. A new vein was now to be opened. On the 3d of December Mr. Pitt gave an estimate of the amount of supply required. The total was upward of twenty-nine millions. The estimate for 1793 was sixteen millions. To meet this ever-increasing expenditure all sorts of devices of direct taxation had been resorted to—devices described by the Marquis of Lansdowne as "irksome, petty, and unproductive exactions which fret and disturb men's minds." ‡ Mr. Pitt now proposed, for the first time in the history of British finance, an income tax. He estimated the total income of Great Britain at 102,000,000*l.*, which he proposed to tax, upon a graduated scale, at 10 per cent; to commence with incomes above 60*l.* a year, but in a reduced ratio from 60*l.* to 200*l.* He assumed that this tax would produce an annual revenue of ten millions. In 1859-60 the income tax was 9*d.* in the pound, which also produced very nearly ten millions. The great financial measure of the minister of 1798 was called by Mr. Tierney "indiscriminate rapine;" and he and others urged the objections which have been so often ineffectually urged, however impossible to be refuted. Mr. Tierney asked, "Does the minister mean to say that a person possessing an income for life of a certain sum, and another person of the same income which he derives from the interest of his own capital, can equally bear the same taxes?" A more obvious objection was put by Mr. Hobhouse: "The man who had an income of 1000*l.* per annum arising from capital, and the man who gained the same annual sum by a profession or business, surely ought not to be assessed in the same degree." § In the House of Lords the argument, which left out of view the pressure upon industry, was used by Lord Holland—that a direct tax of this nature would be oppressive to the landed interest. "Could their lordships look forward to the prospect of their posterity becoming titled beggars? Their property was easily known, and they could not, if they were inclined, evade the tax. The whole weight of the tax must fall on those who should not be able to escape—in fact, on landowners—on those who had ostensible possessions." ‖ The measure of an income tax was passed without any division in either house.

In the royal speech of the 20th of November there were two references to the internal condition of Great Britain and Ireland which are of more than temporary importance: "The extent of our preparations at home, and the demonstrations of zeal and spirit among all ranks of my subjects, have deterred the enemy from attempting to execute their vain threat of invading the coasts of this kingdom." The "demonstrations of zeal and spirit" had chiefly reference to the formation of volunteer corps throughout the country. How imperfectly the zeal of the people was then seconded by the aid of the gov-

* Lord Dundonald, "Autobiography," vol. i. p. 88.

† "Plain Englishman," vol. iv. p. 563; a periodical work for popular instruction, conducted, in 1821, by the son of Admiral Locker and by the author of this history.

* "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. i. p. 215.

† Coleridge, Apologetic Preface to "Fire, Famine, and Slaughter."

‡ "Parliamentary History," vol. xxxiii. col. 1538.

§ Ibid., vol. xxxiv. cols. 23 and 25.

‖ Ibid., col. 185.

ernment may be collected from a letter of Lord Cornwallis in May, 1798. He was then master-general of the ordnance: "The only means by which the innumerable local corps in all parts of the country can be armed is by providing balls for fowling-pieces." *

The other noticeable passage in the royal speech is this: "In Ireland the rebellion which they [the enemy] had instigated has been curbed and repressed; the troops which they landed for its support have been compelled to surrender; and the armaments since destined for the same purpose have, by the vigilance and activity of my squadrons, been captured or dispersed." The policy of curbing and repressing rebellion was now to be associated with a higher ambition in the British government. The first proposal to the British Parliament of a legislative union with Ireland was conveyed in a passage of the king's message on the 22d of January, recommending to the "parliaments of both kingdoms to provide, in the manner which they shall judge most expedient, for settling such a complete and final adjustment as may best tend to improve and perpetuate a connection, essential for their common security, and to augment and consolidate the strength, power, and resources of the British empire."

During the progress of our narrative, from the year 1795, we have deferred any detailed notice of the condition of Ireland. In the next chapter we shall endeavor to present a connected view of the circumstances which preceded the rebellion, of the progress of that calamitous struggle, and of its final issue in the measure which has been a never-ceasing source of bitterness to Irish factions, but of the benefits of which to both countries no wise or honest politician can now doubt.

CHAPTER CXCVII.

Ireland—Comparative tranquillity after 1783—Recall of Lord Fitzwilliam—United Irishmen—Irish Directory—Commencement of the rebellion—Suppression of the rebellion—Marquis Cornwallis lord-lieutenant—Landing of a French force under Humbert—Surrender of the French—Napper Tandy—The union proposed—Desire of the government for the relief of the Catholics—Debates on the union in the British and Irish parliaments—Lord Castlereagh—Corruption of the Irish parliament—Grattan returns to his seat in the Irish House of Commons—Articles of the union proposed—Arguments for and against the union—The union completed.

The great legislative measures for the relief of Ireland, which were passed in the period from 1779 to 1783, were succeeded by an interval of comparative quiet.† The question of parliamentary reform was indeed agitated in 1784 and in 1790, but without any approach to success in the divisions of the Lords and Commons who sat at Dublin. The general evils of the representation were similar in principle to those of England. "Of three hundred members," said Mr. Grattan, "above two hundred are returned by individuals; from forty to fifty are returned by ten persons; several of the boroughs have no resident elector at all; and, on the whole, two thirds of the representatives in the House of Commons are returned by less than one hundred persons.‡ But previous to 1793 there was an especial evil in the representation of Ireland. Three fourths of the people were Roman Catholics, paying their proportion of taxes, without any share in the representation or any control of the expenditure. Roman Catholics were excluded from the Irish parliament by an English act of 1691, the fourth year of the reign of William and Mary. By the act of the first year of George II. they were deprived of the right of voting at elections. In 1793 Roman Catholics were admitted, by an act of the Irish Parliament, to the exercise of the elective franchise. That the agitation for the removal of other civil disabilities would cease was scarcely to be expected. In 1795 Mr. Fox wrote, "To suppose it possible that now that they are electors they will long submit to be ineligible to parliament, appears to me to be absurd beyond measure." § There were other particulars in which Roman Catholics labored under serious disadvantages. The laws of exclusion from many offices in great part remained.

There was a partial change in the English cabinet in 1794 by the introduction of three important statesmen who, formerly attached to the party of Mr. Fox, seceded from him on questions connected with the French Revolution.* Earl Fitzwilliam became Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. Before his actual appointment it was a complaint against him that "he has pledged himself too far to recede with respect to a total new system both of men and measures." † Great is the consternation when Lord Fitzwilliam enters upon his office. Loud is "the creaking which some of the old worm-eaten furniture makes at its removal." ‡ Lord Fitzwilliam, who arrived in Dublin on the 4th of January, 1795, immediately displaced with compensation some of the holders of office who were the most hostile to the plan which he contemplated for the government of Ireland. He entered upon his functions in the belief that the ministry would impose no restrictions upon him in carrying forward a full measure of Catholic emancipation. On the 12th of February Grattan obtained leave, in the Irish House of Commons, to bring in a bill for the repeal of all the remaining disqualifications of Catholics. A fortnight later Earl Fitzwilliam was recalled, and Earl Camden appointed in his place. The moderate Catholics anticipated the most disastrous results from a measure so decided on the part of the British cabinet. Dr. Hussey, the friend and correspondent of Burke, wrote to him on the 26th of February: "The disastrous news of Earl Fitzwilliam's recall is come, and Ireland is now on the brink of a civil war." § He adds, with a temper as admirable as it was rare, "Every man that has anything to lose, or who loves peace and quiet, must now exert himself for the salvation of the country, and to keep the turbulent in order."

Although disappointed in their hopes the Catholics, as a body, were not those whose turbulence most required to be kept down. A most formidable association, under the denomination of United Irishmen, was now being organized. Burke describes them as "those who, without any regard to religion, club all kinds of discontents together, in order to produce all kinds of disorders." ‖ By the end of 1796 this organization was becoming truly dangerous. "Many thousands, I am assured," writes Dr. Hussey to Burke, "are weekly sworn through the country, in such a secret manner and form as to evade all the law in those cases." ¶ In connection with some of the leaders of the United Irishmen the expedition to Bantry Bay, in December, 1796, was undertaken. Through 1797 the northern districts were in a disturbed state. Houses were broken into and arms seized by bands of nightly marauders. At funerals, and at gatherings for football and other games, large numbers collected and marched in military array. The government was alarmed; the passions of those who professed sentiments of loyalty were roused; severity and intimidation, the dangerous remedies for discontent, were alone resorted to; martial law took the place of civil justice. The administrators of martial law were undisciplined troops of yeomanry, headed by ignorant and reckless officers. They made the government odious by their cruel oppressions. The remedy for disturbance was the stimulant to insurrection. From the couch from which he never expected to rise, Burke dictated the great lesson of true statesmanship at such a crisis: "The first duty of a state is to provide for its own conservation. Until that point is secured it can preserve and protect nothing else. But, if possible, it has greater interest in acting according to strict law than even the subject himself. For if the people see that the law is violated to crush them, they will certainly despise the law. They or their party will be easily led to violate it, whenever they can, by all the means in their power. Except in cases of direct war, whenever government abandons law it proclaims anarchy." **

In August, 1797, the military severities of the north of Ireland were discontinued. The disturbances had there ceased. The schemes of rebellion, to be seconded by the landing of a French army, received a great discomfiture by the victory of Duncan, off Camperdown. But the efforts of the United Irishmen contemplated a wider field than the province of Ulster. The executive power of this extensive organization was a directory. Its five members were Arthur O'Connor, Lord Edward Fitzgerald (brother to the Duke of Lein-

* "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 337.
† See *Ante*, vol. vi. p. 902.
‡ Grattan's speech, Feb. 11, 1793.
§ Fox, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 100.

* *Ante*, p. 1007.
† Lord Grenville to Thomas Grenville, "Court and Cabinets," vol. iii. p. 314.
‡ Burke, "Correspondence," vol. iv. p. 271, Letter to Dr. Hussey, Feb. 4, 1795.
§ Ibid., p. 282.
‖ Ibid., p. 314.
¶ Ibid., p. 372.
** Ibid., p. 393.

ster), Oliver Bond, a merchant, Dr. MacNevin, a Catholic gentleman, and Thomas Addis Emmet, a barrister. The plans of a general insurrection were disclosed to the Irish government, and arrests of the Leinster delegates, and of Bond, MacNevin, and Emmet were effected in March, at the house of Bond, in Dublin. Lord Edward Fitzgerald was absent from the meeting. O'Connor and O'Coigley, a priest, were in England, discussing plans of sedition with "The London Corresponding Society." They were arrested on a charge of high treason, and were tried at Maidstone on the 21st of May, when O'Connor was acquitted, and O'Coigley was convicted and was executed. The vacancies in the Irish Directory were filled up, and a general rising on the 23d of May was determined upon. The government had, on the 30th of March, issued a declaration that a traitorous conspiracy had manifested itself in acts of open rebellion, and that orders had been issued to the officers commanding his majesty's forces to employ them, with the utmost vigor and decision, for the suppression of the conspiracy and for the disarming of the rebels by the most summary and effectual measures.

The agitations of Ireland had gradually proceeded to such an excess on either side that they had ceased to be matter of compromise or of argument. The Whig leaders in the Irish parliament had adopted a measure which, however rightly intended, amounted to a declaration that the contest was to be decided by physical force. On the 15th of May, 1797, Mr. Ponsonby brought forward a motion for the fundamental reform of the representation, upon the principle that all disabilities on account of religion be forever abolished; that the privilege of returning members in the present form should cease; and that every county should be divided into districts, each consisting of 6000 houses, and each returning two members to parliament. The government held this maxim: "You must subdue before you reform." It was on this occasion that Mr. Grattan said, "We have offered you our measure; you will reject it. We deprecate yours; you will persevere. Having no hope left to persuade or dissuade, and having discharged our duty, we shall trouble you no more, and after this day shall not attend the House of Commons." The true leaders of the people had abdicated. They were left to be acted upon by those who would have handed over their country to the French Directory. The people, left to the guidance of frantic enthusiasts, were to be betrayed by spies, to be tortured, to be plundered and massacred by a native army, which, upon taking the field in February, 1798, under the command of Sir Ralph Abercrombie, was declared by him to be "in a state of licentiousness which must render it formidable to every one but the enemy."

Lord Edward Fitzgerald had remained concealed for two months. He might have escaped had he been less obstinate in his attempt to carry through the plan of a general insurrection. On the 19th of May, when a party of military surrounded the house in Dublin where he was hidden, and their officer exhibited the warrant for his arrest, he madly resisted, mortally wounded a magistrate who accompanied the soldier, and was himself shot by Major Sirr, the Town-major of Dublin. Lord Edward died of his wounds on the 5th of June. In the mean time the insurrection broke out in the immediate neighborhood of Dublin. A night attack on the city was projected by the United Irishmen. Two brothers, of the name of Sheares, and other chiefs, were arrested on the 23d of May. A large number of insurgents were collecting on the north and south of the metropolis. An immediate attack was expected. The garrison and the yeomanry were under arms during that night, stationed in the cattle-market. The scene has been described with some humor: "All the barristers, attorneys, merchants, bankers, revenue-officers, shopkeepers, students of the university, doctors, apothecaries and corporators, of an immense metropolis, in red coats, with a sprinkling of parsons, all doubled up together amid bullock-stalls and sheep-pens, awaiting, in profound darkness, for invisible executioners to dispatch them without mercy, was not a situation to engender much hilarity." Yet in this motley assemblage there was hilarity. "The danger was considered imminent, the defence impracticable, yet there was a cheerful, thoughtless jocularity with which the English nation, under grave circumstances, are totally unacquainted. * The rebels had learned that the yeomanry of Dublin were ready to receive them, and had deferred their attack after destroying the mail-coaches that were approaching the city. Skirmishes between bands of rebels and the soldiery were then taking place daily. Martial law was proclaimed. The insurrection appeared to be somewhat quelled, when it broke out with unexpected fury in the county of Wexford. It was headed by a fanatical priest, John Murphy, who, in the progress of his military career, had persuaded his followers that he was invulnerable. The rebels were generally successful when they fought in small bodies. There were great conflicts, which might be termed battles; but the system of these armed bands was little fitted for encounters with regular troops. They were in want of ammunition. Round stones and balls of hardened clay were the substitutes for bullets. They endeavored to make their own gunpowder, which of course failed in explosive force. By a rapid onset they sometimes seized the cannon of the royal troops, which they contrived to fire with lighted wisps of straw. Armed with the pike, they were, nevertheless, very formidable. Had they submitted to any command, the rebellion might have had other results than a sanguinary struggle, in which either side was disgraced by a ferocity which had all the attributes of barbarism. They chose their stations on hills with a commanding prospect. Here they slept in the open air, both sexes intermingled, for many women were among them. Their commissariat was of the rudest description. When they could seize a herd of bullocks, or a solitary cow, they cut the carcase to pieces, without removing the hide, and each cooked the mangled lumps of flesh after his own fashion. Weather of unusual warmth and dryness was favorable to this rude campaigning.*

It would be tedious, as well as useless, to enter into details of the lamentable conflicts of the rebellion that commenced on the 23d of May, and was almost entirely suppressed by the end of June in the districts where it had most raged. Wexford surrendered to the insurgents on the 30th of May; but it was retaken by Sir John Moore on the 21st of June. The principal battles were those of Arklow, Ross, and Vinegar Hill, near Enniscorthy, which town had surrendered to the rebels. On the 21st of June General Lake attacked the main body of the rebels at Vinegar Hill, dispersed them, and they never again rallied. The desolation of the districts to which this rebellion was confined, and particularly that of the county of Wexford, was excessive. The sum demanded by the loyalists as compensation for the destruction of their property was nearly a million and a quarter, of which Wexford claimed one half. The massacres, the military executions, were frightful. No quarter was given to the rebels; and when the contest assumed the sanguinary character of a religious warfare the cry of revenge on "the bloody Orange dogs" was the signal for excesses which can better be imagined than described.

Earl Camden had been recalled, to give place to Marquis Cornwallis, who was appointed to the offices of lord-lieutenant of Ireland and commander-in-chief. He arrived in Dublin on the 20th of June. He found that troops had been landed from England, and that General Lake's arrangements for attacking the rebels on the 21st had rendered it unnecessary that he himself should proceed immediately to join the army. One of his first acts was to interfere to prevent the rash and often unjust severities of inferior officers of the militia and yeomanry. He issued a positive order against the infliction of punishment, under any pretence whatever, not authorized by the order of a general officer, in pursuance of the sentence of a general court-martial.† This order was signed by Viscount Castlereagh, who was then temporarily filling the office of secretary. Cornwallis wrote to the Duke of Portland, "It shall be one of my very first objects to soften the ferocity of our troops, which I am afraid, in the Irish corps at least, is not confined to the private soldiers."‡ He further says, "I shall use my utmost endeavors to suppress the folly which has been too prevalent in this quarter, of substituting the word *Catholicism* instead of Jacobinism, as the foundation of the present rebellion." In another letter, about the same time, he writes, in the confidence of old intimacy, "The ardor of our friends, and their folly in endeavoring to make it a religious war, added to the ferocity of our troops, who delight in murder, most powerfully counteract all plans of conciliation." It is to the Irish militia that he especially applies these bitter words—a body of men that he

* Sir Jonah Barrington, "Historic Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 258.

* Gordon, "History of Ireland," vol. ii. p. 443–445.
† Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 355.
‡ Ibid., vol. ii. p. 357.

describes in his official dispatches as "contemptible before the enemy when any serious resistance is made to them, but ferocious and cruel in the extreme when any poor wretches, either with or without arms, come within their power." * They had encouragement from their superiors: "The principal persons of this country and the members of both houses of parliament are, in general, averse to all acts of clemency." While himself advocating the most lenient measures the lord-lieutenant writes, "Lord Castlereagh is a very able and good young man, and is of great use to me." The accusation, so long repeated by party writers, that Lord Castlereagh was the supporter of the system of repression by cruel and indiscriminate punishment, has about the same truth in it as another favorite assertion of Irish declaimers, that the rebellion was encouraged by Mr. Pitt that he might have a plausible argument for the union of the two nations. At the end of July the overt rebellion was almost at an end; but there was no law for town or country but martial law. "The feeble outrages, burnings, and murders which are still committed by the rebels serve to keep up the sanguinary disposition on our side. . . . The conversation of the principal persons of the country all tends to encourage this system of blood; and the conversation, even at my table, where you will suppose I do all I can to prevent it, always turns on hanging, shooting, burning, etc., etc.; and if a priest has been put to death the greatest joy is expressed by the whole company." † This is the evidence of the chief administrator of Ireland—a brave soldier and a sound statesman. It is the most impartial testimony that can be desired to show wherein the great *political* evil of Ireland consisted—"the narrow hard-heartedness of a monopoly," which had banished from the minds of the leading men of the nation "habits of moderation, lenity, equity, and justice." ‡ But political discontents and religious animosities, kept alive by French influence, which was denominated Jacobinism, were scarcely sufficient to have caused the revolt of several hundred thousands of the peasantry, both Catholics and Protestants, had there not been a great *social* evil which made men ready to fight for some vague good which was to be effected under a new order of things. Of the proximate incitements to the Irish rebellion, some allege that Catholicism was the chief. Others attribute the outbreak to Jacobinism. But no writer of those days hints that *landlordism* kept the bulk of the people in a worse than Egyptian bondage; held them in ignorance of the real sources of their misery; exacted from them the highest rent that could be obtained by the subdivision of the land; and by this multiplication of small holdings left them to multiply upon the barest amount of subsistence, and with a total absence of the ordinary decencies and comforts of the humblest life. When the bulk of the people are wholly wretched in their domestic condition—when the moral ties that unite master to servant, and landlord to tenant, rest no longer upon the principle of reciprocal need and reciprocal obligation, but upon enforced obedience and slavish use and wont, then allegiance to the state is very easily loosened, and men become rebels without knowing exactly for what object they rebel. The leaders are hanged; the multitudes are shot down; the clique that governs Ireland by "monopoly" makes way for imperial legislators; another generation comes, and civil disabilities are removed; but still disaffection is rampant. Political agitation throws its veil over the social evil; and only after the pressure of a terrible calamity is it discovered that just government cannot save a people from ruin, under a systematic violation of those economic laws through which the earth yields its abundance, and without which the rain cannot fertilize or the sun ripen.

The sound discretion which the government had evinced in placing the chief military command of Ireland in the hands of an experienced officer was sufficiently manifested in a very dangerous crisis at the end of August. A French squadron of three frigates had sailed from Rochelle on the 4th. On the 22d it had landed eleven hundred men in the Bay of Killala, in the county of Mayo. Eleven hundred men formed a small force with which to venture upon invasion. The French Directory had purposed to send a second division of six thousand men, but some financial derangements prevented its embarkation; and Humbert, the general of the eleven hundred, was left without support.* He was prepared for the support of a disaffected population. He could scarcely have reckoned upon a further support in the cowardice of a large portion of a royal army—volunteers and militia—who fled before him without waiting to be assailed, and who never rested in their flight till they had put eighty miles between themselves and the enemy. General Hutchinson had assembled two or three thousand men at Castlebar. The French, with a large number of the country people, advanced to the attack, and "began a rapid charge with the bayonet in very loose order. At this moment the Galway volunteers, the Kilkenny and Longford militias, ran away." † The writer of this account expresses his opinion that there was disaffection in the two militia regiments—that they were Catholics and sworn United Irishmen. The more rational solution of the conduct of these men is, that they were enervated by the license of tyrannizing over defenceless people, when once brought to face a regular and determined foe. In their precipitate retreat the depredations they committed on the road exceeded all description, and they raised a spirit of discontent and disaffection which did not before exist in that part of the country. ‡ Upon learning that the French had landed, Lord Cornwallis immediately determined to take the command of the main army himself. Assembling troops of the line he made a rapid march from Dublin; but he so arranged his forces that he could cover the country, and afford an opportunity of rallying to any small bodies of soldiery that might be defeated. Humbert, after the affair of Castlebar, had moved into the heart of the country, and on the 8th of September had reached Ballynamuck, in the county of Longford. Here he was encountered by the troops under General Lake, and after an action of half an hour the French surrendered at discretion. Bartholomew Teeling, formerly a member of the Irish Directory, but now aide-de-camp to Humbert, was among the prisoners. He said that "he conceived another column had attempted to sail, but had been prevented; that when they found themselves unsupported at Castlebar, they resolved to attempt something daring, and to march for Dublin upon speculation of insurrection." § With an infatuation which no reverses could extinguish, the leaders of the United Irishmen who had as yet escaped the executioner were urging the French government to new attempts which might keep up the hopes of the insurgents. On the 16th of September a French brig landed Napper Tandy and some men on the north-west coast of Donegal. He issued manifestoes, but found that he had arrived too late. On the 11th of October the armament that was intended to co-operate with Humbert appeared off the coast of Donegal. It had sailed from Brest on the 17th of September, the squadron consisting of a seventy-four-gun ship, eight frigates, and two smaller vessels. Sir John Borlase Warren, with a superior force, had pursued the French, and after an engagement of three hours, in which the enemy fought with a desperate bravery, the ship of the line (the Hoche) and one frigate surendered. The remaining frigates had made all sail to escape, but they were subsequently taken, with the exception of two. On board the Hoche was captured the famous Irish leader, Wolfe Tone. He was tried by court-martial in Dublin, was sentenced to death, cut his throat in prison, and died on the 19th of November.

The rebellion was at an end, but its termination brought no wisdom to those who believed that severity was the only mode of establishing obedience to authority. Lord Cornwallis speaks with honest indignation about the nonsensical clamor against his lenity. From England, Lord Castlereagh had to learn that it was "the universal persuasion that lenient measures had been carried too far." Lord Castlereagh answered the reproach by stating that exclusive of all persons tried at the assizes, Lord Cornwallis had decided personally upon 400 cases; that out of 131 condemned to death, 81 had been executed; and that 418 persons had been transported or banished, in pursuance of the sentences of courts-martial, since Lord Cornwallis had arrived in Ireland. ‖ On the 6th of October an Act of General Pardon received the royal assent; its exceptions were very numerous. The exceptions were calculated to include nearly all the leaders who had taken an active part in the rebellion; but the greater num-

* Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 399.
† Ibid., p. 371. ‡ Burke, "Correspondence," vol. iv. p. 272.

* Thiers, livre xl.
† Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 393. Cooke to Wickham.
‡ Ibid., p. 396. Captain Taylor (secretary to Cornwallis) to Viscount Castlereagh. § Ibid., p. 404. ‖ Ibid., vol. iii. p. 90.

ber of these obtained a conditional pardon, and their followers had little to apprehend from the terrors of the law. Some of those who had perished by the executioner were objects of commiseration. In several cases, as in that of the two brothers Sheares, the determined traitor involved his weak disciple in his fate; and no pity was shown by the executive to the wretched man who said, when too late, "I will lie under any conditions the government may impose upon me. I will go to America if the government will allow me, or I will stay here and be the most zealous friend they have." * The brothers died hand in hand, and some honest tears were shed for them. For the banished, too, there was deep feeling. Many a heart responded to the sympathy of Thomas Campbell, when, having met Anthony Maccan, one of the proscribed, at Altona, he wrote a lament for "The Exile of Erin" who still

"Sang the bold anthem of Erin go Bragh."

During the short period of this unhappy conflict it is calculated that seventy thousand perished, either in the field, by military execution, or by popular vengeance. Of these it is held that fifty thousand were insurgents, and that twenty thousand were soldiers and loyalists. Of the miseries that resulted from the burning of houses, from flogging for the purpose of extorting confession, and from "free quarters, which comprehended universal rape and robbery throughout the whole country," † who can form an estimate?

In the king's message to the British Parliament on the 22d of January, 1799, the proposed measure of the union was first formally announced.‡ A similar announcement, though in less direct terms, was made by the lord-lieutenant to the Irish Parliament, in the speech from the throne on the same 22d of January. The question was not hastily taken up by Mr. Pitt. It formed the constant subject of correspondence between the English ministry and Lord Cornwallis. In September, 1798, while the rebellion still demanded the utmost vigilance of the lord-lieutenant, he wrote to the prime minister, "The principal people here are so frightened that they would, I believe, readily consent to a union, but then it must be a Protestant Union." § Cornwallis saw, from the determination of the leading persons in Ireland to resist the extension of its operation to the Catholics, that the measure would be incomplete. He determined, however, "not to submit to the insertion of any clause that shall make the exclusion of the Catholics a fundamental part of the union." He was "convinced that until the Catholics are admitted into a general participation of rights (which when incorporated with the British government they cannot abuse), there will be no peace or safety in Ireland." ‖ However Mr. Pitt and Lord Cornwallis might be anxious to connect with the union a great and final measure of relief to the Catholics, it is clear that no pledge was given on the part of the Irish government that disabilities for civil office on account of religion should then come to an end. Mr. Pitt, on the 17th of November—about two months before he brought the proposed measure before the British Parliament—wished that in Ireland "time should be given for communication to leading individuals and for disposing the public mind." In writing to the lord-lieutenant he says, "Mr. Elliott, when he brought me your letter, stated very strongly all the arguments which he thought might induce us to admit the Catholics to parliament and office; but I confess he did not satisfy me of the practicability of such a measure at this time, or of the propriety of attempting it. With respect to a provision for the Catholic clergy, and some arrangement respecting tithes, I am happy to find a uniform opinion in favor of the proposal among all the Irish I have seen; and I am more and more convinced that those measures, with some effectual mode to enforce the residence of *all* ranks of the Protestant clergy, offer the best chance of gradually putting an end to the evils most felt in Ireland." ¶ Pitt doubted the practicability of Catholic emancipation by an Irish parliament. He feared the discontents of the Irish Protestants at such a measure. The principal Catholics themselves, as Cornwallis believed, did not wish the question of admitting Catholics to parliament to be agitated at that time. "They do not think the Irish Parliament capable of entering into a cool and dispassionate consideration of their case. They trust that the united parliament will, at a proper time, allow them every privilege that may be consistent with the Protestant establishment." * After a little while the lord-lieutenant thought he had been too sanguine when he looked to the good inclinations of the Catholics. They made no violent opposition to the measure; some gave it a very cold support. But, although no pledge was given by the government, the hopes which had been encouraged by the highest in office placed Mr. Pitt under a responsibility which he felt most deeply, when resistance to a measure without which the union was a delusion arose out of the personal feelings of the sovereign. The history of the first thirty years of the nineteenth century offers a painful exhibition of the dangers and miseries that resulted from the obstinate though conscientious views of his duty entertained by George III. His example was pleaded by his successor, whose conscience was far from tender, and it always afforded a rallying-point for the bigotry that called itself sound Protestantism. Mr. Pitt found himself powerless, not only to propose a general measure of Catholic relief, but even to deal as he wished with tithes and a provision for the Catholic clergy. The chief difficulty in carrying the union in its incompleteness arose out of the necessity of propitiating the placemen and boroughmongers, whose power and influence would be abridged by a measure which, in a great degree, would take what was called "the management of the country" out of their hands. To Mr. Pitt Lord Cornwallis wrote, "That every man in this most corrupt country should consider the important question before us in no other point of view than as it may be likely to promote his own private objects of ambition or avarice, will not surprise you." †

The debates in the parliament sitting at Westminster and in the parliament sitting at Dublin, on the question of a legislative union, continuing as they did through two sessions, are necessarily too diffusive to admit of any satisfactory abstract. The national character is strongly expressed in the mode in which the measure was discussed on either side of the water. In the British House of Commons Mr. Pitt is the calm and dignified exponent of a statesman's policy. In the Irish House of Commons Mr. Grattan is the glowing impersonation of a patriot's impulses. In the British parliament there is an almost unanimous opinion of the necessity of the proposed union; and those who differ from the majority abstain from invective. In the Irish parliament the supporters and opposers are more evenly balanced; and the personal hostility is displayed, not only in the bitterest denunciations, but in actual or threatened appeals to the last and worst argument, the duellist's pistol. When the king's message of the 22d of January was taken into consideration by the Commons at Westminster, the amendment to the address, moved by Mr. Sheridan, was negatived without a division. To the address proposed in answer to the royal speech at Dublin, Mr. Ponsonby moved an amendment, which was carried—after a debate which continued twenty-one hours—by a majority of five. It was to declare their intention of maintaining the right of the people of Ireland to a free and independent legislature, resident within the kingdom. This was decisive as to the immediate result in Ireland of the ministerial proposition. But Mr. Pitt was not to be deterred from advocating the measure in the assembly where he reigned paramount. On the 31st of January the king's message was taken into further consideration. Mr. Pitt laid before the house the general nature and outline of the plan, which in his conscience he thought would tend in the strongest manner to insure the safety and happiness of both kingdoms. If the house should agree with him in opinion, he should propose "that its determination should remain recorded as that by which the parliament of Great Britain is ready to abide, leaving to the legislature of Ireland to reject or to adopt it hereafter, upon a full consideration of the subject." ‡ The resolutions proposed by Mr. Pitt were discussed in both houses during nearly three months, and then finally agreed to. On the 26th of April both houses attended the king with their joint address; and his majesty expressed the greatest satisfaction, declaring his intention of embracing the first favorable opportunity of communicating to the parliament of Ireland the propositions laid

* See a facsimile of the letter of Henry Sheares to Barrington, written a few hours before his execution. "Historic Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 266.
† Cornwallis to Ross, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 89.
‡ *Ante*, p. 1023.
§ Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 416.
‖ Ibid., p. 417.
¶ Ibid., p. 442.

* Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 8.
† Ibid., p. 8.
‡ "Parliamentary History," vol. xxxiv. col. 256.

before him, as the basis of a settlement to be established by mutual consent, and founded on a sense of mutual interest and affection.

These were lofty words. The settlement "to be established by mutual consent" was really accomplished by a system of which the "mutual interest and affection" was described by lord Cornwallis in a letter of the 8th of June: "My occupation is now of the most unpleasant nature, negotiating and jobbing with the most corrupt people under heaven. I despise and hate myself every hour for engaging in such dirty work, and am supported only by the reflection that without a union the British empire must be dissolved."* On the 29th of March Lord Cornwallis deprecated, in a letter to the Duke of Portland, the introduction of the measure to the Irish parliament until another session: "I am assured that the number of parliamentary converts is not by any means as yet so numerous as to render a second discussion safe." Lord Cornwallis had to work the system of "negotiating and jobbing," by promising an Irish peerage, or a lift in that peerage, or even an English peerage, to a crowd of eager competitors for honors. The other specific for making converts was not yet in complete operation. Lord Castlereagh had the plan in his portfolio—borough proprietors to be compensated; the primary and secondary interests in counties to be compensated; fifty barristers in parliament, who always considered a seat as the road to preferment, to be compensated; the purchasers of seats to be compensated; individuals connected either by residence or property with Dublin to be compensated. "Lord Castlereagh considered that 1,500,000*l.* would be required to effect all these compensations."† The sum actually paid to the boroughmongers alone was 1,260,000*l.* Fifteen thousand pounds were allotted to each borough, and "was apportioned among the various patrons." The greater number of these dealers in mock-representation had only two boroughs each. Ten distinguished persons had forty-five seats among them. Lord Downshire had seven seats; Lord Ely had six seats. These patriotic noblemen were fit patients for the infallible remedy for the cure of tender consciences. In July, 1799, Cornwallis writes to Dundas, "The language which Lord Downshire has held respecting the union has done great mischief. There cannot be a stronger argument for the measure than the overgrown parliamentary power of five or six of our pampered boroughmongers, who are become most formidable to government by their long possession of the entire patronage of the crown in their respective districts." There were a few Tritons of the minnows to be dealt with as well as these monsters of the deep. Of Lord Castlereagh, the noble author of "Sketches of Statesmen" says, "The complaints made of his Irish administration were well grounded, as regarded the corruption of the parliament by which he accomplished the union, though he had certainly no direct hand in the bribery practised."‡ Not till cabinets have been unlocked after sixty years of secrecy is it safe to assert of any politician that he had not sought the most direct course to his purpose, in the belief that the end would justify the means. On the 2d of January, 1799, Lord Castlereagh wrote to Mr. Wickham of the English Treasury, "Already we feel the want, and indeed the absolute necessity, of the *primum mobile*. We cannot give that activity to the press which is necessary. We have good materials among the young barristers, but we cannot expect them to waste their time and starve into the bargain." "Five thousand pounds in bank-notes by the first messenger" was a moderate demand.§ At the end of the year the Duke of Portland was requested to assist in the same way and to the same extent. "The advantages have been important.‖ The Irish parliament met on the 15th of January, 1800. Something more direct than paying young barristers for leading articles had become necessary. Castlereagh, on the 27th of February, again calls upon the ministering angel of the secret-service money to help him in his troubles: "I see no prospect of converts; the opposition are steady to each other. I hope we shall be able to keep our friends true. A few votes might have a very injurious effect. We require *your assistance*, and you *must* be prepared to enable us to fulfil the expectations which it was impossible to avoid creating at the moment of difficulty."¶ It had become a contest of bribery on both sides. There was an "opposition stock-purse," as Lord Castlereagh describes the fund against which he was to struggle with the deeper purse at Whitehall. He writes to the Duke of Portland in this critical time, "We have undoubted proofs, though not such as we can disclose, that they are enabled to offer as high as 5000*l.* for an individual vote, and I lament to state that there are individuals remaining among us that are likely to yield to this temptation."* But there were other modes, to which we have alluded, of strengthening the government than the coarse gratifications administered to those who had "an itching palm." During the administration of Lord Cornwallis twenty-nine Irish peerages were created, of which seven only were unconnected with the question of union. Six English peerages were granted on account of Irish services; and there were nineteen promotions in the Irish peerage earned by similar assistance.†

At the opening of the Irish parliament on the 15th of January, in the speech which the lord lieutenant delivered from the throne, not a word was uttered on the subject of the union. Lord Castlereagh stated that it was the intention of the government to make the union the subject of a distinct communication to parliament. A vacancy had occurred for the close borough of Wicklow. On the day of the meeting of the houses the writ was delivered to the returning officer, and Mr. Grattan was returned before midnight. An amendment upon the address had been debated through the night, and before it was concluded, at seven o'clock of the morning of the 16th, the new member for Wicklow, who was taken from a bed of sickness, was led into the House of Commons. Every member rose from his seat; Grattan was too feeble to stand. He delivered an oration that appeared like the prophetic utterance of a dying man, having asked permission to address the house without rising. It thus concluded: "The question is not now such as occupied you of old—not old Poynings, not peculation, not plunder, not an embargo, not a Catholic Bill, not a Reform Bill—it is your being—it is more—it is your life to come." The great orator produced no permanent effect. There was a majority of forty-two in favor of a union when the house divided at ten o'clock on that morning. On the 5th of February Lord Castlereagh read a message from the lord-lieutenant, communicating the resolutions of the parliament of Great Britain in the previous year. The question was debated from four o'clock in the afternoon of the 5th to one o'clock in the afternoon of the 6th. During that time the streets of Dublin were the scene of a great riot, and the peace of the city was maintained only by troops of cavalry. The bitter personalities between Mr. Corry, the chancellor of the Irish exchequer, and Mr. Grattan gave rise to a duel, in which Mr. Corry was wounded. On the division of the 6th there was a majority of forty-three in favor of the union.

The great question was virtually decided, as regarded the votes of the parliament of Ireland. In the parliament of Great Britain Mr. Pitt, on the 2d of April, laid on the table of the House of Commons the joint addresses to the king of the Lords and Commons of Ireland, with resolutions containing the terms proposed by them for an entire union of both kingdoms. In the House of Lords a similar message was presented by Lord Grenville. The first article of the proposed union provided that the kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland should, upon the 1st of January, 1801, be united into one kingdom, by the name of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The United Kingdom was to be represented in one and the same parliament. In the united parliament there were to be twenty-eight temporal peers, elected for life by the Irish peerage, and four spiritual peers, taking their places in rotation. There were to be one hundred members of the lower house; each county returning two, as well as the cities of Dublin and Cork. The University returned one, and thirty-one boroughs each returned one. Of these boroughs twenty-three remained close borough still the Reform Bill of 1831. Those of the borough patrons who could return one member to the imperial parliament had no compensation for losing the power of returning two members. The Churches of England and Ireland were to be united. The proportion of revenue to be levied was fixed at fifteen for Great Britain and two for Ireland, for the succeeding twenty years. Countervailing duties upon imports to each country were fixed by a minute tariff, but some commercial restrictions were

* Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 102. † Ibid., p. 82.
‡ "Statesmen," etc., by Lord Brougham, 2d series, p. 124.
§ Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 27.
‖ Ibid., p. 151. ¶ Ibid., p. 200.

* Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 182.
† See the list in Cornwallis's "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 318.

to be removed, in the confidence that, with the kingdoms really and solidly united, "to increase the commercial wealth of one country is not to diminish that of the other." On the 21st of April, when Mr. Pitt explained the details of the measure, Mr. Grey moved an address to his majesty, "praying that he will be graciously pleased to direct his ministers to suspend all proceedings on the Irish union till the sentiments of the people of Ireland on that measure can be ascertained." This motion was rejected by a majority of two hundred and six. There were other debates in both houses. On the 8th of May a joint address of the Lords and Commons to the king was determined on, signifying their approbation of the resolutions, and congratulating his majesty upon the near prospect of the accomplishment of a work which, as the common father of his people, he had declared to be so near his heart. In the Irish parliament the subsequent proceedings gave occasion for brilliant displays of oratory. Grattan fought the battle to the last. Whatever we may now think of his prophecies of ruin to Ireland—especially of those which are based upon antiquated notions of commercial protection—we cannot refuse our admiration of an eloquence inspired by real patriotism. On the motion of the 26th of May that the bill be committed, he thus concluded his speech: "Identification is a solid and imperial maxim, necessary for the preservation of freedom, necessary for that of empire; but without union of hearts, with a separate government, and without a separate parliament, identification is extinction, is dishonor, is conquest—not identification. Yet I do not give up the country. I see her in a swoon, but she is not dead—though in her tomb she lies helpless and motionless, still there is on her lips a spirit of life, and on her cheek a glow of beauty:

> 'Thou art not conquer'd; beauty's ensign yet
> Is crimson in thy lips and in thy cheeks,
> And death's pale flag is not advanced there.'

While a plank of the vessel sticks together I will not leave her. Let the courtier present his flimsy sail, and carry the light bark of his faith with every new breath of wind—I will remain anchored here—with fidelity to the fortunes of my country, faithful to her freedom, faithful to her fall." *

It is impossible not to feel a deep sympathy with the great asserters of Irish nationality at this eventful period—with such as Grattan, Ponsonby, Plunkett, Bushe. The patriotic party of Ireland had not seen half a century of parliamentary existence. It first successfully asserted itself in 1753. In thirty years after it established the legislative independence of the country, under the leader who now declared himself "faithful to her fall." But it is as impossible not to acknowledge that the settlement of 1782 was a very imperfect measure. "It leaves," said Mr. Pitt, "the two countries with separate and independent legislatures, connected only with this tie, that the third estate in both countries is the same—that the executive government is the same—that the crown exercises its power of assenting to Irish acts of parliament, under the great seal of Great Britain, and by the advice of British ministers." Mr. Pitt then asked whether this is a sufficient tie to unite the two countries in time of peace; whether in time of war it is sufficient to consolidate their strength against a common enemy; to guard against local jealousies; to give to both nations an increase of strength and prosperity. † But the English minister gave very precise indications of more especial benefits which he anticipated from a union, as regarded questions of contending sects or parties. "Until the kingdoms are united, any attempts to make regulations here for the internal state of Ireland must be a violation of her independence." He looked to the dangers of Ireland "in the hostile division of its sects; in the animosities existing between ancient settlers and original inhabitants; in the ignorance and want of civilization which marks that country more than almost any other country in Europe." He maintained that a complete union was the only remedy: "Every one, I say, who reflects upon these circumstances must agree with me in thinking that there is no cure but in the formation of a general imperial legislature, free alike from terror and from resentment, removed from the danger and agitation, uninfluenced by the prejudices and uninflamed by the passions, of that distracted country." ‡

The Union Bill passed the Irish House of Commons at ten o'clock on the night of the 7th of June. Sir Jonah Barrington describes the scene with great pomp of words. Lord Castlereagh, "tame, cold-blooded," moving the third reading; the speaker, Foster, "looking steadily around on the last agony of the expiring parliament;" putting the question, "As many as are of opinion that this bill do pass say aye;" and then, "with an eye averted from the object which he hated," proclaiming, with a subdued voice, "The ayes have it." "The fatal sentence was now pronounced—for an instant he stood statue-like, flung the bill upon the table, and sunk into his chair with an exhausted spirit." * A more sober narrative relates that when the house adjourned, the speaker walked to his own residence, followed by forty-one members, uncovered and in deep silence; bowed to the crowd before he entered his doors; and "then the whole assemblage dispersed, without uttering a word." † The legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland was completed in both parliaments, and the king, on closing the session at Westminster on the 29th of July, said, "This great measure, on which my wishes have been long earnestly bent, I shall ever consider as the happiest event of my reign."

The halcyon time was far distant. Cornwallis saw the danger that would infallibly attend a continued attempt to govern Ireland upon principles of exclusion: "This country could not be saved without the union, but you must not take it for granted that it will be saved by it. Much care and management will be necessary; and if the British government place their confidence in an Irish faction all will be ruined." ‡

CHAPTER CXCVIII.

India—Lord Mornington governor-general—Arthur Wellesley—War with Tippoo—Capture of Seringapatam—Bonaparte in Egypt—March to Syria—Jaffa—Siege of Acre—Battle of Aboukir—Bonaparte hears of the defeats of the French—He leaves Egypt and arrives in Paris—The French Directory—Revolution of the eighteenth Brumaire—Overthrow of the Directory by Bonaparte—British expedition to Holland—New constitution in France—Bonaparte first consul—The first consul's letter to the king—Lord Grenville's hostile answer—High price of corn in England—Distress and riots—Injudicious attempts to regulate prices—Bonaparte's civil administration—He assumes the state of a sovereign—Italy—Bonaparte takes the command of the army—The campaign—Battle of Marengo—Campaign under Moreau in Germany—Peace of Luneville.

Bonaparte was shut up in Egypt. To conquer the country—to establish a sovereignty that might ultimately make him the master of India—was a project of romantic grandeur. But its immediate realization had become an impossibility. The battle of the Nile had dissipated some of these dreams. Nevertheless, on the 26th of January, 1799, Bonaparte addressed a letter from Cairo to Tippoo Sultaun: "You have been informed of my arrival on the borders of the Red Sea, with an innumerable and invincible army, full of the desire of releasing and relieving you from the iron yoke of England." Within a few months from the date of this letter Tippoo was slain in the defence of Seringapatam, and his kingdom of Mysore came to an end.

Sir John Shore, afterward Lord Teignmouth, succeeded Earl Cornwallis in the government of India. During his administration the two sons of Tippoo, who had been taken as hostages for the due performance of their father's engagements, were given up, however doubtful might have been the continued amity of the sultan. In 1798 Lord Teignmouth was succeeded by Lord Mornington, afterward created Marquis Wellesley. At the head of the Indian government was now a man of splendid abilities, and of vigor of character well fitted for action in any great crisis. He had a sound adviser, not only in military affairs, but in political, in his younger brother, Arthur Wellesley, then in his thirtieth year, who held the rank of colonel. The "Supplementary Dispatches," edited by the present Duke of Wellington, exhibit very strikingly how, at a very early period of his great career, the mind of this remarkable man was formed to embrace the largest views with the closest attention to the

* "Grattan's Speeches," vol. iv. p. 21.
† "Parliamentary History," vol. xxxiv. col. 263.
‡ Ibid., cols. 263 and 270.

* "Historic Memoirs of Ireland," vol. ii. p. 369.
† Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 251.
‡ Ibid., p. 249.

most minute detail. From his arrival in India as the colonel of an infantry regiment in 1797, to his acceptance of a responsible command in 1799, we may trace the same qualities which, more than any other man, fitted him for an encounter with the genius of Bonaparte. Arthur Wellesley's regiment, the 33d, formed part of an army assembled at Vellore, in November, 1798, under the command of General Harris. Lord Mornington had endeavored, without effect, to detach Tippoo from the dangerous influence of the agents of the French government. The language of the governor-general was conciliatory, but it was firm. His proposal to negotiate was met by evasions. Tippoo continued to rely upon the assistance of the French. "The providence of God and the victorious arms of the British nation frustrated his vain hopes, and checked the presumptuous career of the French in Egypt, at the moment when he anxiously expected their arrival on the coast of Malabar." * He rejected every pacific overture. General Harris accordingly entered the Mysore territory on the 5th of March, 1799. The ally of the English, the Nizam of the Deccan, sent a large contingent to join the army; and this force, to which the 33d regiment was attached, was placed under the command of Colonel Wellesley.

The novelty no less than the magnitude of these operations appears to have impressed the young commander of the Nizam's army with a feeling of wonder which inexperience is not ashamed to display. The British grand army and the Nizam's army marched in two columns parallel to each other. "The march of these two armies was almost in the form of a square or oblong, of which the front and rear were formed of cavalry, and about two or three miles in extent; the right and left (owing to the immense space taken up in the column by field-pieces drawn by bullocks) about six or seven miles. In this square went everything belonging to the army. . . . You will have some idea of what there was in that space when I state to you the number of bullocks that I know were in the public service." These he computes at sixty thousand. The Nizam's army had twenty-five thousand bullocks loaded with grain, besides elephants, camels, bullocks, carts, belonging to individuals, beyond all calculation. "You may have some idea of the thing when I tell you that, when all were together, there was a multitude in motion which covered eighteen square miles." † The Bombay army joined these two moving multitudes; and after several encounters with the forces of Tippoo, the united armies had taken up a position before Seringapatam. A series of successful attacks upon the enemy's posts enabled the breaching batteries to be erected at a short distance from the walls; and the breach was sufficiently complete for the city to be stormed on the 4th of May. It was in the possession of the besiegers within two hours. Tippoo was killed in one of the gateways. His body was found among five hundred others, piled in a very narrow compass. Colonel Wellesley's letter to the governor-general is very characteristic: "It was impossible to expect that, after the labor which the troops had undergone in working up to this place, and the various successes they had had in six different affairs with Tippoo's troops, in all of which they had come to the bayonet with them, they should not have looked to the plunder of this place. Nothing therefore can have exceeded what was done on the night of the 4th. . . . I came in to take the command on the morning of the 5th; and, by the greatest exertion, by hanging, flogging, etc., etc., in the course of that day, I restored order among the troops, and I hope I have gained the confidence of the people." ‡ Colonel Wellesley congratulates his brother "upon having brought the war to a most fortunate conclusion in the course of about two months, and of having destroyed the greatest enemy the British nation ever had in India, and one whose powers were most formidable." The territories of Tippoo were divided among the English, the Nizam, and a descendant of the ancient rajahs of Mysore, who had been dispossessed by Hyder. Colonel Wellesley was appointed governor of Seringapatam, and during several years he was employed in the organization of the civil and military administration of Mysore.

When Bonaparte wrote to Tippoo at the end of January, 1799, the Porte had declared war against France. Jezzar, the Pasha of Acre, had received orders from the sultan to commence hostilities against the French, and he had seized El Arish, on the borders of Egypt. The war against the invaders of the dominions of the sultan was to be carried on with vigor. An army was collecting in Syria; another army was to be landed at Alexandria; in the spring they were to operate in combination. Bonaparte resolved to anticipate these movements by attacking the fortified places in Syria where troops and stores were being gathered together. He thought the reduction of these positions would be soon effected; that he should add the conquest of Syria to that of Egypt; become master of the Euphrates as he had become master of the Nile; and then have all the communications with India open to him. On the 1st of February his army, consisting of about thirteen thousand men, entered the desert. He had mounted one of his regiments on fleet dromedaries, each dromedary carrying two men, seated back to back. The French on the march followed the course of the Mediterranean. El Arish surrendered to them on the 18th of February, and Gaza surrendered on the 25th. On the 3d of March they had reached Jaffa, the ancient Joppa. This place was defended by a thick wall flanked with towers, and contained a garrison of more than four thousand men. It was taken by assault, and for thirty hours was delivered over to pillage and massacre. Something followed more horrible even than the ordinary atrocities of warfare. Several thousand of the garrison were prisoners. "Bonaparte," says Thiers, "decided upon a terrible measure, which is the sole cruel act of his life. Transported into a barbarous country, he had involuntarily adopted its measures. He caused these prisoners to pass under the edge of the sword." * The justification alleged is that the French had no means of sending them to Egypt, that the army was itself in want of rations, and that to let them go free would be to increase the number of their foes. The decision was not taken upon the single authority of Bonaparte. It was debated for three days in councils of war; and then the prisoners were marched out from the camp in parties to the sand-hills around Jaffa, and there put to death by volleys of musketry or by the bayonet.

Before the French marched from Jaffa the plague had made its appearance. Hospitals were established there, and the army moved forward to Acre. Jezzar had resisted the solicitations of the French to become their friend, and had determined to defend the strong place in which he was shut up. In the Gulf of Acre was Sir Sidney Smith, with two English ships of war. He had captured some vessels bringing along the coast from Egypt some of the heavy artillery of the French army, and these were landed for the defence of Acre. A French emigrant officer, Colonel Philippeaux, who had been a fellow-student with Bonaparte in the military school, co-operated with Sir Sidney Smith in this gallant defence. A small breach having been made, the French ventured upon an assault on the 25th of March. They were arrested by a counterscarp and a fosse. For two months was Acre vainly attempted to be taken. In April an army from Damascus had crossed the Jordan for the relief of Acre. Kleber, with a small number of troops, first encountered this force of thirty thousand, chiefly cavalry. He maintained his ground until the arrival of Bonaparte and Murat with effectual aid. The Mussulmans were completely routed on the plain of Esdraelon, between Mount Hermon and Mount Tabor. Bonaparte then hurried back to Acre. The English and Turks, during the temporary suspension of assaults, had constructed intrenchments outside the town. In the early part of May the French repeatedly attacked these works, but without success. On the 7th of May a Turkish fleet with reinforcements appeared in sight. The place must be stormed before the reinforcements could land. It was stormed on the 7th; it was stormed on the 8th; it was stormed on the 10th. Bonaparte was held at bay. On the 21st the camp before Acre was broken up. On his return march to Egypt, from Cæsarea to Jaffa, the whole country was set on fire. The Turks and Arabs hung on the French rear and killed every straggler. The sick dropped on the burning sand, unable to keep up with their comrades. At Jaffa the army halted. What was to be done with the sick in the hospitals? Thiers gives one version of a story that brought as much odium upon Bonaparte as the massacre of the Turkish prisoners: "Bonaparte said to the physician Desgenettes that it would be much more humane to administer some opium to them than to leave them alive. The physician made this an-

* Declaration of the Governor-general in Council, February 22d, 1799.
† "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. i. p. 204. ‡ Ibid., p. 212.

* "Révolution Française," livre xliii.

swer, 'My business is to cure, and not to kill.' No opium was administered; and the fact only served for the propagation of an unworthy calumny, now destroyed." * A French historian, Poujoulat, who had travelled in Palestine, does not doubt that between three and four hundred sick and wounded were poisoned. Bonaparte himself denied to O'Meara the poisoning even of "a few *miserables*, who could not recover." But he added, "Not that I think it would have been a crime had opium been given to them; on the contrary, I think it would have been a virtue." †

Bonaparte returned to Cairo, assuming to himself all the honors of a conqueror. It is difficult to determine whether his proclamations to the people of Egypt or his dispatches to the French Directory contain the greater number of lies and exaggerations in reference to this Syrian campaign. But the misfortunes of the siege of Acre were redeemed by a great victory, on the 25th of July, over a Turkish army which had landed at the peninsula of Aboukir. Bonaparte, upon the news of their landing, had made a rapid march from Cairo to Alexandria, with ten thousand men, and the rout of the Turks, who fought most bravely, was complete.

After the decisive battle of Aboukir Bonaparte became restless. His communication with Europe had been cut off for nearly a year. It had been an eventful year. The French armies in Italy and in Germany had sustained great reverses, of which he was ignorant. He had in vain sent forth some brigs to detain merchant vessels, that he might obtain news from Europe. He then sent a flag of truce to the Turkish fleet, under the pretence of negotiating an exchange of prisoners, but with the real intent that some intelligence should be obtained. Sir Sidney Smith, says Thiers, learning that Bonaparte was ignorant of the disasters of France, "felt a malignant pleasure in sending to him a packet of all the journals." Bonaparte passed an entire night in devouring the information contained in these newspapers. He at once took his determination to embark secretly for Europe. Let us take a rapid glance at the various events that led this man of decision to resolve that "the time is out of joint," and that he alone was "born to set it right."

After the separate treaty of Campo Formio between Austria and France, a congress assembled at Radstadt to treat of the complex subject of a general peace, to include all the states of the German Empire. Its sittings, which commenced in December, 1797, were continued through 1798. At the end of that year a treaty of alliance between Great Britain and Russia, against France, was agreed upon; and the Emperor Francis and the Emperor Paul were drawing together in a determination to unite their forces in a common endeavor to resist the growing power of the ambitious republic. Naples and Sardinia had declared war against France. At the beginning of January, 1799, the King of Naples had fled from his capital to Palermo; the French general, Championnet, had entered the city, proclaimed the abolition of royalty, and the kingdom of Naples was henceforth to be the Parthenopeian republic. A Russian army of sixty thousand men, commanded by Suwaroff, arrived in Moravia in December, and were welcomed by the Emperor of Germany with unmistakable demonstrations. The French plenipotentiaries at Radstadt demanded that the diet of the empire should oppose the entrance of the Russian army upon Germanic territory. The answer being unsatisfactory, Ehrenbreitstein, which had been long blockaded by the French, was besieged, and the fortress capitulated in January. The French were now masters of both banks of the Rhine. Jourdan crossed the river into Suabia; the directory declared war against Austria; Jourdan advanced to the Danube, was encountered by the Archduke Charles, and driven back over the Rhine in April. When Switzerland was invaded by the French, in 1798, the Grisons stood aloof. They were now assaulted by the French; but the Austrians came from the Tyrol to their aid, and drove the invaders from their territory. Switzerland now became the seat of war, and Massena stood upon the defensive at Zurich. At the close of March the Austrian and French armies were actively engaged in Italy. The French were driven beyond the Mincio. The ability of Moreau could not enable him to make a stand against the determination of the old Austrian general, Melas. On the 18th of April Suwaroff joined the Austrians with fifty thousand Russians, and this famous slaughterer of Turks and Poles took the command of the combined armies. The battle of Cassano, on the 27th of April, was decisive of the fate of the Cisalpine republic. The battle of the Trebbia ensued, in which, after three days of desperate conflict, Suwaroff defeated Macdonald and Victor, who retreated over the Apennines. The attempted junction of the two armies of Italy resulted in the defeats of the two commanders, Moreau and Macdonald. In three months the great campaigns of Bonaparte thus appeared to have been productive only of fleeting triumphs. Royalty was restored at Naples by Cardinal Ruffo, with English assistance; and, painful to record, the bad faith and miserable vengeance of the corrupt and despotic court upon the patriotic party found a supporter in the greatest of British admirals. Such was the posture of European affairs when George III. closed the session of parliament on the 12th of July, and said, "It is impossible to compare the events of the present year with the state and prospects of Europe at the distance of but a few months, without acknowledging, in humble thankfulness, the visible interposition of Divine Providence, in averting those dangers which so long threatened the overthrow of all the establishments of the civilized world." Such were the confident expectations of the parties to the second coalition against France, concluded on the 22d of June, between Great Britain, the Emperor of Germany, the Emperor of Russia, some of the German minor states, Naples, Portugal, Turkey, and Barbary. France herself was exposed to a greater danger than that of external foes. Her executive government was weak and unpopular. The people were oppressed by taxes; and more oppressed by the conscription, by which every Frenchman, from the age of twenty to forty-five, was liable to be chosen by lot for military service. Such was the news that Sir Sidney Smith might have placed before Bonaparte on the banks of the Nile. The intelligence of the journals, it is believed, was confirmed by a private communication from his brothers Lucien and Joseph, which had reached him by a faithful messenger, in spite of the vigilance of the English cruisers.

On the 24th of August Bonaparte embarked at Alexandria, accompanied by seven of his generals. Two frigates and two smaller vessels had been got ready, by his orders, for this perilous adventure. This was not, says Thiers, a desertion; "for he left a victorious army to brave dangers of every kind, and, most horrible of all, the danger of being carried in fetters to London." Bonaparte was himself very calm amid these dangers. He possibly did not imagine that Pitt would carry him about in an iron cage, like another Bajazet, even if he were captured by an English fleet. It was the 9th of October when he landed at Fréjus. The people ought to have opposed his landing as a violation of the quarantine laws, but they said, "Better the plague than the Austrians." The Austrians were close at hand. They occupied all the mountainous passes which separate France from Italy. After the great victory of the Austro Russian army at Novi, in August—which victory was succeeded by other triumphs—the French were expelled from the land which Bonaparte had conquered and revolutionized. That he should have been received in Provence as the man whose advent would be the safety of France was a natural and reasonable confidence. On the 16th of October Bonaparte was in Paris. From his old house in La Rue Chantereine he proceeded immediately to the Luxembourg, the palace of the Directory. He told the members that, having become apprised of the disasters of France, he had come to defend the country. But he was to them an object of suspicion and of fear. Bernadotte, it is said, counselled the arrest of Bonaparte for desertion; and Barras replied, "We are not strong enough for that." The Directory consisted of Barras, Sièyes, Ducos, and two obscure republicans, Moulins and Gohièr. They were divided in their policy as to abiding by the existing constitution, which some wished to modify and some to overturn. Bonaparte came as a new power to mould or to awe conflicting opinions, whether of the directors or of the legislative bodies, into a shape favorable to his own ambition. He attached himself to the party of Sièyes and Ducos. Barras preserved a sort of neutrality. Bonaparte had two able counsellors to assist him in any intrigue for the transfer of power to new hands—Talleyrand and Fouché. The majority of the Council of Five Hundred, with Bernadotte, were against any project for organic change. Three weeks of intrigue ended in placing France under a dictatorship—three weeks of plots, which Bourienne, Bonaparte's secretary, says, "were accompanied by so much trickery, falsehood, and treachery, that for

* "Révolution Française," livre xliii.
† "Voice from St. Helena," vol. i. p. 332.

the honor of human nature it is desirable to hide them under a veil." The preparations of the conspirators were at length complete. The Council of Ancients possessed an authority, under the constitution, for determining the place of meeting of the legislative body. A packed number assembled privately on the 9th of November (18th Brumaire), and decreed that the sitting should be held the following day at the palace of St. Cloud. Bonaparte was charged with the execution of this decree; and all the troops of the line and the National Guard were placed under his orders. He very quickly availed himself of his power by stationing troops at the Tuileries, at the Luxembourg, at St. Cloud, under the command of his trusty generals; and by assigning to other chosen lieutenants positions where military force might put down all opposition that might be excited by those whose reign was coming to a close. Barras, Moulins, and Gohièr were left to their own reflections in the Luxembourg, while their servant was thus preparing to become their master. The Council of Five Hundred met on the 9th of November, only to hear the decree which suspended their sitting on that day, and which ordered their assembling on the next day at St. Cloud. At one o'clock on the afternoon of the 10th the Council of Ancients and the Council of Five Hundred there assembled, surrounded by troops. Bonaparte came in his carriage, with a numerous escort. Sièyes and Ducos were also there to confer with him. The ancients were told that the directors had resigned, and it was proposed to replace them according to the provisions of the constitution. Barras had indeed resigned, by getting away from Paris in hot haste. Moulins and Gohièr were prisoners in the Luxembourg. It was a critical moment. Bonaparte came into the assembly, and, according to the historical authorities of the revolution, harangued with visible emotion but with great effect. The speeches which the historians put into his mouth differ very considerably; and well they may differ, says Bourienne, who was present, "for he made no speech, but delivered a series of rambling, unconnected sentences and confused replies to the president's questions." Berthier and Bourienne were glad to get him away from the wearied and impatient assembly. At the Council of Five Hundred, to which Bonaparte then repaired, there were fewer words but more action. He entered the wing of the palace where they were sitting, followed by grenadiers. Furious cries assailed him of "Down with the tyrant! Down with the dictator! Go out! go out!" His soldiers surrounded him as he made for the door. He mounted his horse when he escaped from what he represented as a danger to his person, and told his troops that an attempt had been made to assassinate him. "Vive Bonaparte!" was the reassuring cry. Within there was now a greater danger than the imaginary daggers of the irritated members of the Five Hundred. His brother Lucien was the president, and he was called upon to declare Napoleon "hors la loi"—those terrible words which had sent Robespierre and many another revolutionary tyrant to the scaffold. Lucien refused to put the question, and implored them to hear his brother. By direction of Napoleon grenadiers again entered the hall, seized Lucien, and carried him forth. The two mounted their horses; Lucien harangued the troops; told them that assassins were overwhelming the majority; that he and his brother would swear to be faithful to liberty. The soldiers hesitated at the proposal to expel the Five Hundred from their hall; but Lucien exclaimed, "I swear that I will stab my own brother to the heart if he ever attempt any thing against the liberties of France." Again the soldiers shouted, "Vive Bonaparte!" Murat and Leclerc then put themselves at the head of a battalion, led them to the door of the assembly, drowned the outcries of the members by the beat of drums, and cleared the hall by that irresistible power which Mirabeau declared should alone disperse the Tiers État, "We will only quit by the power of the bayonet." * Night came on. Lucien collected some thirty members of the Five Hundred, who passed decrees, in the name of that body, to the effect that the Directory existed no longer, that sixty persons were no longer representatives, and that a provisional executive commission should be formed of three members, who should be styled consuls—Sièyes, Ducos, and Napoleon Bonaparte being named to that office. The Council of Ancients concurred in the decrees. The three colleagues immediately took the oaths to be faithful to the sovereignty of the people, to the republic, to liberty and equality, and to the representative system. The republic on that night really came to an end.

While these events were taking place in Paris, while the supreme power was passing into the hands of a great soldier, a man of indomitable energy, gathering around him all the civil and military talent of his country, without respect to the claims of birth, and despising the routine which placed authority in the hands of the incapable, the British administration, rarely departing from its almost slavish dependence upon royal command or parliamentary influence, had sent a powerful force for the deliverance of Holland, organized upon the old principles of favoritism. Other men than equerries at Windsor anticipated the result, when "unformed regiments were hurried on immediate service," and brigades were made up "for the amusement of young princes and of foolish and inexperienced generals." * The "young princes" likely to be employed were the Dukes of York, Cumberland, and Gloucester. The Duke of York was the only prince of the three who went to Holland for his "amusement." A British army was assembled on the coast of Kent. A general, neither foolish nor inexperienced, Sir Ralph Abercrombie, sailed on the 12th of August, with a first detachment of twelve thousand men, and he was to be joined by a Russian contingent of seventeen thousand men, paid by England, for the conveyance of which force to Holland a squadron had been sent forth in July. All went well for a time. Abercrombie effected a landing at the Helder, supported by the fire from the fleet, and the troops were all disembarked on the 27th, after a feeble resistance. The fort of the Helder, which commanded the entrance of the Texel, was taken possession of and the English fleet entered and summoned the Dutch fleet to surrender. There was no battle; for the Dutch seamen were in a state of insubordination, and thus eight sail of the line and seventeen frigates fell into our hands. The ships were sent to England, our sailors murmuring that they had not been taken as prizes in fair fight, and public opinion complaining that we had turned a mutiny to our own advantage when we had so recently been placed in extreme danger by a mutiny in our own fleet. Abercrombie, with his small force, maintained a defensive position; and on the 10th of September repulsed a fierce attack of twenty-four thousand French and Dutch under General Vandamme. The Russian contingent, with an additional force of seven thousand British, now arrived. But there came with them a commander-in-chief who was to supersede Abercrombie. The Duke of York took the command of the united British and Russian army of thirty-six thousand men. This was indeed to make war upon a large scale, as far as numbers were concerned. The expedition to Holland was the greatest attempt of the British government since the beginning of the contest with France. One thing was wanted—a general fit to command. The Duke of York was not without experience in military matters; he was personally brave; but what he had done before as the leader of an army was no warranty for his fitness for this high responsibility. On the 19th of September it was determined to attack the enemy in four columns, the ground being of a nature to prevent a concentrated operation. The Russian column under General Hermann was routed. On the centre and left, where the Duke of York was present, General Dundas and General Pulteney were defeating the enemy. But the duke, hearing of the disaster of Hermann, instantly changed a plan which was leading to victory, and marched to the assistance of the broken Russians. The duke was himself then compelled to retreat, and the day presented the usual consequences of bravery without judgment. On the 2d of October another battle was fought, in which the right and centre of the British and Russians were partially successful, but where the want of combination prevented any real advantage. Time was precious. The republicans were gathering in great force; and some strong place must be obtained, through the possession of which supplies from the interior of the country could alone be insured. The army could not remain to starve in the narrow corner on which they were encamped, amid dykes and causeys, on swampy ground now saturated with autumnal rains. Haarlem must be taken. The French, posted on a narrow isthmus by which it was necessary to approach Haarlem, were ready to contest the passage. On the 6th of October a battle was fought during the whole day, with equal bravery and equal loss. But the Duke of York was no nigher the pos-

* *Ante*, p. 962.

* Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 123.

session of Haarlem. The French were reinforced; the Duke of York retired. Dangers were thickening around him. His great army was reduced to twenty thousand men, by sickness as much as by battle. He had provision only for eleven days. He proposed a suspension of arms to General Brune, the French commander, preparatory to the evacuation of Holland by the British and Russians. The only point gained in this convention was that the Dutch fleet was to be retained. He bought the permission to go home in safety, upon the condition that eight thousand French and Dutch seamen, prisoners of war in England, should be given up to the French government. The troops quitted Holland on the 30th of November. Loud were the murmurs at home. The people were thankful that a navy remained to them in which command did not wholly go "by favor and affection." Some were glad that the ending of the expedition was no worse. "The armistice in Holland," wrote Cornwallis, "although it is not, perhaps, the most brilliant way of getting out of the scrape, has relieved my mind from much anxiety, and has insured to us some army, if we are not bent upon throwing it away."*

When Bonaparte and his two colleagues had taken possession of the Luxembourg, on the 11th of November, he had no precedence. Each consul was in his turn to act as president. There was much to be accomplished before Bonaparte could be installed in that almost absolute power to which all his movements were tending. A new constitution was to be made. Commissions were appointed to square and dovetail the work into shape. Sièyes had his plan ready. The details were to be debated between the consuls and the commissioners. The aptitude of Bonaparte for power, his sagacity, his quickness of observation turned every discussion to his own prospective advantage. By the 24th of December the constitution was completed and published. The executive authority was to consist of three consuls, Bonaparte being first consul for ten years. This executive was to propose the laws. The legislative authority was a tribunate, to discuss the projects of laws, and approve or reject them; a legislative body of three hundred members, to vote upon the laws proposed by the tribunate, without the right of discussion; and a senate, of eighty members, who were to sit in secret. It was a mock legislature, to strengthen the executive. All these classes of legislators were to be paid. The three consuls were to have an allowance, the first consul receiving 500,000 francs a year; each of the others three tenths of that sum. Cambacérès and Lebrun were associated with Bonaparte in the consular office; but the real power was in his hands alone. The constitution was accepted by the votes of the people, three millions having registered their approval. Their votes were doubtless influenced by the agents of the government. But it is clear that the people were tired of anarchy, had no confidence in a directory and councils of ancients and five hundred, cared little about liberty, and had a profound admiration for military glory.

When the British Parliament met, on the 22d of January, 1800, after an adjournment in October, a royal message was presented, the chief purport of which was to lay before the two houses "copies of communications recently received from the enemy, and of the answers which have been returned thereto by his majesty's command." The communications "received from the enemy" were a brief note from Talleyrand, Minister for Foreign Affairs in France, to Lord Grenville, inclosing a letter from the first consul to the King of Great Britain and Ireland. This letter, dated 5th Nivose,† is too interesting as well as too laconic to be abridged:

"Called by the wishes of the French nation to occupy the first magistracy of the republic, I think it proper, on entering into office, to make a direct communication of it to your majesty.

"The war, which for eight years has ravaged the four quarters of the world, must it be eternal? Are there no means of coming to an understanding?

"How can the two most enlightened nations of Europe, powerful and strong beyond what their safety and independence require, sacrifice to ideas of vain greatness the benefits of commerce, internal prosperity, and the happiness of families? How is it that they do not feel that peace is of the first necessity, as well as of the first glory?

"These sentiments cannot be foreign to the heart of your majesty, who reigns over a free nation, and with the sole view of rendering it happy.

"Your majesty will only see in this overture my sincere desire to contribute efficaciously, for the second time, to a general pacification, by a step speedy, entirely of confidence, and disengaged from those forms which, necessary perhaps to disguise the dependence of weak states, prove only, in those which are strong, the mutual desire of deceiving each other.

"France and England, by the abuse of their strength, may still for a long time, for the misfortune of all nations, retard the period of their being exhausted. But I will venture to say it, the fate of all civilized nations is attached to the termination of a war which involves the whole world."

Lord Grenville wrote on the 4th of January to Talleyrand, saying that his majesty, "seeing no reason to depart from those forms which have long been established in Europe for transacting business with foreign states," had directed him to return an official answer, which he inclosed. This answer breathed no spirit but that of determined hostility. Recapitulating the charges so often made against France, that she desired "the extermination of all established governments"—that "the most solemn treaties have only prepared the way for fresh aggression"—his majesty could not "place his reliance on the mere renewal of general professions of pacific dispositions." He required to be convinced "that, after the experience of so many years of crimes and miseries, better principles have ultimately prevailed in France." The conviction of such a change could only result from experience. "The best and most natural pledge of its reality and permanence would be the restoration of that line of princes which for so many centuries maintained the French nation in prosperity at home and in consideration and respect abroad." Nevertheless, "his majesty makes no claim to prescribe to France what shall be the form of her government." As there existed "no sufficient evidence of the principles by which the new government will be directed, no reasonable ground by which to judge of its stability," to persevere in "a just and defensive war" was the only course which his majesty could at present pursue.

It was eighteen days after this answer was written that the correspondence was laid before parliament. The letter of Bonaparte and the answer were, however, no secret. On the 1st of January Grenville sent a copy of the letter to his brother, as "a curiosity"—"I need not tell you that we shall say no." On the 3d he describes his answer, of which he says we have not hands enough to make sufficient copies. On the 16th he writes, "His Corsican Majesty's letters will be out on Monday."* It is not difficult to see that a haughty contempt for the attainment of almost regal power by a plebeian was at the root of that fierce indignation which the British government had never evinced when they twice negotiated for peace with the Directory. It is difficult to understand how Pitt could have sanctioned such a letter as Grenville's. Yet on the 4th he wrote to Addington, "We have felt no difficulty in declining all negotiation under the present circumstances; and have drawn our answer as a sort of manifesto both for France and England, bringing forward the topics which seem most likely to promote the cause of royalty, in preference to this new, and certainly not less absolute, government."† Lord Grenville found in Talleyrand one who saw the weak points of the "manifesto" at a glance, and exposed them with an irresistible logic. In his rejoinder of the 14th of January there is this passage: "The first consul of the French Republic would not doubt that his Britannic Majesty recognized the right of nations to choose the form of their government, since it is from the exercise of this right that he holds his crown. But he has been unable to comprehend how to this fundamental principle, upon which rests the existence of political societies, the minister of his Britannic Majesty could annex insinuations which tend to an interference in the internal affairs of the republic, and which are not less injurious to the French nation and to its government than it would be to England and to his majesty, if a sort of invitation were held out in favor of that republican government of which England adopted the forms in the middle of the last century, or an exhortation to recall to the throne that family whom their birth had placed there, and whom a revolution compelled to

* "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 141.
† December 25th, according to the translation laid before parliament; the 26th according to Thiers.

* "Court and Cabinets, etc.," vol. iii. pp. 4, 5, 6.
† "Life of Sidmouth," vol. i. p. 249.

descend from it." Statesmen thinking and acting with Mr. Pitt could not approve of Lord Grenville's letter. It is "too caustic and opprobrious," said Addington—"it has not quite enough of the character of moderation." * Wilberforce writes, "I must say I was shocked at Lord Grenville's letter; for though our government might feel adverse to any measure which might appear to give the stamp of our authority to Bonaparte's new dignity, yet I must say that, unless they have some better reason than I fear they possess for believing that he is likely to be hurled from his throne, it seems a desperate game to play—to offend, and insult, and thereby irritate, this vain man beyond the hope of forgiveness." † Cornwallis, six months after, designated Grenville's letter as "haughty and most unwise." "The unprovoked insolence of Lord Grenville's letter has placed us in a state of such embarrassment that I must confess I have hardly a hope that we can extricate ourselves." ‡ Bonaparte had written a conciliatory letter to the Emperor of Austria, which also had been treated with contempt. The consequence was Marengo. The correspondence with France again roused Fox into political activity. He wrote, in January, "My letters tell me what I can scarce credit, that the ministers have given a flat refusal to the great consul's proposition to treat. Surely they must be quite mad." § Fox again appeared in his place in parliament; made one of his greatest speeches, which was a reply to an equally grand oratorical display by Pitt; and was in a minority of 64 to 265. In the House of Lords Grenville delivered a speech of remarkable ability, but tending, even more than his letter, to make the quarrel with France a personal quarrel with Bonaparte. In the third year of the republic, said the noble secretary for foreign affairs, he imposed upon the French people, by the mouth of the cannon, that very constitution which he has now destroyed by the point of the bayonet. Treaties made and broken with Sardinia, with Tuscany, with the petty states of Italy, were ratified and annulled by Bonaparte. Venice, Rome, Genoa, Switzerland, were examples of his perfidy. He pointed to Egypt to exhibit his falsehoods, his blasphemies, his hypocrisies, his multiplied violations of all religious and moral ties. "Having, therefore, such bases for us to form a correct opinion of his policy, can it be thought inconsistent to believe that he has no intention of fulfilling his engagements." ‖ We can scarcely object to Thiers when he says, "The English ministers, especially Lord Grenville, employed, with regard to the first consul, language the most offensive. They had not otherwise treated Robespierre." ¶ We look back upon the first fifteen years of the nineteenth century, and see much to prove the ambition, the bad faith, and the insolence of Bonaparte. But we cannot deny that the affronts of the ministry of Pitt and Grenville were sufficient to stir within him an unextinguishable hatred of England.

The time was not opportune for rejecting overtures of peace. In the minds of the people "peace" was always associated with "plenty." Scarcity and even famine were regarded, and not unjustly so, as consequences of war. The people of these islands were, throughout the year 1800, and partly in 1801, on the brink of famine. There had been a bad harvest in 1795, when Burke published his "Thoughts and Details on Scarcity." In a few pointed sentences he expressed the great economic truth which agitators conceal and pseudo-philanthropists despise: "Labor is a commodity like every other, and rises or falls according to the demand. . . . Wages have been twice raised in my time, and they bear a full proportion, or even a greater than formerly, to the medium of provision during the last bad cycle of twenty years. If we were wildly to attempt to force them beyond it, the stone which we had forced up the hill would only fall back upon them in a diminished demand, or, what indeed is the far lesser evil, an aggravated price of all the provisions which are the result of their manual toil." In saying that the squires of Norfolk had dined when they gave it as their opinion that the rate of wages ought to rise and fall with the market of provisions, he laughed at a theory which the squires of many a county would soon reduce to very efficient practice. The Berkshire justices and "other discreet persons" decided, in 1795, that when the gallon of 8 lbs. 11 ozs. should cost 1*s.*, then every man should receive in wages, or in allowance from the poor-rates, 3*s.* weekly, an 1*s.* 6*d.* for the support of every other of his family; and in proportion as the price of bread rises or falls, 3*d.* to the man, and 1*d.* to every other of the family, on every penny which the loaf rises above a shilling. This Berkshire bread-scale was almost universally adopted in the agricultural counties; and thus, as the price of the loaf of bread continued to rise almost invariably from 1795 to 1800, the allowances from the rates were an encouragement to consume as much in a season of scarcity as in a season of abundance. Deficient harvests raise the price of wheat to 134*s.* a quarter in 1800, and to 156*s.* a quarter in the spring of 1801. The danger had become imminent, at the time when the conclusion of a peace offered by France might have opened our ports to importations which would have fed that large body of the artisan class that were not fed, without stint, by the operation of a bread-scale. In February, 1800, palliatives were resorted to. The sale of bread which had not been baked twenty-four hours was prohibited. The people were exhorted to economy by proclamation. Brown bread was to be eaten instead of white. Noble lords resolved to discourage the use of pastry in their families. At the end of November the prospect became more alarming. Importation was encouraged by excessive bounties. Great Britain did not grow enough corn, even in average years, for the subsistence of the people. The price of corn was always subject to extreme fluctuations. The whole tendency of the financial operations of the government was to raise prices to an unnatural height. The government, when the evil reached its culminating point at the end of 1800 and the beginning of 1801, was powerless, except to bring in a Brown Bread Bill. They did something more. They again suspended the Habeas Corpus Act, for the people were rioting. Pitt clearly saw the social danger to which these riots would lead: "Unless the magistrates and gentlemen are firm in discountenancing and resisting all arbitrary reductions of price and regulations of the mode of dealing great mischief must follow." * Romilly saw the same mischief as the consequence of economic ignorance: "Never, to be sure, were there such temptations held out to riot and insurrection as the resolutions which, in consequence of the late riots, have been entered into in different parts of the country respecting the price of provisions. . . . . I cannot find that the least attempt has been anywhere made to undeceive the people; but, on the contrary, an opinion the most repugnant to common-sense—that is, that provisions of all kinds bear a higher price than the persons who deal in them can well afford to sell them at—is, without the least inquiry upon the subject, everywhere acted upon as an established truth." † The author of this history has a distinct recollection of his alarm, when, a child of nine years old, he saw a mob parading the streets of Windsor, breaking the windows of the bakers, and going forth in a body with the intention of burning a neighboring mill. The military were called out. The mayor and aldermen sat on a Friday night in solemn deliberation on the imperative necessity of quieting the people by making provisions cheaper. There were difficulties in the way of this magnanimous resolve as regarded bread and meat. The worshipful body compromised the matter by solemnly proclaiming that when the butter-women brought their butter to market on the Saturday morning they should not presume to ask more than a shilling a pound, under penalty of confiscation. In the spring of 1801 the high prices reached their maximum. On the 5th of March the price of the quartern loaf was 1*s.* 10½*d.* A good harvest came to ease the sufferings of the people; and in the middle of October the price of the quartern loaf had fallen to 11½*d.* In 1801 the poor rates had risen to a sum exceeding four millions sterling, with a population of nine millions. The provision for the poor had doubled since 1783. How much temporary mischief was averted, and how much permanent evil was created, by the system of multiplying paupers by paying wages out of rates, is not necessary here to consider.

Montholon, in his history of Napoleon at St. Helena, represents him as saying that when he made overtures of peace to England he "had need of war;" that Mr. Pitt's answer was impatiently expected. "When it arrived it filled me with a secret satisfaction; his

* "Life," vol. i. p. 248, Letter of January 9.
† "Life of Wilberforce," vol. ii. p. 354, Letter of January 7.
‡ Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 270–277.
§ "Correspondence of Fox," vol. iii. p. 174.
‖ See "Parliamentary History," vol. xxxiv.
¶ "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tom. i. livre ii.

* "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. i. p. 262.
† Romilly, "Memoirs," letter cxviii.

answer could not have been more favorable." Bonaparte had, nevertheless, victories of peace to achieve as well as victories of war. He probably only wanted a breathing-time when he proposed to negotiate—a truce rather than a lasting pacification. Nevertheless, the satisfaction which he derived from the rejection of his proposals is not a tribute to the soundness of the policy of the British cabinet. Bonaparte was thus enabled to persuade the French that his personal ambition was not the motive for a continuance of a war which brought so many sufferings to the great body of the people. Their desire for glory was at that time greatly diminished by their greater desire for rest under a settled government. By the vigor of his administrative genius he soon brought the civil institutions of France into working order. The treasury of the Directory had depended upon forced loans, confiscations, and plunder of foreign countries. Bonaparte enforced a regular system of direct taxation, and compelled the functionaries to keep correct accounts. He established the system of prefectures—that system of departmental administration which, with little variation during sixty years, has always been an efficient support of every government, whether its objects were beneficent or despotic. He remodelled the judicial system. He did many wise and good things which France would probably not so readily have received from any other authority than that of an incipient despotism. He did not hesitate to show the direction which his government was prepared to take for its conservation. He propitiated the clergy; he organized a police as one of the chief instruments of repressing new tendencies to revolution; he destroyed that liberty of the press which had kept the people in a ferment since 1789. "Every journal," said a decree of the consul, "shall be immediately suppressed which shall insert any articles contrary to the respect due to the social pact, to the sovereignty of the people, and to the glory of the armies; or which shall publish invectives against the government and the nations which are friends or allies of the republic, even if those articles should be taken from foreign journals." He had given to the Consul Cambacérès the control over the judicial system; and to the Consul Lebrun the administration of the finances. He retained, as his own especial charge, the departments of war, marine, interior, foreign affairs, and police. Never was there a more efficient machinery, not only for extinguishing Jacobinism, but for taking away even the semblance of liberty from a nation that did not understand it—a nation "indocile by temperament, yet accepting the arbitrary and even the violent rule of a sovereign more readily than the free and regular government of the chief citizen." *

The pacification of La Vendée was completed by the end of January, without any sanguinary struggle. The insurgents were won to submission by moderation, instead of being trodden into despair, as they had been by the severities of the old republican authorities. Suwaroff had gone home after having been kept at bay in Switzerland; and the mad Emperor Paul was won over by the courteous policy of the first consul. Bonaparte had now only two enemies to contend with, Great Britain and Austria. But these were by far his most powerful enemies. He must break up their alliance by some signal triumphs in Italy and Germany before the could be safe in his sovereign rule. To contend with Great Britain at sea would have been a vain ambition. He was now established in regal state at the Tuileries. He was surrounded by a court, as glittering in dress, and almost as rigid in ceremonial, as that of the dukes and marquises at Versailles. He would have his own dukes and princes in good time. Meanwhile his fascinating wife would gather around her the fashion of Paris, as fashion then existed there. There were beautiful women, victorious generals, and submissive ambassadors, in those saloons; and there was no limit to the cost of the most luxurious display. Madame de Staël has described these first days of the consulate: "I saw the first consul enter the palace built by kings; and although Bonaparte was yet far from the magnificence he has since developed, one beheld already in all who surrounded him an anxiety to do him homage after an oriental fashion, which would persuade him that to govern the world was a very easy thing. . . . In ascending the staircase in the midst of the crowd who pressed around him, his eyes would rest neither upon one object nor upon any person in particular. There was always something of the vague and careless in his physiognomy, and his looks only expressed what was always suitable to his character to show, indifference to fortune and contempt for men." * Madame de Staël had a hatred of Bonaparte; but she is perhaps not wholly unjust when she says, "He has in his whole nature a foundation of vulgarity that even the gigantic reach of his ambition cannot always hide." From the luxurious grandeur of the Tuileries, from the flatteries of his sycophants, from his earnest work as chief magistrate, he resolved to depart for a season—to make an effort in his own person to recover the ground which had been lost in Italy. It was an infraction of the constitution that the first consul should command an army on a foreign soil. He did not stand upon such nice points of observance. But he would conceal his plans, and find safety in a new career of irresponsible glory.

There was an army of reserve formed at Dijon, to review which army Bonaparte ostensibly left Paris on the 6th of May. He inspected the troops, and quitted Dijon on the 7th. On the 8th he was at Geneva. He had deputed one of his generals to inspect the pass of the Great St. Bernard. "Can we pass?" said Bonaparte. "With great difficulty," replied the general. "Then let us set out," said the man who would have banished the word "impossible" from his vocabulary. The Austrian general, Melas, with the main body of the army, was in the territory of Genoa. The object of Bonaparte was to seize Milan, and place himself between the Austrian army and the emperor's dominions. Thirty-five thousand men, under General Lannes, went forward to cross the Great St. Bernard. The cannon were dismounted at the foot of the mountain, and dragged over on sledges and hollow trunks of trees. Lannes, and Berthier with another division, had crossed the mountain on the 16th. Bonaparte followed them from Lausanne on the 17th, with a young Swiss for his guide. The famous picture by David represents the hero of a melodrama in the grandest of "poses." Bonaparte went over the Alps like a very ordinary traveller, without danger, and suffering no privation. His army had difficulty enough with their munitions of war. He had not, like Cæsar, to fight many battles in these mountain-passes. He only met with a slight resistance at Bard, a fort which commanded the narrow pass in the valley below Aosta. Other divisions of the French army had crossed by the St. Gothard, the Simplon, Mount Genèvre, Mont Cénis, and the Little St. Bernard. Sixty or seventy thousand enemies were on the Italian side of the Alps without the knowledge of the Austrians. On the 30th of May Bonaparte was in Milan, having entered the city without opposition. The Austrian commander-in-chief, Melas, an aged man of large experience and of well-tried bravery, was at Nice, from which he had driven the French under Suchet. He rapidly marched to encounter Bonaparte, whose advanced guard was on the Po. He was between Melas and another Austrian army at Mantua, on the Adda, and in the Tyrol. His situation was hazardous. If he lost a battle he could only retreat over the Alps by the passes he had crossed. Melas concentrated his forces at Alessandria. Bonaparte marched to meet him, crossed the Po at Piacenza, and took up his position in the plain of Marengo. On the 14th of June Melas came out of Alessandria and attacked the French. For some time he appeared to be winning a great victory. He had beaten the division of Victor, had driven Lannes back, and, worn out with fatigue, had gone back to Alessandria, leaving the triumph to be completed by General Zach. Desaix, who had very recently returned from Egypt, was ordered by Bonaparte to lead up a division to engage the advancing Austrians. Desaix turned the tide of battle, and was himself killed. The whole Austrian army now gave way: Marengo was won. The next day Melas asked for an armistice. By the convention of Alessandria the Austrians lost all that they had gained in 1798 and 1799. They evacuated Italy as far as the Mincio, and gave up Genoa and all the strong places in Piedmont and the Milanais. On the 2d of July Bonaparte was again in Paris. During his absence various parties of republicans and royalists were formed against him, who might have shaken his power had his bold plan of a campaign been a failure. Marengo seated him firmly in the curule chair, which was to be exchanged for a throne.

The campaign of Moreau, who entered Germany at the head of a hundred thousand men, was a series of victories, until an armistice was concluded on the 15th of July. Hostilities were suspended while

* De Tocqueville, "France before the Revolution," book ii. chap. xx.

* "Sur la Révolution Française," tom. ii.

negotiations for peace were proceeding at Luneville. The preliminaries were signed on the 28th of July. But the emperor had entered into an engagement with Great Britain, that no peace should be concluded by either power which did not comprehend the two allies. His resolution was fortified by a new loan. The emperor refused to ratify the preliminaries which had been agreed to at Luneville. Meanwhile, Malta, which had been blockaded for two years by the English fleet, surrendered to the British troops in September. Hostilities were revived in Germany on the 29th of November. The Archduke John, who had taken the command of the Austrian army, crossed the Inn with a hundred thousand men to attack Moreau, whose troops were concentrated near the village of Hohenlinden, about twenty miles from Munich. The forest of Hohenlinden lay between the imperial army and the position which Moreau had taken up. It could only be reached by two great roads through the forest of thick pine trees, and by cross-roads rendered almost impassable by the snows and storms of a winter that had now set in. To describe this great battle on the difficult ground between the Iser and the Inn is a task for voluminous historians. The general reader will derive more vivid impressions from the spirited poem of Campbell than from all the exactness of strategic details. He will call to mind the picture of the evening, when "all bloodless lay th' untrodden snow"—of the beat of drum "at dead of night"—of the morning when the level sun scarce "can pierce the war-clouds rolling dun"—of the deepening contest between "furious Frank and fiery Hun;"

> "Few, few shall part where many meet;
> The snow shall be their winding-sheet."

On that 3d of December the victory of Moreau was decisive. The French lost four thousand men; the imperialists lost a far greater number, besides fifteen thousand prisoners and all their artillery. Moreau pursued the Archduke John, and was on the road to Vienna. The archduke proposed an armistice, which was concluded on the 26th of December, the emperor engaging to negotiate separately for peace. Great Britain had released him from his pledge. The peace of Luneville was completed on the 9th of February, 1801.*

CHAPTER CXCIX.

Commencement of the nineteenth century—Parliament opened—The king's opposition to concessions to the Catholics of Ireland—Mr. Pitt resigns in consequence—Mr. Addington prime minister—The king again becomes insane—The northern powers form a treaty of armed neutrality—Expedition against Denmark—The naval battle of Copenhagen—Nelson's victory—An armistice concluded—Assassination of the Emperor Paul—Expedition to Egypt—Battle of Alexandria and death of Abercrombie—The French evacuate Egypt—Preliminaries of peace with France—Negotiations of Lord Cornwallis at Amiens—Diplomatic disputes and difficulties—The peace of Amiens concluded.

A New Century! The commencements of another year, of another decade, of another century, are rarely marked by any corresponding changes in the affairs of nations; but they are suggestive of comparisons with other similar eras. At the commencement of the eighteenth century it has been estimated, upon the imperfect data of the registers of births and burials, that England and Wales contained a population of about five millions and a half. At the commencement of the nineteenth century a census of the people had been taken, and it was found that England and Wales contained about nine millions. At the commencement of the eighteenth century William III., from his death-bed, recommended the completion of a firm and entire union between England and Scotland; and within seven years the Act of Union was passed. At the commencement of the nineteenth century the union between Great Britain and Ireland was perfected; and on the 22d of January, 1801, the first session of the first parliament of the United Kingdom commenced by the election of the speaker. At the commencement of the eighteenth century William III. accomplished the grand alliance of the powers of Europe against the ambitious designs of the despotic head of the French monarchy. At the commencement of the nineteenth century George III. was the sole sovereign of Europe who had not succumbed to the military despotism of the French republic. The two centuries seem separated by a vast chasm. History bridges over the gulf, and, rightly considered, shows how one series of events is essentially connected with a preceding series—how great moral causes are ever steadily moulding the future of mankind, while the reign of violence and injustice endures but for a season.

The session was opened on the 2d of February by a speech from the throne. The king expressed his satisfaction at availing himself of the advice and assistance of the Parliament of the United Kingdom at a crisis so important. "This memorable era, distinguished by the accomplishment of a measure calculated to augment and consolidate the strength and resources of the empire"—"this happy union, which by the blessing of Providence has now been effected"—such were the vague congratulations in which the intentions of the government toward Ireland were studiously veiled. Mr. Grey said, "I should indeed have augured more favorably of that union, had I found that the speech from the throne contained a recommendation (as it was reported it would do) to consider of taking off those disabilities to which the Catholics of Ireland are subject." What was then impossible to be explained is now matter of historical record. On the 1st of February Mr. Pitt wrote to the king a letter expressive of his regret, knowing his majesty's sentiments on that subject, to find himself under the absolute necessity of submitting to him that he felt a strong opinion, in concurrence with a majority of the cabinet, that it would be expedient to repeal the laws which exclude Catholics from parliament and from offices, as well as the laws which exclude Dissenters from offices. Mr. Pitt added that he would endeavor, as far as could depend upon him, to keep the matter from being agitated, or to effect the postponement of the measure, provided his majesty would engage to avoid expressing his opinion so as to influence others in their conduct.* On the 2d of February the king replied to Mr. Pitt, stating his determined resolution not to acquiesce in an alteration of the laws respecting Catholics and Dissenters, conceiving himself bound by his coronation oath to support those laws. The king added that, as he had never been in the habit of concealing his sentiments on important occasions, he would enter into no engagement to act otherwise now; still trusting, however, that Mr. Pitt would not leave him while he lived.† The king, before he received the letter of Mr. Pitt, was perfectly aware that the matter had been discussed in the cabinet several months previous. It was an opportunity for intriguing statesmen to violate the confidence reposed in them as members of the government, and to enrol themselves among that dangerous body which stood between a prime minister and his constitutional responsibility, under the title of "the king's friends." Lord Loughborough, the chancellor, was of this number. On the 13th of December he placed in the king's hands an elaborate argument in opposition to "the very able paper on the question of admitting Catholics to a full participation of all the privileges of subjects."‡ Lord Loughborough refers to "the very able paper" as "the paper of Lord C." (Castlereagh). There was a confederate with the wily chancellor, according to the well-founded belief of that time. "We learn," says the biographer of Lord Sidmouth, "from published records, that he (Loughborough), in conjunction with Lord Auckland, first made his majesty acquainted with the intentions of the cabinet respecting the Roman Catholics, through the Archbishop of Canterbury." The king afterward made no secret of his opinions: "At the levee on Wednesday, the 28th of January, his majesty said to Dundas, 'What is this that this young lord has brought over, which they are going to throw at my head?' . . . 'I shall reckon any man my personal enemy who proposes any such measure. The most Jacobinical thing I ever heard of.' 'You'll find,' said Dundas, 'among those who are friendly to that measure, some you never supposed your enemies.'"§ It appears from the diary of Lord Colchester (Abbot), that he was informed by the speaker that "on Thursday last (January 29th) the king

---

* See the Chronological Table of Treaties at the end of the next chapter.

* Rose, "Diaries and Correspondence," vol. i. p. 288.

† Ibid., p. 289.

‡ See "The Lord Chancellor's Reflections on the Proposal from Ireland"—indorsed by the king as received on the 14th of December, in the Appendix to Life of Sidmouth, vol. i.

§ Wilberforce's "Diary," Life, vol. iii. p. 7.

had come to an explanation with his ministers, who had pledged themselves, without his participation, for granting to the Irish Catholics a free admission to all offices and seats in parliament; and for repealing the Test Act, etc.; and some project upon tithes that they had persisted in, and he had peremptorily refused to agree, saying that it was a question not of choice but of duty, and that he was bound by his coronation oath. That on Friday evening he had sent for the speaker, and desired him to undertake the conduct of affairs." * Dundas had gone to the king on the 1st of February, and had explained to him that on the view of the coronation oath taken by the majority of the cabinet, they held that it referred to the executive action of the sovereign, and not to his legislative action. The king exclaimed, "None of your Scotch metaphysics, Mr. Dundas." On the 3d of February Mr. Pitt replied to the letter of the king, urging the impossibility of his continuing in his majesty's service, knowing that his majesty would influence the conduct of others on the Catholic question; and he requested the king to make an arrangement as soon as he conveniently could, assuring his majesty that he would give his best assistance to the new government. The king replied that he would endeavor to make a new arrangement as soon as possible.† We have seen that his majesty had taken the speaker into his confidence from the first. The king's request to him that he would "open Mr. Pitt's eyes on the danger arising from agitating this improper question," had been made in vain.‡ On the 5th of February Mr. Addington had accepted the charge of forming a new administration. He did this "with the concurrence of Mr. Pitt, who wished all his private and personal friends to remain in office."§ "I am convinced," says Rose, "that there was from the beginning an eagerness in Mr. A. to catch at the situation." On the 8th of February Mr. Canning told Lord Malmesbury that Pitt had pressed him to remain in, but that his mind was made up to retire. "He confessed he had been one of those who had strongly advised Pitt not to yield on this occasion, in the closet. That for several years (three years back) so many concessions (as he called them) had been made, and so many important measures overruled, from the king's opposition to them, that government had been weakened exceedingly; and if on this particular occasion a stand was not made Pitt would retain only a nominal power, while the real one would pass into the hands of those who influenced the king's mind and opinion out of sight."‖ The experience of forty years had not taught the king to avoid the first great error of his reign. There was one man whose active participation in the accomplishment of the union, and his sound knowledge of the condition of Ireland, enabled him clearly to see the danger that would arise from the king's narrow and egoistical view of one of the greatest questions of philosophical statesmanship. He writes, on the 17th of February, "After having, as I thought, nearly accomplished the settlement of this devoted country in peace and tranquillity, and rendered Ireland a powerful bulwark for the security of Britain, an unexpected blast from St. James's has overset me, and has added grievously to the perils which have of late surrounded us and threatened to overwhelm us."¶

It was as late as the 14th of March that the king received from Mr. Pitt the resignation of his office, and that Mr. Addington received the seals as first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer. There had been an interregnum. The king had again become insane. On the 17th of February rumor said that the king had got a bad cold. On the 19th he could not be disturbed. On the 22d he was getting worse—"Fatal consequence," says Malmesbury, "of Pitt's hasty resignation." On that day the Prince of Wales said to Calonne, "Do you know that my father is as mad as ever?" * The old intrigues in expectation of a regency were renewed. The prince was again ready to grasp "the likeness of a kingly crown." But on the 7th of March the king was "recovered in mind as well as in body;" and the people made the most earnest demonstrations of their joy and their attachment to their old sovereign. The people were not very far advanced in political intelligence. They could scarcely look at a state question except through the medium of their passions and prejudices; and the king had therefore their hearty sympathies in refusing to concur in a measure of justice to those whose very names stirred up the bitter animosities of past generations, to be reproduced, not in cruel penal statutes, but in a denial of equal rights to their fellow-subjects. The king directed Dr. Willis to announce his recovery to Pitt, Addington, Loughborough, and Eldon. To Pitt he directed Willis to write or say thus: "Tell him I am now quite well, quite recovered from my illness; but what has he not to answer for who is the cause of my having been ill at all?" Pitt, says Malmesbury, in his answer "by Willis," which answer "was most dutiful, humble, and contrite, said he would give up the Catholic question." †

The new ministry was in office. Mr. Addington had succeeded Mr. Pitt as premier; Lord Eldon had succeeded Lord Loughborough as chancellor. Loughborough had gained nothing by his intrigues, except the privilege of flattering the king in his casual visits to Windsor. Lord Grenville was replaced as foreign secretary by Lord Hawkesbury; Mr. Dundas, secretary of state, made way for Lord Hobart; Mr. Windham, secretary of war, was superseded by Mr. Yorke. Canning promised Pitt that he would not laugh at the speaker's appointment to the treasury. The substitution of respectable mediocrities in the great offices held by Grenville, Dundas, and Windham, was not likely to bring his sarcastic powers more under the control of his prudence.

In the royal speech at the opening of the session, on the 2d of February, it was announced that the court of Petersburg had concluded a convention, with the courts of Copenhagen and Stockholm, for establishing a new code of maritime law, inconsistent with the rights and hostile to the interests of this country. The king, therefore, had taken the earliest measures to repel the aggressions of this hostile confederacy. On the previous 16th of December a treaty of armed neutrality had been ratified between Russia, Denmark, and Sweden, upon the principle that neutral flags protect neutral bottoms. To the remonstrances of the British government, the Emperor Paul answered by causing an embargo to be laid on all British vessels in his ports. On the 14th of January a proclamation was issued by Great Britain, authorizing reprisals, and laying an embargo on all Russian, Swedish, and Danish vessels. In a treaty of amity and commerce made in September, 1800, between France and the United States of America, it was stipulated that the flag should protect the cargo. The previous conduct of France to America had been grounded upon the most arbitrary assertion of the old maritime law of Europe. England had relaxed the strictness of the right of search and of blockade in some exceptional instances. France had now a direct interest in encouraging the northern powers in an armed resistance to that system of maritime law which England generally upheld; for the navies of France had been swept from the seas, and she could only obtain articles "contraband of war" through the ships of the northern powers and other maritime neutrals, such as Prussia. Hostilities against these powers was a measure of national safety. An expedition to the Baltic had been planned and organized before the resignation of the Pitt ministry. Another expedition, whose destination was Egypt, had also been planned upon a magnificent scale—that of the united action of a body of troops under General Abercrombie, of a detachment from India, and of an armament promised by the Grand Seignior. During the ministerial crisis of suspense, and after the change of government, there was no relaxation in the progress of these warlike demonstrations. On the 10th of December Abercrombie had sailed from Malta in a fleet which carried seventeen thousand British troops, and had arrived in the Levant in the beginning of February, where he found that the success of his

* "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. i. p. 222. We quote this passage literally, even to the punctuation, from the recently published "Diary of Lord Colchester." The passage is quoted from the MS. diary in Dr. Pellew's "Life of Lord Sidmouth," but with an important variation. There it is printed thus: "for granting to the Irish Catholics a free admission to all offices, and to seats in parliament, and for repealing the Test Act, and some project upon tithes; that they had persisted, and the king had peremptorily refused to agree." (Vol. i. p. 311.) This is very different from "some project upon tithes that they had persisted *in*." If Mr. Abbot's Diary is accurately edited by his son, Lord Colchester, the ministers only "persisted in" some project for tithes—a project which Mr. Pitt had advocated in the parliamentary discussions upon the union. (See "Parliamentary History," vol. xxxiv., col. 272.)

† Rose, vol. i. p. 290. ‡ "Life of Sidmouth," vol. i. p. 286.

§ Rose, vol. i. p. 292. ‖ Malmesbury, "Diaries," vol. iv. p. 4.

¶ Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 338.

Malmesbury, vol. iv. p. 21. † Ibid., p. 34.

operations must depend upon himself alone. On the 12th of March a fleet of eighteen sail of the line, with frigates and smaller vessels, left Yarmouth roads for the Baltic, under the command of Admiral Sir Hyde Parker, with Lord Nelson as vice-admiral. Both these expeditions were successful, and their success gave *éclat* to the early days of the Addington administration—although the honor, whatever it might be, of their conception rested with the predecessors of "*my own* chancellor of the exchequer," as the king rejoiced to call his new minister.

On the 21st of March the English fleet was in the Kattegat. Mr. Vansittart, who had come with the expedition as an envoy, had gone to Copenhagen in a frigate, with a flag of truce, to see if war could be averted by negotiation. He brought back an answer of defiance on the 23d. The question then arose, whether Copenhagen should be attacked by the fleet proceeding by the passage of the Belt or by the passage of the Sound. Nelson was impatient of delay, and said to the admiral, "Let it be by the Sound, or by the Belt or any way, so that we lose not an hour." The Danes had been working most assiduously at their defences, while Vansittart was negotiating and Parker was hesitating. M. Thiers suggests that the admiral was chosen because he was old and experienced, and knew how to conduct himself under difficult circumstances; that the vice-admiral was placed at his side, in case it were necessary to fight, for that Nelson was only fit to fight.* The issue of this great contest will show us what Nelson was fit for. Orders were at last given to pass the Sound as soon as the wind would permit. At daybreak on the 30th the signal for sailing was given. In order of battle, Nelson leading the van, the fleet prepared to force the passage to the Baltic between the coast of Denmark and the coast of Sweden—the famous passage where every ship, from a far-gone time, had been compelled to lower her topsails and pay toll at Elsinore. The Danish side of the passage was guarded by Cronenburg Castle. On the Swedish side, at Helsenburg, separated in this, the narrowest part, by a distance of about three miles, there were no defences capable of resistance. The British fleet kept within a mile of the Swedish shore, and the guns of Cronenburg Castle were harmless. The whole fleet anchored at noon above the island of Huën, about fifteen miles from Copenhagen. The defences were surveyed, and being found very formidable, a council of war was held in the evening. Nelson opposed all arguments for delay, and offered to conduct the attack with ten sail of the line and all the smaller vessels. Parker assigned him twelve sail of the line. But there were other perils than that of the fire of the enemy. The approach to Copenhagen was by an intricate and dangerous channel, and the Danes had removed or misplaced the buoys. Nelson, on the night of the 30th, proceeded himself in his boat to survey and re-buoy the outer channel. He was then meditating an attack from the eastward. This plan was changed; and on the morning of the 1st of April the fleet took up another position off the north-western extremity of the Middle Ground, a shoal which extends along the whole sea-front of Copenhagen, leaving an intervening channel about three quarters of a mile wide. Close to the city the Danes had moored their ships. They had six sail of the line and eleven floating batteries, besides small vessels. Their line of defence nearest the town was flanked by two formidable works called the Crown Batteries. In the forenoon of the 1st Nelson again reconnoitred the Danish position, and upon his return gave the signal to weigh. At about eight o'clock the ships dropped anchor, having coasted along the edge of the Middle Ground. Their anchorage was distant about two miles from the southernmost ship of the Danish line. Captain Hardy was employed in soundings far into the night. When he reported that there was sufficient depth of water there was no more sleep for the impatient vice-admiral. He was at work till morning with his clerks, preparing his orders for this day's terrible duty.

"It was ten of April morn by the chime:
As they drifted on their path
There was silence deep as death;
And the boldest held his breath,
For a time." †

Well might the bravest have some doubts. The pilots had been ordered on board Nelson's ship. They were mostly mates of vessels in the Baltic trade. Their indecision perplexed and irritated the vice-admiral. He said afterward that Heaven only knew what he must have suffered: if any merit attached to him, it was for combating the dangers of the shallows in defiance of these pilots, who only wanted to keep their own heads clear of shot. The Edgar led the way. "The Agamemnon could not weather the shoal of the Middle, and was obliged to anchor. . . . The Bellona and Russell grounded. . . . These accidents prevented the extension of the line by the three ships." * The mistakes of the pilots led to the disasters of the Bellona and Russell; for they had said that the water shoaled on the larboard shore. Nelson came next to these ships, in the Elephant. He repaired the error, and led all the vessels astern of him safely on the starboard side. † Captain Fremantle followed him in the Ganges. This officer says, "I dropped my anchor in the spot Lord Nelson desired me from the gangway of the Elephant. In passing the line, my master was killed, and my pilot had his arm shot off, so that I was obliged to carry the ship in myself, and I had full employment on my hands." ‡ By half-past eleven the action had become general. Nine ships of the line only could take part in it. The diminution of Nelson's available force by one fourth caused those who were in the action to suffer more from the enemy's ships and batteries. Captain Riou, with six frigates and sloops, was to assist in the attack of the ships at the mouth of the harbor. "These accidents," writes Nelson, "threw the gallant and good Captain Riou under a very heavy fire: the consequence has been the death of Captain Riou, and many brave officers and men in the frigates and sloops." § Admiral Parker, when the cannonade had lasted three hours, seeing how little progress to the scene of action had been made by three ships which he had sent as a reinforcement, gave the signal for discontinuing the engagement. That signal was No. 39. Nelson continued to walk the deck without appearing to notice the signal. "Shall I repeat it?" said the signal-lieutenant. "No. Acknowledge it." He turned to the captain: "You know, Foley, I have only one eye. I can't see it," putting his glass to his blind eye. ‖ "Nail my signal for close action to the mast," cried Nelson. Poor Riou saw the admiral's signal, and was killed as he hauled off from the tremendous fire to which he was exposed. About two the firing ceased along nearly the whole of the Danish line. But the vessels that had struck their flags fired on the boats that went to take possession of them. Fremantle says, "When the ships abreast of the Elephant and Ganges were completely silenced, Lord Nelson desired me to go to him. He was in his cabin, talking to some Danish officers out of one of the ships captured, saying how anxious he was to meet the Russians, and wished it had been them instead of Danes we had engaged. At this time he put into my hand a letter, which he meant immediately to send to the Crown Prince of Denmark in a flag of truce." It was the famous letter which he would not seal with a wafer, calling for wax and a candle, saying, "This is no time to appear hurried and informal:" "Vice-admiral Lord Nelson has been commanded to spare Denmark when she no longer resists. The line of defence which covers her shores has struck to the British flag; but if the firing is continued on the part of Denmark, he must set on fire all the prizes he has taken, without having the power of saving the brave men who have so nobly defended them." Fremantle says, "At this time he was aware that our ships were cut to pieces, and it would be difficult to get them out." A Danish superior officer appeared in about half an hour with a note from the crown prince, desiring to know the particular object of sending the flag of truce. Nelson wrote, that his object was humanity; that he consented that hostilities should cease; that he would take his prisoners out of the vessels, and burn or carry off his prizes as he should think fit; concluding with saying that he should consider this the greatest victory he had ever gained, if it should effect a reconciliation between his own sovereign and the King of Denmark. The firing having ceased entirely, Nelson lost not a moment in endeavoring to get out of his dangerous position

* "Le Consulat et l'Empire," livre ix.
† Campbell, "Battle of the Baltic."

* Nelson's Dispatch, "London Gazette."
† See, for these nautical details, James's "Naval History," which is more accurate in these matters than Southey's "Life of Nelson."
‡ Letter, dated April 4th, in "Court and Cabinets," etc., vol. iii. p. 151. § Dispatch. ‖ Southey, "Life of Nelson."

among the shoals. "We cut our cables and ran out," writes Fremantle. "The ships were so crippled they would not steer. The Elephant and Defiance both ran on shore. We ran on shore, and the Monarch." There were six sail of the line and a frigate fast on shore before the batteries ceased firing. Nelson left the Elephant, and went to his admiral in the London, following the Danish adjutant-general, who had gone to the flag-ship to negotiate for terms. It was agreed that there should be a suspension of hostilities for four-and-twenty hours. During the night the boats of Sir Hyde Parker's division were employed in getting the grounded ships afloat, and in bringing out the prizes.

This great battle was fought on Good Friday. The next day Nelson went on shore, as arranged, for an interview with the crown prince. The accounts of Nelson's reception by the Danish people, on his way to the palace, differ. "There were neither murmurs nor acclamations," says Southey. Nelson himself told Fremantle that "he was hailed with cheers by the multitude, who came to receive him at the water-side." Some consider the cheers as a tribute to Nelson's humanity in sparing the conquered in the prizes, when he might have destroyed them. Fremantle attributes the popular feeling to distaste of the quarrel with England: "The populace are much in our favor, and the merchants already feel the total want of commerce." After a negotiation which lasted five days, an armistice for fourteen weeks was agreed upon. The Danish government wanted an armistice for a shorter period, for Nelson said plainly that he required a long term that he might act against the Russian fleet. He finally prevailed. The Danish prisoners and the wounded were sent on shore, to be credited to the account of Great Britain in the event of renewed hostilities. The prizes, with the exception of one sixty-four, were burned. The stores found in the captured vessels enabled our fleet to be refitted. Nelson went off to the Baltic to look for the Russians; but a sudden event had changed the temper of the Court of St. Petersburg. The Emperor Paul had been assassinated.

The Czar of Russia was of a violent nature, bordering on insanity, if he were not really mad. From being one of the fiercest haters of the French Revolution he had suddenly become an idolator of Bonaparte. Russia had sent her armies under Suwarroff to fight in the cause of the allied powers in 1799. In 1800 Paul declared war against England and burned her merchant vessels. The suspension of the interchange of Russian products with British manufactures was fatal to the interests of the Russian proprietors of the soil. When they remonstrated Paul threatened them with Siberia. Exile after exile was hurried away; the prisons were filled; executions were frequent; till the greatest and most powerful of the aristocracy began to think that their own safety could only be secured by the one terrible defence of enslaved populations against the caprices of their tyrants. His ministers, his wife, his children, were not safe from his fury. The palace in which he lived was guarded as a fortress. On the night of the 23d of March the conspirators, by virtue of their military rank, obtained admission; and the czar was murdered in his bedroom. Bonaparte had the almost incredible meanness to promulgate in the *Moniteur* that the English government was to be suspected of this crime. The death of Paul destroyed one of his projects for the ruin of England. It broke up the adhesion of Russia to the Northern Treaty of Armed Neutrality; Sweden made no hostile demonstrations; and the armistice with Denmark was followed up by a general convention in which all the disputes were adjusted.

The French army in Egypt, when left by Bonaparte under the command of Kléber, had contended with very partial success against the Turks, under the command of the grand vizier, assisted by an English fleet commanded by Sir Sidney Smith. The allies recovered the fortress of El Arish; and Kléber, left with a force which he felt to be unequal to the retention of the country, agreed to evacuate Egypt, by a treaty sighed at El Arish in January, 1800. One of the conditions was that the French troops should return without molestation to Europe. The British government refused to ratify the treaty; and Kléber renewed the war with increased vigor. He achieved victories over the troops of the grand seignior, which appeared to give the French secure possession of the country which they now expected that they should colonize. On the 14th of June, 1800, this most able of the French generals was assassinated at Cairo by a fanatic, and the command fell to General Menou. The expedition under General Abercrombie was undertaken through the vigorous determination of Mr. Pitt to make one strenuous effort for the expulsion of the French. On the 2d of March the English fleet anchored in the bay of Aboukir—the scene of Nelson's great victory. Beneath the waters of that bay the hulk of l'Orient lay engulfed, and was touched by the cable of a ship of that armament that now came to finish the work of the 1st of August. It was two o'clock on the morning of the 8th of March before a debarkation could be attempted. Five thousand five hundred troops first left their transports, and proceeded in a hundred and fifty boats toward the castle of Aboukir and the sand-hills where the French were posted. The sailors steadily rowed on; the soldiers sat unmoved; while showers of ball fell among them and all around them. The loss was considerable; but on went this first division in unbroken array. The shore was reached almost simultaneously by all the boats; the men jumped out into the surf, and were quickly charging up the sand-hills. A second party landed in the same style; and then a third. Bertrand, a French general at St. Helena, said that the landing of the first division was like a movement on the opera stage—in five or six minutes five thousand five hundred men stood in battle array.* The French retired, but our gallant fellows had five hundred killed or wounded. During the day Abercrombie completed the landing of the remaining divisions of his army. But it was not so easy to land the cannon and stores. It was necessary also to invest the castle of Aboukir. It was the 12th before the British general advanced. On the 13th a severe action took place, in which our loss was considerable. On the 19th the main armies of the two nations were in strong positions near Alexandria. Their numbers were nearly equal. Early in the morning of the 21st the French infantry under Lanusse commenced an attack on the British lines. Lanusse was driven back and was killed. Another column came up to renew the attack; and now the French cavalry, with Menou at their head, made a desperate charge. The famous 42d Highlanders bore the brunt of this conflict. Various were the changes of fortune through this fight, which began at daybreak and lasted till ten of the forenoon. At length Menou retreated. Early in the day Abercrombie received a wound which proved mortal. When the French cavalry charged he galloped to the spot, was unhorsed, but with his own hand the gallant soldier, who had seen sixty-two years, disarmed the enemy who had wounded him. He again mounted his horse and concealed his hurt from his faithful soldiers. When the action was over he fainted from loss of blood, was conveyed to the admiral's ship, and lingered till the 28th.

The battle of Alexandria first destroyed the belief that the British land forces were unequal to a struggle with the troops that Bonaparte had led to many a victory. The French were no longer "the Invincibles." The army of Abercrombie had lost its veteran leader; but the command did not fall into the hands of one destitute of vigor. General Hutchinson was reinforced; the Turks under the grand vizier again advanced through the desert to encounter the enemy that had so severely handled them in the previous year. They were assisted by experienced English officers. On the 20th of May Hutchinson, on the left bank of the Nile, invested Cairo, which had been strongly fortified by Kléber and Menou. The grand vizier was in force on the opposite bank. The Indian army under General Baird was daily expected to arrive from Bombay. Belliard, who commanded at Cairo, proposed to capitulate; and it was at once agreed to accept the same conditions as those of the rejected treaty of El Arish—that the French troops should be conveyed home, with their arms, baggage, and ten pieces of artillery. Many of the objects of Egyptian art, collected by the French, were to be surrendered.† Menou, who was at Alexandria, refused at first to accept the conditions for himself, but he yielded to the presence of a British force on the 27th of August. In that autumn Egypt was cleared of the French, and was restored to the dominion of the sultan.

At the period when the armed neutrality of the northern powers was broken up, chiefly by our naval preponderance, and the first successes of the British arms in Egypt had given the people some

* Quoted by Alison from Las Cases.

† The Rosetta stone, and the Sarcophagus of Alexander, now in the British Museum, were among these ancient monuments; many of which the French were ultimately allowed to take with them.

confidence in our generals and soldiers, there were negotiations for peace with France proceeding in London with great secrecy. M. Otto, a French Protestant, of some experience in diplomacy, had been in London since 1799. In August, 1800, during the suspension of arms between Austria and France, the first consul gave to "Citizen Otto, commissary of the government for the exchange of French prisoners in England, power to propose, consent to, and sign a general armistice" between the French Republic and Great Britain. The papers which related to this negotiation, which had reference also to a negotiation for peace, were laid before parliament. The negotiation was broken off, and M. Otto had little reason to think that his peace-making services would be again required, when France had compelled the peace of Luneville, and Bonaparte was proclaiming his intention immediately to invade England. Mr. Pitt, had he remained in power, would probably have rejected any pacific overtures made to Great Britain, when she stood alone in her resistance to the government whose territory was now only bounded by the Rhine; which dominated over Italy; to which Holland and Spain were vassals. Having prepared for one great effort in the Baltic and in Egypt, Pitt would have waited the result in the attitude of majestic pride. Could he have made the union with Ireland a real union, he would still have defied France, and even Europe prostrate before her. To the weak government of Addington, M. Otto could apply with more hope of success. He was in indirect communication with the first minister in May; his visits to Lord Hawkesbury were frequent during the summer. In August Bonaparte, either in bravado or with a real purpose, was threatening invasion. The French armies were, for the most part, at home, eager for employment. It was determined to invade England, not with a hundred thousand men carried over in transports, convoyed by a powerful fleet. That dream was at an end. The hundred thousand men were to come over in a flotilla of gun-brigs or rafts—flat vessels of about 200 tons, armed each with four or eight heavy guns. Such a flotilla was collected at Boulogne. Nelson was sent in August to attack this flotilla—to cut it out of the harbor. He failed. In the middle of September the best informed men did not think that there would be any suspension of hostilities. "I confess," wrote Cornwallis, who commanded the forces on the eastern coast, "that I see no prospect of peace, or of anything good." At this moment Bonaparte was pressing on the negotiations for peace. "The first consul," says Thiers, "in seeing what were the first acts of Menou, had judged the campaign lost, and he was desirous, before the dénouement that he foretold, to have a treaty signed at London. The English minister," Thiers adds, "incapable of seeing beforehand, as Bonaparte had seen, the result of events, feared some vigorous blow from the French army in Egypt, so renowned for its valor." * The preliminary articles of peace between the United Kingdom and the French Republic were signed at London, on the first of October, by Lord Hawkesbury and M. Otto. Hostilities were to cease as soon as the preliminaries should be signed and ratified, which ratification was to take place within fifteen days. Immediately after their ratification plenipotentiaries were to be named on each side, who should repair to Amiens, for the purpose of concluding a definitive treaty of peace in concert with the allies of the contracting parties.

The burst of popular enthusiasm at the news of peace was naturally somewhat extravagant. General Lauriston arrived in London with the ratification on the 10th of October. When he was proceeding with M. Otto to Whitehall, the populace took the horses from the carriage, dragged it to Downing Street, and into the park to the garden entrance to the admiralty. There stood Lord St. Vincent, who thus addressed the mob: "Gentlemen! gentlemen! (three huzzas) let me request you to be as orderly as possible, and if you are determined to drag the gentleman accompanied by M. Otto I request you to be careful and not overturn the carriage." † The mob cheered and dragged the Frenchmen home. There were illuminations in London for two nights. The rejoicings throughout the country were equally demonstrative of natural gladness that the war was at an end, no matter how. Wilberforce was at Bath, and writes in his diary, "The people intoxicated with joy here and everywhere." The king was not pleased with the peace. He wrote to Lord Eldon on the 28th of October, approving of the election of an alderman of London, for he was a loyal subject and diligent magistrate. "Such men are peculiarly suited for the present year, when, by the embarrassed situation from the trial of peace, with a turbulent and revolutionary republic, every attention of the police must be exerted to avoid the dangers and difficulties that may otherwise ensue." * The king talked more wisely to Lord Malmesbury in November. "Do you know what I call the peace? an experimental peace, for it is nothing else. But it was unavoidable." † "During October," says Malmesbury, "I observed that the people's joy, which was immoderate at first, abated, and that the more thinking and wiser part of the community began to demur as to all the certain advantages that must follow peace." The veteran negotiator did not much care whether the terms were better or worse than those which he had proposed at Lisle. Had peace, he thought, been made at Lisle, France would have been under a moderate government, desirous to consolidate the power she had attained. "The government of France, while Bonaparte remains as first consul, is like that of Persia under Kouli Khan; it knows no bounds, either moral or civil—is ruled by no principles; and to pretend to say that Bonaparte's ambition is circumscribed, or that, with the means of doing everything, he will do nothing, is talking criminal nonsense." ‡ It was not very long before all England came to Lord Malmesbury's opinion. The terms of the preliminaries were discussed in parliament. We shall briefly notice the final terms of the definitive treaty. In the debates in November Sheridan best expressed the common feeling of the nation: "This is a peace which all men are glad of, but no man can be proud of." Fox did not express the common feeling of the nation when he wrote: "Bonaparte's triumph is now complete indeed, and since there is to be no political liberty in the world, I really believe he is the fittest person to be master." §

The Marquis Cornwallis was appointed as plenipotentiary to conduct the negotiations at Amiens. A more subtle diplomatist might have been chosen, but it would have been difficult to have found one more honest. He arrived in Paris on the 7th of November. On the 10th he had an audience of Bonaparte. The first consul was gracious, inquired after the health of the king, and "spoke of the British nation in terms of great respect, intimating that as long as we remained friends there would be no interruption to the peace of Europe." Bonaparte might have thought the millennium was at hand when Cornwallis thus addressed him: "I told him that the horrors which succeeded the revolution had created a general alarm; that all the neighboring nations dreaded the contagion; that when, for the happiness of mankind, and of France in particular, he was called to fill his present station, we knew him only as a hero and a conqueror; but the good order and tranquillity which the country now enjoyed made us respect him as a statesman and a legislator, and had removed our apprehensions of having connection and intercourse with France." ‖ Cornwallis fancied that he might have had frequent interviews with the first consul, and that they could have got through the business without diplomatic delays. He soon found that he was not likely to have any such confidential communications. They had another interview; and then Cornwallis went to Amiens, to negotiate with Joseph Bonaparte, who was described by his brother as "a just and fair man." Our ambassador felt that in his two conversations with the first consul, he spoke in the tone of a king ("*Il parle en roi*"): "I would rather give up; it is hard upon me; I will take care of the Stadtholder." ¶ Bonaparte was indeed as absolute as any king. Lord Broome (the son of Cornwallis), who accompanied him, writes: "I believe Windham would find it difficult to discover any Jacobin principle in the constitution, which is certainly the most despotic that ever existed in any country." ** It would be idle for us to attempt to unravel the tangled web of the four months' diplomacy at Amiens. New demands were set up by the French, although they had originally professed to adhere to the preliminary treaty. At the end of January Cornwallis has lost confidence in the negotiations terminating happily. "What can be expected from a nation naturally overbearing and insolent, when all the pow-

* "Le Consulat et l'Empire," livre xi.
† "Annual Register," 1801, p. 32.

* Twiss, "Life of Eldon," vol. i. p. 398.
† Malmesbury, "Diaries," vol. iv. p. 65. ‡ Ibid., p. 63.
§ "Correspondence of Fox," vol. iii. p. 345.
‖ Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 390.
¶ Ibid., p. 406. ** Ibid., p. 410.

ers of Europe are prostrating themselves at its feet, and supplicating for forgiveness and future favor, except one little island, which, by land at least, is reduced to a strict and at best a very inconvenient defensive?" * In January Bonaparte had gone to Lyons, and had there accepted, from the deputies of the Cisalpine Republic, the presidency of those states—in other words, the sovereignty. Hawkesbury wrote to complain to Cornwallis of "the inordinate ambition, the gross breach of faith, and the inclination to insult Europe, manifested by the first consul on this occasion." Nevertheless, said our foreign secretary, "the government here are desirous of avoiding to take notice of these proceedings, and are sincerely desirous to conclude the peace, if it can be obtained on terms consistent with our honor." † The definitive treaty was signed on the 27th of March, without any material variation from the preliminaries. The question of Malta, upon which the war was ostensibly renewed, was left in a very ambiguous position. By the preliminary treaty it was stipulated that Malta should be evacuated by the troops of his Britannic majesty, and restored to the Order of St. John of Jerusalem. "For the purpose of rendering this island completely independent of either of the two contracting parties, it shall be placed under the guarantee and protection of a third power, to be agreed upon in the definitive treaty." This was a constant subject of contention at Amiens. The Knights of Malta were in truth a nullity. The guarantee was to be given for a scattered and bankrupt body, with a traitor as their nominal head, who had betrayed the island to the French. The end was a compromise, sure to produce a quarrel. There was no ambiguity about Great Britain surrendering all the conquests she had made in the war, except Ceylon, taken from the Dutch, and Trinidad, taken from the Spaniards. The French were to evacuate Naples and the Papal States. Egypt was to be restored to the sultan. The republic of the Seven Ionian Islands was to be recognized. The integrity of Portugal was guaranteed. The French retained all that they had acquired in Europe by the war. The balance of power, the orthodox creed of a century, had received many rude assaults; it had now become "a creed outworn."

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF TREATIES.

(Continued from volume vi. page 952.)

1787 August 18: the Turks declare war aaginst Russia.
1788 February 10: the Emperor of Germany joined Russia against Turkey.
1788 September 25: the King of France convened the states-general to assemble in January, 1789.
1790 September 27: the preliminary treaty ratified with Spain relative to Nootka Sound; definitive treaty signed on the 28th of October.
1791 July 20: *Convention of Pilnitz*, between the Emperor Leopold and the King of Prussia.
1792 April 20: the French National Assembly declared war against the Emperor of Germany.
1792 June 26: the *first coalition* against France took place, and the King of Prussia issued his manifesto.
1792 September 16: war declared against Sardinia by the French National Assembly.
1793 February 1: France declared war against Great Britain and Holland.
1793 February 9: the Duke of Tuscany acknowledged the French Republic.
1793 May 25: Spain engaged to assist Great Britain.
1793 September 3: the King of Naples declared war against the French Republic.
1793 Great Britain concluded treaties—July 14, with Prussia; August 30, with Austria; and September 26, with Portugal.
1795 February 15: the first pacification between the National Assembly of France and the Vendeans concluded.
1795 February 18: a defensive alliance entered into with Russia by Great Britain.
1795 April 5: *Peace of Basle*, between the King of Prussia and the French Republic.
1795 May 16: treaty of alliance signed at Paris, between France and the United Provinces, against England. Dutch Flanders ceded to France.
1795 July 22: peace ratified at Basle between France and Spain. Spanish St. Domingo ceded to France.
1795 November 25: *the partition of Poland* took place between Russia, Austria, and Prussia.
1796 May 15: *Treaty of Paris*, between the French Republic and the King of Sardinia, the latter ceding Savoy, Nice, the territory of Tende, and Beuil, and granting a free passage for troops through his states.
1796 August 5: the *Treaty of Berlin* ratified between Prussia and France, whereby the neutrality of the north of Germany was guaranteed.
1796 August 19: an *alliance*, offensive and defensive, concluded at *St. Ildefonso*, between France and Spain.
1796 October 6: war declared by Spain against Great Britain.
1797 February 19: *Treaty of Tolentino*, between the French Republic and the pope.
1797 April 18: preliminaries of the *Peace of Leoben* signed between Austria and France.
1797 October 17: *Treaty of Campo Formio*, between France and Austria, the latter power yielding the Low Countries and the Ionian Islands to France; and Milan, Mantua, and Modena to the Cisalpine Republic; Venice assigned to the emperor.
1797 December 9: *Congress of Radstadt* commenced its labors to treat concerning a general peace with the Germanic powers.
1798 Switzerland invaded by the French.
1798 September 12: war declared against France by the Porte, and an alliance, offensive and defensive, entered into between the latter power, Russia, and Great Britain.
1798 October 3: Naples and Sardinia commence hostilities against France.
1798 December 29: a treaty of alliance and subsidies agreed upon between Great Britain and Russia, against France.
1799 June 22: the *second coalition* against France, by Great Britain, the Emperors of Germany and Russia, part of the German Empire, the Kings of Naples and Portugal, Turkey, and the Barbary States. Conference of Radstadt broken up.
1800 June 20: a treaty of subsidies ratified at Vienna, between Austria and England, stipulating that the war should be vigorously prosecuted against France, and that neither of the contracting powers should enter into a separate peace.
1800 December 16: a *treaty of armed neutrality ratified*, between Russia, Denmark, and Sweden, at Petersburg, in order to cause their flags to be respected by the belligerent powers.
1801 February 9: *Peace of Luneville*, between the French Republic and the Emperor of Germany, confirming the cessions made by the Treaty of Campo Formio, stipulating that the Rhine, to the Dutch territories, should form the boundary of France, and recognizing the independence of the Batavian, Helvetic, Ligurian, and Cisalpine republics.
1801 March 3: war declared by Spain against Portugal.
1801 March 21: a treaty signed at Madrid between France and Spain, whereby the estates of Parma were yielded to France, who in return ceded Tuscany to the Prince of Parma, with the title of King of Etruria.
1801 March 28: a treaty of peace between France and the King of Naples, signed at Florence, by which France acquired the Isles of Elba, Piombino, and Presides.
1801 June 17: a treaty concluded between Great Britain and Russia at Petersburg.
1801 July 15: the *Concordat* between Bonaparte and Pius VII. signed at Paris.
1801 August 8: a treaty of peace concluded between Spain and Portugal.
1801 September 29: a treaty of peace signed at Madrid, between France and Portugal.
1801 October 1: preliminary articles of peace between France and England, signed at London by Lord Hawkesbury and M. Otto.
1801 October 8: a treaty of peace ratified at Paris between the Emperor of Russia and the French government.
1802 March 25: *Peace of Amiens* between Great Britain, France, Spain, and Holland.
1802 June 25: definitive treaty between France and the Ottoman Porte.

CHAPTER CC.

The peace a precarious armistice—Demands of Bonaparte—English in France—French encroachments—The king's allusion to them in his speech—French expedition to St. Domingo—Toussaint l'Ouverture—Mr. Addington's policy—Bonaparte and Lord Whitworth—Trial of Peltier—Speech of Macintosh—Despard's conspiracy—Militia called out—Violence of Bonaparte toward the British ambassador—Malta—War declared—Negotiations for Mr. Pitt's return to power—Detention in France of English travellers—Great Britain roused—Preparations for invasion—Emmet's insurrection—Rapid enrolment of volunteers—Bonaparte at Boulogne—Pitt at Walmer—The volunteers reviewed—Weakness of the Addington ministry—The king's illness—Negotiations for a change of ministry—Pitt presses for an administration on a broad basis—His failure—Pitt prime minister—Conspiracy against the first consul—Murder of the Duc d'Enghien.

LET us compare the opinions of two historians on the likelihood of the duration of peace. "The Treaty of Amiens had scarcely been signed when the restless ambition and the insupportable insolence of the first consul convinced the great body of the English people that the peace, so eagerly welcomed, was only a precarious armis-

* Cornwallis, "Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 489. † Ibid., p. 457.

tice." * We turn from the view of Macaulay to that of Thiers: "The Treaty of Amiens had been signed only a few months, and their joy at the peace had a little cooled among the English, when there remained before their eyes, as if it were a bright and troublesome light, the grandeur of France, unhappily too little disguised in the person of the first consul. Some civilities to Mr. Fox, on his visit to Paris, did not prevent their seeing that the first consul had the attitude of master, not only in the affairs of France but in the affairs of Europe. His language, full of genius and ambition, offended the pride of the English; his devouring activity disturbed their repose." † What the English historian calls "insupportable insolence," the French historian describes as "language full of genius and ambition." Two months only had passed since the conclusion of peace, when M. Otto said that if paragraphs against Bonaparte continued to appear in the English papers, there would be "war to the death." ‡ The casual conversations of M. Otto soon took the form of positive demands on the part of the first consul. They were these: To put a stop to offensive publications; to send away certain disaffected persons and transport others; to require the princes of the house of Bourbon, resident in England, to repair to Warsaw; to expel all French emigrants who may wear decorations belonging to the ancient government of France. M. Otto was told by Lord Hawkesbury that "no representation of a foreign power would ever induce government to violate those rights on which the liberties of the people of this country are founded;" that if emigrants did not break the laws they could not be molested; that the law admitted no previous restraints upon publications; and that the law alone was the only protection which the government itself possessed or required against libels. Words incomprehensible to despotism! "Alas," says M. Theirs, "the first consul descended from his glorious height to listen to pamphleteers, and to deliver himself to transports as violent as they were unworthy of him. To outrage him, the wise, the victorious, what an unpardonable crime! Torrents of blood must flow because pamphleteers, always assailing their own government, had insulted a stranger—a great man, without doubt, but a man, after all, and the chief of a rival nation." §

The session of parliament was closed on the 28th of June, and the parliament was dissolved on the following day. Mr. Speaker Abbott, in addressing the king, said, "We now indulge the flattering hope that we may cultivate the arts of peace." The country generally did not indulge that hope. The people began "at last to apprehend that neither credit, satisfaction, nor even security, had been attained by the Treaty of Amiens." ‖ Yet there was a feeling among the higher and richer classes more intense than dread of the ambition or indignation at the arrogance of Bonaparte:

> "Is it a reed that's shaken by the wind,
> Or what is it, that ye go forth to see?
> Lords, lawyers, statesmen, squires of low degree,
> Men known, and men unknown; sick, lame, and blind,
> Post forward all, like creatures of one kind,
> With first-fruit offerings crowd to bend the knee
> In France, before the new-born majesty." ¶

Much of the rush to France was a natural curiosity. Certainly among many there were higher motives in the desire to look upon a country in which ten years had produced such marvellous changes, than a slavish admiration of irresponsible power. And yet Romilly, who was in Paris in September, had a kindred feeling with the poet who had seen France,

> "When faith was pledged to new-born liberty."

"Talleyrand sent me word, by Charles Fox, that I might be presented to-day (anniversary of the republic) to the first consul, together with Erskine, at his levée at the Tuileries. I had been disgusted at the eagerness with which the English crowded to do homage at the new court of a usurper and a tyrant, and I made an excuse." Bonaparte had then become consul for life, with power to choose his successor. "A more absolute despotism," says Romilly, "than that which now exists here, France never experienced." The police was never so vigilant; there was no freedom of discussion; the press was never so restrained; all English newspapers were prohibited; spies were in every society; all this machinery of despotism was carried on in the name of liberty and equality. The despotism was endured and even coveted, for it "is a sort of paradise, compared with the agitation, the perpetual alarm, the scenes of infamy and bloodshed which accompanied the pretended liberties of France." *

When the session of the new parliament was opened on the 23d of November there was something ominous in the king's speech. In his intercourse with foreign powers he had been actuated by a sincere disposition for the maintenance of peace; but it was nevertheless impossible to lose sight of that established and wise system of policy by which the interests of other states are connected with our own. "I cannot, therefore," continued the king, "be indifferent to any material change in their relative condition and strength." During the progress of the negotiations at Amiens, Bonaparte had become the dictator of the Cisalpine Republic. After the conclusion of the peace, the first consul, to use the sugared words of M. Theirs, "exercising in Switzerland his beneficent dictation, sent an army to Berne." The government of Mr. Addington made a mild remonstrance, which was answered by Bonaparte asserting that the King of England "had no right to complain of the conduct or to interfere with the proceedings of France, on any point which did not form a part of the stipulations of the Treaty of Amiens." † In September Piedmont was formally annexed to the French territory. The first consul had stipulated with the Batavian Republic that he would withdraw the French auxiliary troops on the conclusion of the definitive treaty. At the end of October the British minister at the Hague reported that 11,000 French soldiers were halted on the Dutch frontiers, and that their pay and maintenance was demanded from the Batavian government. It was time that the recommendation in the king's speech should be attended to—that the means of security for preserving peace should be adopted. These means were represented by a vote for 129,000 land forces and 50,000 seamen and marines. The necessity for an additional military establishment was supported by the statement that France had a total regular force of 427,000 men, and altogether had at command 929,000 men. ‡ The vote for additional seamen was urged as an imperious necessity, required on account of "a large armament being fitted out in the ports of a rival nation." Mr. Windham said of the French, "Their temple of liberty is transformed into the temple of Mars." § In the debates on these estimates Mr. Fox held that, "with regard to the views of Bonaparte, he saw no reason why, having gained great military glory, his ambition might not now induce him to turn his attention to the improvement of the commerce of his country." Previous to the debate on the army estimates, Fox wrote to Sheridan, "I am very much against your abusing Bonaparte, because I am sure it is impolitic both for the country and ourselves. But as you please; only, for God's sake, peace." ‖

There is an entry in Mr. Wilberforce's Diary of the 3d of February, 1803, which has reference to an unreported debate of that day when parliament reassembled after the recess: "House of Commons. Busy about our helping Bonaparte with ships for St. Domingo." The help was given by British merchants, who had agreed to let out their ships to the French to carry over troops and stores to that island, which was struggling for the freedom of the blacks. Addington was cool about this transaction, and half defended it. Pitt reprobated what Wilberforce describes as a monstrous crime. While the negotiations at Amiens were proceeding, the French government was preparing an expedition upon the largest scale for the destruction of the government in St. Domingo, where, after a long struggle, the military genius and the political sagacity of Toussaint l'Ouverture had succeeded in establishing the civil and military dominion of free negroes, of which government he was the undisputed head. ¶ The English ministry made some remonstrance against the formidable outfit of the French expedition, but the first consul said that "we were materially interested in the reduction of Tous-

* Macaulay, "Biographies"—Pitt, p. 217.
† Thiers, "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tom. xvii. p. 845. 1860.
‡ "Life of Sidmouth," vol. ii. p. 153.
§ "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tom. xvii. p. 846.
‖ Malmesbury, "Diary," May to October, 1802.
¶ Wordsworth, Sonnet, 1802.

* Romilly, "Diary," October, 1802.
† Declaration of the British Government, 18th of May, 1803.
‡ Debate on the Army Estimates, December 8.
§ "Parliamentary History," vol. xxxvi. col. 1096.
‖ Moore, "Life of Sheridan," p. 599, quarto ed.
¶ See *ante*, p. 990.

saint's power, who would otherwise establish in the West Indies a piratical state."* The French republican government had in 1794 issued a proclamation emancipating the slaves. Toussaint became from that time a supporter of France, and in 1796 was appointed commander-in-chief of the armies of St. Domingo. He manifested his confidence in the French by sending his children to be educated in Paris. By the time Bonaparte had assumed the reins of power, Toussaint had reduced St. Domingo to a condition of tranquillity, and had exercised a strict but just sway, which allowed the agriculture and commerce of the great island to attain some degree of their ancient prosperity. In 1801 the leading chiefs, in a constitution which they formed, appointed Toussaint president and governor for life. He apprised Bonaparte of his new dignity in a letter beginning, "The first of blacks to the first of whites." This was probably held an assumption not to be endured. The expedition was instantly prepared, and a fleet of nearly a hundred and forty vessels, with twenty-one thousand troops, sailed on the 14th of December, 1801. When this great force appeared off the island, Toussaint was disheartened. He nevertheless resisted for some time, until some of his generals were won over by the generals of Bonaparte, on receiving promises of honors and rewards. Toussaint resisted, because he knew that the object of the French was to re-establish slavery, as they had done in Guadaloupe. He was finally compelled to submit; but he refused to accept any authority at the hands of those who brought fetters for his African brethren. He retired to his farm in the mountains, where he remained for two months. But, being invited to a conference with the French generals, he left his retreat, was arrested, and with his wife and children was taken on board a vessel of war and carried to Brest. He was finally immured in the castle of Joux, near Besançon, was subjected to the most frightful severities; and died there on the 27th of April, 1803.† The death of Toussaint produced a deep impression in England. The abolition of the slave trade had been agitated in every recent session of parliament, and the fate of the heroic negro was ever in men's minds when they thought of the wrongs of his race. In his treatment, in the name of liberty and equality, they saw that magnanimity formed no portion of the nature of the first consul.

Since the conclusion of the peace Mr. Addington had endured a good deal of reproach as a man incompetent to direct the affairs of the country at a crisis of great difficulty and danger. He was held to be too timid in his dealings with France. On the 19th of February he told Lord Malmesbury that his maxim was "to resist or bear all clamor and invective at home till such time as France (and he ever foresaw it must happen) had filled the measure of her folly, and had put herself completely in the wrong."‡ That time the minister thought had arrived. Bonaparte had published in the "Moniteur" of the 30th of January a report of Colonel Sebastiani, who had been sent by him to explore Egypt and Syria. This report stated that with a few thousand men France might easily reconquer Egypt; that the people were in love with the French and hated the English; and that the inhabitants of the Ionian Islands were ready to declare for the French. Addington told Malmesbury that the cabinet, in consequence of this report, had directed Lord Whitworth, our ambassador, to declare that the first consul's views on Egypt were now made manifest; that his intention of annulling the republic of the Seven Islands was also demonstrated; that every part of the report betrayed views of hostile aggrandizement as regarded Great Britain; and that until a full and unequivocal explanation was given, the fulfilment of the article of the Treaty of Amiens respecting Malta could not be expected. This dispatch to Lord Whitworth went on the 7th. On the 24th the ambassador sent an account of what had taken place at the Tuileries on the morning of the 18th. Bonaparte harangued him for two hours, Lord Whitworth in vain trying to put in a word: every wind that blew from Dover brought additional instances of our personal dislike to him; there were two French newspapers paid by us to abuse him; had we treated him with confidence and attention he was ready to have joined with us in governing the world, which, with his army and our fleet, might certainly be done; that he now saw plainly that the two countries must ever be at enmity, if not at war; that the mode in which we had taken up the affair of his officer in Egypt was injurious and unwarrantable; that he had rather see us in possession of the Faubourg St. Antoine than in possession of Malta; that he would not provoke war, but that he had an army of 400,000 men, with which he would attack us at home, command the expedition himself, run all risks, and sacrifice army after army till he succeeded. Lord Whitworth replied with calmness; noticing that the acquisitions which France had made since the peace, and those she evidently had in contemplation to make, rendered it impossible for England to remain quiet. "What," said Bonaparte, "you mean France has got Piedmont, and part of Switzerland—*deux miserables bagatelles.*"

Within a day or two of this memorable interview another cause of offence was blown by the winds over the Straits of Dover. One of the French papers published in London, *L'Ambigu*, conducted by M. Peltier, a royalist emigrant, contained many bitter reproaches and insinuations against Bonaparte. The first consul had demanded, as we have seen, that a vigor beyond the law should be exercised with regard to journals; he required that Peltier should be banished, but he was told that the law alone could give him redress. He then demanded the prosecution of Peltier by the attorney-general for "a libel on a friendly government." This was putting his complaint upon a right issue. Mr. Perceval opened the case for the crown; Mr. Macintosh defended Peltier. The jury returned a verdict for the crown, and so far Bonaparte had every reason to be satisfied with the impartiality of the English laws. But Peltier published a report of the trial, with a full translation of the speech of Macintosh, which, re-translated into other languages—and among the translators was Madame de Staël—was circulated throughout Europe, with the exception, no doubt, of France. The triumph of the first consul in the verdict of an English jury must have been a small compensation for the surpassing eloquence of an English advocate. The triumph of Bonaparte was nothing to the triumph of dispassionate Englishmen in the assertion of the majesty of the law under which they lived. Their feelings would go with the great advocate. Their judgments would go with the verdict against an unscrupulous writer, who had hinted at assassination as a remedy for the evils of tyranny. It was difficult to come to a sound conclusion, under the power of such eloquence. "Gentlemen," said Macintosh to the jury, "the real prosecutor in this case is the master of the greatest empire the civilized world ever saw. The defendant is a defenceless, proscribed exile. . . . I am to consider this as the first of a long series of conflicts between the greatest power in the world and the only free press remaining in Europe." It is impossible to give a notion of the grandeur of the speech of Macintosh. On the Stock Exchange of London it was thought that the acquittal of Peltier would be considered in France as tantamount to a declaration of war. The eloquence poured forth in his defence was in reality the manifesto of a nation, and not the formal declaration of war by a government. When all freedom of opinion had been trampled down in France, let us consider what must have been the effect in England of such words as these: "One asylum of free discussion is still inviolate. There is still one spot in Europe where man can freely exercise his reason on the most important concerns of society; where he can boldly publish his judgment on the acts of the proudest and most powerful tyrants. The press of England is still free. It is guarded by the free constitution of our forefathers. It is guarded by the hearts and arms of Englishmen, and I trust I may venture to say, that if it be to fall, it will fall only under the ruins of the British Empire." Having proceeded to describe "circumstances in the history of this country which have induced our ancestors at all times to handle, with more than ordinary tenderness, that branch of the liberty of discussion which is applied to the conduct of foreign states," the orator indirectly, but not the less distinctly, pointed to the attitude of France at the moment in which he was speaking: "When vast projects of aggrandizement are manifested, when schemes of criminal ambition are carried into effect, the day of battle is fast approaching for England. Her free government cannot engage in dangerous wars without the hearty and affectionate support of her people. A state thus situated cannot, without the utmost peril, silence those public discussions which are to point the popular indignation against those who must soon be enemies. In domestic dissensions it may sometimes be

* "Cornwallis Correspondence," vol. iii. p. 400.

† For an interesting description of this prison, see Miss Martineau's "The Hour and the Man," vol. iii. p. 258.

‡ Malmesbury, "Diaries," etc., vol. iv. p. 243.

the supposed interest of government to overawe the press. But it never can be even their apparent interest when the danger is purely foreign. A king of England who, in such circumstances, should conspire against the free press of this country would undermine the foundations of his own throne; he would silence the trumpet which is to call his people round his standard."

While the trial of Peltier was proceeding in the Court of King's Bench on the 21st of February, a fearful tragedy was enacted at the new jail in the Borough. Colonel Despard and six accomplices were executed for high treason. This was no case of constructive treason. Edward Marcus Despard, a native of Ireland, had served in our army with a bravery and good conduct to which Lord Nelson bore testimony on his trial. Toward the close of the war he had preferred some claim against government which was not attended to, had become irritated, and had so conducted himself as to be arrested, and confined in Coldbath Fields prison, until he was released by the expiration of the Act for the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus. Maddened into wild prospects of revenge, this fierce enthusiast engaged privates of the guards, and some of the humblest workmen, in a conspiracy which he said was to have the most extensive ramifications, for killing the king; for attacking the Tower; for taking possession of the bank, the public offices, and the houses of parliament. During the trial it was distinctly ascertained that there was no foreign instigation to this wild plot, and that the obscure actors, who met in low public houses, had no correspondence in any other part of the United Kingdom. The madman had seduced ignorant men to believe in him, and he and they suffered the penalty of the highest crime known to the law.

On the 8th of March a royal message was delivered to parliament, for calling out the militia, "in consequence of the preparations carrying on in the ports of France and Holland, while important discussions are subsisting between his majesty and the French government." On the 14th Lord Whitworth sent a remarkable dispatch to Lord Hawkesbury, the official publication of which in May had been anticipated by the details of all the journals of Europe, except those of France. At the court of the Tuileries on Sunday, the 13th of March, an extraordinary scene between Bonaparte and the British ambassador took place, in the presence of two hundred persons, including the foreign ministers. While the ambassadors were waiting for their audience, we are informed by M. Thiers, "the first consul was with Madame Bonaparte in her apartment, playing with the infant who was then intended to be his heir, the newly-born son of Louis Bonaparte and Hortense de Beauharnais."* The name of Lord Whitworth was announced, continues Thiers. "It produced upon the first consul a visible impression. He left the child, took abruptly the hand of Madame Bonaparte, rushed through the door which opened into the saloon of reception, passed before the foreign ministers who pressed around him, and went straight to Lord Whitworth." Then came a series of rapid interrogations and reproaches: Have you any news from England? So you are determined to go to war! No, said the ambassador, we are too sensible of the advantages of peace. You wish then for war? Lord Whitworth goes on to relate that Bonaparte "then proceeded to Count Marcow and the Chevalier Azara, who were standing together at a little distance from me, and said to them, The English wish for war, but if they are the first to draw the sword I shall be the last to sheathe it. They respect not treaties; henceforth we must cover them with black crape. He then went his round. In a few minutes he came back to me. He began again: Why armaments? Against whom are these measures of precaution? I have not a ship of the line in the ports of France. But if you desire to arm, I also will arm; if you will fight, I will fight. You may destroy France, but you cannot intimidate her." We wish neither the one nor the other, said the calm ambassador. We wish to live in a good understanding with France. "Respect treaties, then," said Bonaparte. "Woe to those who respect not treaties." There were two months more of diplomacy, but this scene at the Tuileries was the beginning of the end. "The first consul from that day swore to perish or to punish England. Fatal oath!"†

The first orders that bore upon his design to cross the strait between Dover and Calais, and to carry into England one of the armies that had conquered Europe, date from the day when he first heard of the message to parliament of the King of England.* If the first consul had been patient, if he had insisted with firmness, but with gentleness, upon the evacuation of Malta, the excuses for the non-performance of the conditions of the Treaty of Amiens would have soon given up by the feeble minister of Great Britain. So thinks M. Thiers.† This result is not very probable. The French historian holds that the English were altogether wrong, for their ambition with regard to Malta, so slightly covered by dissimulation, had become a real scandal. The first consul, he says, ought to have wholly left them in the wrong, instead of making his bursts of anger resound from one end of the world to the other.‡ France demanded a literal fulfilment of the treaty; that the island should be surrendered to the Knights of Malta. France and Spain had sequestrated the possessions of the knights. "We bound ourselves to surrender it to a known order, clothed with certain powers, and capable of exerting themselves in consequence of certain revenues. We found no such order. The men indeed and the name we found."§ This is the ostensible defence of the conduct of England as regards its morality. The truth is, we had possession of Malta, and we had learned its value, through its sagacious governor, Sir Alexander Ball. The first consul had pursued a system of aggression after we had signed away this key of the Mediterranean, which France desired to be in the hands of those who could not keep it. Malta, in itself, was not worth a war; but on the eve of a war which most men saw would be inevitable, it would have been very chivalrous to have evacuated Malta, but it may be questioned whether in that case the ministry of Mr. Addington would not have been laughed at by Bonaparte and Talleyrand for their weakness. The impolicy of the evacuation of Malta is the real defence for its retention. And thus we went to war, after a peace which had lasted one year and six weeks. On the 18th of May the declaration of war and the various documents by which the final measure was to be supported were laid upon the tables of the two houses of parliament.

It is scarcely necessary that we should enter into any minute details of the negotiations for the return of Mr. Pitt to power, in conjunction with Mr. Addington—a negotiation which had been going on during the months of March and April. There are various accounts of these negotiations, but it appears clearly that an overture to Pitt was made to him from Addington, through Lord Melville; and that it was proposed to Pitt that he should name some one to be first lord of the treasury, not receiving that situation himself, but taking the office of secretary of state, Addington being the other secretary.‖ Wilberforce tells the story of the mission of Dundas with a variation: "After dinner and port wine he began cautiously to open his proposals. But he saw it would not do, and stopped abruptly. 'Really,' said Pitt, with a sly severity, and it was almost the only sharp thing I ever heard him say of any friend, 'I had not the curiosity to ask what I was to be.'"¶ Pitt was then offered the treasury, on condition that there should be no extensive changes in other offices. Pitt stipulated that Melville, Spencer, Grenville, and Windham should be of the cabinet; that there must be a general sweep; and that the change must be made with the king's desire. Addington demurred.** The king's "own chancellor" saw his majesty on the 20th of April, and "told the story in his own way, as the king expressed resentment against Pitt, talked of his putting the crown in commission, and that he carried his plan of removal so extremely far and so high that it might reach *him*."†† Pitt would not come into office upon Addington's propositions. But he was tired, and so were his friends, of bolstering up a feeble government. The admirers of Pitt felt that a great crisis was at hand; and Canning, on a subsequent occasion, expressed what he and others had long suppressed, or conveyed only in sarcastic allusions: "Away with the cant of 'Measures, not men;' the idle supposition that it is the harness and not the horses

* Louis and Hortense (the daughter of Josephine by her first husband) were married in 1802. The infant was their first son. Louis Napoleon was the third son.

† Thiers, "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tome xvii. p. 817 (Paris, 1860).

* Thiers, "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tome iv. p. 315 (Paris, 1845).
† Ibid., tome xvii. p. 847. ‡ Ibid., tome iv. p. 314.
§ Coleridge, "Friend," Essay vi.
‖ Rose, "Diaries and Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 31.
¶ Wilberforce, "Life," vol. iii. p. 219.
** See Lord Colchester's "Diary," p. 414 to 417.
†† Malmesbury, vol. iv. p. 190.

that draw the chariot along. . . . What is the nature of the times in which we live? Look at France, and see what we have to cope with, and consider what has made her what she is—a Man." Addington remained in power during another year.

On the 23d of May there was unusual excitement with reference to the proceeding of the House of Commons. The king's message was to be taken into consideration. The strangers' gallery was filled at an early hour; and the reporters for the journals, then and long afterward, obliged to struggle for their places, were shut out. We have thus lost irrecoverably the oration of Pitt, who had been for some time absent from parliament. It is universally represented to have been one of his greatest efforts. The finest speech, says Malmesbury, he ever made—strong in support of war, but silent as to ministers. His very finest, according to Romilly: "His influence and authority in the House of Commons, shown upon the debate I have just mentioned, and still more on the day when Fox moved that the house should recommend the crown to accept the mediation of Russia, exceed all belief."* Fox said of Pitt's speech "that if Demosthenes had been present, he must have admired and might have envied."† But neither Pitt nor Fox pressed for the retirement of ministers. They did not vote for the condemnatory resolutions that were proposed, and Addington had therefore a large majority. Whoever was minister at that crisis, and would carry on the war vigorously, would have the support of the country. Bonaparte, in addition to his manifestations of bitter hostility against the British government, had committed an outrage upon British subjects which roused the national feeling. Two French vessels had been captured under English letters of marque. The first consul, under the pretence that it was contrary to the law of nations to make captures at sea before a general declaration of war, arrested ten thousand English travellers in France. The plea was a false one. The vessels were taken on the 20th of May, at which time war had been openly announced by the departure of the ambassadors of either country. He detained the English visitors in captivity till his abdication in 1814 restored most of them to their homes. "If," writes Romilly, "it had been Bonaparte's object to give strength to the British ministry, and to make the war universally popular in England, he could not have devised a better expedient." In a frenzy of passion he sent for Junot, the governor of Paris, and ordered him to take measures that all the English should be seized—the Temple, the Force, the Abbaye, (prisons) would hold them. Junot remonstrated; but he told him, with an oath, that he would show him and his other generals that he would make himself obeyed.‡

And now there was only one mind in Great Britain. "The land bristled." The spirit that was raised in France by the Duke of Brunswick was raised in England by Bonaparte. The pressure of taxation, the desire for a reformed House of Commons, the remembrances of despotic acts of the government, the sympathy with republican France—all was forgotten in the one absorbing impulse for the defence of the soil. Throughout the land went the eloquent declaration of "the merchants, bankers, traders, and other inhabitants of London," agreed to at the Royal Exchange amid the cheers of five thousand of the most eminent citizens of the greatest commercial community of the world. The declaration was written by Macintosh. The pledge of London became the common pledge of every town and city of the provinces. "We deem it our duty solemnly to bind ourselves to each other, and to our countrymen, in the most sacred manner, that we will employ all our exertions to rouse the spirit and to assist the resources of the kingdom; that we will be ready with our services of every sort, and on every occasion, in its defence; and that we will rather perish together than live to see the honor of the British name tarnished or that noble inheritance of greatness, glory, and liberty destroyed which has descended to us from our forefathers, and which we are determined to transmit to our posterity."§ To the "English commercial aristocracy, more active than the old aristocracy of the nobility," M. Thiers attributes the war. They were afraid, he says, of the competition with which they were menaced by the French, Spanish, Dutch, and Genoese flags; "the mercantile interest (*haut commerce*) of London became hostile."‖ The merchants must have kept very bad accounts, and have made very unsound calculations, to have feared the competition of France and her dependencies, when their flags could traverse the seas uninterrupted by war. In 1801, before the peace of Amiens, the official value of our exports was thirty-seven millions; in 1802, a year of uninterrupted peace, they had risen to forty-one millions; in 1803, when the peace was broken, they fell to thirty-one millions.

It had become a sort of popular tradition in France that an army might be transported from Calais to Dover in flat-bottomed boats. France, by a common movement of its departments and its towns, offered flat-bottomed boats to the government. These boats were, when unladen, to draw only three or four feet of water. Built in the interior, on the banks of the Gironde, the Loire, the Seine, the Somme, the Oise, the Scheldt, the Meuse, the Rhine, they were to descend these rivers to their mouths, and, creeping along the shores, to be united in the ports of La Manche. There they were to take on board a hundred and fifty thousand men, ten thousand horses, and four hundred pieces of ordnance.* Lord Dundonald says that Bonaparte had become aware that any number of French gunboats could sail along their own coasts, under the protection of the numerous batteries; and although it has been the custom to deride this armament, he sees no cause to doubt that it might have been successful, sooner or later.† To cross the Channel with an army, to terminate in London the rivalry of two nations, was the prodigious enterprise to which Bonaparte applied his faculties during three successive years. "So filled was he with hope that he rested, calm, confident, happy even, in preparation for an attempt which would conduct him either to be the master of the world, or to be engulfed, himself, his army, his glory, at the bottom of the ocean."‡

On the 23d of June the first consul, accompanied by Madame Bonaparte, set out to visit the coasts of the Channel from the Seine to the Scheldt. He demanded from the minister of the public treasure the diamonds of the crown, to form ornaments for his wife. He would show himself in the splendor of regality, "in all but name a king." In the autumn of 1803 his plans of invasion were becoming mature. He would attack the United Kingdom on several points at once. A portion of his army should invade Ireland from Brest. There were Irish fugitives in France with whom the first consul negotiated. He would send an expedition of eighteen thousand men, with an ample supply of arms, if they would furnish twenty thousand insurgents. Of course the fugitives were ready to promise, and to stipulate that France should not make peace with England without the independence of Ireland being a condition. The issue of the Irish insurrection of the 23d of July abated nothing of these sanguine hopes. Robert Emmet, who with his elder brother had been implicated in the rebellion, had returned to Ireland in 1802. By the death of his father he had obtained 3000*l.*, a sum which he employed in organizing a new rebellion. The peace was not at an end when young Emmet began to swear in conspirators. On the 23d of July —the government being aware that mischief was brooding—the insurrection broke out in Dublin. It was marked by an act of peculiar atrocity—the murder of the venerable Lord Kilwarden, the lord chief justice, a man of the most upright and amiable character, who came among an armed mob, in his carriage, accompanied by his daughter. The nephew of Lord Kilwarden was also murdered. The daughter escaped. The insurrection, if so it can be called, was put down in a few hours. Robert Emmet fled, with some of his misguided companions, to the Wicklow mountains; returned to take leave of the daughter of Curran, the great advocate, whose affections he had clandestinely obtained; was tried, and was executed with others whose names are forgotten. The romance of his love appears to have saved the memory of the chief conspirator from oblivion. The young men and maidens of this age ask who he was, when they hear the well-known lament of

"Oh, breathe not his name, let it sleep in the shade."

Emmet was a rash enthusiast, who stirred up a hopeless conspiracy, with no support except among the dregs of the populace. He was a Protestant, and his revolt had no reference to the disregarded claims of the majority of the Irish people. He desired to see Ireland

* Letter cxx. † Horner, "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 221.
‡ "Memoirs of the Duchesse d'Abrantes."
§ "Annual Register," 1803, p. 412.
‖ "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tome iv. p. 311.

* See Thiers, tome iv. pp. 352–3.
† "Autobiography of a Seaman," vol. i. p. 167.
‡ Thiers, tome iv. p. 368.

an independent republic ; and he depended for assistance upon that man who had trodden the liberties of republican France under the hoof of an armed despotism.

On the 26th of June Charles Yorke, the secretary at war, proposed that an army of reserve of 50,000 men should be immediately raised. Mr. Windham maintained that this was a mere addition to the militia, with all the evils of that system, one of which evils was the privilege of exemption from personal service of the man chosen by ballot who could provide a substitute. A militia could never be equal to a regular army. He preferred what he called "a Vendêan rising *en masse.*" On the 18th of July a more extensive measure was proposed by the secretary at war : that an enrolment should be made of all men in every parish between the ages of seventeen and fifty-five. These were to be divided into four classes, and, according to their ages and family condition, as indicated by the class, they were to be called out and exercised, arms being provided for them. Mr. Windham thought that powers such as those proposed by the bill should be vested in the executive government, but that government should not be in haste to make use of them till it should be seen what might be hoped from exertions purely voluntary. Fox took the course which was at once the most practical and the most patriotic. He wished that there were no compulsory provisions in the bill, of the principles of which he approved. Go round from house to house and ask who would be willing to serve their country in the hour of danger ; there would not be five refusals in five hundred ; and let those who agree to serve be immediately called forth to be instructed. "I am not attempting to give you soldiers, but armed citizens ; men whose bosoms glow with the love of their country and their connections, and who, in defence of them, would be as ready to fight an enemy as the best disciplined soldiers in the world." * Addington said that sixty thousand volunteers had already offered. When, on the 10th of August, Sheridan proposed a vote of thanks to the volunteers, it was stated that three hundred thousand had been enrolled. At the commencement of the next session a return was made of such corps as had been accepted and placed on the establishment, and the number enrolled was 379,943.

There was a prorogation of parliament for about three months. That interval of legislation was one of the most stirring periods of Britain's history. There are a hundred and twenty thousand Frenchmen encamped at Boulogne and its neighborhood. The first consul passes much of his time amid these troops. He puts them through exercises on land and on water. He gallops along the sands. He traverses the sea margin in a small boat. He writes to Cambacérès, "I have passed three days in the midst of the camp and the port. From the heights of Ambleteuse I have seen the coast of England as one sees Calvary † from the Tuileries. One can distinguish the houses and objects in motion. It is a ditch that will be leaped over, when we shall have the boldness to make the attempt." ‡ He would make the attempt in the autumn ; then he would wait till the beginning of winter ; then he would wait till February ; he would wait till a fleet with twenty thousand more men had arrived from the Texel, and eighteen thousand in a fleet from Brest. Meanwhile, according to M. Thiers, although thirty thousand Frenchmen would not have caused the English to fear, a hundred and fifty thousand led by General Bonaparte produced a shiver of terror in every class of the nation.§ Let us see how they shivered.

At Walmer Castle, near Deal, in September, October, and November, was residing William Pitt. How is the man engaged who for seventeen years had been prime minister of his country ? On the 9th of August Wilberforce wrote, "Pitt is about to take the command of three thousand volunteers, as Lord Warden. I am uneasy at it. He does not engage on equal or common terms ; and his spirit will lead him to be foremost in the battle." ‖ On the 8th of September Pitt writes to Rose that he could not go far from his post, "though we have certainly no immediate indication of any intention from the other side of the water to give us employment." In October he thinks that some attempt will be made soon. "In this situation I am likely to have my time very completely occupied by the various concerns of my regiment and my district." At the beginning of December he will be so constantly occupied all next week in going round to his different battalions that it would be impossible for him to think of going to town.* How Bonaparte would have laughed could he have seen from those heights of Ambleteuse the tall, gaunt figure of the statesman whom he most hated and dreaded, dressed in regimental scarlet, and giving the command to a few companies of awkward volunteers. He would have laughed with that full measure of contempt with which a great captain always regards unprofessional soldiers. He would have sneered with the pride of a despot at the spirit of a constitutional government which had called up the power of a people, "for freedom combating," to meet "the power of armies." The great ex-minister doing the duties of a simple citizen, amid the changes of a limited monarchy, was the embodiment of the principle of duty, as opposed to the principle of personal ambition, which knew no law but the will of the strongest. What Pitt was doing as Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports was being done by every lord lieutenant of England and of Scotland. Nearly four hundred thousand men, providing their own clothing, receiving no pay, having no privilege but what they considered an exemption from being balloted for the militia, sprang up at a word. "An imposing force," says M. Thiers, "if it had been organized." It was partially organized in a few months ; and it had this specialty in its organization, that it was not a mere military machine, but a congregation of citizens, "united as one individual soul," each of whom would fight to the death as long as there was a Frenchman in arms on the soil. Minister or mechanic, lawyer or laborer, peer or peasant, all were inspired by one spirit. The king, on Windsor Terrace, calls to the band to play "Britons, strike home." The ploughman whistles "Rule Britannia" as he cleaves his furrow. The Dumfries weaver sings at his loom "Scots wha ha' wi' Wallace bled." The drum is heard in every village. The musket-shot strikes the target on many a common. There are not muskets at first for all, and the pike is a temporary weapon. A fast-day is appointed on the 19th of October, and the churches from the Land's End to John o' Groats" are filled with young and old, who feel that it is a solemn time, and that their defenders, who are worshipping with them, in serried rank, must look to the Highest for the victory. On the 26th of October the king reviews the volunteers of London in Hyde Park —twelve thousand four hundred. On the 28th the king reviews fourteen thousand six hundred of the volunteers of Westminster, Lambeth, and Southwark. They come "from shop and palace, cot and hall." This "general agitation of all classes," says the considerate M. Thiers, "this call of mechanics from their workshops, of merchants from their business, of rich lords from their luxuries," was "a punishment for the conduct of the British government." If prolonged, this agitation would become "an immense evil, and a source of great danger for public order." It was the great principle by which public order was preserved. At a cabinet council ministers hesitated about allowing volunteer regiments. "Do as you please," said Eldon, "but if these men do not volunteer for you, they will against you." † Extreme Toryism drew a line of demarcation between "you," the government, and "they," the people. It trusted in suspensions of the Habeas Corpus Act and in *ex-officio* informations. It was slow to trust in the people. At a later period Eldon thought that "the volunteers saved the country." They saved their own hearths, and in doing so they saved the throne and the woolsack.

The king opened the session on the 22d of November. The well-worn congratulations were used upon the acquisition of the West Indian Islands—acquisitions which Windham described as objects of no importance, when compared with the immense projects of the enemy. During six months of that session night after night was spent in reprobation or in defence of the volunteer system. They would never be fit to act in the field ; they cost too much ; they ought to be disbanded ; a great army of regulars should be created ; an armed peasantry would be a better force. Pitt stood up steadily for supporting and encouraging the volunteers. He truly said that ministers had rather retarded and enfeebled the volunteer system than contributed anything to its force and efficiency. While they

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xxxvi. col. 1646.
† An artificial hill near Paris ; also called Mount Valerien.
‡ Thiers, tome iv. p. 493.
§ Ibid., p. 504.
‖ "Life," vol. iii. p. 113.

* See Rose, "Diaries," etc., vol. ii. pp. 69–73.
† Twiss, "Life of Eldon," vol. i. p. 416.

gave a pompous detail of the force of the country, they should have recollected that it proceeded from the resources and spirit of the nation, and not from their energy and wisdom. "Whatever the spirit and zeal of a free and brave people may have been under the sense of danger, ought fairly to be separated from the tardiness, languor, and imbecility of ministers, in everything of which they have assumed the direction."* The want of arms was a formidable obstacle to the efficiency of the volunteers. The great mechanical resources of Britain were then very imperfectly developed. Abbott writes in his "Diary" of the 30th of December, 1803, "The supply of muskets slow. London supplies not more than 500 per week. None come from Birmingham." A wonderful vigor was infused into the government in March. They set up works at the Tower "for stocking and fitting muskets." In April they were able to stock 350 in one week; "2000 firelocks, condemned as useless, are now refitting by these means."† At this period Malmesbury wrote in his "Diary," "The strongest proof of Bonaparte's inability to invade us is his not attempting it at such a moment." The veteran diplomatist was not looking to the want of arms, or to the deficiencies in the naval administration, which Pitt had attacked. The ships of England were wearing away with unprecedented rapidity, and no efforts had been made to build new ships. Lord Malmesbury was looking to courts and cabinets rather than to fleets and armies. He trembled at the uncertain state of political parties—their agitations and intrigues. It was clear that the ministry of Addington must fall. It was also clear that the almost unanimous voice of the nation called for Pitt to take the helm. But with whom should he unite himself? Circumstances, then unhappily of no unusual occurrence, had suspended the decision of this question for three months.

On the 12th of February the king's mind was again affected. He had been previously ill of rheumatic gout. His mental attack appears to have been less violent than on previous occasions; but he remained incapable of transacting business in public till the 23d of April; and it was the 10th of June before it was thought fit to remove the medical control which was essential to his complete recovery. The ministers in March and April constantly maintained that the interference of parliament was unnecessary. The chancellor submitted bills to the king, and received his sign-manual. The mere formal acts of sovereignty were performed by him. The grave responsibility which the ministers took upon themselves was repeatedly animadverted upon in parliament.‡ But there was one member of the cabinet who laid himself open to a more serious charge. Mr. Pitt, on the 22d of April, had written a letter to the king, stating that he could not, consistent with a sense of duty, forbear any longer a direct opposition to the measures of administration. "From the 22d of April to May the 2d there were frequent communications *verbally* between the king and Mr. Pitt through the chancellor, which led to Mr. Pitt writing a letter to his lordship to be communicated to his majesty; having, during that intercourse, been encouraged to submit his thoughts to the king respecting a new administration, at the head of which he should be." This is Mr. Rose's account.§ Lord Eldon is accused by the biographer of Mr. Addington of having betrayed his political chief; and Lord Campbell thinks the charge is completely established.‖ We leave the consideration of this question of personal character to the minute historians. It is sufficient for us to select the more important circumstances of this negotiation.¶ The letter from Mr. Pitt to the chancellor, which was submitted to the king on the 2d of May, stated "how desirable it would be in the present circumstances of this country and of Europe, that an administration should be formed on a broad basis, combining the best talents and the great weight of property of the country; and with that view earnestly recommended including Lord Grenville and his friends, and Mr. Fox and his friends."** Mr. Rose, who was in the confidence of Mr. Pitt, wrote to the chancellor on the 4th, urging the same course. Lord Eldon immediately answered, "that he thought the advice to form an administration on the basis alluded to would be the very worst that could be given; adding terms of the highest reprobation, and in a style of acrimony."†† On the 6th the king wrote to Mr. Pitt. His majesty required of him, before he would consent that he should form an administration, that he would *never* agitate or support Catholic emancipation or the repeal of the Test Act; his majesty disapproved of the conduct of Lord Grenville and Mr. Dundas when they went out of office; he hoped in a new administration Mr. Pitt would include as many of his majesty's present servants as possible; to the admission of Mr. Fox in the administration the king expressed an absolute negative.‡‡ In the autumn of that year the king told Mr. Rose "that he had taken a positive determination not to admit Mr. Fox into his counsels, even at the hazard of a civil war."§§ Bonaparte was at the gates; and the king would risk something far higher than his crown—the lives of his people, the independence of his country—for a miserable personal pique, which he was compelled to lay aside two years afterward. In an evil hour Pitt complied with the will of his obstinate sovereign. The Grenvilles refused to take office without Fox. Pitt had stated in his letter of the 2d of May that he would not agitate for Catholic emancipation during the king's lifetime; but he contrived to evade giving the monstrous pledge required by the king, that he would *never* support the claims of the Catholics or the repeal of the Test Act. In an evil hour Pitt accepted the post of prime minister, under the limitations prescribed by the king. On the 10th of May Addington resigned.‖‖ Grenville, on the 8th, had written to Pitt, on the part of himself and the other members of the opposition, declining his offers: "We rest our determination solely on our strong sense of the impropriety of our becoming parties to a system of government which is to be formed, at such a moment as the present, on a principle of exclusion."¶¶ On the 18th of May William Pitt, first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer, took the oaths and his seat in the House of Commons, upon his re-election for the University of Cambridge. On the 18th of May the senate of France, by their decree, declared Napoleon Bonaparte Emperor of the French.

The indiscretion, to use no harsher term, of the Addington ministry had contributed toward placing Bonaparte on the throne. Lord Malmesbury thus writes in his "Diary": "In the beginning of February the measures concerted by Pichegru, Moreau, etc., were confided to me. They were represented as *immanquable*. The idea was the restoration of the monarchy under a Bourbon prince. Their plans were extensive, and, as they thought, well and secretly arranged." It is not likely that what Lord Malmesbury knew was concealed from the leading members of the administration. He adds that "whenever the event became certain, and the moment arrived that a more conspicuous character was necessary, Lord Hertford was to appear in the double character of making peace and restoring the old dynasty." Lord Hertford—the second marquis—was not a very "conspicuous character" in 1804, although he figured in the court scandals of 1814. Nevertheless the Lord of Ragley might have been considered by the French emigrants as the noblest representative of the British aristocracy; and the French Bonapartists might have regarded him as impersonating the British monarchy. Pichegru went to Paris in January, where Georges Cadoudal, one of the insurgents in Brittany, had also arrived. On the 17th of February the minister of justice made a report to the first consul of the discovery of a conspiracy. It begins thus: "New plots have been hatched by England." It concludes by saying, "England had no hopes of accomplishing her design but by the assassination of the first consul." The report implicates Pichegru, Georges, and Moreau, with others designated as brigands. Georges and Pichegru, after some time had elapsed, were apprehended. Georges was executed, Pichegru was found strangled in prison, and Moreau was exiled.

* Hansard, vol. ii. col. 210. ("The Parliamentary History," from which we have quoted up to the first session of the second parliament of the United Kingdom, was superseded by "The Parliamentary Debates," now commonly quoted as Hansard.)

† Colchester, "Diary," vol. i. p. 495.

‡ The constitutional question of the regal incapacity under such circumstances is fully set forth in the third chapter of Mr. Erskine May's "Constitutional History of England since the Accession of George III." (1861.)

§ "Diary," vol. ii. p. 113.

‖ "Lives of the Chancellors," chap. cxcviii.

¶ Rose, vol. ii. p. 114.

* Rose, vol. ii. p. 116. † Ibid., p. 117. ‡ Ibid., p. 156.

§ See "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. i. p. 508. "He told us he had resigned, and should pack up his *awls*." The transcriber or the printer of this "Diary" must imagine that Addington, in the humility of the moment, thought with the citizen in Julius Cæsar, "Truly, sir, in respect of a fine workman, I am but, as you would say, a cobbler—all that I live by is with the awl."

‖ "Court and Cabinets of George III.," vol. iii. p. 352.

The conspirators denied that the assassination of Bonaparte was any part of their plot. Although it is perfectly clear that no idea of assassination could ever have been contemplated by the most violent of English statesmen, the complicity of the ministry with the scheme of overturning the consular government and restoring the monarchy was reasonably inferred by the discovery of a clandestine correspondence between Mr. Drake, our minister at Bavaria, and some disaffected persons in France, which correspondence was carried on by a spy, who betrayed Drake to the French government. Mr. Spencer Smith, our envoy at Würtemburg, was also involved in these intrigues. Official notes passed between Talleyrand and Lord Hawkesbury upon the conduct of these envoys; and in answer to the remonstrances of the French government our secretary for foreign affairs maintained that "a minister in a foreign country is obliged, by the nature of his office and the duties of his situation, to abstain from all communication with the disaffected of the country where he is accredited, as well as from every act injurious to the interests of that country; but he is not subject to the same restraints with respect to countries with which his sovereign is at war."* This is very doubtful morality. When Lord Hawkesbury said that "belligerent powers have an acknowledged right to avail themselves of all discontents that may exist in countries with which they may be at war," he did not very logically close his argument by reproaching the French for their encouragement of Irish rebels. The murder of the Duc d'Enghien, the only son of the Duc de Bourbon and grandson of the Prince de Condé, quickly followed the discovery of what French writers call the Anglo-Bourbon conspiracy. He was residing in the state of Baden, was carried off to France by a troop of horse which had crossed the Rhine in the night; was conducted to Paris on the 20th of March, heavily fettered; was hurried to the Castle of Vincennes, and was subjected the same night to an examination by a military commission, who sentenced him to death. He was shot before dawn, in the ditch of the castle, by the light of torches. His murder produced a profound sensation throughout all civilized countries. Thiers has a few epigrammatic sentences on the conduct of Bonaparte in this hateful transaction. "The sage consul had suddenly become a madman. He was the injured man who breathes only vengeance; he was the victorious man voluntarily braving the enemies that he is sure to conquer. The better to defy his adversaries, and to satisfy his ambition at the same time as his anger, he put the imperial crown upon his head."†

CHAPTER CCI.

Parties opposed to Mr. Pitt's government—Indications of a new grand alliance—Napoleon and the army at Boulogne—Coronation of Napoleon—His letter to the king—Addington joins the ministry—War with Spain—Charges against Lord Melville—His impeachment—Treaty with Russia—Annexation of Genoa—Nelson's chase after the French and Spanish fleets—Sir Robert Calder's naval action—Napoleon's anxiety at Boulogne—He breaks up the camp—March into Germany—Surrender of the Austrian army at Ulm—Nelson takes the command of the fleet off Cadiz—Victory of Trafalgar—Death of Nelson—His Funeral—French enter Vienna—Austerlitz—Peace of Presburg—Pitt's failing health—Death of Pitt.

When Mr. Pitt returned to power in May, 1804, he did not enter the House of Commons with his old confidence in an overwhelming majority. There were three parties who were either wholly or partially opposed to the government. The Addington party was sore and was capricious. The Grenville party was disgusted at the acceptance of office by Pitt without having stoutly resisted the king's system of exclusion. The Fox party was systematically opposed to the war policy which had been pursued since 1793. The ministry could only absolutely command about 230 votes; and it would be beaten whenever the three neutral or opposition parties coalesced.‡ There was a great trial of strength on the 18th of June in the largest house since 1741. The ministerial majority was only 42, there being 493 members present at the division.* The session, however, would soon come to a close. On the 31st of July the prorogation took place. There was a curious incident which the speaker has recorded. The king read the speech with great animation, but accidentally turned over two leaves together, and so omitted about one fourth of his intended speech. Mr. Abbott adds, with a slight touch of sarcasm, "The transition was not incoherent, and it escaped some of the cabinet who had heard it before the king delivered it." The king's printer did not turn over two leaves. The speech went forth with this significant paragraph: "I entertain the animating hope that the benefit to be derived from our successful exertions will not be confined within ourselves, but that by their example and their consequences, they may lead to the establishment of such a system in Europe as may rescue it from the precarious state to which it is reduced, and may finally raise an effectual barrier against the unbounded schemes of aggrandizement and ambition which threaten every independent nation that yet remains on the Continent." The "effectual barrier" evidently contemplated a new grand alliance—"a system in Europe" which should take Great Britain out of her isolation and give new occupation to the enemy who had vowed her destruction. Wilberforce, after the prorogation, had discovered in Pitt "a greater willingness to subsidize," of which policy he disapproves: "Pitt is the most upright political character I ever knew or heard of; but with all public men it is extremely dangerous for a country that they should be under a temptation to fight it out—to try their fortune again after having been unsuccessful in a former war."†

The 16th of August was the birthday of Napoleon. On that day the emperor was at Boulogne, seated on a magnificent throne, with the dignitaries of his empire, his marshals and his ministers, grouped around him, and before him the mighty army of a hundred thousand men destined for the conquest of England. The spot where this spectacle was exhibited is marked by a column which every Englishman may see—and not without his own national pride—when he is passing the Channel. There Napoleon distributed the crosses of the Legion of Honor to a chosen band; ever and anon raising his telescope to gaze upon a division of his flotilla exchanging a cannonade with an English squadron. He looked upon the white cliffs of Albion as Caligula had looked. Unlike Caligula, he had a people who did not despise his "lofty throne," and he has found historians who are prostrate before the grandeur of this empty pageantry.‡ If the press had been free in France, the wits would have laughed at this rivalry of the tinsel magnificence of the theatre. The English journals did laugh. "The British Press," says Thiers, "insulting and arrogant as the whole press is in a free country, ridiculed Napoleon and his preparations; but it was the ridicule of a mocker who trembles while he appears to laugh."§ The emperor proceeded to Aix-la-Chapelle, and thence to Mayence, to receive the homage of the petty princes of Germany. He returned to St. Cloud on the 12th of October. He had looked upon England; he had heard his legions swear that they would shed their blood on that chalky shore to make him master of the world; yet he would let the autumn pass without taking the leap of ten leagues across that bewildering sea. "Providence," says M. Thiers, "which had in reserve for him such abundance of glory, had not permitted him to give this *éclat* to his coronation. There remained to him another mode to dazzle men's minds—to make the pope descend for an instant from the pontifical throne, to come to Paris to bless the emperor's sceptre and his crown." A very different sort of victory; a triumph like that over "the poor beetle that we tread upon." The sovereign pontiff made many objections. They were overcome by the man who acknowledged no will but his own. The pope must come at once; so that the emperor might proceed in December to the conquest of England. On the 2d of December the coronation took place in the metropolitan church of Notre Dame. The pope anointed the emperor and the empress with the sacred oil. The crown, the sceptre, the mantle, and the sword were on the altar. The pope lifted the crown; but Napoleon, snatching the diadem, modelled after the crown of Charlemagne, out of the hands of the Holy Father, placed it upon his own

* "State Papers;" "Annual Register," 1804, p. 602.
† "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tome xvii. p. 848.
‡ Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 9.

* Colchester's "Diary," vol. i. p. 520.
† "Life," vol. iii. p. 206.
‡ For a parallel between Caligula and Napoleon at Boulogne, see *ante*, vol. i. p. 7.
§ "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tome v. p. 197.

head; and then he crowned the empress, who knelt before him. Still no invasion of England. "The cry is still they come." But they did not come; and in the social meetings of that Christmas the sturdy Anglo-Saxon race joined in many a chorus of "Come if you dare," "The tight little island," and "The land, boys, we live in."

On the 2d of January, 1805, Napoleon addressed a letter to the King of England, beginning, "Called to the throne of France by Providence, and by the suffrages of the senate, the people, and the army, my first sentiment is a wish for peace." There was much commonplace in this epistle, and some good sense. "Your nation is at the highest point of prosperity; what can it hope from war? To form a coalition with some powers of the Continent? The Continent will remain tranquil: a coalition can only increase the preponderance and continental greatness of France." The secretary for foreign affairs answered, in the name of the king, that it was impossible for him to reply to this overture till his majesty had communicated with the powers of the Continent, and particularly with the Emperor of Russia. With an unusual candor the historian of the empire considers this letter of Napoleon too palpably designed to affect moderation, and to seize an occasion to address the King of England as from monarch to monarch.* When the Imperial Parliament met, this letter to "Monsieur mon frère" was alluded to in the royal speech; but no debate was raised, as on the letter of the first consul in 1800. All felt that the profession of a desire for peace was a mere form of words, which the writer scarcely expected to deceive.

Mr. Pitt had strengthened himself before the meeting of parliament on the 15th of January, by a reconciliation with Mr. Addington. The party of the ex-minister, small as it was, and by no means popular in its exclusive pretensions to be called "the king's friends,' was yet able to turn the scale upon any nicely balanced question. Addington was raised to the peerage as Viscount Sidmouth, and was appointed president of the council. "So far," writes Francis Horner, "as I had opportunities of observing the first impression of it, it was strongly disapproved by Pitt's intelligent admirers, and lowered him a little in the city."† The royal speech announced that war had been declared by Spain against this country. The causes of the war formed the subject of the first important debate of this session. It was a complicated question; and one in which the British government was, upon the face of it, open to very serious blame. No one could doubt that Spain was in reality the vassal of France; that reinforcements for the French fleets at Toulon and Ferrol had been allowed to pass through Spain; that the court of Madrid was arming vessels of war in various ports; and that while these measures were the continual subjects of remonstrance by the British chargé d'affaires the Spanish government refused all satisfactory explanation. All this was perfectly clear; but the remonstrances of Mr. Addington's ministry had been so mild, and his acceptance of excuses so very ready, that the Spanish government could scarcely have been prepared for an act of vigor which appeared somewhat opposed to international law. The precautions of Mr. Pitt's government were chiefly directed to "the possible consequences of the safe arrival of the expected American treasure-ships in the Spanish ports—an event which has more than once, in former times, become the epoch of the termination of discussions, and of the commencement of hostility, on the part of Spain."‡ What the first William Pitt proposed to do in 1761 the second William Pitt did in 1804.§ On the 5th of October Captain Moore, in the command of four English frigates, met with a Spanish squadron of four frigates proceeding to Cadiz. He told the Spanish admiral that he had orders to detain these vessels, and that it was his earnest wish to execute his orders without bloodshed. The Spaniard would not yield; an engagement ensued, in which one of the Spanish ships blew up; the other three were taken, with an immense amount of treasure. There was mismanagement in not sending a force sufficiently large to compel the Spanish commander to surrender without loss of honor. The bullion was meant for France, under a treaty by which Spain engaged to pay a large subsidy instead of furnishing France with troops and sailors. The cruel necessity of warfare might be some plea for this measure of precaution. The affair was badly managed, and the resistance which rendered a fight necessary gave the act the character of an unjust aggression, instead of a wise measure of self-defence. The British government, a year before, had given notice to Spain that if her armaments were not discontinued, no declaration of war would be made beyond what had been made in repeated remonstrances. The Spanish government in its final manifesto did not hesitate to assert that it had always contemplated war with Great Britain since France had declared war. Upon this question Mr. Pitt had large majorities in both houses. He had a majority of 207 in the Commons. Napoleon was indignant at the loss of his subsidy, and immediately applied himself to render Spain an effectual co-operator in hostilities against England. On the 4th of January Admiral Gravina, the Spanish ambassador at Paris, signed a convention which specified the proportions of forces which each power was to furnish in a naval war. Spain engaged to prepare thirty-two ships of the line.

Mr. Pitt came triumphantly out of the discussion on the Spanish war. To one so proud and so sensitive—so elevated himself above the slightest suspicion of corrupt dealings with the public money, and so confiding in his official friendships—no mortification during his public life could have been equal to that which he endured when the "Tenth Report of the Commissioners of Naval Inquiry" was laid upon the table of the House of Commons, and ordered to be printed on the 13th of February. That report deeply implicated Lord Melville, now first lord of the admiralty, when, as Mr. Dundas, he filled the office of treasurer of the navy before the dissolution of the Pitt ministry in 1801. The report alleged that the sums standing in the name of the treasurer of the navy at the Bank of England had been less than the unappropriated balances; that Mr. Trotter, the paymaster, had admitted that Mr. Dundas had permitted him to withdraw money from the bank and lodge it in the hands of private bankers; that Mr. Trotter had also admitted that, under the direction of Mr. Dundas, he had laid out 10,000*l.* or 20,000*l.* for his use and benefit, without considering whether such sums came from public or private balances; and that Lord Melville had declared to the commissioners that he could not say what had been done with some of these sums, without disclosing delicate and confidential transactions of government, which his duty to the public must restrain him from revealing.*

On the 8th of April Mr. Whitbread brought forward a motion of censure upon Lord Melville. Mr. Pitt moved the previous question, not with the desire of defending or justifying the conduct alleged by the commissioners in their report, but with the view that a select committee should be appointed to inquire into the case, and receive explanations if any could be given. At four o'clock in the morning the house divided, 216 to 216. The speaker gave the casting vote for the motion of Mr. Whitbread. Lord Fitzharris, the son of Lord Malmesbury, made the following interesting record in his note-book of 1806: "I sat wedged close to Pitt himself the night when we were 216 to 216; and the speaker, Abbott (after looking as white as a sheet, and pausing for ten minutes), gave the casting vote against us. Pitt immediately put on the little cocked hat that he was in the habit of wearing when dressed for the evening, and jammed it deeply over his forehead, and I distinctly saw the tears trickling down his cheeks. We had overheard one or two, such as Colonel Wardle (of notorious memory), say, they would see how Billy looked after it. A few young ardent followers of Pitt, with myself, locked their arms together, and formed a circle, in which he moved, I believe unconsciously, out of the house; and neither the colonel nor his friends could approach him."†

On the 10th of April Mr. Pitt announced Lord Melville's resignation. On the 6th of May he informed the house that he had thought it his duty to advise his majesty to erase Lord Melville's name from the council. On the 27th of May Mr. Whitbread gave notice of moving an impeachment against Lord Melville. On the 11th of June Lord Melville, at the bar of the House of Commons, spoke for more than two hours in defence of his conduct, declaring that with regard to two sums, amounting to 21,000*l.*, being "intrusted with the confidential management of the king's interests in Scotland, he had applied the money in a way which no consideration should induce him to reveal."‡

* Thiers, tome v. p. 274.
† "Memoirs of Horner," vol. i. p. 281.
‡ British Declaration of War, January 24, 1805.
§ *Ante*, vol. vi. p. 843.

* See Report in Hansard, vol. iii. col. 1147 to 1211
† Malmesbury, "Diaries," etc., vol. iv. p. 355.
‡ "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. ii. p. 8.

On the 12th of June Mr. Whitbread's motion for impeachment was rejected by a majority of 77, in a house of 467 members. On the 25th of June upon the motion of Mr. Leycester, it was determined to proceed against Lord Melville by impeachment, the majority being 23 in a house of 309 members. On the 26th Mr. Whitbread carried up the impeachment to the bar of the House of Lords; and a bill was rapidly passed which provided for the continuance of proceedings on the impeachment, under a prorogation or a dissolution of parliament. On the 12th of July the parliament was prorogued by commission. A week before the prorogation Lord Sidmouth had resigned. He had taken part against Lord Melville, and there were other differences which could not be reconciled. Under ordinary circumstances Mr. Pitt would have felt his tenure of power considerably shaken by this defection, when he should have to meet the House of Commons in another session. His health was impaired, but his spirit was unbroken. He was looking forward to the results of a policy which would place his country in a position of security, and in the success of which his own pre-eminence could not be assailed, even by Fox and Grenville, much less by so feeble a rival as Sidmouth. On the 21st of June Mr. Pitt had received a confiding vote of the House of Commons, "that a sum not exceeding 3,500,000*l.* be granted to his majesty, to enable his majesty to enter into such engagements and to take such measures as the exigency of affairs may require."

On the 11th of April a treaty had been signed between Great Britain and Russia, by which each power agreed to unite in the endeavor to form a general league of the states of Europe, for resisting the encroachments of France. Austria hesitated about joining the alliance, and would not agree to proceed to hostilities till negotiations with France had been attempted and had failed. Napoleon manifested no disposition to relax his system of aggrandizement, or to exhibit any respect for the independence of nations. The delusion of a Cisalpine Republic was at an end when, on the 26th of May, he was crowned King of Italy in the cathedral of Milan. He had told his senate, when he addressed them on the 17th of March, in explanation of his design to assume the sovereignty of Italy as a separate kingdom, that "the genius of evil would search in vain for pretexts to plunge the continent again in war. What has been united to our empire will remain united. No new province will be incorporated with it." On the 4th of June the Doge of Genoa, with a deputation of the senate, came to Milan, to supplicate the Emperor of the French to deign to unite to his empire the Ligurian Republic, in which Genoa was comprised, and to grant them the happiness to be his subjects. It would have been cruel to have been deaf to so pleasant a petition. England only would care about this trifling annexation. What could Austria and Russia care about Genoa? He would soon resolve in London all European questions. He would not hesitate about the danger of offering new provocations, and of giving new pretexts for decrying the ambition of France. He would not hesitate. Genoa should be annexed, and should lend the aid of her ships and sailors to the French marine.*

From the prorogation in July till the end of October there had never been such suspense and anxiety in England since the May of 1588, when the Spanish Armada had sailed down the Tagus, and an agent of Elizabeth's council had written home that he judged they would soon be in the English quarters, "so that the lightning and the thunder-clap will be both in a moment."† On the 19th of July the British fleet was at anchor in the Bay of Gibraltar. On the 20th Nelson writes in his diary, "I went on shore for the first time since June 16th, 1803, and, from having my foot out of the victory, two years wanting ten days." What duty had occupied the great admiral during this period? The duty of long watching and waiting; of pursuing the enemy, without any certain knowledge of his destination, from one end of the Mediterranean to the other, and then to the West Indies. He had been appointed to the chief command of the fleet in the Mediterranean at the breaking out of the war, and had sailed from Spithead on the 20th of May. On the 1st of August, 1804, he wrote a very remarkable letter to the Lord Mayor of London, which gave the British people a better notion of the man than the speech of Alderman Curtis in the common council. Nelson acknowledged the honor of the resolutions, "thanking me, as commanding the fleet blockading Toulon. . . . I beg to inform your lordship that the port of Toulon has never been blockaded by me; quite the reverse. Every opportunity has been offered the enemy to put to sea; for it is there that we hope to realize the hopes and expectations of our country, and I trust that they will not be disappointed."* On the 18th of January, 1805, the Toulon fleet came out. Nelson was at anchor off the coast of Sardinia. The weather was stormy. He could hear nothing of the French fleet; and he sailed away for Egypt. He returned; and at Malta found that the French fleet, having been dispersed in a gale, had put back for Toulon. On the 4th of April he learned that the French fleet, under Admiral Villeneuve, had again put to sea on the 31st of March. They were joined by the Spanish fleet at Cadiz, having four thousand five hundred troops on board. The combined fleet numbered twenty sail of the line and ten frigates. Nelson had ten sail of the line and three frigates. He had guessed their destination, and wrote accordingly to the admiralty. Pitt, with a patriotic exultation, told the speaker on the 6th of June that Nelson in his letters received that day said, "he was sailing after the combined fleet to the West Indies, and if he did not find them there he would follow them to the Antipodes."† The Toulon fleet had the start of Nelson more than a month. He was at Barbadoes on the 4th of June; but he was again deceived by false intelligence. The combined fleet had appeared before several West India islands—Martinique, Granada, Antigua; but they had not ventured to stop. They fled back to Europe, with Nelson after them. On the 3d of May there was in London a "great alarm for the West Indies."‡ Two months later it was known that Nelson had saved the West Indies. But he was baffled in his great hope of encountering the French and Spaniards. That exploit was reserved for Sir Robert Calder, who, with fifteen line-of-battle ships, fell in with them, sixty leagues west of Cape Finisterre, on the 22d of July. After an engagement of four hours, the English admiral captured two Spanish ships, an eighty-four and a seventy-four. The French and Spanish fleet got into Cadiz a month after the action. The British people were indignant that Calder had not done more. He was tried in December by court-martial, and was reprimanded "for error of judgment." Nelson had traversed the Bay of Biscay, and had sought the enemy on the north-west coast of Ireland, in the belief that the combined fleet was about to make a descent there. He then thought that it was his duty to reinforce the Channel Fleet, and he joined Admiral Cornwallis off Ushant. The course of the French and Spaniards was still unknown. Nelson, worn out with the fatigue and anxiety of his chase of the enemy, went home in the Victory. At Portsmouth he learned of the action of the 22d of July. The encounter with Admiral Calder had been sufficient to disturb the plans of Napoleon for the invasion of England. Villeneuve did not hazard a nearer approach to the English Channel than Ferrol and Corunna. He then altered his course, steering southward; and was safe in Cadiz on the 20th of August. In that port six Spanish ships of the line had been previously at anchor. Collingwood was at hand with four sail of the line; and on the 21st he was reconnoitring the port in which thirty-five French and Spanish sail of the line lay ready for sea. The British squadron cruising off Cadiz was reinforced in August and September. The French admiral had little prospect of obeying his orders to bring his fleet fresh and entire into the British Channel.

On the 3d of August Napoleon was again at Boulogne. The next day he reviewed the infantry of this great army of England. In one line of battle were drawn up a hundred thousand men—a line which occupied more than three leagues, reaching from Cap Alpreck to Cap Grisnez. He inspected his flotilla, now all united in the four ports of Ambleteuse, Wimereux, Boulogne, and Etaples. The whole force, ready to embark, comprised a hundred and thirty-two thousand men and fifteen thousand horses, with nearly six hundred pieces of artillery. There were, moreover, twenty-four thousand troops on the Texel, ready to embark, under the command of Marmont. To prepare the army of England for their great adventure, the troops were brought down to the beach, where the gun-boats were lying to receive them. Every man had his appointed boat and his appointed place. Again and again men and horses were embarked and disembarked. It was found that an hour and a quarter

* See Thiers, tom. v. p. 384.

† *Ante*, vol. iii. p. 371.

* "Annual Register," 1800, p. 415.

† Ibid., vol. i. p. 555.

‡ Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 6.

was sufficient to get on board the right wing of the army, consisting of twenty-six thousand men, under the command of Davoust; and it was estimated that in two hours after the order had been given the whole of this mighty force might be out of its harbors. But there was no protecting fleet of men-of-war in the Channel. Where were Villeneuve and Gravina? Where was Ganteaume, with the Brest squadron? Napoleon had no doubt that these fleets would unite, with a force sufficient to give battle to the British commanders. Let him once be assured that they were at hand, and not an hour should be lost in making the attempt that had been preparing for two years and a half. Let France be mistress of the passage for twelve hours, and England has lived.* All along the coast signals had been prepared to announce when the French and Spanish fleets should have appeared on the horizon. No signal was given. On the 22d of August Napoleon received a dispatch, by a courier from Lauriston at Ferrol, "We are going to Brest." He dictated instantly a letter to Ganteaume: "Set out and come here. Let us avenge six centuries of insult and shame." He dictated a letter to Villeneuve: "I hope you are at Brest. Set out; lose not a moment; and to be united with my squadrons come into the Channel. England is ours. We are all ready. All is embarked. Appear within twenty-four hours and all is finished." By the courier which brought Napoleon the dispatch of Lauriston, Admiral Decrès, the minister of marine, who was also at Boulogne, received a dispatch from Villeneuve, which truly described the difficulties of his position. The emperor went into a tremendous passion, denouncing Villeneuve as a fool and a traitor. He was violent with Decrès, who offered him sound advice; but Decrès was a man of firmness, and he persuaded the emperor to give up his project for a season. The tempests of the equinox were at hand; the English were prepared to encounter the combined fleet. After several days of irresolution, which to men of dominant will is misery, he determined to relinquish for a season the invasion of England, and to march the army of the camp of Boulogne into Germany. He left Boulogne on the 2d of September.

On the 26th of September Mr. Pitt gave to Lord Malmesbury a "most minute and clear account" of the proceedings which he had taken in negotiating his great alliances with Russia and Austria. "Never was any measure, as far as human foresight could go, better combined or better negotiated."† Its failure, Malmesbury adds, "was solely in the execution." Neither Mr. Pitt nor the allies had sufficiently taken into account the extraordinary rapidity of the operations of Napoleon, or the prodigious faculty of combination with which he had organized the movements of his various armies. The emperor called upon the senate to raise eighty thousand conscripts. He told them, on the 23d of September, that the wishes of the eternal enemies of the continent are at last fulfilled. Austria and Russia have joined England. The Austrian army has crossed the Inn; the Elector of Bavaria has been driven away from his capital; all my hopes of the preservation of peace have vanished. The Elector of Bavaria was the ally of France. Bonaparte left Paris on the 24th. The army at Boulogne had broken up its camp. Napoleon had formed the plan of a campaign which should unite this army with two other great divisions of his forces—that of Hanover, under Bernadotte; and that of Holland, under Marmont. The army of Boulogne marched to the Rhine, which river Napoleon crossed at Strasbourg on the 1st of October. In Franconia he would join the other two armies, cross the Danube below Ulm, in the neighborhood of Donauwerth, and cut off the Austrians before the junction of the Russians. By the end of October the rapidity of his movements and their evident design had caused alarm in London. "The newspapers," writes Wilberforce, "will have excited in your mind the same fears they have called forth in mine, that Bonaparte has been too rapid for the Austrians. . . . I cannot help fearing, from the accounts the papers give us, that the French have penetrated so far as to get between the Russians, who were coming forward, and the Austrians."‡ This was not an idle fear. Ney's division had defeated the Austrians at Elchingen and at Guntzburg. Large detached masses had capitulated at other places without fighting. Napoleon's marshals had very speedily reduced the Austrians in Bavaria to a force of about thirty thousand men at Ulm. The wall and bastions and ditch of this city offered no adequate protection; for Napoleon had obtained possession of the adjacent heights, from which he could bombard a place from which escape was impossible. He summoned General Mack, the commander of the imperialists, to surrender. Mack returned an indignant answer; but finally agreed to surrender in eight days if he were not relieved. He considered that the Russians were close at hand. Napoleon knew otherwise. But time was of the greatest value to him; and in an interview with Mack he persuaded him to surrender at once. On the 20th of October thirty thousand men, with sixty pieces of cannon, marched out of the fortress and laid down their arms. The conqueror made an address to some of the officers, telling them that he wanted nothing on the Continent—he wanted ships, colonies, and commerce.

"O'er England's seas his new dominions plann'd,
While the red bolt yet flamed in Nelson's hand."*

Rumors of this inauspicious beginning of the operations of the alliance that was to have saved Europe had reached London very quickly. On the 2d of November Pitt said to Malmesbury, "Don't believe it—it is all a fiction." On Sunday, the 3d, a Dutch newspaper had reached Downing Street, with the terms of the capitulation of Mack given at full length. Mr. Pitt and Lord Mulgrave came to Lord Malmesbury to translate the account, for the clerks of the Foreign Office who were able to translate Dutch were absent. "I observed but too clearly the effect it had on Pitt, though he did his utmost to conceal it. . . . This visit has left an indelible impression on my mind, as his manner and look were not his own, and gave me, in spite of myself, a foreboding of the loss with which we were threatened."† On the 7th of November the news arrived of the crowning glory of Trafalgar.

Nelson was enjoying a little quiet at his house in the pretty village of Merton, in Surrey, when he learned that the French and Spanish fleet, joined by the Ferrol squadron, had succeeded in entering Cadiz. His resolution was quickly taken. He went to the admiralty and offered his services, which were joyfully accepted. Nelson was full of hope. "Depend on it," he said to Captain Blackwood, "I shall yet give M. Villeneuve a drubbing." He formed his plans of attack during the short time of preparation, when the Victory had to be refitted, and other ships were to be got ready to accompany him. Lord Sidmouth told Mr. Rush, the American ambassador, that in the course of a visit he had received from Nelson, three weeks before the battle of Trafalgar, he described the plan of it, with bits of paper, on a table as it was afterward fought.‡ Yet he had a presentiment of his own fate. The coffin which was made out of the mast of l'Orient was deposited at an upholsterer's. He desired its history to be engraved on its lid, saying that he should probably want it on his return. When he arrived at Portsmouth, on the 14th of September, the enthusiasm of the people reached that height which sometimes gives a character of sublimity to the movements of multitudes acting with one heart. They wept; they blessed him; they even knelt as he passed along. The cheer which went up from thousands of voices as his barge pushed off to his flag-ship was the Godspeed of his country. He waved his hat—a last farewell to England.

The 29th of September was Nelson's birthday. On that day he arrived off Cadiz. He had sent forward the Euryalus frigate to inform Collingwood of his approach, and to direct that no salute should be fired to apprise the enemy that the British fleet had been reinforced. When he took the command he had twenty-seven sail of the line, with which he retired to a station more than sixteen leagues from Cadiz, leaving two frigates to watch the harbor. He established also a line of communication between his main body and the frigates. On the day that Nelson joined the fleet, Villeneuve had received the positive orders of Napoleon that the French squadron should enter the Mediterranean, and, sweeping away the British cruisers and merchant vessels, should proceed to Toulon. The ships that had been damaged in the action with Calder were repaired, with the exception of one that was nearly destroyed. When Villeneuve determined to go out from Cadiz, he could not risk the attempt without the sup-

* "Si nous sommes maîtres douze heures de la traversée, l'Angleterre a vécu" (an idiom which has the meaning of "has ceased to live"). Letter of Napoleon to Decrès, in Thiers.
† Malmesbury, "Diaries," etc., vol. iv. p. 347.
‡ Wilberforce, "Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 48.

* "Ulm and Trafalgar," by J. W. Croker.
† "Malmesbury," vol. iv. p. 347.
‡ Rush, "Residence at the Court of London," p. 459.

port of the Spanish squadron. The combined fleet, therefore, moved to the entrance of the harbor, all ready for a start with a fair wind. Eight days elapsed before the wind was favorable. On the 19th and 20th of October thirty-three sail of the line, five frigates, and two brigs weighed anchor and put to sea. Nelson had dispatched six sail of the line to Gibraltar for stores and water. Sir Robert Calder desired to return home, and Nelson insisted that he should go in his own ninety-gun ship. There remained to him twenty-seven sail of the line and four frigates. On the 9th Nelson sent to Collingwood his plan of attack. It was conceived upon the general principle of breaking the line—a principle, says Thiers, by which the English had effected at sea a revolution similar to that which Napoleon had effected on land. But Nelson's plan of attack, in this his greatest adventure, was a more scientific application of the plan which had on many previous occasions been successful. The fleet was to move toward the enemy in two lines, with an advanced squadron of eight of the fastest two-deckers. Collingwood, having the command of one line, was to break through the enemy about the twelfth ship from their rear; Nelson would lead through the centre; the advanced squadron was to cut off three or four ships ahead of the centre. The plan would necessarily vary according to the strength of the enemy; but its general object was that the British should always be one fourth superior to the ships which they cut off. Few signals would be made. One direction was worth many embarrassing orders: "No captain could do wrong who placed his ship close alongside that of an enemy."

When Nelson learned on the 19th that the combined fleet had put to sea, he concluded that their destination was the Mediterranean, and he immediately made all sail for the entrance of the Straits of Gibraltar. At daylight on Monday, the 21st, when about seven leagues from Cape Trafalgar, the enemy was discovered six or seven miles to the eastward. Nelson was upon deck, and the signal was given to bear down in two lines, as arranged. Collingwood led one line in the Royal Sovereign; Nelson led the other line in the Victory. He retired to his cabin, and wrote down a prayer that God would grant to his country a great and glorious victory; that no misconduct should be allowed to tarnish it; and that humanity after victory might be the fundamental feature in the British fleet: "For myself, individually, I commit my life to Him that made me." He then wrote a memorandum reciting the public services of Lady Hamilton, and leaving her, as well as his adopted daughter, to the beneficence of his country. He was calm, but without that exhilaration of spirit which he exhibited in his other great battles. Of Captain Blackwood he asked what he should consider as a victory? The enemy had shown a bold front of battle; and Blackwood answered that the capture of fourteen sail of the line would be a glorious result. "I shall not be satisfied with less than twenty," said Nelson. He then inquired whether a signal was not wanting? When Blackwood answered that he thought the whole fleet knew what they were about, up went the signal which conveyed the immortal words, "ENGLAND EXPECTS EVERY MAN TO DO HIS DUTY." Three cheers from every ship was the response.*

In the Painted Hall of Greenwich, under a glass cover, is the admiral's coat which Nelson wore on the 21st of October. On its left side are four embroidered stars, the emblems of the orders with which he was invested. He was implored to put on a plainer dress, for there were riflemen among the four thousand troops which were on board the French and Spanish ships. No. What he had won he would wear. On the deck he stood, a mark for the enemy—one whose life was worth a legion. There was a carelessness about his own safety that day which was chivalrous, however unwise. He was persuaded to allow some other vessel to take the lead in his line. He gave a reluctant order, but he made every effort to counteract it, for he would not shorten sail himself. Collingwood, at the head of his line, made all sail, steering right through the enemy's centre: "See how that noble fellow carries his ship into action," said Nelson. "What would Nelson give to be here," said Collingwood. Collingwood was spared to write the dispatch which told our country of its gain and of its loss.

"The action began at twelve o'clock, by the leading ships of the columns breaking through the enemy's line; the commander-in-chief about the tenth ship from the van, the second in command about the twelfth from the rear, leaving the van of the enemy unoccupied, the succeeding ships breaking through in all parts, astern of their leaders, and engaging the enemy at the muzzles of their guns: the conflict was severe; the enemy's ships were fought with a gallantry highly honorable to their officers; but the attack on them was irresistible, and it pleased the Almighty Disposer of events to grant his majesty's arms a complete and glorious victory. . . . Such a battle could not be fought without sustaining a great loss of men. I have not only to lament, in common with the British navy and the British nation, in the fall of the commander-in-chief the loss of a hero whose name will be immortal and his memory ever dear to his country, but my heart is rent with the most poignant grief for the death of a friend, to whom, by many years' intimacy, and a perfect knowledge of the virtues of his mind, which inspired ideas superior to the common race of men, I was bound by the strongest ties of affection; a grief to which even the glorious occasion in which he fell does not bring that consolation which perhaps it ought."

The moving circumstances of the death of Nelson have been told by Southey with a touching fulness which has found its way to many a heart of the past and the present generations. He was shot from the mizzen-top of the Redoubtable, which he supposed had struck. He fell where his secretary had previously fallen. "They have done for me at last," he said to Captain Hardy, "my backbone is shot through." He was carried below, covering his face and his stars with his handkerchief, that his crew might not see who had fallen. His wound was soon perceived to be mortal. Every now and then a ship struck, and the crew of the Victory huzzaed. Then his eyes lighted up for a moment. He lingered in great agony for a little more than three hours. The last guns which were fired at the flying enemy were heard a minute or two before he expired. Twenty of the French and Spanish ships had struck. But a gale came on; some of the prizes went down; others were wrecked on shore; one escaped into Cadiz; four only were saved. Four of the ships that made off during the action were captured on the 4th of November by Sir Richard Strachan. The French and Spanish navies never recovered, during the war, this tremendous blow. Napoleon's projects of invasion were at an end.

It was the 7th of November when Collingwood's dispatches reached London. Pitt was roused in the night to read them. He said, a day or two after, that he had been called up at various times by the arrival of news, "but that whether good or bad he could always lay his head on his pillow and sink into sound sleep again. On this occasion, however, the great event announced brought with it so much to weep over as well as to rejoice at that he could not calm his thoughts, but at length got up, though it was three in the morning." * The feelings of the prime minister were shared by the humblest in the land. Malmesbury writes: "I never saw so little public joy. The illumination seemed dim, and, as it were, half clouded by the desire of expressing the mixture of contending feelings; every common person in the streets speaking first of their sorrow for him, and then of the victory." † The same feeling pervaded all when the body of the hero was borne to St. Paul's on the 9th of January:

> "To thy country thou cam'st back
> Thou, conqueror, to triumphal Albion cam'st
> A corse. I saw before thy hearse pass on
> The comrades of thy perils and renown.
> The frequent tear upon their dauntless breasts
> Fell. I beheld the pomp thick gather'd round
> The trophied car that bore thy grac'd remains
> Through arm'd ranks, and a nation gazing on.
> Bright glow'd the sun, and not a cloud distain'd
> Heaven's arch of gold, but all was gloom beneath.
> A holy and unutterable pang
> Thrill'd on the soul. Awe and mute anguish fell
> On all. Yet high the public bosom throbb'd
> With triumph." ‡

The pageant lives in the ineffaceable remembrance of our boyhood.

---

* The telegraph which communicated the noble exhortation was in numbers, thus:

253 269 863 261 471 958 200 870 4 21 19 24.
England expects that every man will do his d u t y.

See James's "Naval History," vol. iii. p. 289.

* Note of Lord Fitzharris, "Malmesbury," vol. iv. p. 349.
† Ibid., p. 349. ‡ Sotheby's "Saul."

Six-and-forty years afterward the remembrance crowded upon our thoughts when we beheld the car of another warrio rmoving through the same streets to the same place of rest. Mute veneration for him who died, full of years, while every year he lived added to a nation's love, marked the funeral pomp of Wellington. Impassioned grief, audible sighs, tears coursing down rugged cheeks, marked the funeral pomp of Nelson. They sleep together in the same crypt beneath the dome of St. Paul's—the two who in the agony of England's fate best fought the fight and achieved the victory.

Ulm surrendered to the French the day before the victory of Trafalgar had annihilated the French and Spanish fleets. When Napoleon heard of the event he was advancing upon Vienna. He manifested his sense of its importance by sending to Paris his orders that the French journals should say as little as possible about it—merely say that it was an imprudent encounter, in which the combined fleet had suffered more from a tempest than from the enemy. On the 13th of November Vienna was entered by French dragoons and grenadiers. They marched through the city without a halt, to reach the great wooden bridge over the Danube. The Austrians had received orders to destroy this bridge, which was the only passage from the capital to the northern provinces. For several days there had been a partial suspension of hostilities, while negotiations for an armistice were proceeding. The French generals advanced to the Austrian troops who kept the bridge, and called out that the armistice was concluded. The unsuspecting Germans let the troops pass, and the French soon held both sides of the Danube. The magistracy of Vienna came to Napoleon at the palace of Schönbrunn, to implore him to spare their city. There was no national enthusiasm to stimulate resistance. The German people had not yet been roused to fight for their independence. Their governments were despotic. It was a quarrel of crowned heads, to be decided either way by armed masses, with little harm or little benefit to the commonalty. Napoleon soon quitted Vienna in the confidence that he should finish the war by a decisive victory over the Austrians and Russians. With the allied army were the Emperor of Germany and the Emperor of Russia. On the 2d of December Napoleon encountered about a hundred thousand Russians and Austrians with a somewhat smaller number of highly disciplined Frenchmen at Austerlitz, in the neighborhood of Brunn, in Moravia. The battle began at sunrise and lasted till sunset. The defeat of the allies was complete. On the 3d of December Napoleon wrote to his brother Joseph that he had taken 40,000 prisoners, and that the enemy had left from 12,000 to 15,000 men on the field. "A whole column threw itself into a lake, and the greater part of them were drowned. I fancy that I still hear the cries of these wretches, whom it was impossible to save."* There is another version of this horrible story. The flying Russians crowded on the frozen lakes. Napoleon, from the table-land of Pratzen, on the side of these lakes, saw the disaster which he had so well prepared. He ordered the battery of his guard to fire round shot on the ice that was unbroken, to complete the destruction of those who had taken refuge upon the frozen waters.† Another account says that the French, having fired first upon the ice nearest the shore, the Russians were then upon an island of ice. They went on their knees, and then the batteries fired upon them till six thousand were killed or drowned.‡ Napoleon slept comfortably after this feat. He had been sleeping for a week in the open air. "To-night I sleep in a bed in the fine country house of M. de Kaunitz near Austerlitz, and I have put on a clean shirt, which I had not done for a week."§ On the 4th of December he had an interview with the Emperor Francis. On the 26th was signed the peace of Presburg, by which the Emperor Francis gave up to the new kingdom of Italy those parts of the Venetian territory which he had acquired by the peace of Campo Formio. Napoleon made two kings out of two electors his allies—the Elector of Bavaria and the Elector of Würtemberg. The Emperor Alexander refused to retreat according to the time and route furnished by Napoleon. He retired unmolested, to try his fortune once more in conjunction with the King of Prussia, with whom he had formed a treaty of alliance. Prussia had been temporizing, as usual. The king decided too late to render assistance to Austria and Russia; too soon for his own eventual safety.

The great triumph of Napoleon gave the final blow to the shattered health of the English minister who had organized the coalition. He scarcely bore up against the disaster of Ulm; he revived at the news of Trafalgar; he sank when the calamity of Austerlitz became known to him. He went to Bath on the 8th of December. The waters produced a fit of the gout, which was succeeded by a total debility of digestion. At the end of the month Lord Castlereagh went to Bath to tell him the fatal end of all his great plans. "It struck Pitt so deeply and found him in such an enfeebled state that he certainly never recovered it."* By slow journeys, attended by his physician, Sir Walter Farquhar, he arrived at his villa at Putney, so emaciated as not to be known. On the 13th he saw Lord Castlereagh and Lord Hawkesbury for the last time. Malmesbury says that after this interview he said to the Bishop of Lincoln, putting his hand on his stomach, "I feel something here that reminds me I shall never recover." On the 13th he saw Lord Wellesley, who had just returned from India; and he fainted, according to Malmesbury, before Wellesley left the room. Lord Brougham gives an interesting account of this interview, but with a material variation: "This, their last interview, was in the villa on Putney Heath, where he died a few days after. Lord Wellesley called upon me there many years after; it was then occupied by my brother-in-law, Mr. Eden, whom I was visiting. His lordship showed me the place where these illustrious friends sat. Mr. Pitt was, he said, much emaciated and enfeebled, but retained his gayety and his constitutionally sanguine disposition; he expressed his confident hopes of recovery. In the adjoining room he lay a corpse the ensuing week; and it is a singular and a melancholy circumstance, resembling the stories told of William the Conqueror's deserted state at his decease, that some one in the neighborhood having sent a message to inquire after Mr. Pitt's state, he found the wicket open, then the door of the house, and, nobody answering the bell, he walked through the rooms till he reached the bed on which the minister's body lay lifeless, the sole tenant of the mansion of which the doors a few hours before were darkened by crowds of suitors, alike obsequious and importunate, the vultures whose instinct haunts the carcases only of living ministers."† The doors darkened by crowds of suitors, only a few hours before his death, appears to be a flight of imagination. George Rose came to Putney on the 15th, and there learned that Lord Castlereagh and Lord Hawkesbury had insisted on seeing Mr. Pitt on points of public business of the most serious importance, which interview visibly affected him. He saw Mr. Rose for five minutes on the 15th. From that time Rose says, "no one had access to him but the bishop (of Lincoln) and the physicians." On the 23d Rose enters in his diary that about seven in the morning he received a note "to tell me that my most inestimable friend quitted the world about four o'clock. He saw no one after the bishop had taken notes of his last desires but Lady Hester (his niece), who went to his bedside in the evening. He at first did not know her; but afterward he did, and blessed her: nor did he utter another word, except that about half an hour before he breathed his last the servant heard him say, 'My country! oh, my country!'"‡ The bishop went away from Putney Heath, as soon as the dreaded event of this winter morning was over, before the busy world was stirring. We ourselves, long ago, heard the story of the deserted house, with a sufficient explanation. Nothing more natural than that the few servants should have gone from Putney Heath upon the necessary duties of such mournful occasions, and have left the doors of the solitary house unfastened.

William Pitt died on the 23d of January. It was the twenty-fifth anniversary of the day on which he first entered parliament. And this was the end of his struggle for thirteen years against the power of revolutionary France, against the Directory, against the Consulate, against the Empire. He "died of a broken heart," says his devoted friend, Wilberforce. "The accounts from the armies struck a death-blow within." On the 26th of January the leader of these armies entered Paris, after a victorious campaign of three months, to receive the homage of a nation which saw in the glory of one man a

* "Correspondence of Napoleon with his Brother," vol. i. p. 64 (1855).
† Thiers, tome vi. p. 326.
‡ "Correspondence with Joseph," p. 65. (Translator's note.)
§ Ibid.

* Malmesbury, vol. iv. p. 352.
† "Statesmen of the Time of George III.," vol. iii. p. 312.
‡ Rose, "Diaries," p. 223 and p. 233.

recompense for all the miseries of the republic; a nation which believed that to make France mistress of the world was to make Frenchmen prosperous and happy.

The great parliamentary career of William Pitt commences in 1781.* His supreme command of the political action of his country commences in 1783. † In 1784 Gibbon wrote from Lausanne, "A youth of five-and-twenty, who raises himself to the government of an empire by the power of genius and the reputation of virtue, is a circumstance unparalleled in history, and, in a general view, is not less glorious to the country than to himself." ‡ We have traced the history of this great orator and statesman from the brilliancy of his life's day-spring to the clouds and darkness of its evening, and, we trust, in no unfriendly spirit—rather with a profound admiration of intellectual and moral qualities such as the sons of men are rarely endowed with. Nevertheless, we have not repressed a conviction that, if his peace administration was as eminently sagacious as it was safe and prosperous, his war administration and his domestic policy from 1793 gave few occasions in which to display the ascendency of his genius in high and blameless deeds, however surpassing his power of justifying his measures by majestic and all-prevailing words. He was indeed "the top of eloquence." We cannot deny that he was also the most ardent among "lovers of their country;" the farthest elevated above all mercenary objects. Those who affected to be of his school were really, with one or two exceptions, not his pupils. Had Pitt lived to behold a war triumph, he might again have vindicated his claim to be a great peace minister and a sincere social reformer.

CHAPTER CCII.

India—Attacks in parliament upon Marquis Wellesley—The subsidiary system—The Mahratta chiefs—The Mahratta war—General Lake—General Wellesley—The battle of Assye—End of the campaign—Holkar—Famine in India—Mutiny at Vellore—Administration of Grenville and Fox—Financial measures—Volunteers—Acquittal of Lord Melville—The Princess of Wales—Mr. Fox and the king—Declining health of Mr. Fox—Slave trade—Progress of the cause of abolition—Thomas Clarkson—Negotiations for peace—End of the negotiations—Death of Mr. Fox—Confederation of the Rhine—Prussia—Aggressions of Napoleon—Murder of Palm—Joseph Bonaparte, King of Naples—British army in Calabria—Battle of Maida—Capture of Buenos Ayres by Sir Home Popham—Its recapture.

TWELVE days after the Marquis Wellesley had seen his great friend for the last time, and had felt that the voice would soon be mute which could best defend him from the enemies that were gathering around, Mr. James Paull, who had aspired to sit for Westminster, moved for papers, upon which he purposed to ground grave charges against the late governor-general of India. He had to lament, he said, in common with every man who had turned his thoughts to India, and in common with all the nations of Hindostan, that Lord Wellesley's spirit of aggrandizement, his love of power, and insatiable ambition had led him into errors and mistakes that had shook to their base our very existence in India, and to consequent acts of great injustice and oppression.§ The Indian policy of Wellesley had been somewhat too bold for the timid expediency of the Addington government. The prime minister told Mr. Henry Wellesley that the administration "could not support the governor-general against the court of directors," and that as a private friend he could not advise him to stay beyond the year 1803. ‖ Before that year had closed the statesmanship of Lord Wellesley and the military exploits of his brother Arthur and of General Lake had established the supremacy of the British in India, "under a combination of circumstances in the highest degree critical and difficult." Such were the terms addressed to Wellesley by the directors of the East India Company in 1837. In 1805 no Indian administrator was ever more the object of their jealousy and suspicion. Arthur Wellesley returned to England in September of that year. He thus writes to his brother after an interview with Lord Castlereagh: "He lamented in strong terms your differences with the court of directors, and entered with some detail upon the causes of them. These were principally the old story—disobedience of their orders, contempt of their authority, neglect to write to them to inform them of the most important events, and declared dislike of their persons." They feared that he would endeavor to overturn their authority when he returned home. *

After the fall of Tippoo, and the partition of the Mysore territory in 1799,† Lord Wellesley steadily pursued the policy which is distinguished as the subsidiary system. Its principle was to form treaties with native rulers; in compliance with which a military force, under our own command, was to be maintained at the expense of the native prince, and the control of state affairs was to be vested in the British resident, with the exception of all that related to the domestic arrangements of the sovereign, who preserved the regal pomp without the regal power. This subsidiary system was warmly opposed in the British parliament as unjust and tyrannical. Its defence is succinctly stated by one who has been a constant enemy of all injustice and tyranny: "We had been compelled to interfere in their affairs, and to regulate the succession to their thrones, upon each successive discovery of designs hostile to us, nay, threatening our very existence, the subversion of all the fabric of useful and humane and enlightened polity which we had erected on the ruins of their own barbarous system, and particularly the restriction of the cruel despotism under which the native millions had formerly groaned." ‡ In 1800 a subsidiary treaty was formed with the Nizam, who ceded all his Mysorean territories in exchange for aid and protection. In 1801 the nephew of the deceased Nabob of Arcot was raised to the nominal throne, renouncing in favor of the British all the powers of government. The Subahdar of Oude and the Peishwa came also under subordination to the British authority. After the rupture of the peace of Amiens a new danger had arisen in a confederacy of Mahratta chiefs, assisted by French arms and French influence. The war of England against Napoleon was in effect to be carried on in a war with the Mahrattas. In the districts watered by the Godavery and the Poorna were the qualities of a great captain to be displayed, which, a few years later, were to drive the legions of Napoleon from the Tagus to the Garonne.

The warlike race of the Mahrattas were the lords of a population of forty millions, who occupied the fertile provinces extending in length from Delhi to the Toombuddra, and in breadth from the Bay of Bengal to the Gulf of Cambay. There were five Mahratta chieftains, whose collective military force amounted to 300,000, of which 100,000 were cavalry. The authority of the nominal sovereign, the Rajah of Sattara, was in the hands of the Peishwa, or prime minister, whose office was hereditary. He held his court at Poonah. The ostensible but feeble head of the Mahratta chiefs, he generally looked for aid to the British to defend him from his ambitious rivals, but he had sometimes intrigued to throw off the British connection and form an alliance with the French. At the beginning of the century the great chief Holkar was at war with the equally valorous chief Scindia. Holkar, to strengthen his own power and destroy an ally of his rival, attacked the Peishwa, who fled from Poonah after a signal defeat. It was then that he called the British to his aid, with whom he concluded the treaty of Bassein, on the last day of December, 1802. General Wellesley marched six hundred miles, from Seringapatam to Poonah, in the worst season of the year, drove out the Mahrattas, and reinstated the Peishwa in his capital. Holkar now turned to his old rival, Scindia, to coalesce with him against the Peishwa, the Nizam, and the British. Directing the military operations of Scindia was a clever Frenchman, M. Perron, who had under him a large army of infantry disciplined in the European manner, many thousand cavalry, and a well-appointed train of artillery. Bhoonsla, the Rajah of Berar (or Rajah of Nagpoor), joined the alliance of Scindia and Holkar. The fifth Mahratta chieftain was Guickwar, and his territory was Guzerat, where Scindia had some possessions and great power and influence. Guickwar took no part in the approaching contest. For some time after the Peishwa had been restored, negotiations were going on between the British government and Scindia and the Rajah of Berar. They professed friend-

* *Ante*, vol. vi. p. 899.
† *Ante*, vol. vii. 954.
‡ "Life of Pitt," by Earl Stanhope, vol. i. p. 237; 1861.
§ Hansard, vol. v. col. 564.
‖ Wellington's "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. iv. p. 339.

* Wellington's "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. iv. p. 535.
† *Ante*, p. 1029.
‡ Lord Brougham, "Sketches of Statesmen," vol. iii. p. 308.

ship, but it soon became clear that they were confederates with Holkar, and were depending for assistance upon Perron. The Nizam was known to be dying, and it was one of the objects of these chieftains to arrange the succession so as to aggrandize their own power. It was thus necessary to make war upon this confederacy, which threatened the security of the British dominion in India as much, if not more, than the hostility of Tippoo. There was the same danger, as in his case, of an alliance with France on the part of the Mahrattas. Pondicherry had been given up to France by the treaty of Amiens. When the Mahratta war broke out the rupture of that treaty was not known. The vicinity of Pondicherry to the Mahratta country required the greatest vigilance. While negotiations with the Mahratta chiefs were still in progress the news came of the renewal of the war. A French force attempted to land at Pondicherry, and were made prisoners. Providing against hostilities upon a great scale, the governor-general decided upon the plan of a campaign, in which the rare faculty of organizing the co-operating movements of troops acting upon different points insured the same success as had attended the campaigns of Napoleon. One element of success was the unshackled power of an able commander in the Deccan, the most important portion of the field of war. On the 26th of June Arthur Wellesley was appointed to the command of all the British and allied troops in the territories of the Peishwa and the Nizam, and to the direction of the political affairs of this district, which was surrounded by the dominions of the confederate chiefs. In Hindostan the same complete authority was given to General Lake. General Wellesley was at Poonah, with 17,000 men, when the negotiation with Scindia was at an end. General Lake was upon the Junna, watching the movements of Perron, who was in a part of the Douab which had been bestowed upon him by Scindia. In Guzerat Colonel Murray commanded the Bombay army, a force of seven thousand men, and he was afterward reinforced by Colonel Woodington. In the province of Cuttack Colonel Harcourt was at the head of the Madras army, a small body of troops, who were able to render efficient service. All these armies, not great in numerical amount, but most formidable in their discipline, were all in motion, at one and the same time, to close round the enemy from the south and the north, from the east and the west; "from the sea, the mountains, and the forests, over the salt sands of Cuttack, and the high plains of the Dekkan, and through the passes of the Ghauts, and over the rivers of Hindostan, and out of the rank swamps of the basin of the Ganges." *

It was the 3d of August when the British resident quitted Scindia's camp. His departure was the signal for immediate hostilities. On the 6th of August General Wellesley wrote a letter to Scindia, characterized by his usual decisive language: "I offered you peace on terms of equality, and honorable to all parties; you have chosen war, and are responsible for all consequences." † On the 12th of August he had advanced through roads rendered almost impassable by violent rains, and had taken the strong fort of Ahmednuggur. General Lake was equally prompt in his movements. The French force under Perron fled before him, retreating from Coel, which Lake then occupied. Perron in a few days put himself under British protection, and was received with kindness. He complained of the treachery of his officers, and is supposed not to have been insensible to the attractions of drafts upon the treasury of Calcutta. On the 4th of September the strong fortress of Ali-Ghur was taken by a storming party of the army of Lake. The Bombay and the Madras armies were equally successful in their advances. On the 6th of August General Wellesley had sent orders to the officer in command of the Bombay army to attack Baroach. In a little more than three weeks Baroach had surrendered. On the 12th of September Lake obtained a great victory over the troops of Scindia, and over the French army which Perron had formed. They were commanded by another Frenchman, Bourquien. On the following day the British were in possession of Delhi. Lake restored the Mogul emperor, Shah Allum, who had been deposed, and thus propitiated the Mohammedan population of Hindostan. The triumphant career of Lake was followed up in the battles of Muttra and Agra, and was completed in the great victory of Laswarree on the 1st of November. He was worthy of all honor. The thanks of parliament and a peerage were never more properly bestowed than upon the senior general in this astonishing campaign.

Splendid and decisive as was the career of the northern army—important as were the successes of the Bombay army and the Madras army—the chief interest of this Mahratta war nevertheless consists in following the military operations, in tracing the evidence of the qualifications for a great captain, of one whom Napoleon, with his characteristic want of honesty, to say nothing of magnanimity, pronounced to be "*un homme borné*"—a general fit only to command sepoys.

Colonel Stevenson was to the east of General Wellesley, after the capture of Ahmednuggur. It was necessary to effect a junction of their two armies. Wellesley directed Stevenson to take a bold course: "Move forward yourself with the company's cavalry, and all the Nizam's and a battalion, and dash at the first party that comes into your neighborhood. . . . A long defensive war will ruin us. . . . By any other plan we shall lose our supplies." * On the 21st of August Wellesley's cavalry was passing the wide Godavery. They passed in wicker boats covered with bullock skins. General Wellesley—who did not disdain to make himself thoroughly acquainted with what some would have considered matters out of a commander's vocation—when he first entered the Mahratta territory sent the most minute directions to an officer how such boats were to be made, in the construction of which "well-cured skins" were most essential articles.† During a month Wellesley and Stevenson were pursuing Scindia's forces, united with those of the Rajah of Berar, each of the British commanders never allowing the enemy to rest, and marching always with the rapidity which could alone keep pace with the Mahratta cavalry. On the 21st of September Wellesley and Stevenson were a little to the east of Aurungabad. They were sufficiently near to each other to concert a plan of joint operations against the Mahratta armies, which had been reinforced with sixteen battalions of infantry, commanded by French officers, and with a train of artillery. This formidable force was concentrated on the banks of the Kaitna.

On the 22d of September the division under Wellesley and the division under Stevenson marched with the intention to attack the enemy. There was a range of hills between the British and the Mahrattas. One division marched by the eastern road round the hills; the other by the western road. They encamped that night at the two extremities of the range of hills. On the morning of the 23d General Wellesley received information that Scindia and Bhoonsla had moved off with their cavalry, but that their infantry were still in camp, and were about to follow the cavalry. Their camp might be seen from a rising ground. "It was obvious that the attack was no longer to be delayed," writes Wellesley. It was no longer to be delayed, although Colonel Stevenson had not arrived with his detachment. He was misled by his guides. A lieutenant of the 78th, who had behaved well at the attack of Ahmednuggur, had been appointed by the general to act as his brigade-major.‡ That lieutenant was Colin Campbell, who afterward served under Wellington in the Peninsular War. From the similarity of name he has been sometimes mistaken for the Sir Colin Campbell, who in 1857 and 1858 was the sagacious commander-in-chief of the forces of India, and whose distinguished services raised him to the peerage as Lord Clyde. The young lieutenant's description of the battle of Assye, contained in a private letter of the time, is the clearest description of this extraordinary conflict which we have seen.§ "The general," says Campbell, "immediately formed his plan." In his latter years the Duke of Wellington related to "an early and intimate friend" how "he formed his plan:"

"I was indebted for my success at Assye to a very ordinary exercise of common-sense. The Mahratta chiefs, whom I was marching to overtake, had made a hasty retreat with their infantry and guns, and had got round behind a river on my right, leaving me exposed to an overwhelming force of native cavalry. To get rid of these gentlemen, and to get at the others, I had no chance but getting

* Miss Martineau, "Introduction to the History of the Peace," p. cxxxv.

† "Dispatches," vol. ii. p. 179.

* "Dispatches," vol. ii. p. 210.

† "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. iv p. 54.

‡ "Dispatches," vol. ii. p. 361.

§ It is published, as a note, in the "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. iv. p. 184.

over the river also; but my native guides all assured me that the river was impassable in this part, and the superior force of the enemy would not permit me to have it examined. I was rather puzzled, but at last I resolved to see what I could of the river myself, and so, with my most intelligent guides and an escort of (I think) all my cavalry, I pushed forward till I could see with my glass one village on the right or near bank of the river, and another village exactly opposite on the other bank, and I immediately said to myself that men could not have built two villages so close to one another, on opposite sides of a stream, without some habitual means of communication, either by boats or a ford—most probably by the latter. My guides still persisted that there were neither; but on my own conjecture, or rather reasoning, I took the desperate, as it seemed, resolution of marching for the river—and I was right. I found a passage, crossed my army over, had no more to fear from the enemy's cloud of cavalry, and my force, small as it was, was just enough to fill the space between that river and another stream that fell into it thereabouts, and on which Assye stood, so that both my flanks were secure. And there I fought and won the battle—the bloodiest for the number that I ever saw; and this was all from the common-sense of guessing that men did not build villages on opposite sides of a stream without some means of communication between them." *

The battle of Assye might well be called "the bloodiest for its number" that the hero of so many battles had ever seen. Well might it be so, when the Mahratta's force was at least seven times as numerous as the British army. It was one o'clock when the enemy's camp was in view, extending from five to seven miles. "We began to advance," writes the brigade-major, "a little after three, and the action was not entirely over till six o'clock." The 74th and 78th regiments and four battalions of sepoys moved forward to the attack, the pickets led, and the cavalry brought up the rear to protect the infantry from the enemy's horse. We continue the spirited narrative of Colin Campbell:

"The line was ordered to advance. The pickets at this period had nearly lost a third of their number, and most of their gun-bullocks were killed: some of the corps, I think, waited too long, wishing to bring forward their guns, which could be of no service. The line moved rapidly (I may say without firing two rounds) and took possession of the first line of guns, where many of the enemy were killed. They then moved on in equally good order and resolution to the second line of guns, from which they very soon drove the enemy; but many of the artillery, who pretended to be dead when we passed on to the second line of guns, turned the guns we had taken upon us, which obliged us to return and again to drive them from them. Things at this period did not go on so well on our right, owing to some mistake of the pickets in having, when ordered to advance, inclined to their right, which brought the 17th regiment into the first line. Major Swinton went to the pickets, and asked them why they did not move on? On his return to his regiment he found that numbers of his officers and men had fallen. He immediately moved forward. At this period the cannonade was truly tremendous. A milk hedge in their front, which they had to pass to come at the enemy's guns, threw them into a little confusion; but they still pushed forward, and had taken possession of many of their guns, when the second line, which opened on them, obliged them to retire from what they had so dearly purchased. The numbers of the 74th regiment remaining at this period were small; on their returning, some of the enemy's cavalry came forward and cut up many of the wounded officers and men. It was at this critical moment that the 19th charged, and saved the remains of the 74th regiment. General Wellesley at the same time threw the 78th regiment forward on their right, to move down on the enemy, who still kept their position at Assye. This movement and the charge of the 19th light dragoons made the enemy retire from all their guns precipitately, and they fled across the nullah to our right at the village of Assye, where numbers of them were cut up by the cavalry. The general was in the thick of the action the whole time, and had a horse killed under him. No man could have shown a better example to the troops than he did. I never saw a man so cool and collected as he was the whole time, though I can assure you, till our troops got orders to advance, the fate of the day seemed doubtful; and if the numerous cavalry of the enemy had done their duty, I hardly think it possible that we could have succeeded. From the European officers who have since surrendered, it appears they had about twelve thousand infantry, and their cavalry is supposed to have been at least twenty thousand, though many make it more. We have now in our possession one hundred and two guns, and all their tumbrils."

In the middle of October Colonel Stevenson obtained possession of the strong fortresses of Asseerghur and Burhampoor. General Wellesley had followed the Mahratta army in their various movements, their stratagems never defeating his vigilance. Scindia at last desired a truce. This was granted. But it was soon discovered that his cavalry were serving in the army of the Rajah of Berar, and that the truce was altogether delusive. On the 29th of November General Wellesley obtained a victory over the united armies of Scindia and Bhoonsla. The troops had marched a great distance, on a very hot day; but, although late, the general determined to encounter the long line of infantry, cavalry, and artillery, regularly drawn up on the plains of Argaum. Their line extended above five miles. That great array was soon broken by the resistance of the British infantry when they were attacked. The Mahrattas retired in disorder, leaving their cannon, and pursued by moonlight by the British, the Mogul, and the Mysore cavalry.* This wonderful campaign, of little more than four months, was finished by the successful termination of the siege of Gawilghur, a strong place, thus described by General Wellesley: "The fort of Gawilghur is situated in a range of mountains between the sources of the rivers Poorna and Taptee. It stands on a lofty mountain on this range, and consists of one complete inner fort which fronts to the south, where the rock is most steep, and an outer fort, which covers the inner to the north-west and north. This outer fort has a third wall, which covers the approach to it from the north by the village of Labada. All these walls are strongly built, and fortified by ramparts and towers." † Colonel Stevenson broke ground near Labada on the 12th of December. Gawilghur was bombarded for three days, and the fort, heretofore deemed impregnable, was in the possession of the British on the 15th of December.

The Mahratta war with Scindia and Bhoonsla was at an end. The Rajah of Berar, who had sued for a peace, signed a treaty on the 17th. He ceded Cuttack, which was annexed to the British dominions, and he agreed to admit no Europeans but the British within his territories. Scindia also was completely humbled. A treaty with him was signed on the 30th of December, he agreeing to give up Baroach, Ahmednuggur, and his forts in the Douab, and to exclude all Europeans except the British. He was to receive the protection which was extended under the subsidiary system to other dependent states.

But there was another great Mahratta chieftain yet unsubdued. His intriguing spirit was exercised in urging the other chiefs to break the treaties which they had entered into. The governor-general tried to convert this enemy into a friend by negotiation. Holkar openly defied him; he would come with his army, and sweep and destroy like the waves of the sea. In April, 1804, war was declared against Holkar. The war went on through 1804 and 1805. Marquis Wellesley had resigned the government of India at the end of July, and Marquis Cornwallis had succeeded him, before Holkar was subdued. Cornwallis died on the 5th of October, and Sir George Barlow assumed the government. On the 24th of December a treaty was signed with Holkar, and he also agreed to exclude from his territories all Europeans except the British.

Sir Arthur Wellesley (he had received the Order of the Bath for his great services) returned to England in 1805. During his voyage home he employed his active mind in writing an interesting paper on the subject of "Dearth in India." ‡ There had been a famine in the Deccan in 1803 and 1804, which he had witnessed. The dearth and its fatal effects were to be attributed principally to the dry season of 1803. He describes the physical geography of the peninsula, the peculiar cultivation of wet lands or of dry, the dependence of the rice-produce of the wet lands upon the fall of the rain, assisted by the artificial canals, tanks, and wells, many of which were ancient works, and the entire dependence of the dry lands, where what are called dry grains are cultivated, upon the critical arrival and the

* "Quarterly Review," vol. xcii. p. 513.

* "Dispatches," vol. ii. p. 556. † Ibid., p. 583.
‡ "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. iv. p. 514.

quantity of the periodical rains. The portions of our Indian empire to which Sir A. Wellesley directed his attention were far less extensive than at present. Since 1804 there have been many famines, especially one very terrible in 1837, in the north-western provinces. Such a calamity has again occurred in 1860. Awful as the distress has been, it is satisfactory to know that the question which Sir A. Wellesley asked, "In what manner the deficiency produced by the seasons in any particular part could be remedied by the government in that part?" has been to some extent answered by the construction during recent years of great canals for irrigation. The eastern and the western Jumna canals and the Ganges canal are the grandest of these works, and are capable of irrigating several millions of acres.

After his return from India the Marquis Wellesley had to endure the bitter mortification of finding that his great public services had rendered him a mark for the attacks of James Paull, who, having failed in India of advancement at his hands, returned to England and became a member of parliament. In 1822, when Marquis Wellesley was lord-lieutenant of Ireland, some allusions having been made in the House of Commons to the conduct of the governor-general of India, twenty years before, as partaking of the spirit which distinguished all those possessed of despotic power, Lord Castlereagh truly said that when the marquis had to undergo a long investigation of his conduct there was considerable delay "before he received that homage which was justly due to his talents and integrity, and which he did ultimately receive, in spite of all opposition." * It is unnecessary for us to follow the parliamentary discussions on this subject. The accusations were, in a great degree, the result of private malice and party rancor, and, like all such abuses of the privileges of representative government, their interest very quickly passed away. Paull had sufficient notoriety during the short period he was before the English public. He fought a duel with Sir Francis Burdett in 1807, and he terminated his career by suicide in 1808.

In the affairs of India an event of far more lasting importance than the assaults upon the Marquis Wellesley took place on the 10th of July, 1806. At two o'clock in the morning of that day the European barracks at Vellore, in which were four companies of the 69th regiment, were surrounded by two battalions of sepoys in the service of the East India Company. Through every door and window these mutineers poured in a destructive fire upon the sleeping soldiers. The sentinels were killed; the sick in the hospital were massacred; the officers' houses were ransacked, and they, with their wives and children, were put to death. Colonel Fancourt, the commander of the 69th, fell in the attempt to save his men. His widow wrote an interesting account of the horrors of that night, having, almost miraculously, escaped with her little boy.† There was a terrible retribution the next day. The 19th regiment of dragoons arrived; took the fort of Vellore from the insurgents; six hundred of the sepoys were cut down, and two hundred were dragged out of their hiding-places and shot. The sons of Tippoo Saib, who were residing at Vellore, were suspected of being concerned in this mutiny. But there were demonstrations of a spirit of disaffection among the native troops in other places. Some extremely foolish regulations had been attempted by the military authorities at Madras with respect to the dress of the sepoys. It was wished to transform the turban into something like a helmet. An opinion had been spread that it was the desire of the British government to convert the native troops to Christianity by forcible means. This notion was disavowed in a subsequent proclamation of the government at Madras. But at that time the zeal of some persons for the conversion of the Hindoo population was far from discreet; and in England there was no hesitation in declaring that "the restless spirit of fanaticism has insinuated itself into our Indian councils," and that, unless checked in time, it will lead to the subversion of our Indian empire, and the massacre of our countrymen dispersed over that distant land." ‡

The House of Commons has voted an address to the king, for a public funeral for Mr. Pitt, and a monument to be erected to his memory in Westminster Abbey. The house was not unanimous in this vote. Mr. Windham objected because "it has not been the usage of this country, or of mankind in general, to grant the highest rewards, unless in cases where merit has been crowned with success." He could not agree in awarding the highest honors to Mr. Pitt, "in the midst of the very ruin which his last measures had brought on." Mr. Fox praised the disinterestedness of Mr. Pitt's career as a minister—that "with regard to private emolument he had acted with a high degree of integrity and moderation." But, he said, "I cannot consent to confer public honors, on the ground of his being 'an excellent statesman,' on the man who, in my opinion, was the sole, certainly the chief supporter of a system which I had early been taught to consider as a bad one." The motion was carried by a majority of 169. The House of Commons has unanimously voted 40,000*l.* for the payment of Mr. Pitt's debts. The great question now is, who is to be the head of a new administration, at a time of such extraordinary danger and difficulty. The post has been offered to Lord Hawkesbury, and he has wisely declined it. Lord Hawkesbury did not decline to be Mr. Pitt's successor in the enjoyment of the lucrative office of Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, at which, according to Mr. Abbott, a general dissatisfaction was expressed. On the 27th of January the king saw Lord Grenville, and desired him to form a new administration. Lord Grenville told his majesty that he could not propose any arrangements which did not give Mr. Fox a distinguished place in the cabinet. The king replied, "I know all that; have your arrangements ready by Wednesday." * The ministry of "All the Talents" was accepted without any hesitation on the part of the king. There were some incongruous materials in its composition. Lord Sidmouth could command forty or fifty parliamentary friends, "who constituted a species of armed neutrality far too powerful to be overlooked." † He was appointed lord privy seal. He brought with him into the cabinet Lord Ellenborough, the lord chief justice—an arrangement which one of Sidmouth's friends described as reminding him of "a faithful old steward, with his mastiff, watching new servants, lest they should have some evil designs against the old family mansion." ‡ The appointment was open to serious constitutional objections. Romilly, who was now solicitor-general, thought there was "nothing illegal or unconstitutional" in this nomination, although "it is certainly very desirable that a judge should not take any part in politics." § Wilberforce expressed the general feeling when he deprecated the mischievous consequences of subjecting the decisions of our courts of justice to the influence of party attachments; or, which he thought of equal importance, of producing an impression on the public mind that such a bias existed. ‖ Lord Campbell holds—and there can be no higher authority—that "the duties of criminal judge and member of the cabinet are incompatible." ¶ When the ministry was finally constituted Mr. Erskine (Lord Erskine) became lord chancellor; Lord Grenville, first lord of the treasury; Lord Howick (late Mr. Grey), first lord of the admiralty; Earl Spencer, secretary of state for the home department; Mr. Fox, secretary of state for foreign affairs; Mr. Windham, secretary of state for war and colonies; and Lord Henry Petty (the present Lord Lansdowne), chancellor of the exchequer.

The financial measures of the new ministry, however necessary, did not advance their popularity. Lord Henry Petty is described by the speaker as "going through the whole financial state of the country in a clear, distinct, and comprehensive manner." But no lucidness of detail could reconcile the nation to the property tax being raised to ten per cent from six and a half per cent. Mr. Windham's plan for improving the condition of the soldier, by enlisting him for a stated period and not for life, was a real improvement in the constitution of the army. But Mr. Windham knew little of the character of the British people. He considered that he was a faithful advocate of popular rights when he resisted any attempt to legislate against bull-baiting. He believed that he was not wanting in public spirit when he would have rested the security of the land from invasion upon a vast standing army. He was an able and honest politician, but one whose alliance was as dangerous as his hostility. He brought

* Hansard, N. S., vol. vi. col. 169.
† "Plain Englishman," vol. ii. p. 437.
‡ "Annual Register," 1806, p. 254.

* Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 32.
† "Life of Sidmouth," vol. ii. p. 412.
‡ Ibid., p. 417.
§ Romilly, "Diary," March 1.
‖ Wilberforce, "Life," vol. iii. p. 258.
¶ "Lives of the Chancellors"—Erskine.

odium upon the government by the discouragement he gave to that national feeling which the alarm of 1803 had called forth, and in his contempt of four hundred thousand citizens embodied for the defence of their country. Wilberforce writes, "I hear from Lascelles that administration is highly unpopular on account of Windham's treatment of the volunteers." *

The trial of Lord Melville, during this session, upon the impeachment of the Commons in 1805, excited little interest in the public mind. On the 10th of May Romilly, as one of the managers for the Commons, summed up the evidence for the impeachment. It was his first public appearance as a political leader, and, says Horner, "his success was as great as his friends predicted." The result of the trial gave to many opponents of the Tory party, as it gave to Horner, "much disgust and despondency with respect to public affairs." They considered the verdict—not guilty—"contrary to plain, strong, accumulated evidence." Nevertheless, there was no marked expression of dissatisfaction at his acquittal by the Peers on the 12th of June, after a proceeding which had lasted sixteen days. Nor did the people take more interest in the protracted debates upon the charges against Marquis Wellesley. There was one subject which did excite them—the rumors of a solemn inquiry into the conduct of the Princess of Wales, by virtue of a commission from the king to the chancellor, Lord Grenville, Lord Spencer, and Lord Ellenborough. The servants of the princess were examined. Romilly, as solicitor-general, was engaged in these examinations, and, in his opinion, the principal charge against the princess, which arose out of her adoption of a child, was completely disproved. He adds that "the evidence of all the servants as to the general conduct of the princess was very favorable to her." † During six months this inquiry furnished ample scope for the exercise of curiosity. It terminated by the king referring the whole matter to his cabinet; and by their advice his majesty sent a written message to the princess, saying that there was no foundation for the graver charges against her, but that he saw with serious concern, in the depositions of the witnesses, and even in her royal highness's own letter to him written by way of defence, evidence of a deportment unbecoming her station.‡ The hateful question of this unseemly deportment in its extent and consequences was long a source of prurient excitement, and of consequent injury to public morals.

The secretary of state for foreign affairs was the member of the government upon whose influence all looked with anxiety—some with extravagant hope; some with causeless alarm. Would the king long agree with Mr. Fox, whom he hated? was the first question. The king not only tolerated Mr. Fox, but he soon came to like him. In a memorandum of the late Princess Augusta it is recorded that after Mr. Fox's return to power a gloom appeared to hang over the spirits of the king, but that after their first interview the cloud was evidently removed. The king said to his new minister, "Mr. Fox, I little thought that you and I should ever meet again in this place. But I have no desire to look back upon old grievances, and you may rest assured I never shall remind you of them." Mr. Fox replied, "My deeds, and not my words, shall commend me to your majesty." § A base motive has been imputed to George III., in his ready consent to admit Mr. Fox into the cabinet in 1806, as contrasted with the time when he would rather have hazarded the greatest of all evils than have allowed him to be a colleague of Mr. Pitt. "The king is said to have had early intelligence of Mr. Fox's days being numbered." ‖ We are unable to trace, in any of the correspondence and diaries which have appeared since this sentence was written, any apprehension among the colleagues of Fox, or among any other public men, as expressed earlier than two months after his appointment to office, that he was in ill-health, or that a fear was entertained that he would soon be likely to be laid at rest by the side of his great rival. On the 5th of March Wilberforce enters in his "Diary," that consulting with Fox on the question of abolition he found him "quite rampant and playful as he was twenty-two years ago, when not under any awe of his opponents." ¶ But the speaker records that on the 31st of March Mr. Fox was taken ill at the House of Commons, and that Mr. Cline, the eminent surgeon, entertained a very bad opinion of his case, general symptoms appearing of a dropsical habit.* Three days after Fox spoke for an hour in the House of Commons on Windham's military plans. At the end of April the same diarist records that Mr. Fox was "advised to retire for a time from his unceasing attention to business, which he positively refuses to do at this period." He had, indeed, no common work in hand which required the exercise of his vast ability, his energy, and his discretion. He died on the 13th of September, having been engaged to the last in consultation with his colleagues on two great points of national policy. In the House of Commons, in January, 1807, Lord Howick thus described the leading aspirations of Mr. Fox in the last conversation of the two friends on the 7th of September: "On that occasion he told me that the ardent wishes of his mind were to consummate before he died two great works on which he had set his heart, and these were the restoration of a solid and honorable peace and the abolition of the slave trade." † In the one object he did not live to see the unsuccessful issue of a negotiation with France which was begun soon after his entrance into office. In the other object he had the happiness of being partially successful, but the final success was reserved for his colleagues, as the one great measure of permanent good which they accomplished during their brief tenure of power.

The history of the abolition of the slave trade is a history of individual efforts, carried on, through many years, with unexampled zeal and perseverance, and taken up, again and again, by the British legislature, amid slight hopes of success against an opposition resolute to defend a traffic, of which the enormity of the evil was reconciled to many minds by the magnitude of the profits. Truly, for the few enthusiasts who entered into a contest with the great merchants of Bristol and Liverpool, whose ships carried every year fifty thousand captive negroes from the African coast to the West India Islands—truly, for such as Thomas Clarkson, "it was an obstinate hill to climb." ‡ In looking back to the growth of public opinion on the subject of African slavery, some may believe that the triumphant exclamation of Cowper, "Slaves cannot live in England," had reference to an earlier time than that of Lord North's administration. It was through the exertions of Mr. Granville Sharp that it was solemnly declared "that a slave, the moment he lands in England, falls under the protection of the laws, and becomes a free man." We quote the words of Blackstone, who refers to the great case of the negro Somerset, as reported in the State Trials. That case was not decided till 1772. To the Society of Friends in England belongs the honor of the first united efforts to prevent the continuance of the slave trade, against which they petitioned parliament in 1783. Clarkson was a graduate of St. John's College, Cambridge, when the vice-chancellor of the university announced as the subject of a Latin prize essay, "Is it right to make slaves of others against their will?" Clarkson obtained the prize. He has recorded that after having read his essay in the Senate House, on returning to London on horseback, he sat down disconsolate on the turf by the roadside, asking himself if the horrible facts stated in his own composition could be true. "Here a thought came into my mind that, if the contents of my essay were true, it was time some person should see these calamities to their end." Timidly he asked himself, a young man of twenty-four, if the business of his life lay in that direction? He was intended for the Church. He thought that there were few laborers in the vast field which was always present to his agitated imagination, and that in that field he would work in his "great taskmaster's eye" better than in the field where the laborers were many. He translated his essay into English, with additional facts. He became known to some zealous Quakers. He obtained introductions to Wilberforce, Pitt, and Fox. Henceforth the cause was in the hands of men whose voices would go through the world, and would speak trumpet-tongued to the justice of mankind. From this time to 1788 Clarkson pursued his great object in the most practical manner—by the collection of a vast body of details, totally new to the English people, which he published in 1788. These facts he

* Wilberforce, "Life," vol. iii. p. 267.
† Diary in Romilly's "Memoirs," June 7, 1806.
‡ Ibid., February 29, 1807.
§ "Quarterly Review," vol. cv. p. 482.
‖ Lord Brougham, "Statesmen," vol. iii. p. 313.
¶ Wilberforce, "Life," vol. iii. p. 259.

* Colchester, "Diary," vol. ii. p. 48.
† "Hansard," vol. viii. col. 324.
‡ Wordsworth's "Sonnet to Clarkson."

gathered together by incessant labor; by obtaining evidence, often at his personal peril, among the seafaring population of the great commercial ports. The difficulty of finding a disinterested witness was almost insurmountable. He searched fifty-seven vessels to find one sailor who had been serving in the Canterbury slave-ship, and had gone up the river Calabar with the canoes of the natives, when they seized all the inhabitants of a village and carried them off, men, women, and children. Narratives such as this roused the feelings of the country—the feelings, we mean, of families who pondered over those horrors, as dangers from without, and dangers from within, gathered around the land, and who thought that God would not bless their nation while it tolerated such crimes. It was a time when in this as in every other instance men were afraid to touch any foul ulcer of the commonwealth lest the vital parts should be endangered by the attempts to cure. Slaves were property, some said; destroy slavery and you render all property insecure. We have matters of more consequence to attend to than what you term negro wrongs, said others. The interests, so called, of the West Indies were for a long time paramount, amid the sophistries and indifference of either party in parliament. At length Wilberforce came, with his persuasive eloquence and his influence over Pitt, and the cause of the abolition gradually grew into shape. In 1788, Wilberforce being seriously ill, Pitt carried a resolution binding the House of Commons to consider the circumstances of the slave trade early in the ensuing session. From that time the abolition of the slave trade was never suffered to pass wholly out of the view of the English parliament. Wilberforce and his immediate friends, who looked upon the abolition as a great religious question, were indefatigable. Pitt, who had to deal with the matter as a statesman, was often held, perhaps unjustly, to be lukewarm. The motions of the abolitionists were uniformly defeated in the House of Lords. In the House of Commons they were carried twice—in 1792 and in 1796—by small majorities. In 1804 Wilberforce carried his bill by a majority of 75. Although lost in the upper house, he was now sanguine of its ultimate success. It was, however, lost in the Commons in 1805. In 1806, under the ministry of Lord Grenville and Mr. Fox, a bill introduced to the Peers by the first lord of the treasury, prohibiting British subjects from engaging in the trade for supplying foreign settlements or the conquered colonies, was carried. This almost unexpected success called for new efforts. On the 10th of June Mr. Fox proposed a resolution "that this house, conceiving the African slave trade to be contrary to the principles of justice, humanity, and sound policy, will, with all practical expedition, proceed to take effectual measures for abolishing the said trade in such manner and at such period as may be deemed advisable." The motion was carried by 114 against 15. In moving his resolution Mr. Fox used these touching words: "So fully am I impressed with the vast importance and necessity of attaining what will be the object of my motion this day, that if, during the forty years that I have now had the honor of a seat in parliament, I had been so fortunate as to accomplish that, and that only, I should think I had done enough, and could retire from public life with comfort, and conscious satisfaction that I had done my duty." On the 19th of June Mr. Fox spoke, for the last time, in the House of Commons. There is a pleasant reminiscence of this, his last attendance in parliament, in the Diary of Lord Colchester. In the room behind the chair he drank tea with the speaker, while the evidence upon the Oude charge against Lord Wellesley was being discussed in committee. They gossiped pleasantly upon a variety of subjects—upon the dark ages, which Fox denied to be so dark as we were apt to represent them; upon Livy's history, which he looked upon as a beautiful romance; upon the Greek historians; upon political economy, and his little faith in Adam Smith and in the other economists, whose reasons were so plausible but so inconclusive; on the eminence of the Greeks in arts and arms, which he chiefly attributed to their abandonment of pursuits, such as those of commerce and manufactures, which engaged modern nations. "In this desultory talk he was extremely pleasant, and appeared to please himself."* A week later, Wilberforce records in his Diary that William Smith, after they left the house, was talking of Fox constrainedly; "when at last, overcome by his feelings, he burst out, with a real divulging of his danger—dropsy. Poor fellow! how melancholy his case! he has not one religious friend, or one who knows anything about it. How wonderful God's providence! How poor a master the world! No sooner grasps his long-sought object than it shows itself a bubble, and he is forced to give it up."*

The second great point upon which Mr. Fox had set his heart, when he accepted office, was the conclusion of a sound and honorable peace. He had not received the seals as foreign secretary longer than ten or twelve days when he had occasion to address M. Talleyrand upon a very singular occurrence, which he felt it his duty, "as an honest man," to communicate to the French minister. A person informed Mr. Fox that he had lately returned from Paris, and had something to impart which would give him satisfaction: "I received him," says Fox, "alone in my closet; when, after some unimportant conversation, this villain had the audacity to tell me that it was necessary for the tranquillity of all crowned heads to put to death the ruler of France, and that for this purpose a house had been hired at Passy, from which this detestable project could be carried into effect with certainty, and without risk." Mr. Fox caused the man to be detained, and wrote to Talleyrand, in continuation of this statement, that he could not, according to our laws, detain him long; but that the wretch should not be sent away till full time had been gained to avert any danger. The letter was laid before Bonaparte, who upon reading it said, "I recognize here the principles of honor and of virtue by which Mr. Fox has ever been actuated." On the 5th Talleyrand sent to Fox a copy of the emperor's speech to the legislative body. It contained these words: "I desire peace with England. On my part I shall never delay it for a moment. I shall always be ready to conclude it, taking for its basis the stipulations of the Treaty of Amiens." On the 26th of March the secretary for foreign affairs wrote a long dispatch to the French minister, in which he stated that he had submitted the private letter to the king; that his majesty's wishes were uniformly pacific, but that a safe and lasting peace was what the king had in view, and not an uncertain truce; that the stipulations of the Treaty of Amiens had been variously interpreted, but that the true basis of a negotiation would be the reciprocal recognition of the following principle: "That the object of both parties should be a peace honorable for both, and for their respective allies, and at the same time of a nature to secure, as far as is in their power, the future tranquillity of Europe." Many were the letters that passed between Fox and Talleyrand, in which the simple and straightforward style of the Englishman contrasts in a striking manner with the involved sentences, well adapted to conceal his thoughts, of the subtle Frenchman. Fox set out by assuming that the negotiation was to be conducted as by "two great powers, equally despising every idea of chicane." This correspondence went on up to the 14th of June, the British minister insisting that the negotiation should be conducted with reference to the British alliance with Russia, and the French minister as constantly refusing to treat upon that principle. The negotiation then took another shape. Lord Yarmouth was among the Englishmen detained in France at the commencement of the war. Talleyrand induced him to be the medium of a communication with the court of St. James's, of a private and confidential conversation, in which Talleyrand would explain the sentiments and views of France. At a second interview Talleyrand told Lord Yarmouth that the restoration of Hanover should be no difficulty; that the restoration of Naples to the King of Sicily should be no difficulty. Full powers were then sent to Lord Yarmouth to negotiate, which he properly held back till he had seen more clearly what was really meant. Talleyrand had gone from his former propositions with regard to Sicily. At the end of July Lord Yarmouth communicated to Mr. Fox that a separate treaty had been concluded between Russia and France. This was a great discouragement to the successful termination of the negotiation. But Fox still persevered in his endeavors for peace, and directed the Earl of Lauderdale to proceed to Paris as a plenipotentiary, although he feared that no peace could be concluded upon terms which would be admissible. The negotiations were begun upon the principle of the *uti possidetis*—the principle of retaining what each party possessed. The French government shifted from that position. Meanwhile the Emperor of Russia repudiated the treaty which a rash if not treacherous agent had concluded. This fact was known in England on the

* Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 70.

* "Life of Wilberforce," vol. iii. p. 268.

4th of September. Mr. Fox died on the 13th. The diplomatic intercourse was prolonged till the 1st of October, when Lord Howick wrote to Lord Lauderdale that after six months of negotiation there could be no reason why France should not give a plain and decisive answer upon points which had been so long under consideration. In the last note of Talleyrand which preceded the final rupture of the negotiation, he said, "The event will disclose whether a new coalition will be more disadvantageous to France than those which have preceded it. The event will also disclose whether those who complain of the grandeur and ambition of France should not impute to their own hatred and injustice this very grandeur and ambition of which they accuse her." When the papers were laid before parliament, in January, 1807, Lord Howick, who, in common with his party, had maintained that in the negotiations for peace, in the time of Mr. Pitt, the English government was chiefly to be blamed for their failure, now said that in the negotiations of 1806 "there never was any opportunity of procuring such terms as would have been adequate to the just pretensions and consistent with the honor and interests of this country." At that time the predictions of Talleyrand as to the issue of a new coalition had been partly accomplished. Lord Howick saw then what all true-hearted Englishmen began to see, "The event is in the hands of Him who giveth the victory. But one thing is clear—the progress of Bonaparte has never yet been stopped by submission, and our only hope, therefore, is in resistance, as far as we can resist his ambitious projects. We have done what our honor and duty called upon us to do. When this instrument of vengeance may be deprived of his terrors, I know not, but we may at least look to the honor and independence of this country as secure against all his attacks, and while this country exists as an honorable and independent nation there will still remain some hopes of restoring that political balance in Europe which has for the present been overturned." *

Thus one of the two great objects upon which Fox had set his heart had utterly failed. More than a month before his death he had almost ceased to hope for the accomplishment of this object. The failure was not to him a fatal blow as Austerlitz was to Pitt; but the protracted negotiation wore his spirit, breaking down under disease, and his end came on rapidly. The final dispatch from Lord Lauderdale was received by him on the 7th of September, the day of his last interview with Lord Howick. He died at the Duke of Devonshire's villa at Chiswick, being unable to bear the journey from Downing Street to his beloved St. Anne's Hill. He was buried with all public honors on the 10th of October. The grave of Fox in Westminster Abbey is within six yards of the grave of Pitt.

"The mighty chiefs sleep side by side." †

Most of that generation, who had looked upon the battles of these chiefs during a quarter of a century—fierce battles, but rarely wanting in chivalrous respect each for the other—most men felt what Francis Horner expressed—"The giant race is extinct, and we are left in the hands of little ones, whom we know to be diminutive, having measured them against the others." ‡

We must turn back to the disreputable contests between the House of Commons and John Wilkes, to see the opening of the career of the great parliamentary advocate of liberty, of the never-failing enemy of oppression, of the constant opponent of war. The young orator of 1769 was not then a tribune of the people.§ He soon took his proper position by the side of Burke and Barré, as the greatest master of "argumentative vehemence." ‖ His acceptance of office as a member of the coalition ministry, and his ejection from power by Pitt made them rivals. Their different views of the French revolution made their rivalry life-long. But what noble rivalry! What a contrast in the very nature of the eloquence of these orators—the sustained majesty of the one; the rapid transitions of the other; the withering sarcasm opposed to the passionate invective; the proud self-assertion checked by the generous tribute of genius to genius. No two statesmen, so dreaded for their mental powers, so hated and suspected by the violence of party, were ever more beloved in private life, or had more devoted friends. They were each loved with an attachment stronger than that of political ties—with the love that the genial nature, more than the towering intellect, endures with constancy, even beyond the grave.*

While the ministry of Grenville and Fox were negotiating for peace, with all honesty of purpose, Napoleon put himself at the head of the confederation of the Rhine. This was not an empty title of honor for the Emperor of the French. It was a result of the humiliation of the Emperor of Germany, and of the terror which France was holding over the head of the King of Prussia. It placed the minor states of Germany under the absolute control of Napoleon; it destroyed all nascent feeling of Germanic unity; it confined the contest for Germanic independence to Austria and Prussia, always disunited and jealous, and it compelled the greater of these powers to renounce the proud title of the successor of the Cæsars, and to be content with the humbler dignity of Emperor of Austria. The treaty for the federal alliance of the states that separated themselves from the empire of Germany, to place themselves under the protection of a new chief of the empire, was signed on the 15th of July. The King of Prussia made no resistance to this confederacy, for he had hoped to form another union of states in the north of Germany, of which he should be the head. He was soon taught by Napoleon to have humbler aspirations. He had been bribed by the possession of Hanover into acts of hostility toward Great Britain in the exclusion of British vessels from her ports. The British government retaliated by a blockade of the Ems, the Weser, the Elbe, and the Trave, and also by an embargo upon Prussian vessels in the ports of the United Kingdom. The King of Prussia found that there was danger in quarrelling with the court of St. James's. France had no hesitation in proposing to take out of the mouth of Prussia the bait which she had greedily snatched at. Hanover was to be restored to George III. The King of Prussia had begun to find that the ties which bound him to France were no silken fetters; that he was despised by his great ally; that his people were becoming indignant at the humiliating position of their sovereign, and impatient of the loss of their commerce in consequence of the British blockade. There was something more to raise the indignation of the Prussian people than the degradation of their sovereign or the loss of their trade. They had a foretaste of the tyranny with which the military slaves of Napoleon's will endeavored to put down any manifestation of public opinion in opposition to that will. On the frontiers of Prussia was collected a large French army, occupying territories of Austria and of free states, and levying excessive contributions. In the imperial city of Nuremberg a bookseller, John P. Palm, was arrested by order of the French government, as five other publishers had also been arrested in other towns. Palm was dragged from his house to the fortress of Braunau, and he was there shot by the sentence of a French military commission. He had published a book calculated to rouse a national spirit in Germany, but which his captors described as seditious writings tending to excite the populations to insurrections against the French armies. The merciful tribunal at Braunau offered the publisher his pardon if he would give up the author of the book. He refused, and he was murdered. A touching letter which Palm wrote to his widow, a few hours before his execution on the 26th of August, was printed and extensively circulated in Germany. One yell of indignation rose against the foreign tyrant. There was another power rising up against Napoleon than the power of kings and cabinets—the power of opinion. The King of Prussia was compelled to yield to this power, and for a season he was crushed under the iron heel of the conqueror. He was tardily making up his mind to break his chains while Lord Lauderdale was negotiating at Paris. Before the British envoy had quitted Paris, Napoleon had set off with the determination to cut short the vacillation of Prussia by one blow, which should destroy all the ascendency which the house of Brandenburg had acquired since the days of Frederick the Great. England was no prompter in the contest for which Prussia was now preparing.

Compared with the mighty warlike operations over Germany during the autumn of 1806 the exertions of the British arms read like

* "Hansard," vol. viii. col. 323.
† Scott, "Introduction to Marmion."
‡ "Life," vol. i. p. 373; Letter of 15th September.
§ *Ante*, vol. vi. p. 856. ‖ Ibid., p. 343.

* In the "Life of William Pitt," by Earl Stanhope, there is a parallel between the two statesmen, written in a candid and impartial spirit—vol. i. p. 238 to 251.

trifling episodes of a great epic. In November, 1805, a Prussian and British force had landed in Naples, without opposition by the Neapolitan court, which had professed neutrality while the war of the coalition of Austria and Russia against France was in progress. This was an opportunity for Napoleon. From his camp at Schönbrunn, on the 27th of December, 1806, he addressed a proclamation to an army appointed to enter Naples: "The Neapolitan dynasty has ceased to reign. Its existence is incompatible with the tranquillity of Europe and the honor of my crown. Soldiers! march; throw into the waves, if they wait for you, the weak battalions of the tyrant of the seas." His brother Joseph was at the head of this army. Napoleon in a few weeks wrote to this brother, "My will is that the Bourbons shall have ceased to reign at Naples. I intend to seat on that throne a prince of my own house. In the first place you, if it suits you." * Whether it suited or not, the command was sufficient, as it was sufficient for brother Louis, who was proclaimed King of Holland in June. Joseph entered the city of Naples on the 15th of February, the king withdrew to Palermo, and Joseph caused himself to be proclaimed king on the 30th of March. In Sicily there was a British army commanded by Sir John Stuart. Sir Sidney Smith had the command of a squadron at Palermo. The people of Calabria were discontented under their French masters, and Stuart was urged by the court of Naples to render them assistance. He landed near the northern frontier of Lower Calabria on the 1st of July. The French general Reynier collected his forces, and directed them toward the place of disembarkation. "I wished to march immediately on the English, to throw them into the sea," he writes to King Joseph. The English did not wait upon the beach to be thrown into the sea. They marched to the interior, and on the 4th fought the battle of Maida—a battle which has given a name to a district of London. It was quickly decided—not by cannon or musketry, but by the bayonet. Reynier has related his defeat with unusual candor. When within half gun-shot of the English, which remained carrying arms, the drums of the French regiments beat the charge. On they rushed, as the English battalions opened their fire. "But," says Reynier, "when they had only fifteen steps to make in order to reach the enemy's line with the bayonet, and destroy it, the soldiers of the 1st regiment turned their backs and fled. Those of the 42d perceived the movement, and, though they had only a few more steps to take, began to hesitate, and followed the example of the 1st. As soon as I perceived the flight of the 1st regiment I turned toward the second line, to charge with that, but the Poles were already in flight." † It was all over. The slaughter of the flying French was terrific. There was an officer in Reynier's army, more known as a man of genius—one of the wittiest of pamphleteers after the restoration of the Bourbons—Paul Louis Courier, who writes to a friend after this battle, "The adventure is grievous for poor Reynier. We fought nowhere. All eyes are upon us. With our good troops, and forces equal, to be beaten in a few minutes! Such a thing has not been seen since the revolution." ‡ The victory was decisive, but there were no permanent advantages from the victory. The Calabrian insurgents drove the French out of the province. But they returned after Sir John Stuart had left; and there was a protracted and a cruel warfare of soldiery against peasantry, with the usual result of such unequal conflicts.

The news of the battle of Maida, which reached London on the 2d of September, made the English pulse beat a little higher, but it did not produce half the excitement of the news of the taking of Buenos Ayres, which news arrived on the 13th. What did it matter to the eager hopes of commercial men that Sir Home Popham had accomplished this great adventure without orders from home? He had commanded the naval force at the taking of the Dutch settlement of the Cape of Good Hope in January—an important conquest, which, whether for good or for evil, we have retained ever since. The Spanish colonies on the Rio de la Plata were considered to be ill-defended, and Sir Home Popham determined to make a dash at a region reported to be so rich in treasure and merchandise, and so capable of affording a great opening to British commercial enterprise, that he would be justified in acting upon his own impulse. Having obtained from the general at the Cape the assistance of some troops, he arrived in June at the mouth of La Plata. Buenos Ayres was taken without opposition, with a great booty in the treasury, and vast stores in the shipping on the river. The triumphant man sent home a circular addressed to the mercantile and manufacturing towns in Great Britain, which drove the speculators wild. Not the Scotch when they colonized Darien sent out such wonderful cargoes of goods as were sent in 1806. When the cargoes arrived Buenos Ayres had again changed masters. Under the command of a French colonel in the Spanish service an attack was made on the British troops in the city, and after a sanguinary conflict they surrendered as prisoners of war. There was a more fatal termination of the South American enterprises in the following year. Thus it was, and thus it had been from the commencement of the war in 1793. Year after year the armies of England were engag d in what the greatest of her commanders described as the most ruinous of systems—the carrying on "a little war." Expeditions were again and again organized to operate rather as distractions of the enemy than to produce any permanent impression upon the issue of the contest. While Napoleon rapidly directed a great and overwhelming force upon one point, England was attempting enterprises in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, in America, some of which had a temporary success, others a lamentable failure, but in all of which the bravery of her troops amply proved what a large army of such men could do, if fairly brought to grapple even with the veterans of Marengo or Austerlitz. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, and for seven years before, vast as were the sums expended upon small achievements, the government of George III. could never "screw its courage to the sticking-place," to conduct a war against the aggressions of the republic and the ambition of Napoleon, upon a scale that might emulate the vigor with which the government of Anne conducted the war against the ambition of Louis the Fourteenth.

* "Letters of Napoleon to Joseph," vol. i. p. 74.
† Reynier to Joseph, July 5.
‡ "Œuvres de P. L. Courier," tome iv. p. 113 (Bruxelles, 1828).

CHAPTER CCIII

Napoleon takes the field against Prussia—Positions of the Prussian and French armies—Battle of Jena—The French enter Berlin—The new parliament meets—Bill passed for the abolition of the slave trade—Proceedings which resulted in a change of ministry—A great constitutional question—The new administration—Parliament dissolved—Battle of Eylau—Cold encouragement of England to the allies—Expeditions to various points—Expedition to the Dardanelles—Its failure, and that of other Turkish expeditions—Expedition against Buenos Ayres—Its lamentable results—General Whitelock—Meeting of the new parliament—Battle of Friedland—Peace between Russia and France—Treaty of Tilsit—Secret articles of the treaty become known to the British government—The Danish fleet—expedition to Copenhagen—Bombardment—Surrender of the fleet.

On the night of the 25th of September Napoleon, accompanied by the empress and by Talleyrand, left Paris. There was something more important to accomplish than remaining at the Tuileries for the mystification of Lord Lauderdale. The French emperor proceeded with his usual rapidity to Mayence, and from Mayence to Wurtzbourg, where German potentates and German generals came to bow before his greatness. Around him was his army of a hundred and fifty thousand men, divided into nine corps. There were three Prussian armies, of which the principal army of fifty-five thousand men was commanded by the king in person, with his nephew, the Duke of Brunswick, as his lieutenant-general. This was the famous general who advanced into France at the beginning of the revolution, and raised a spirit in the people that, begun in patriotism and a passion for liberty, degenerated into a passion for conquest. The duke was now seventy-one years of age. He had resigned the command of the Prussian and Austrian forces in 1793, and for thirteen years had been looking upon the great contests of Europe without taking any part in the struggle. The issue of one of the most tremendous conflicts of a time when the whole system of military tactics was changed was now confided to a pupil of Frederick the Great. He was confronted with Napoleon, with Bernadotte, Davoust, Soult, Lannes, Ney, Augereau, Murat, Bessières, Lefebvre—commanders who were formed in a school of warfare which, utterly disregarding the rou-

tine of the parade-ground, and the systematic and slow manœuvres of a past time, rapidly concentrated large masses for the attack of an enemy, indifferent to the amount of carnage in their own ranks so that the opposing force was annihilated. The ancient duke had some notions that he had discovered the secret of French success. He was for advancing against Napoleon's legions and boldly attacking them. But time was an important element in these calculations. The Prussians, before they moved to attack, were holding councils of war, discussing plans, attempting to negotiate, and, as a preliminary to pacific overtures, desiring the haughty emperor immediately to withdraw his troops beyond the Rhine, and to commence his retreat on the 8th of October. Napoleon replied by an instant march into Saxony, after issuing a proclamation to his soldiers which concluded by saying that the Prussians would find that the hostility of "the great people" was more terrible than the tempests of the ocean.

The Prussian armies were posted on the Saale, in the vicinity of Erfurt, Gotha, and Eisenach. The outposts of the Prussians and French were close to each other on the 8th of October. Battles of separate divisions had been fought, as the Prussians advanced to meet their antagonists. They were compelled to relinquish the offensive system, which was incompatible with the tardiness and irresolution of their commanders. All that bravery could do would be done. All that patriotism could do would be stimulated into chivalrous enthusiasm, when the beautiful Queen of Prussia rode from rank to rank of the soldiery and exhorted them to fight for their country. Bonaparte sneered at the queen in one of his bulletins: "We seem to behold Armida in her madness setting fire to her own palace." But something, without which patriotism and bravery are of little avail, was wanting to Prussia. On the night of the 13th of October the Prussian watch-fires extended for six leagues. The fires of the French under Napoleon spread over a small space, of which the central fires lighted up the summit of the Landgrafenberg, on which Napoleon bivouacked. On the morning of the 14th of October he attacked that portion of the Prussian army which, under the command of the Prince of Hohenlohe at Jena, was unprepared for an immediate assault. The main body was at Auerstadt, and was attacked by Davoust. Thus this great battle, which decided the fate of the Prussian monarchy, is sometimes called the battle of Jena and sometimes the battle of Auerstadt. By whatever name this fatal day of the 14th of October is known, in that double battle, in which two hundred-and fifty thousand men were engaged, with seven hundred pieces of cannon, twenty thousand Prussians were killed or wounded, and above thirty thousand were taken prisoners. The king fled from the field; the Duke of Brunswick received a shot in his eye, of which wound he died on the 10th of November. All the principal fortified towns surrendered to the French, without resistance. In the northern provinces the Prussian generals Blücher and Lestocq kept some regiments together. All the rest of the great force that was on the banks of the Saale in October was broken. On the 25th the French, under the command of Davoust, entered Berlin. Napoleon made his triumphal entry on the following day. On the 15th of November he wrote to his brother Joseph, "The Prussian army and monarchy have ceased to exist." * On the 20th of November he issued from the palace of the house of Brandenburg the celebrated decree against the commerce of England, known as the Berlin Decree. The ambition of Napoleon could scarcely be satiated by the destruction of the monarchy that Frederick the Great had built up; for Russia was still in arms; England was still unscathed. His project of invasion was laid aside, to give place to a project quite as impracticable—that of putting England into a condition of isolation with the rest of Europe. He now writes to Joseph, "The news of what has just happened has thrown London into consternation. The occupation of Hamburg, which I have just effected, and the declaration of the blockade of the British Islands, will increase this uneasiness."

At this moment Marshal Lannes wrote to the conqueror at Berlin that the soldiers of his corps, having heard a proclamation addressed to the great army, had cried out, "Live the Emperor of the West!" In the name of his corps the politic Lannes desired to know whether in future he might address his dispatches to the Emperor of the West. No answer was given; but the idea took possession of the soul of Napoleon. The enthusiasm of the soldiers, says Thiers, divined his ambition. It inspired him with a profound joy. He kept his own counsel, while he cherished in secret his passion for this title.* Emperor of the West! But how so, while England was in arms? Perish then her commerce! The Berlin Decree went forth, followed by that of Milan; and upon the raft of Tilsit the Emperor of the French and the Emperor of all the Russias agreed to divide the world, the one as Emperor of the West, the other as Emperor of the East.

From battle-fields and triumphs we turn to a warfare that looks less magnificent, but which is nevertheless not without its influence in the affairs of nations—the party conflicts of the British parliament, the ministerial changes of the British monarchy.

After the death of Mr. Fox the ministry of Lord Grenville felt itself weak in parliament. No statesman of commanding ability had joined the government. Lord Holland was the only new member of the administration. Mr. Canning resisted an overture to take office. A dissolution was resolved upon. The result was favorable to the administration, and they had a considerable majority when the new parliament met on the 15th of December. The great subject of debate was on the papers which related to the negotiation for peace with France. The able and spirited speech of Lord Howick, in which he advocated an amount of resistance to Napoleon which even the keenest war partisan could not disapprove, gave the ministers a triumph without a division. The financial propositions of Lord Henry Petty contemplated an annual system of loans, to make provision for a permanent state of warfare, setting a portion of these loans aside at accumulating interest, to constitute a sinking fund for their redemption. These schemes have passed "into a limbo large and broad," which statesmen have long since deserted. The great work of this session was the abolition of the slave trade. On the 23d of February, 1807, the House of Commons decided by the vast majority of 283 to 16 that the house should go into Committee on the Slave Trade Bill, the second reading having been previously carried, as it had been carried in the Lords. When Sir Samuel Romilly burst into unusual eloquence, in describing the feelings with which Mr. Wilberforce would that night lay his head on his pillow, as the preserver of millions of his fellow-creatures, as contrasted with that man who had waded to a throne through slaughter and oppression, the house shouted again and again, even as uneducated multitudes shout when their feelings are deeply stirred by impassioned oratory. The bill was read a third time on the 18th of March, was passed, with some trifling amendments, in the Lords, and received the royal assent on the 25th of March. On that day the Grenville ministry delivered up the seals of office. They had not been ejected from the counsels of the sovereign by a parliamentary majority. They had been required by the king to give a pledge which no constitutional minister could give. They had, somewhat indiscreetly, it is held, but as many will think, most conscientiously, brought forward the question, though in a very limited shape, which drove Mr. Pitt from office in 1801. There were too many "friends of the king" ready to take advantage of their indiscretion. They were excluded from power, and for nearly a quarter of a century the party of the Whigs was the party of opposition.

On the 5th of March, 1807, Lord Howick moved for leave to bring in a bill for securing to all his majesty's subjects the privilege of serving in the army or navy, upon their taking an oath prescribed by act of parliament. He asked, Was it prudent, was it politic, when we were contending with such a powerful enemy, to prevent a large portion of the population of the country from contributing to the common defence? Mr. Perceval denounced the proposed bill as one of the most dangerous measures that had ever been submitted to the judgment of the legislature. On the 18th of March Lord Howick postponed the second reading of the bill. He was not authorized, he said, nor would it accord with his duty, to enter into any explanation on the subject. The king had then declared against the bill. Lord Sidmouth had sent in his resignation. The king's mind was diligently made known. The expectants of office, even those who advocated the measure of Catholic relief, would sacrifice every consideration to the comfort of the king. The ministers saw their dan-

* "Correspondence with King Joseph," vol. i. p. 222.

* "Histoire du Consulat et l'Empire," tome vii. and tome xvii.

ger, and, in deference to the earnestly expressed wishes of his majesty, consented to withdraw the measure on Roman Catholic enlistment. Mr. Abbott enters in his Diary of the 18th of March, "The Duke of York, Duke of Portland, and Lord Eldon have been very busy for the last ten days, and the tone at Windsor very triumphant over the yielding ministers." * The ministers did not yield an unqualified abandonment of their desire to avert the dangers of Ireland by concession. They sent a cabinet minute to the king on the 15th of March, stating that those of his confidential servants who had promoted the bill in parliament now abandoned the whole measure; that it was intended as the first step toward a system of policy which they thought essential to the interests of the empire; that although they had endeavored to prevent the Catholic petition from being brought forward, they must necessarily declare their own individual opinions in its favor whenever agitated in parliament, and that their sense of duty required them to propose at any time, from time to time, such measures toward the Catholics as should in their judgments most contribute to the security and tranquillity of Ireland. † This abstract of the cabinet minute, by the speaker, from a copy shown to him, is more circumstantial than any account we have seen of the ministerial proceeding. The immediate cause of the termination of the ministry is stated in a letter of Lord Grenville to the speaker: "On the merits of the measure which has led to this consequence, I fear we are not wholly agreed in opinion. But that measure is not the point on which the government is now at issue. We had decided to let it drop; but there has been since required of us a written and positive engagement never, under any circumstances, to propose in the closet *any* measure of concession to the Catholics, or *even connected with the question.*" ‡ If the ministers had given such a pledge they would have been fitter ministers of the Sublime Porte than of the court of St. James's. They might have said to their sovereign,

"This is the English, not the Turkish court."

They refused to give the pledge required, and the king very quickly formed a new administration. The constitutional question of the danger to which the country would be exposed, if ministers should bind themselves by pledges to their sovereign not to give advice that might be disagreeable to him, was ably maintained in a spirited debate on the 9th of April, when Mr. Brand moved a resolution, "that it is contrary to the first duties of the confidential servants of the crown to restrain themselves by any pledge, expressed or implied, from offering to the king any advice which the course of circumstances may render necessary for the welfare and security of the empire." The resolution was met by a motion for reading the other orders of the day. The opposition sustained a most unexpected defeat, having a majority against them of thirty-two in an extraordinarily full house. On that occasion Sir Samuel Romilly declared that the true question before the house was whether it was not a high crime and misdemeanor in any minister in the confidence of the king to subscribe to a pledge that he would not offer any advice to his majesty which might appear to him to be essential to the interests of the empire. There was another constitutional question mooted in this debate—that there could be no exercise of the prerogative in which the king could be without some adviser. The new ministers had avowed that the king had acted without advice. They disowned the responsibility, but they could not escape from the constitutional inference—that by accepting office they had assumed the responsibility. § Mr. May, in his recent excellent work, says, "No constitutional writer would now be found to defend the pledge itself, or to maintain that the ministers who accepted office in consequence of the refusal of that pledge had not taken upon themselves the same responsibility as if they had advised it." ‖ The holders of office had now a majority over those whom the king had turned out. The alarmists of the Church took part with the king, and the ministers, knowing the value of the old popular cry of "No popery," dissolved the parliament at the end of its first session.

The new ministry—of which the Duke of Portland was the nominal head, but of which Mr. Perceval, as chancellor of the exchequer, was the real leader—enrolled Lord Eldon as chancellor, Mr. Canning as foreign secretary, Lord Hawkesbury as home secretary, and Lord Castlereagh as war and colonial secretary. The Duke of Richmond was lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and Sir Arthur Wellesley chief secretary. There were other holders of high office, who were long associated with the fortunes of the great party upon whom the conduct of affairs now devolved—Lords Bathurst, Camden, and Westmoreland. The deliberations of parliament were soon terminated. It was prorogued by commission, and a dissolution announced on the 27th of April. His majesty was "anxious to recur to the sense of his people, while the events which have recently taken place are yet fresh in their recollection." The people, thus addressed, understood little of constitutional questions. They had a horror of any approach to conciliation of the Catholics of Ireland, whatever the most enlightened statesmen of either party might think was just. They had a natural sympathy with the personal feelings of their king, now advanced in years, with the infirmities of age coming fast upon him, for he was nearly blind. The corporation of London addressed the king as the preserver of our religion, laws, and liberties, and the protector of the religious interests of his people.* The party cry was "King and Constitution," at a time when the successful attempt to merge the responsibility of the king's ministers in the irresponsible power of the king had given the constitution as rude a shock as any encroachment of the old days of "the right divine of kings to govern wrong."

On the point of leaving Downing Street, Lord Grenville wrote to his brother, "The deed is done, and I am again a free man, and to you I may express, what it would seem like affectation to say to others, the infinite pleasure I derive from my emancipation." To continue actively to participate in the conduct of the war on the continent would have appeared a hopeless task, even to the sanguine mind of Mr. Pitt. After Austerlitz the great minister was reported to have said, "Tear up the map of Europe." It was frightfully torn after the Prussian humiliation at Jena. That it would ever be joined again now appeared very improbable, although the Prussian and Russian forces had, in February, made a determined stand at Eylau. At this place in eastern Prussia was fought, on the 9th of February, one of the most terrible battles of the great war. The remnant of the Prussian army had been enabled to form a junction with the main Russian army under General Benningsen. The French, at the end of November, had entered Warsaw, where the prospect of national independence, to which Napoeon had given an equivocal encouragement, insured the French a welcome reception. Napoleon himself entered Warsaw on the 19th of December. The French armies had crossed the Vistula, and had taken up their winter quarters from Elbing to Warsaw. They wanted rest, but the active Russian general allowed them no rest. He attacked Bernadotte on the 26th of December, and in the battle of Pultusk the French found that their emperor had undervalued the enemy with whom he had to deal. He had written to Cambacérès, before crossing the Vistula, "All this is child's-play, to which I must put an end." † He could not "finish with all his enemies" as quickly as he expected. Bernadotte, under the orders of the emperor, moved to Thorn, on the Vistula, in the expectation that Benningsen would follow, and that Napoleon would go forth and fall upon the too eager Russian. But Benningsen was not so easily entrapped. He retired to Preussisch Eylau, a small town in the circle of Königsberg. Here he was followed by Napoleon, with eighty thousand men, according to the Russian accounts. Some French historians admit sixty-eight thousand. Thiers maintains that only fifty-four thousand were in the field. He estimates the Russians at seventy-two thousand, with eight thousand Prussians. There was probably no great disproportion of numbers on either side. The French, says Thiers, had the confidence of success and the love of glory; the Russians had a certain fanaticism of obedience, which led them blindly to defy death. Some may think—which the historian evidently does not think—that the fanaticism of duty is more to be admired than the presumption of vanity. Napoleon had passed the night of the 7th of February at the house of the postmaster, in the little town of Eylau, situate on a small eminence. As the winter morning broke the emperor stood in

* Lord Colchester's Diary, vol. ii. p. 102.
† Ibid., p. 103.
‡ Ibid.
§ Hansard, vol. ix.
‖ May, "Constitutional History," vol. i. p. 27.

* "Annual Register," 1807—April 22.
† Thiers, tome vii. p. 216.

the churchyard, straining his eyes to watch the movements of masses of Russians in the plain below. A keen east wind was blowing; the snow was falling thick and fast; he was scarcely aware that a detachment of Russians was upon him, from whose hands he was only rescued by the devotion of his guard. The battle soon became general, and the dreadful struggle went on till ten o'clock at night. For hours the advantage on either side was very doubtful. When darkness fell upon the combatants there was still no victory. The next morning Napoleon looked upon the field of battle, and there beheld thousands of dead and dying; horses struck down; cannon dismounted—all lying amid frozen ponds and drifts of snow, while burning hamlets and farms added to the horror of the scene. Napoleon, for once, seemed to feel the "one touch of nature" which "makes the whole world kin." This spectacle, he cried, should inspire princes with the love of peace and the horror of war.* His heart was scarcely affected by what was not agreeable to his taste to look upon. He had made an experiment of dressing some regiments in the white uniform of the old days of the Lilies. He turned shuddering from the patches of blood which the white cloth made too conspicuous. He would, in future, have nothing but blue for his soldiery. The butcher's blue frock hides the blood; but nevertheless there is the same blood on the floor of the slaughter-house.

For more than four months it was expected that important results would have ensued from the vigorous resistance which Napoleon had encountered at Eylau. The King of Prussia had rejected his propositions for peace; the Russians had been reinforced; the Emperor of the French had ordered a new conscription, the third within seven months, and France was losing heart. Had there been a vigorous war ministry in England when the allies applied for assistance, some great result might have been obtained. Lord Howick answered their application by stating that "the allies must not look for any considerable land force from Great Britain." A subsidy of 500,000*l.* was granted—a very petty and therefore very useless aid. The Emperor of Russia had asked for a loan of six millions from the government. The government proposed to sanction a private loan, upon a complicated security for interest—that the Russian duties upon British merchandise should be levied in British ports. Great Britain had other modes of employing her money and her arms than in carrying on war upon a great scale. Whether her government were Whig or Tory, there was the same passion for little expeditions. A writer of remarkable powers of sarcasm has described what Bonaparte would do if his counsellors "were taken from the English political caste." He would "delay doing anything until the season for operations was nearly gone by; he would then probably treat a little, and be duped by his allies, and cavil and wrangle a good deal, and quarrel with some of them, and excite a hatred of all of them and of himself, and a contempt of his plans among his own subjects. But all these preliminaries of failure being settled, he would at last come to his operations, and his policy would be to get up a number of neat little expeditions equal in number to the things he wants to take—just one for each thing."† This is a masterly description of the councils, in 1806, of the Whigs, who bequeathed their policy to their Tory successors in 1807. But it was not directed against the Whigs. It was published in October, 1808, and was intended as a philippic against the first measures of the Peninsular war, which it was predicted would fail, as most other military efforts had failed, in producing any real effect upon the issue of the contest. There was a great deal of truth in what was said, and never more truth than if applied to the "neat little expeditions" of the ministry of Lord Grenville and Lord Howick, to which it was not meant to apply.

In February, 1807, Mr. Thomas Grenville is at the head of the admiralty. He does not quite approve of the measures of his colleague, Mr. Windham, who is at the head of the war department. He writes, "Windham is sending out Whitelock to command at Plata. I know not why, for I do not believe that he is a bit better than Auchmuty." Sir Samuel Auchmuty, after the unfortunate result of Popham's attempt upon Buenos Ayres, had been sent out with a reinforcement of 3000 men. He found that he could do nothing at Buenos Ayres, and had attacked Monte Video. He took this fortified seaport by assault, with a severe loss. When Whitelock was sent out "to command at Plata," the government knew nothing of the success of Auchmuty, and his orders were to place his forces, united with those of General Crauford, under the command of General Whitelock. We shall have presently to speak of their operations at Buenos Ayres in June. It is curious to note the want of harmony in the British government in undertaking these enterprises. Thomas Grenville says, "I am more than ever convinced that all those distant combinations are of necessity subject to so many chances that I have little stomach to them; but, in spite of my feeble opposition, our military projectors are running after one expedition, and one general with another and another, till, in military language, the battalions are all clubbed, and no man knows where to find an entire company."* Of his own management of naval expeditions Mr. Thomas Grenville is very confident. An imposing force is to be sent to the Dardanelles, to co-operate with our ally, the Emperor of Russia, against whom the Porte had declared war, we suspecting that the French influence was becoming paramount over the English influence at Constantinople. The admiralty has its favorite commander in its eye. "The Russian minister," writes Grenville, "has the modesty to propose that a Russian admiral shall command the combined naval force at the Dardanelles."† The proud confidence in the valor and sagacity of a British admiral was amply justified by the memories of Howe and Nelson, and by the living examples of Collingwood and Sidney Smith. Sir John Thomas Duckworth was vice-admiral of the white; he was, moreover, a Knight of the Bath—an honor conferred upon him in 1801, on his return from taking quiet possession of the Danish West India Islands.‡ Great was the astonishment of Mr. Thomas Grenville, a few weeks after he went out of office, to find that the expedition to the Dardanelles could not have been worse managed, even if a Russian admiral had commanded. "Duckworth's business and his orders plainly directed him to insist upon the surrender of the Turkish fleet, or to burn it, and to bombard the town. Why he has done neither, and has retired to give them time to make this enterprise impossible, I cannot guess; but am mortified at being disappointed of a triumph which I had thought was as certain as the sailing of the expedition."§ It is scarcely necessary to enter into any lengthened detail of this most ridiculous adventure, which degraded the British flag in the eyes of all the world. The French ambassador at Constantinople was General Sebastiani; the English ambassador was Mr. Arbuthnot. The Russian ambassador had gone on board an English ship; the French and the British ministers remained, each threatening Sultan Selim with the vengeance of their courts if he did not conform to their wishes. But Sebastiani had something better than threats to offer—the invincibles of Napoleon should come to chase away the Russian armies who were on the frontier. Lord Collingwood in January was cruising off Cadiz, when he received orders from the admiralty to detach a force to the Dardanelles; and "as the service will require much ability and firmness in the officer who is to command it, you are to intrust the execution thereof to Vice-admiral Sir John Thomas Duckworth." Collingwood left little discretion to the ability and firmness of the officer that he had not the usual liberty of a chief-in-command to select. He recommended Duckworth not to allow any negotiation to continue more than half an hour, as any proposition to treat would probably be to gain time for preparing resistance or securing the Turkish ships. Duckworth, with seven sail of the line and smaller vessels, forced the passage of the Dardanelles, having received little damage from the fire of the castles at the mouth of that strait. By an unhappy accident the Ajax, of seventy-four guns, had been previously burned. But the force was large enough for complete success. The Turkish fortifications along the Dardanelles were dilapidated. When the fleet appeared before Constantinople the Sultan was alarmed, and would gladly have yielded. But Sebastiani exhorted him to do what Collingwood foresaw would be done—to gain time by negotiation. For days Duckworth sent threatening notes, and persuasive notes, and notes that showed clearly that nothing was to be attempted. Meanwhile

* Thiers, tome vii. p. 395.
† The article appeared in the "Edinburgh Review," October, 1808, and was attributed to Mr. Brougham. See "Horner's Memoirs," vol. i. p. 437.

* "Court, etc., of George III.," vol. iv. p. 123. † Ibid., p. 124.
‡ James, "Naval History," vol. iv. p. 183.
§ "Court," etc., vol. iv. p. 169.

the skilful Sebastiani had taught the Turks how to defend their shores. Cannon were mounted upon works at which the whole population labored day and night. Troops lined the coast. All the passage down the Dardanelles assumed a very different aspect from that which the British saw as they passed up. The longer the fleet stayed before Constantinople the greater would be the danger; and on the 1st of March, during the course of thirty miles, the gauntlet was run through a constant fire. From the castles of Sestos and Abydos enormous granite shots, wondrous missiles which British sailors had never before seen, were discharged, breaking in decks, snapping masts, and producing a consternation such as no ordinary bombardment would have occasioned. The actual loss in this ill-fated expedition was less than might have been expected—about three hundred men killed and wounded. Attempts were made in parliament to investigate the causes of this extraordinary event. But the successors of the Whigs appeared to be tenderly disposed toward their rivals, at a time when a great amount of obloquy had fallen upon themselves, for their scheme of an expedition which, although a signal success, was considered, as that of the Dardanelles was considered, impolitic and unjust. Other expeditions against the Ottoman power had been sent forth by the government of Lord Grenville. On the 20th of March Alexandria capitulated to a force of five thousand men embarked at Messina. But at Alexandria there was apprehension that the troops would soon be in want of provisions unless Rosetta was taken possession of. General Frazer with fifteen hundred men marched into the town, and was soon driven back with great loss, having been received with a heavy fire from the houses and windows of the inhabitants. Another British force of twenty-five hundred men was sent under General Stewart, and that little army had to retreat with a loss of a third of its number. The affair of Alexandria ended by the evacuation of Egypt by General Frazer, on condition that the British prisoners should be surrendered.

The most fatal result of the various projects by which the Whig government acquired the reputation of being the unluckiest of war administrators, was that of the great expedition against Buenos Ayres. The ministry, as it now appears, had asked the advice of Sir Arthur Wellesley, which he gave in November, 1806, and in February, 1807. That advice is chiefly confined to military affairs, which to be successful required to be arranged upon a large scale. In February, he says, "The late occurrences at Buenos Ayres show that we ought not to rest entirely upon the accounts which we have received of the inefficiency of the Spanish military establishments in America." * Upon the political question he is not then so decided. He observes "that all those who have communicated their ideas to his majesty's government upon the subject of the Spanish dominions in America have recommended that they should have in view a revolution, instead of a conquest, in their proceedings." The protection of an independent government would fall upon Great Britain, but he does not see how she is to be compensated for the expense and inconvenience with such protection would entail. All the hopes of assistance from the natives which have been entertained by persons who have written upon Spanish America are founded as much upon their wishes for an independent government as upon their hatred of their masters, the Spaniards.† In February, 1808, when it was seriously contemplated to send out an expedition, under the command of Sir Arthur Wellesley himself, to co-operate with General Miranda in the liberation of Spanish America, he decidedly says (after the adventure which ended calamitously in 1807), "From what has lately passed at Buenos Ayres, and from all that I have read of these countries, I am convinced that any attempt to conquer them, with a view to their future subjection to the British crown, would certainly fail; and, therefore, I consider the only mode in which they can be wrested from the crown of Spain is by a revolution, and by the establishment of an independent government within them." ‡ General Whitelock, on the 28th of June, landed with seventy-eight hundred men about thirty miles to the east of Buenos Ayres. They were before the city, which was nearly invested, on the morning of the 5th of July, when an attack was ordered, each division to enter upon the street opposite to it, and march through its particular street till it reached the last square near the river Plata. In this progress the troops were to advance with unloaded muskets, two corporals marching at the head of each column with tools to break open the doors of the barricaded houses. The doors would not yield, the windows and roofs were crowded with the hostile population, and a terrible fire mowed down the advancing soldiers. Trenches had been dug in the streets, and cannon planted there swept away hundreds with grapeshot. Auchmuty, in spite of these obstacles, made himself master of the Plaza de Toros, a strong post; and another place of strength had been taken, when the action was ended at nightfall. Two thousand five hundred British had been killed and wounded, or were prisoners. General Linieres, the commander in the city, addressed a letter next morning to General Whitelock, offering to give up the prisoners, and those made in the previous year, if he would desist from further attack and withdraw the British forces from La Plata. Monte Video was of course to be surrendered. Whitelock agreed to these degrading terms; returned home with a whole skin; ran great risk of being torn to pieces by the English populace, who nicknamed him General Whitefeather; was tried by court-martial, and was declared "totally unfit and unworthy to serve his majesty in any military capacity whatever." There can be little question that Mr. Windham was decided in the appointment of an incompetent man, by that preponderating influence which in those days rendered a minister, unless he were resolved to maintain his responsible authority, the slave of court favoritism and of base jobs. From these influences the country would not readily have escaped unless a man had arisen to prescribe his own will to courts and ministers—to achieve success by the invincible force of his own sagacity, and yet to keep within the bounds of duty.

The new parliament assembled on the 22d of June. On the 26th upon an amendment to the address, the strength of parties was tested in the fullest house ever recorded. Of five hundred and five members present, not counting the speaker and four tellers upon the division, three hundred and fifty-six voted with the government. The royal speech, delivered by commissioners, referred to the disappointment of the efforts of his majesty's squadron in the Sea of Marmora, and to the losses sustained by our gallant troops in Egypt. Nevertheless, his majesty had thought it right to adopt such measures as might enable him, in concert with his ally, the Emperor of Russia, to take advantage of any favorable opportunity of bringing the hostilities in which they are engaged against the Sublime Porte to a conclusion. His majesty's endeavors had been most anxiously employed for the purpose of drawing closer the ties by which he is connected with the powers of the continent, and of assisting the efforts of those powers against the ambition and oppression of France. Four days after this speech had been delivered came the news of the battle of Friedland. The efforts of the powers of the continent were at an end. Prussia was crouching at the victor's feet; Russia was scheming with him to divide the empire of the world, and they were taking sweet counsel together for the destruction of Great Britain. According to the agreeable arrangement of these potentates, the hostilities against the Sublime Porte were to be brought to a conclusion by Alexander and Napoleon dividing the Turkish empire—Alexander becoming Emperor of the East, as Napoleon was to be Emperor of the West.

After the great battle of Eylau the allied armies and the French armies remained for several months inactive. Reinforcements were necessary to each for repairing the terrible destruction of that day when the falling snow covered thousands of the dead and dying. Napoleon had proposed peace to Alexander, but Alexander refused the proffered terms. He expected aid from England; but the succor did not come in time. The Russians determined to act for themselves. Early in June they attacked the French lines and were repelled. A great encounter then took place at Heilsberg, and on the 14th of June a general battle was fought at Friedland, which broke the Russian spirit, terminated the campaign, and made the two emperors for a season the dearest of friends. Eight days after the victory, which was won on the anniversary of the battle of Marengo, an armistice was concluded, and Napoleon addressed a proclamation to his army from his camp at Tilsit. "From the banks of the Vistula we have arrived on the banks of the Niemen with the rapidity of the eagle. . . . You will return to France covered with laurels, after having obtained a glorious peace which bears a guarantee for its duration. It is time that our country should live in repose under

* "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 58.
† Ibid., p. 50.
‡ Ibid., p. 62.

shelter from the malign influence of England." That shelter was to be found in the new friendship of Alexander—of Alexander, who, only a few days previous, had written to George III., "that there was no salvation to himself or to Europe but by eternal resistance to Bonaparte." * On the 9th of July Napoleon wrote to his brother Joseph: "Peace was signed yesterday, and ratified to-day. The Emperor Alexander and I parted to day at twelve o'clock, after having passed three weeks together. We lived as intimate friends. At our last interview he appeared in the order of the Legion of Honor, and I in that of St. Andrew." †

On the 25th of June the armies on each bank of the Niemen beheld an extraordinary preparation for some grand scenic display. In the middle of the river, near the town of Tilsit, was moored a large raft, upon which was raised a pavilion of the richest stuffs that could be furnished in a district so remote from luxurious capitals. From one bank of the Niemen Napoleon took boat, accompanied by four of his great officers. From the other bank Alexander took boat, accompanied by five of his suite, princes or generals. The two potentates met on the raft at the same moment, and they embraced each other amid the shouts of the soldiery. They then entered the pavilion unaccompanied, and there held a long conversation on matters of high import. Historians take upon themselves to relate what passed at this secret conference and in other private conversations. M. Thiers is careful to show that Napoleon seduced Alexander by his caressing words—flattering the monarch and flattering the man—and he gives us many of the fine speeches in which the pliant Tartar was wont to swear an eternal friendship, founded chiefly upon a mutual hatred of England.‡ Some Russian writers excuse the violent professions of esteem for Napoleon on the part of Alexander, by attributing them to his profound dissimulation. One thing is clear—that Napoleon obtained all that he wanted in the Treaty of Tilsit, and especially in its secret articles. The articles that were patent took away whole provinces from Russia, and gave her back some territory which Napoleon would also have taken, but which was restored at the intercession of Alexander. Out of the spoils of Prussia on the left bank of the Elbe was formed the kingdom of Westphalia, of which Jerome Bonaparte was to be king. The Prussian provinces of Poland were to be erected into the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, and bestowed upon the King of Saxony, with the exception of one province, which Russia coveted. King Louis and King Joseph were to be recognized by Russia, as well as all Napoleon's creations of new subject states, and his willing instrument the confederation of the Rhine. But in addition to the secret articles of this treaty there was a treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, between France and Russia, of which the conditions were to be inviolably secret. M. Thiers says that under the title of "Secret Articles of the Treaty of Tilsit," many conditions absolutely false have been published. "The English, especially, to justify their ulterior conduct toward Denmark, have brought to light many pretended articles of the Treaty of Tilsit, which were communicated to the cabinet of London by diplomatic spies. But," continues M. Thiers, "through authentic and official documents which were open to my investigation, I am able for the first time to give the veritable stipulations of Tilsit, public as well as secret." § We will recapitulate the articles of "*le traité occulte*" thus brought to light by the French historian. It contained an engagement, on the part of Russia and of France, to make common cause under all circumstances; to unite their forces by land and by sea in every war which they should have to maintain; to take arms against England, if she did not subscribe to the mediation of Russia to establish peace between herself and France; to make war against the Porte, if she did not subscribe to the mediation of France to establish peace between herself and Russia, and in case this mediation was refused, to rescue the European provinces from the vexatious authority of the Porte, except Constantinople and Roumelia. Moreover, the two powers agreed to summon, in common, Sweden, Denmark, Portugal, and Austria, to concur in the projects of France and of Russia—that is, to shut their ports against England, and to declare war against her. This is the text of the treaty to be kept inviolably secret, as given by the historian of the empire. It is added, by some writers, that Napoleon imparted to Alexander his schemes of placing members of his family on the thrones of Portugal and Spain, and that a treaty to this effect was concluded.*

"While this was passing in the north," writes Lord Malmesbury, "a plan was forming here of surprising the Danish fleet. Ministers had received the most undoubted information (and, strange to say, the *first* information came through the Prince of Wales to the Duke of Portland in an audience he had at Carlton House in May) that, by the assistance of this fleet, Bonaparte intended to invade the north-east coast of England; and this came from Portugal, whose fleet Bonaparte also wanted. The Regent of Portugal rejected the proposal, and communicated it to us. The Danes accepted it, were silent at the time, and afterward denied it." ‖ Our foreign secretary immediately made preparations for anticipating the hostile submission of Denmark to the commands of Napoleon. These preparations went on, without apparent haste, till after the Treaty of Tilsit was concluded, when Mr. Canning obtained a knowledge of the secret articles. How he obtained that knowledge he never would disclose. The "Memoirs of Fouché"—now generally believed to be the genuine revelations of a notable intriguer—contain the following passage: "About this time it was that we learned the success of the attack upon Copenhagen by the English, which was the first derangement of the secret stipulations of Tilsit, by virtue of which the Danish fleet was to be placed at the disposal of France. Since the death of Paul I. I never saw Napoleon give himself up to such violent transports of passion. That which astonished him most in that vigorous *coup de main* was the promptitude with which the English ministry took their resolution." ‡ Bonaparte suspected Talleyrand, says Fouché. According to another authority, some humbler person was the medium of communication to the British government. Mr. Stapleton, private secretary to Mr. Canning, says that an individual was concealed behind a curtain of the tent on the raft, and heard Napoleon propose to Alexander, and Alexander consent to the proposition, that the French should take possession of the fleet of Denmark. § That Talleyrand should have betrayed the counsels of his master, at the height of his power, is just as improbable as that any "rash, intruding fool" should have been the rat behind the arras, while Bessières and Duroc, Benningsen and Ouwarrow, were watching on either side of the pavilion on the Niemen. Without the knowledge of any special provision that the Danish fleet was to be placed at the disposal of France, the general agreement of the treaty that Denmark and other powers should be compelled to join Russia and France, in a war against England, was sufficient to render a measure of hostility toward Denmark justifiable upon the great principle of self-defence. "No expedition was ever better planned or better executed, and none ever occasioned more clamor." ‖

On the 12th of August Mr. Jackson, an envoy from England, arrived in Copenhagen, to demand the delivery of the Danish fleet to Lord Gambier, the British admiral, who was in the Sound with twenty-seven sail of the line, and many smaller vessels, in company with a fleet of transports, conveying twenty-seven thousand land troops. The demand of Mr. Jackson was accompanied with an assurance that the fleet should be taken care of in British ports, and restored upon the conclusion of peace with France and Russia. The Crown Prince of Denmark indignantly refused, and prepared for defence. The British land forces were commanded by Lord Cathcart, the command of the reserve being intrusted to Sir Arthur Wellesley. He had been called from his civil duty as secretary for Ireland, to take this military duty. The troops were landed on Zealand on the 16th. They were not opposed, and they closely invested Copenhagen on the land side, erecting powerful batteries. Numerous bomb-vessels were ready also to pour their fire from the sea upon the devoted city. Congreve rockets were there to be tried for the first time. Sir Arthur Wellesley, with his customary moderation, would have preferred "an establishment upon Amag, as a more certain mode of forcing a capitulation than a bombardment. . . . I think it behooves us to do as little mischief to the town as possible, and to

* Malmesbury, "Diaries," vol. iv. p. 398.
† "Correspondence with King Joseph," vol. i. p. 249.
‡ "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tome vii. p. 627 to 633.
§ Ibid., p. 628.

* Alison, "History of Europe," vol. vii. p. 308.
† "Diaries," vol. iv. p. 399.
‡ Quoted in Mr. Robert Bell's "Life of Canning," p. 237.
§ Stapleton, "George Canning and his Times," p. 125 (1859).
‖ Malmesbury, "Diaries," vol. iv. p. 399.

adopt any mode of reducing it rather than bombardment." * The bombardment did take place, in spite of one more effort for averting it, by a proclamation on the part of the British commanders that they would withdraw their forces if the fleet were surrendered as a deposit to be restored at the close of the war. The crown prince replied by a proclamation which was a declaration of war, and by ordering the seizure of all British ships and property. The bombardment was commenced with fatal vigor, and continued for four days. The conflagration of the city and the sufferings of the inhabitants were among those occurrences of the war which are most painful to look back upon. The Danish navy and arsenal were surrendered on the 8th of September. Sir Arthur Wellesley was appointed to conduct the negotiation. He writes on the day on which he concluded the settlement with the Danish commissioners, "I have only to observe upon the instrument, that it contains the absolute and unconditional cession of the fleet and naval stores, and gives us the possession of those military points which are necessary in order to enable us to equip and carry away the vessels. This was all that we wanted; and in everything else I did all in my power to conciliate the Danes." † His wise conclusion was not acceptable to violent politicians, who wanted some further evidences of our power. Enough had been done for our own safety; too much had been done to satisfy the honest, but not very politic, indignation of those who felt like Francis Horner. He had "endeavored for a while to view it as one of the extreme cases of that necessity which has no law;" but he turned aside from "the intricacies of state expediency to the daylight of common justice and old rules." ‡ The state expediency is now held to have been justly paramount.

CHAPTER CCIV.

Isolation of Great Britain—Hostility of Europe—Bonaparte's continental system—His plans for becoming master of the peninsula—French invasion of Portugal—The Regent of Portugal flies to the Brazils—Charles IV. of Spain abdicates—He and Ferdinand, his son, entrapped by Napoleon at Bayonne—Insurrection at Madrid—The Spanish juntas ask the aid of England—Sympathy of the English people—Sir Arthur Wellesley sent with troops to Portugal—Successes of the Spaniards—Zaragoza—Victory of Wellesley at Vimiero—Convention of Cintra—Sir John Moore marches into Spain—Napoleon takes the command of his army in Spain—Moore's retreat—Battle of Corunna—Death of Sir John Moore—Sufferings of his army—National gloom—Charges against the Duke of York—Parliamentary inquiry—The duke resigns—Lord Cochrane's enterprise in Aix Roads—Austria declares war against France—Sir Arthur Wellesley takes the command at Lisbon—Passage of the Douro—Intelligence of important events.

THE royal speech, delivered by commissioners, on the opening of the session of parliament on the 21st of January, 1808, was of greater length, and bore upon more important points of foreign affairs, than any similar document during the most stirring years since 1793. The view of our position with relation to the rest of the world was not cheering. Britain seemed to have reached that extremity of isolation which the Roman poet described, and which the French emperor desired to establish as a political fact. The Treaty of Tilsit, said the speech, confirmed the influence and control of France over the powers of the continent, and it was the intention of the enemy to combine those powers in one general confederacy against this kingdom. For this purpose the whole of the naval force of Europe was to be brought to bear upon various points of the British dominions, and specifically the fleets of Portugal and Denmark. It was an indispensable duty to place these fleets out of the reach of such a confederacy. Painful but necessary measures of force were successful with regard to Denmark. The fleet of Portugal had been secured from the grasp of France, and was then employed in conveying to its American dominions the hopes and fortunes of the Portuguese monarchy. The determination of France to excite hostilities between Great Britain and Russia, Austria and Prussia had been too successful. These powers had withdrawn their ministers from London. The machinations of the enemy had prevented the war with Turkey being brought to a conclusion. The King of Sweden alone had resisted every attempt to induce him to abandon our alliance. The government of the United States had refused to ratify a treaty of amity and commerce agreed upon in 1806, and was making pretensions inconsistent with our maritime rights. In consequence of the decree by which France declared the whole of the British dominions in a state of blockade, subjecting the manufactures and produce of the kingdom to seizure and confiscation, his majesty resorted to a measure of mitigated retaliation; but that being ineffectual, other measures of greater vigor had been adopted by orders in council. This was, indeed, a catalogue of ills. In spite, however, said the speech, of the difficulties endeavored to be imposed by the enemy upon the commerce of this country, its resources had during the last year been so abundant as to produce a great increase of revenue.

Gloomy as was the prospect arising out of this frank explanation—England, without one ally but the young King of Sweden, whom some deemed chivalrous and others deemed mad; France, whose territory was extended far beyond the wildest ambition of her old race of kings, under an emperor who was the real suzerain of Naples, of Italy, of Switzerland, of Holland, of Germany; America subject to the will of a president who had ever been a hater of England, and was now anxious for open war—gloomy as was this prospect, was there any ray of hope to illumine the darkness? The historian of the French empire points to this single ray in a brief sentence. To the universal dominion of Napoleon there was only one thing to be desired—nothing more than "the submission of *peoples* to this gigantic edifice." * During fifteen years of war, England, in her system of subsidies and coalitions, had seen only kings as allies. The time was coming when she was to look upon nations for her friends. During that year of 1808 she found out the chink in her enemy's armor, and she soon proved that he was not invulnerable.

The hatred of the people of many countries to the domination of Napoleon received an immense impulse from the tyrannical enforcement of the decrees, which constituted what is called his continental system. The eulogists of Napoleon's glory and the believers in the vocation of France to rule the world are compelled to admit that the decay of his power may be dated from the attempt to destroy England by shutting out her commerce from every port of Europe. "If this interdict had been maintained some years, England would probably have been obliged to yield," says M. Thiers. "Unhappily, the continental blockade was to add to the exasperation of peoples obliged to bend to the exigencies of our policy." † It was not enough to exasperate many populations by handing over ancient states to new masters; by creating kings out of the many sons of the lawyer of Ajaccio; by endeavoring to amalgamate communities wholly different in their laws, their customs, and their creeds; to play with the masses as if they were the pawns of the chessboard. He must cut off the sources of their industrial wealth; he must forbid to mankind, whether enemy, or subject, or allied, or neutral, that interchange of produce and manufactures which were necessary to the prosperity, and even to the existence, of producer and consumer. The defence of the continental blockade was that it was the retaliation of a measure of the British government in May, 1806, when all the ports between Brest and the Elbe were declared in a state of blockade. Napoleon, in the preamble to the Berlin decree, proclaimed that the places declared by England in 1806 to be in a state of blockade were ports before which she had not a single vessel of war. This was wholly untrue. It was not a paper blockade—"*blocus sur le papier, imaginé par l'Angleterre.*" ‡ So far from being a paper blockade, there was a sufficient force to maintain it—a principle recognized by all publicists as constituting the validity of an interference with the right of neutrals to trade with a hostile country. On the contrary, the Berlin decree declared the British Islands in a state of blockade, when France had no ships on the sea to make the blockade real instead of nominal. But this decree went much farther. It not only prohibited all commerce and correspondence with the British Islands, but it declared every English subject to be a prisoner of war who was found in a country occupied by the troops of France or of her allies. It declared all property belonging

* "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 9, letter to Lord Hawkesbury, August 28.
† Ibid., p. 21, letter to Lord Hawkesbury, September 8.
‡ "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 411.

* Thiers, "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tome xvii. p. 869
† Ibid., p. 868. ‡ Ibid., tome vii. p. 223.

to an English subject to be lawful prize. It prohibited all trade in British manufactured goods. It declared all merchandise coming from Great Britain or her colonies to be lawful prize. It shut out every vessel that had touched at any port of Britain or her colonies. By the Milan decree of December, 1807, the British dominions *in all parts of the world* were declared to be in a state of blockade; and all countries were prohibited from trading with each other, in any articles produced or manufactured in the countries thus placed under interdict. This latter decree was alleged to be in retaliation of the British orders in council of November, 1807. Of the impolicy of these orders of the British government we shall have to speak in another chapter. We have at present to confine ourselves to that first decree of Napoleon, whose attempted enforcement upon Portugal in August, 1807, was the alleged cause of the French invasion of that kingdom. It thus led to the great series of events which terminated in the deliverance of Europe from the crushing despotism of the man who was at the height of his power, when he made the extravagant attempt by rash decrees to fetter the freedom of human action, in the indispensable supply of human wants—by decrees which, carrying with them a natural impossibility of execution, rendered the tyrannical machinery by which they were vainly attempted to be enforced, not only odious but despicable, and produced a conviction that the "gigantic edifice" was built upon the sands. Bourrienne, who in 1807 was the *chargé d'affaires* of France at Hamburg, says that the emperor having ordered him to provide an immense supply of clothing for the armies in Prussia, he authorized a house at Hamburg, in spite of the Berlin decree, to bring cloth and leather from England. Had the decrees, he states, relative to English merchandise been observed, the French troops would have perished with cold. Licenses, he tells us, for the disposal of English goods were procured at a high price by those who were rich enough to pay for them. Smuggling on a small scale was punished with death, while the government carried it on extensively. Under Davoust's rule at Hamburg a poor man had nearly been shot for having introduced a loaf of sugar for the use of his family, while Napoleon was perhaps signing a license for the introduction of a million of sugar-loaves. Bourrienne sums up many such instances by saying, "It is necessary to witness, as I have, the numberless vexations and miseries occasioned by the unfortunate continental system, to understand the mischief its author did in Europe, and how much that mischief contributed to Napoleon's fall." *

Whenever the Emperor of the French was reposing after the fatigues of battle-fields, the world might be assured that new schemes of aggrandizement were shaping themselves in his mind into some decided course of action. He was passing the summer of 1807 in the pleasant shades of Fontainebleau, revolving various devices for making himself master of Spain. The fate of Portugal was presumed to be determined by a secret treaty—the treaty of Fontainebleau—between Napoleon and Charles IV. of Spain, by which a partition was made of that kingdom, and by which Godoy, the favorite of the Spanish court, should be endowed with a portion of the spoil, and be Prince of Algarves. But Napoleon had far higher objects in lending his ear to the petty intrigues and disgraceful quarrels of the King of Spain and his son Ferdinand—in propitiating Godoy, and pretending to make family alliances with the Spanish Bourbons. He intended to eject the house of Bourbon from their throne; but this project required to be worked by tentative approaches. Fraud was to go before violence. The dethronement of the house of Braganza was an easier process. It should precede the more difficult operation of entrapping the King of Spain and his son, and holding them in durance, before he could write to his brother Joseph, "I destine this crown for you." † The ejection of the Prince-regent of Portugal was to be accomplished by a simple exercise of military force.

On the 12th of August, 1807, the French ambassador at Lisbon presented a note to the Portuguese government, requiring, by the 1st of September, the Prince-regent of Portugal to emancipate himself from English influence by declaring war, confiscating all English merchandise, closing his ports against English vessels, and uniting his squadrons to the navies of the continental powers. Unless he did so the ambassador would demand his passports. Lord Strangford, our ambassador at Lisbon, knew the force that was put upon the Portuguese government, and did not resent the declaration of war that the prince-regent was compelled to make. The prince, however, refused to confiscate English property. Useless as he knew his remonstrances would be, they gave him a breathing time; and he advised the English merchants to sell their goods and depart the kingdom. On the 19th of October the French general Junot crossed the Bidassoa, with orders to march across Spain and make himself master of Lisbon and of the fleet by the 30th of November. "On no account halt in your march even for a day," wrote Napoleon on the 2d of November. The urgency of his orders made Junot disregard every obstacle presented by the violence of the rains, the badness of the mountain roads, and the difficulty of procuring subsistence. After crossing the Portuguese frontier, and before reaching Abrantes, this army was almost wholly disorganized. Its wretched condition was not known in Lisbon—a city of three hundred thousand inhabitants—or resistance would probably have been made before the court yielded to the fear of some impending calamity. The apathy of the government and the people has been stated as the result of the conviction that the army of Junot was only an advance guard of the legions that were collected at Bayonne, and that another course than that of open resistance was necessarily determined upon. As the French advanced, the Portuguese government sequestrated, or made a show of sequestrating, the property of the few merchants that remained in Lisbon. Lord Strangford then withdrew on board the English fleet in the Tagus. It is generally stated by historians, French, Portuguese, and English, that our ambassador, having received a copy of the "Moniteur" of the 13th of November, which contained these words, "The house of Braganza has ceased to reign," transmitted the newspaper to the prince-regent, who immediately decided on flight to the Brazils. M. Thiers maintains that no such words appear in any "Moniteur" of that date, or near it. But he states that in the "Moniteur" of the 13th of November is an article, evidently dictated by Napoleon, on the four English expeditions in 1807—those of Copenhagen, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Buenos Ayres—which article contains this passage: "After these four expeditions, which so well determine the moral and military decline of England, let us speak of the situation in which they leave Portugal at this day. The Prince-regent of Portugal loses his throne. He loses it, influenced by the intrigues of England. He loses it because he has not been willing to seize the English merchandise at Lisbon. What does England do, this ally? She regards with indifference what is passing in Portugal. . . . The fall of the house of Braganza will remain a new proof that the destruction of whatever power attaches itself to England is inevitable." * There is little to choose between the meaning of the pithy sentence and of the lengthened argument. The prince-regent now took his resolution. The British ambassador returned on shore to aid him in carrying out his purpose. The sailors of our fleet made the most strenuous exertions to fit out the Portuguese fleet of eight sail of the line, three frigates, and twenty-three other vessels. On the 29th of November the archives of Portugal, the treasure, the plate and other valuable effects, having been got on board, a train of carriages moved to the quay of Belem, conveying the prince-regent, his mother the queen, who had been many years insane, and the two princesses of the family. A crowd of attendants and other court fugitives accompanied them. Altogether fifteen thousand persons left Lisbon on the 29th of November. They were going to the great dependency which Portugal had held uninterrupted by any hostility for a hundred and two years—a land of vast natural riches, but one which the parent state governed upon the narrowest principles of monopoly. From the time when the seat of government was transferred from Lisbon to Brazil, the colony prospered in a new life. In 1815 it became a constituent part of the Portuguese empire. As the British fleet saluted the Portuguese squadron as it passed down the Tagus, the sun became eclipsed, and a superstitious dread came over the population. The French, as the last of the royal fleet cleared the bar, came within sight of the Tagus—a ragged and starving remnant of a great army. The prey that they were to seize was gone. They were enough for the occupation of the city; enough to levy contributions on the country; enough to induce the belief that Portugal

* See "Memoirs of Napoleon," translation published in 1830, vol. iii. chap. xxv.

† Letter of May 11th, 1808.

* "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tome viii. p. 340, note.

would never be separated from its French masters. The delivery of Portugal from the thraldom of Napoleon was to turn upon the speedy manifestation of popular resistance to his fraud and oppression in Spain.

Ferdinand, Prince of Asturias, the heir of the Spanish crown, was just entering upon the twenty-fourth year of his age when he addressed a letter to Napoleon which produced very memorable consequences. His wife had died in 1806—a woman of firm mind, who had endeavored to rescue her imbecile husband from the wretched state of pupilage in which he had been kept by his infamous mother and her paramour Godoy. Ferdinand solicited the protection of Napoleon, described the humiliation to which his father and himself were reduced by the favorite, and expressed his wish to be united to a princess of Napoleon's family. Godoy discovered what was passing, and having persuaded Charles IV. that Ferdinand was conspiring against his life, the prince was arrested. With the weakness of his character, he was terrified into the acknowledgment of a conspiracy to dethrone his father—a confession for which it is believed there was no foundation, except in the secret correspondence with Napoleon. Meanwhile Portugal was in the occupation of Junot. French soldiers were constantly crossing the Bidassoa and planting themselves in frontier fortresses. The court became alarmed, and Godoy persuaded the king to follow the example of the Prince-regent of Portugal, and seek in the rich possessions of Spain in the New World that security which the revolutions of the Old World denied to crowned heads. Ferdinand was hesitating what to do, when the people of Madrid, who had always felt a compassionate affection for the Prince of Asturias, resolved that he should not be removed by force; and the guards at Aranjuez revolted, and would have taken the favorite's life had not the prince interfered to save him. This was on the 17th of March. On the 19th Charles IV. abdicated in favor of his son, who took the title of King of Spain and the Indies. The king, in the decree which transferred the crown, asserted that his abdication was his spontaneous act. In a letter to Napoleon he said that he had been forced to abdicate, and had no hope but in the support of his magnanimous ally. The exiled emperor said to O'Meara, "When I saw those *imbécilles* quarrelling and trying to dethrone each other, I thought that I might as well take advantage of it and dispossess an inimical family."* No Englishman would have thought it a calamity that this miserable race should have been set aside by the will of a misgoverned people. But that the father and the son should have been lured out of Spain by devices such as kidnappers could not have excelled, and then compelled to deliver up the proud Spanish people to the rule of an insolent foreigner, filled up the measure of the English wrath against the inordinate rapacity of the man who did not conquer this land of historic renown, but whom they regarded as "a cutpurse,"

> "That from a shelf the precious diadem stole,
> And put it in his pocket."

On the 21st of April Ferdinand was in the hands of the betrayer at Bayonne. On the 30th the old king and queen were in the same clutches. Godoy had been previously seized by Murat, and sent under guard to Napoleon, who had reached Bayonne on the 14th of April. On the 2d of May there was an insurrection at Madrid, upon the people learning that Ferdinand was entrapped into the power of the French emperor. On the 6th of May Napoleon wrote to his brother Joseph, "King Charles has yielded up to me his right to the throne, and he is about to retire to Compiègne with the queen and some of his children. A few days before this treaty was signed the Prince of Asturias abdicated; I restored the crown to King Charles. . . . There was a great insurrection at Madrid on the 2d of May; between thirty and forty thousand persons were collected in the streets and houses, and fired from the windows. Two battalions of fusileers of my guard and four or five hundred horse soon brought them to their senses. More than two thousand of the populace were killed."† Five days after he again writes to Joseph, "The nation, through the supreme council of Castile, asks me for a king; I destine this crown for you." What the nation was really asking for was, help from England. The insurrection at Madrid was quickly followed by popular agitations throughout the country. Provincial juntas were established in many districts. The supreme junta of Seville proclaimed Ferdinand VII., and declared war against France. The new king came to Bayonne, and proposed a constitution to a junta there assembled of submissive nobles. The people flew to arms.

The British nation was not slow to manifest its deep sympathy with the Spanish patriots. Two deputies from Asturias had left Gijon in an open boat, and were picked up at sea by one of our frigates. "They were received with open arms," says Malmesbury. The veteran diplomatist wanted some grander envoys to arrive than an Asturian hidalgo and an Asturian attorney. "Canning would not listen," he says. Canning wanted no better assurance of the spirit of the people than those chosen by the people could afford him. On the 15th of June Sheridan, in the House of Commons, made a speech which electrified the country. He was convinced that there never existed so happy an opportunity for Great Britain to strike a bold stroke for the rescue of the world. He would do nothing by driblets. If a co-operation with Spain were expedient it should be an effectual co-operation. "Bonaparte has hitherto run a most victorious race. Hitherto he has had to contend against princes without dignity and ministers without wisdom. He has fought against countries in which the people have been indifferent as to his success. He has yet to learn what it is to fight against a country in which the people are animated with one spirit to resist him."* Sheridan moved for papers, which Canning said would be inconvenient to produce; but Canning's answer left no doubt as to the intentions of the cabinet: "There exists the strongest disposition on the part of the British government to afford every practicable aid in a contest so magnanimous. In endeavoring to afford this aid it will never occur to us to consider that a state of war exists between Spain and Great Britain." There were a few expressions of doubt and despondency in parliament; but it was impossible to resist what Wilberforce described as the universal feeling. "Every Briton joined in enthusiastic prayers to the great Ruler of events, to bless with its merited success the struggles of a gallant people, in behalf of everything dear to the Christian, the citizen, and the man."† When the parliament was prorogued on the 4th of July, the government was pledged by the royal speech to "make every exertion for the support of the Spanish cause." On that day an order in council announced that hostilities against Spain had ceased. There had been great promptitude in the action of the British government. On the 14th of June Sir Arthur Wellesley had received from the Duke of York his appointment to the command of a detachment of the army, "to be employed upon a particular service;" and on the 30th of June were sent his full instructions from Lord Castlereagh for the employment of a body of troops, to afford "to the Spanish and Portuguese nations every possible aid in throwing off the yoke of France."‡ He was told in these instructions that "his majesty is graciously pleased to confide to you the fullest discretion to act according to circumstances for the benefit of his service." And yet Sir Arthur Wellesley's "fullest discretion" was left at the absolute command of two superior officers. He sailed from Cork for Corunna on the 12th of July. On the 15th Lord Castlereagh writes to him that the command of the troops is intrusted to Sir Hew Dalrymple, and to Sir Harry Burrard as second in command. Nevertheless, Lord Castlereagh points out to Sir Hew Dalrymple, the great hero of the Mahratta war, as "an officer of whom it is desirable for you, on all accounts, to make the most prominent use which the rules of the service will permit."§ The "rules of the service" subjected the man who had given the best evidence of his great military genius to the command of two generals, whose exploits were better known in the private records of the horse-guards than in the annals of their country. Sir Arthur Wellesley's division comprised nine thousand men. Another corps, under Sir John Moore, which had just arrived from the Baltic, numbered eleven thousand men. These two detachments were to co-operate. But their united efforts were to be directed by Sir Hew Dalrymple and Sir Harry Burrard. Moore had shown in Egypt of what metal he was made. When he waited on Lord Castlereagh to receive his instructions, he was apprised that he was to go to Portugal, where he would find Sir Arthur Wellesley; but that if Sir Hew Dalrymple

* "Voice from St. Helena," vol. ii. p. 167, edit. 1822.
† "Correspondence with King Joseph," vol. i. p. 317.

* "Hansard," vol. xi. col. 889.
† Ibid., vol. xi. col. 1145.
‡ "Dispatches," vol. iv. p. 160.
§ Ibid., p. 31.

had not arrived from Gibraltar, the operation would be undertaken by Sir Harry Burrard. "It was thus indirectly notified to Sir John Moore that, after commanding in chief in Sicily and Sweden, he was now to be placed subordinate to two officers, the first of whom had never served in the field as a general." * Moore expressed his feelings in somewhat strong terms. He had not to endure the bitter mortification which Wellesley experienced, when, in the moment of victory, he was compelled to leave his triumph incomplete, at the bidding of "an ordinary general in opposition to a great captain." †

"The character of the Spaniard," writes Lord Malmesbury, "is to let everything be done for him, if he finds any one disposed to do it, and never to act till obliged to do so." ‡ Before anything was done for the Spaniard by England he was obliged to act, and in many things he acted well. There were great difficulties in his acting at all. The provincial juntas, who directed the course of hostilities to the French, were independent bodies, acting each for its own province; not having a federal unity which would be content to place those executive powers which were in a temporary desuetude under some authority competent to represent the monarchy, which, as the Spaniards expressed its condition, was in a state of widowhood. England had abundantly provided arms, ammunition, and pay for large native armies. But there was no one governing power to direct their employment in masses against the enemy, who would seek to overwhelm them by the magnitude of his forces. Still, in the early stages of the contest the Spaniards well employed the means which they possessed. In June the French General Dupont had marched from Madrid to Andalusia- given Cordova up to pillage, and committed atrocities which roused the people to fury. The Spanish General Castanos, with an army sent against Dupont by the Junta of Seville, won the battle of Baylen, and compelled the French to surrender at discretion on the 21st of July. Arragon was defended by its people under the command of Palafox. The siege of Zaragoza, the capital of the province, was commenced by the French on the 15th of June. They carried some of the outer works, but on forcing their way into the city were encountered with a heroism such as the conscripts of Napoleon had rarely beheld in the standing armies of the continental monarchies. The exploits of Augustina, the amazon of Zaragoza, inspired as much courage into the besieged as Joan of Arc had inspired at the siege of Orleans. The trenches were open for forty-nine days. The city was bombarded for twenty-one days. But nothing could shake the courage of its defenders. The French raised the siege on the 4th of August. A fortnight before this termination Napoleon had written to the new king Joseph, who was beginning to despond, "Do not doubt for an instant that everything will end sooner and more happily than you think." § He adds, "All goes well at Zaragoza." On the 24th of July Joseph is still more alarmed. He writes to Napoleon, "Your glory will be shipwrecked in Spain. My tomb will be a monument of your want of power to support me." The confident emperor replies, "To die is not your business, but to live and conquer; which you are doing and shall do. I shall find in Spain the pillars of Hercules, but not the limits of my power." ‖ On the 9th of August he gives him the comfortable assurance that before the autumn Spain will be inundated with troops. "The English are of little importance. They have never more than a quarter of the troops that they profess to have. Lord Wellesley ¶ has not four thousand men, and, besides, I believe that they are directed toward Portugal."

On the 1st of August Sir Arthur Wellesley was on shipboard, off the Mondego River. He was landing his troops at Figuiera, a difficult task on an iron coast. He had heard, from the letter of Lord Castlereagh, of general officers, senior to him, being sent out, and Sir Hew Dalrymple to take the command. To the Duke of Richmond he writes, "I hope that I shall have beat Junot before any of them shall arrive, and then they will do as they please with me." ** On the 7th Major-General Spencer's corps joined the army. With ten thousand British and five thousand Portuguese, Sir Arthur Wellesley then prepared to march toward Lisbon. On the 17th he defeated at Roliça the French under Laborde. The numbers of the enemy were much smaller than our numbers, but Laborde had the advantage of position. Sir Arthur the next day writes to the Duke of Richmond: "The action was a most desperate one between the troops engaged. I never saw such fighting as in the pass by the 29th and 9th, or in the three attacks made by the French in the mountains. These were in their best style." * On the 20th he was at Vimiero, having been joined by General Anstruther and General Acland with their corps. He had now an army of seventeen thousand men. Junot had joined Laborde and Loison at Torres Vedras, and their united force was about fourteen thousand men, of whom sixteen hundred were cavalry. Early in the morning of the 21st, the French attacked the British in their position. Sir Harry Burrard had arrived on the night of the 20th. "He did not land," Sir Arthur writes to his friend, the Duke of Richmond, "and as I am the most fortunate of men, Junot attacked us yesterday morning [the 21st] with his whole force, and we completely defeated him." † The principal attack on the British was on the centre and left; the sea being in their rear, and the French still pursuing their favorite delusion of driving the English into the ocean over which they tyrannized. The attack was repulsed. Kellermann then attacked with the French reserve, and he also was driven back. "Broken by these rough shocks, the French, to whom defeat was amazement, retired in confused masses." ‡ Junot's left wing and centre were discomfited. The road of Torres Vedras, the shortest road to Lisbon, was uncovered. The French general, Brennier, was taken prisoner, and having asked a question with reference to the reserve being engaged, which implied that the attacks had all been in vain, "the English general, judging the French power exhausted, and the moment come for rendering victory decisive, with the genius of a great captain, resolved to make it not only decisive on the field, but of the fate of Portugal." § When the action was nearly over Sir Harry Burrard had landed. There was a powerful force in hand for further operations. Not more than one half of the British army had been engaged. Ferguson's division was close upon the retreating force of Solignac when Burrard commanded him to halt. Sir Arthur designed to push on to Torres Vedras, which if he had reached before Junot he would have cut him off from Lisbon. When Ferguson was interrupted, Solignac joined Junot, who regained his position at Torres Vedras. The great project of the British general "was stifled as soon as conceived." Sir Arthur's superior officer "could not comprehend such a stroke of war." In a private letter he pours out his griefs. "The French got a terrible beating on the 21st. They did not lose less, I believe, than four thousand men, and they would have been entirely destroyed if Sir H. Burrard had not prevented me from pursuing them. Indeed, since the arrival of the great generals, we appear to have been palsied, and everything has gone on wrong." ‖ The great generals! Seldom, indeed, was this equably-minded man stirred into even a mild expression of contempt. He had, however, more to endure. He had to bear his share of public indignation at the convention of Cintra for the evacuation of Portugal by the French. An indefinite suspension of hostilities was agreed upon, with a view to this evacuation. On the 23d of August Sir Arthur Wellesley wrote to Lord Castlereagh: "Although my name is affixed to this instrument, I beg that you will not believe that I negotiated it, that I approve of it, or that I had any hand in wording it." ¶ He thought it right to allow the French to evacuate Portugal, "as soon, and at as little cost of honor as we can." Sir John Moore had arrived with his corps on the 21st, and his troops were nearly all landed when hostilities were suspended. They were ordered to re-embark. Had Sir Arthur's plan of operations been persevered in, and Moore's troops had not been re-embarked, we should have been in a situation, he says, "to have refused the French any capitulation, excepting on the terms of their laying down their arms." No wonder that the people of England were indignant that twenty-six thousand soldiers should have been landed in France, at the expense of the English government. They should have bestowed their indignation upon those who deserved it.

Sir Arthur Wellesley arrived in London at the beginning of October. On the 5th of September he had written to Lord Castle-

* "Life of Sir John Moore," vol. ii. p. 104. † Napier.
‡ "Diaries," vol. iv. p. 415.
§ "Correspondence with King Joseph," vol. i. p. 333.
‖ Ibid., p. 339.
¶ *Sir* and *Lord* seem equivalents to the French.
** "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 95.

* "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 119.
† Ibid., p. 122. ‡ Napier. § Ibid.
‖ "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 127. ¶ Ibid., p. 122.

reagh: "It is quite impossible for me to continue any longer with this army; and I wish, therefore, that you would allow me to return home and resume the duties of my office." * Dalrymple, Burrard, and Wellesley were all recalled home. Sir John Moore remained at Lisbon, having been appointed to command the army. Sir Arthur rejoices to find that he was placed under the command of Moore, "than which nothing," he says, "can be more satisfactory to me. I will go to Corunna immediately, where I hope to find you." But a court of inquiry was ordered on the subject of "the late transactions in Portugal," and Wellesley was detained to be examined. He had to bear much before the publicity of these proceedings was to set him right in public opinion. He was accused, he heard, of every crime of which a man can be guilty, excepting cowardice. "I have not read one word that has been written on either side; and I have refused to publish, and don't mean to authorize the publication, of a single line in my defence." † The inquiry took place in November, and it ended in a formal disapprobation of the armistice and convention, on the part of the king, being communicated to Sir Hew Dalrymple. Neither of the two "great generals" was again employed. One advantage was gained by the convention. The Russian fleet in the Tagus was delivered up to the British.

Sir John Moore, late in October, began his march into Spain, "to co-operate," as his instructions set forth, "with the Spanish armies in the expulsion of the French." He was to lead the British forces in Portugal, and to be joined by Sir David Baird, with ten thousand men, to be landed at Corunna. On the 11th of November Moore had crossed the boundary between Portugal and Spain, and his advanced guard had reached Ciudad Rodrigo. Two days after he was at Salamanca. Instead of finding Spanish armies to co-operate with, he learned that the French had routed and dispersed them. Napoleon had himself come to command his troops, and had arrived at Bayonne on the 3d of November. Moore was separated from Baird by a wide tract of country. He had divided his own army, having received false information that the direct northern road was impassable for artillery, and having consequently sent Sir John Hope by a circuitous route. He remained for some time at Salamanca, inactive and uncertain. Mr. Frere, the British ambassador, urged Moore to advance to Madrid. The clever schoolfellow of Canning, who wrote admirable burlesque, was not the best judge of a military operation, and took a sanguine view of what popular enthusiasm might effect in Spain. The people were ignorant and presumptuous; their rulers were either imbecile or treacherous. Madrid was soon in the hands of the French; and the delusion of Mr. Frere that the capital could be preserved, was at an end before Moore completely felt how hopeless an advance would be. He made a forward movement against the advanced corps of Soult; and then, learning that the French armies were gathering all around him, he determined to retreat. Some partial successes had attended the British general's advance, but an intercepted letter from Napoleon convinced him that he could only save the army by retiring. Sir David Baird had previously joined him. Moore had abandoned all hopes of defending Portugal, and had directed his march toward Corunna. He commenced his retreat from Sahagun on the evening of the 24th of December. On the 27th Napoleon wrote to Joseph, "If the English have not already retreated they are lost, and if they retire they will be pursued so vigorously to their ships that half of them will never re-embark." ‡ On the 31st he wrote from Benevento, "The English are running away as fast as they can." § Running away is not exactly the term for a retreat during which the retiring army constantly turned upon the pursuers, always defeating them, and on one occasion capturing General Lefebvre. This exploit was one of several brilliant efforts in which Lord Paget, afterward the Marquis of Anglesey, distinguished himself. But there were other dangers than that of the pursuing enemy. The winter had set in with terrible severity; the sufferings of the troops were excessive; disorganization, the common consequence of a retreat, added to their danger. Moore saved his army from destruction by an overwhelming force when he carried it across the Esla. The troops effectually destroyed the bridge by which they passed the swollen stream; at which foresight Napoleon affected great indignation: "The English have not only cut the bridges, but have undermined and blown up the arches; a barbarous and unusual use of the rights of war, as it ruins the country to no purpose." * The destruction of the bridge of Castro Gonzalo delayed the advance of the French for two days. Moore thus saved his army from the attacks of fifty thousand French under Napoleon, who were hastening to overpower a force less than one third of the number which he led. But Moore could not save his men from their own excesses, which made enemies of the inhabitants of every place through which they passed. They murmured and were disobedient. The general, in his orders, said that "the situation of the army being arduous, called for the exertion of qualities most rare in military men. These are not bravery alone, but patience and constancy under fatigue and hardship; obedience to command; sobriety and firmness in every situation in which they may be placed." † Despondency had taken possession of the troops. At Astorga Napoleon writes on the 2d of January, "It is probable that more than half of the British army will be in our power; the English themselves think so." ‡ Some of the newspapers of London, having experience of the failure of many warlike enterprises against the French, had become the most confiding believers that resistance to Napoleon and to his invincible armies was altogether vain. This was long the creed of Whig orators and writers—rational enough at first, but betraying a factious and petty jealousy when the bulk of the people had warmed into hope and confidence. Francis Jeffrey, in December, wrote to Horner, "Murray tells me that you have still hopes of Spain. I have despaired utterly from the beginning, and do not expect that we are ever to see ten thousand of our men back again—probably not five thousand." § The evil foreboding was not far from being realized. The French historians believe that the British army would have been wholly destroyed if the emperor had remained to strike the final blow. At Astorga he received dispatches which indicated that war with Austria was close at hand. He gave up the pursuit of Moore to Soult.

At Lugo, on the 7th of January, the British general halted his exhausted troops, determined to give battle to Soult. The conflict was declined, and on the British marched to Corunna. On the 11th, when they had ascended the heights from which Corunna was visible, there was the sea, but there were no transports in the bay. The troops met with a kind reception in the town, and their general applied himself to make his position as strong as possible, to resist the enemy that was approaching. On the 13th Moore wrote his last dispatch to Lord Castlereagh. The French, he says, "are now come up with us; the transports are not arrived; my position in front of this place is a very bad one. . . . It has been recommended to me to make a proposal to the enemy, to induce him to allow us to embark quietly. I am averse to make any such proposal, and am exceedingly doubtful if it would be attended with any good effect." On the evening of the 14th the transports arrived. The sick and wounded were got on board, and a great part of the artillery. Cavalry would have been useless on the broken ground where Moore took his position, so the men were dismounted, and the horses were killed. Fourteen thousand British remained to fight if their embarkation were molested. The battle of Corunna began at two o'clock on the 16th of January. Soult had twenty thousand veterans, with numerous field-guns, and he had planted a formidable battery on the rocks commanding the valley and the lower ridge of hills. Columns of French infantry descended from the higher ridge, and there was soon a close trial of strength between the combatants. From the lower ridge Moore beheld the 42d and 50th driving the enemy before them through the village of Elvina. He sent a battalion of the guards to support them, but through a misconception the 42d retired. Moore immediately dashed into the fight; exclaimed, "Forty-second, remember Egypt," and sent them back to the village. Meanwhile Major Napier, who commanded the 50th, was taken prisoner. He, who was to be the conqueror of Scinde, would there have ended his career, had not a French drummer rescued him from the barbarity

* "Dispatches," vol. iv. p. 147.
† "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 151.
‡ "Correspondence with Joseph," vol. i. p. 387.
§ Ibid., p. 388.

* "Correspondence with Joseph," vol. i. p. 388.
† "Life of Moore," vol. ii. p. 188.
‡ "Correspondence with Joseph," vol. ii. p. 3.
§ "Life of Horner," vol. i. p. 438.

of the enemies who denied him quarter after he had received five wounds. The British held their ground or drove off their assailants, and victory was certain under the skilful direction of the heroic commander, when a shot from the rock battery struck him on the left breast and shoulder, tearing away the flesh and breaking the ribs. He was dashed to the earth, but he continued calmly sitting, surveying the battle at Elvina, until he was assured that his brave fellows were triumphant. Sir David Baird, the second in command, had also been carried off. Moore was placed in a blanket. His sword-hilt crushed against his terrible wound, and it was attempted to be removed, but he said that he would not part with his sword in the field. He was carried into Corunna, and endured several hours of extreme torture before he yielded up his great spirit. But he had the consolation of knowing that the battle was won, and he died expressing a hope that his country would do him justice. The command had devolved upon General Hope, who thought that his first duty was now to embark the troops. Had he known that the ammunition of the French was exhausted, the victory might have been more complete. Darkness came on. The troops were returning from the scene of conflict to be embarked that night. The sound of a few distant guns was heard as their commander was laid in his grave, hastily dug, on the ramparts of Corunna. The noblest dirge that ever was written says,

"We carved not a line and we raised not a stone,
But we left him alone with his glory."

Marshal Soult paid the tribute of a soldier to a soldier, and raised a plain monument on the spot where the English general had been killed. It bore this inscription :

"Hic cecidit Johannes Moore, dux exercitus, in pugnâ Januarii XVI., MDCCCIX., contra Gallos, a Duce Dalmatiæ ductos." *

Soult paid a more ample testimony to the merit of his adversary. He said, in a letter to Colonel Napier, of the 15th November, 1824, that Sir John Moore knew how to profit everywhere by the advantages which the country offered him to oppose an active and vigorous resistance, and ended by sinking in a combat which ought forever to honor his memory. Jomini, a military historian generally impartial, has described the retreat of Moore as nothing more than a flight. A later military historian, who recognizes the greatness of our country's heroes in this crisis of her fate, protests against this assertion. An army composed of young soldiers, commanded by officers without experience, and which, during eleven days, sustained, without being shaken, the pursuit of an army superior in numbers, composed of veteran troops, and led by such chiefs as Soult and Ney—which, in spite of the eagerness of this pursuit, marched fifty-six leagues in eleven days, of which three were days of rest—which, having reached the end of its march, maintained an obstinate fight and embarked in the presence of a superior enemy—which, in fact, from the commencement of the campaign, had only lost and left behind 4033 men—such an army does not fly ; it does not even make a precipitate retreat.† Happier was the lot of Moore than if he had returned to England, to be a mark for party virulence ; to be the subject of a fierce controversy whether he ought to have marched to destruction under the advice of Mr. Frere, or tried to save his army by a retreat. The miseries of that retreat were in some degree a necessary consequence of the absence of that prevision which Moore had not the materials for forming. The great captain of the Peninsular War said he could only see one error in Moore's campaign—he should have considered his advance against Soult as a movement of retreat, and have sent officers to the rear to mark and prepare the halting-places for every brigade. "But," says the Duke of Wellington, "this opinion I have formed after long experience of war, and especially of the peculiarities of a Spanish war, which must be seen to be understood." Canning in parliament spoke of the retreat and its precipitancy as a matter of deep regret. In private he used stronger and less generous language. "Sir John Moore ought never to have been held up as an approved military authority for all he had done in Spain ; for, if he had found the transports at Corunna, and returned without a battle, he must have been tried, and ought to have been disgraced ".‡ Want of accurate information of the disposition of the people, of the geographical features of the country, of the means of communication, of the power of obtaining supplies, produced the indecision of the advance and the calamities of the retreat. But how much more reprehensible was the ignorance of the government at home—"Why," said Canning, "should government be ashamed to say they wanted that knowledge of the interior of Spain which they found no one possessed ? With every other part of the continent we had had more intercourse ; of the situation of Spain we had everything to learn." * This confession of the secretary of state for foreign affairs was heard, says Southey, "with astonishment by the thoughtful part of the people, and not without indignation." The people, whether thoughtful or careless, felt the deepest commiseration for the sufferers in Moore's campaign, who came home to show what war was. There were nine hundred women landed at Plymouth who had followed the army. On board the transports they were separated from their husbands, and for the most part they were ignorant of their fate. The hospitals were filled with wounded and sick ; and some of the troops brought back a pestilential fever. In their sorrow and pity the people forgot their indignation at what they were told had been the conduct of the campaign by the government ; and while they gave a tear to the memory of the brave general who died at Corunna, they despised the attempts of some journals to load his character with obloquy. "The newspapers sounded the pulse of the public as to laying all blame on Sir John Moore, but that nail would not drive." †

The convention of Cintra and the retreat to Corunna produced a national gloom and despondency proportioned to the sanguine hopes with which the first great popular resistance to Napoleon had been hailed. There was little public confidence in further operations in the same direction. And yet the opposition in parliament had no public support when they proposed to abandon Spain and Portugal to their fate, and to keep our troops at home to resist a probable invasion. The reasonable doubts of the success of any future military enterprise were carried to their height, when the country was suddenly startled by charges against the Duke of York, which not only laid bare the vices and follies of his private character, but involved the certainty that he had unworthily bestowed his patronage at the Horse Guards. On the 27th of January Colonel Wardle's motion for an inquiry into the conduct of the commander-in-chief with regard to promotions, exchanges, and appointments to commissions in the army, and in raising levies for the army, was referred to a committee of the whole house. From the 1st of February to the 20th of March the almost undivided attention of the House of Commons and of the country was bestowed upon the contemptible details of the degradation of the king's second son, filling one of the most important offices of the state, in being the dupe of the artifices of an abandoned woman, Mrs. Mary Ann Clarke. The evidence that was given at the bar of the House of Commons occupies hundreds of pages in Hansard's debates. It was a source of amusement in every society, from the saloons of St. James's to the pot-houses of St. Giles's. It was an occasion of disgust to every well-regulated mind. Wilberforce writes in his diary, "This melancholy business will do irreparable mischief to public morals, by accustoming the public to hear without emotion of shameless violations of decency." ‡ The speaker gravely records an example of the universal interest in the ridiculous correspondence of the duke with his mistress : "The joke in the streets among the people is, not to cry 'Heads or Tails,' when they toss up halfpence, but 'Duke or Darling.'" § The debates in the house are so necessarily colored by party feelings that we cannot arrive at any just conclusions from their perusal. There were, however, two men in the house, of singular fairness, whose private opinions during the course of the inquiry may be referred to. Sir Samuel Romilly has this entry in his diary : "It was established, beyond the possibility of doubt, that the duke had permitted Mrs. Clarke, his mistress, to interfere in military promotions ; that he had given commissions at her recommendation ; and that she had taken money for the recommendations. That the duke knew she took

* Alison says that the tomb, since enlarged, bears this inscription : "John Moore, Leader of the English Armies, slain in battle, 1809."
† Brialmont, "Histoire du Duc de Wellington," tom. i. p. 218.
‡ Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 179.

* Debate of May 9, quoted in Southey's "Peninsular War," vol. iii. p. 378.
† Lord Bulkeley to the Marquis of Buckingham, "Court and Cabinets," etc., vol. iv. p. 311.
‡ Life, vol. iii. p. 402.
§ Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 174. The speaker, not familiar with the slang of the streets, writes "Heads *and* Tails," etc.

money, or that he knew that the establishment which he had set on foot for her was partly supported with the money thus illegally procured by her, did not appear otherwise than from her evidence."* Sir Arthur Wellesley, on the 17th of February, wrote to the Duke of Richmond, "The love-letters have created a terrible impression. They prove that the duke allowed Mrs. Clarke to talk to him on the claims and requests of officers, and that she had prevailed upon him to recommend Mr. O'Meara to the king as a preacher. . . . The impression is strong against the duke both in and out of the house. People are outrageous in the country on account of the immorality of his life, which makes no impression in town."† On the 19th Sir Arthur writes, "I am convinced that he cannot continue to hold his office, and that if the present ministers endeavor to support him in it they will be beat in parliament."‡ On the 17th of March Mr. Perceval moved, "That the house, having examined the evidence in the investigations of the Duke of York's conduct, and having found that personal corruption and connivance at corruption had been imputed to him, are of opinion that the imputation is wholly without foundation." The motion was carried by 278 to 196. It was not such an acquittal—such a declaration of innocence, the duke deemed it—as would allow the commander-in-chief to retain his office, in defiance of public opinion. On the 20th of March Mr. Perceval announced in the House of Commons the resignation of the Duke of York. The king communicated to the minister that his son had resigned his office; but he added "that he must ever regret any circumstances which have deprived him of the Duke of York's services, in a situation where his zealous and impartial conduct had been no less conspicuous than his strict integrity." All men were ready to admit that the commander-in-chief had been assiduous in the discharge of his duties, and had done much to improve the condition of the soldier. Sir Arthur Wellesley wrote, "We shall be able to prove that the business of his office is conducted in the most regular manner." Of the nature of the corruption Sir Arthur gives an emphatic opinion: "There has appeared in the last two days a general system of swindling, applicable to all the offices of the state, in which Mrs. Clarke has been most active and a great gainer. . . . These transactions, which have deservedly created so much indignation, have been carried on by the scum of the earth."§ Colonel Wardle became a popular idol, but he quickly sank into contempt when an upholsterer obtained a verdict against him of 2000*l.* for the cost of furnishing Mrs. Clarke's house.

The news of a great naval success came in April, to furnish some compensation for the disasters of the retreat to Corunna, and to inspire a confidence that Britain still held the empire of the sea. Thomas Lord Cochrane was a popular favorite as member for Westminster, and he was looked up to by the nation as one who by his extraordinary daring gave promise of being the true successor of Nelson. Although opposed to the government, he was chosen by the admiralty to conduct a most difficult and dangerous enterprise, under the orders of Lord Gambier. Serving with Lord Collingwood in the Mediterranean, he performed a series of the most brilliant achievements in the Impérieuse frigate. He was selected in 1809 to conduct an attack by fire-ships on the French squadron, which was blockaded in Aix Roads, by our Channel fleet. He performed this task in a way in which few commanders could have done so much by skill and intrepidity. Ten line-of-battle ships and four frigates, with a gun-ship, were moored behind a boom, half a mile in length, in a deep channel, their flanks covered by a shoal on one side and by batteries on the other. Cochrane went in with his fire-ships and frigates on the night of the 11th of April. The explosion vessel broke the boom and scattered terror and destruction through the French squadron. Four ships of the line were taken at their anchorage, and were blown up. The remainder slipped their cables and ran on shore. Captain Cochrane made signal to his admiral, when daylight came, that seven other vessels might be destroyed. Lord Gambier thought the attempt too hazardous. In parliament Lord Cochrane refused to concur in the vote of thanks to Lord Gambier, who was consequently, in 1810, tried by court-martial and acquitted of neglecting or delaying to take measures for completing the destruction which his officer had partially accomplished. The charges against Lord Gambier have been revived by the statements of Lord Dundonald in his autobiography, and the admiral has been defended in his memoirs recently published. The controversy is of too professional a nature to allow of any examination here. The people of 1809 rejoiced that there was a seaman capable of such enterprises. The people of 1860, when Lord Dundonald was borne to Westminster Abbey, after a long life of undeserved obloquy and neglect, lamented that the party feelings of a time of violent politics—perhaps something also of his own impetuous and independent character—should have made the exploit of Basque Roads the last of his services to his own country.

After the forces under Junot had evacuated Portugal according to the conditions of the convention of Cintra, Sir John Cradock was left in the command of the British troops in that country. Soult invaded the northern provinces from Galicia, and took possession of Oporto on the 29th of March. The regency at Lisbon earnestly implored the aid of the British government; and it was determined to render that aid most effectual by intrusting the conduct of the war to the one general who appeared capable of coping with its difficulties. Sir John Cradock was removed to Gibraltar, and on the 2d of April Sir Arthur Wellesley was ordered to replace that officer, and to proceed without delay to Lisbon. When Napoleon suddenly gave up the pursuit of Sir John Moore, on the receipt of intelligence of the disposition of Austria to renew the conflict with him, he lingered for a little while on the frontier, and then proceeded to Paris. Here he made ample preparations for another campaign in Germany. The German people were strongly excited by the resistance in Spain to the domination of France. It was probably difficult for the Austrian government not to go along with this popular spirit. On the 6th of April the Archduke Charles issued a proclamation in which he said the liberty of Europe had taken refuge under their banners. On the 9th Austria declared war against Bavaria, the ally of France, and the Austrian armies crossed the Inn. Napoleon left Paris on the 13th of April. On the 17th he was at Donauwerth, on the Danube. The struggle instantly began, which was terminated by the peace of Vienna on the 14th of October. On the 22d of April Sir Arthur Wellesley landed at Lisbon. His work in the Peninsula was not done till, in February, 1814, he had cleared Portugal and Spain from their invaders.

There was no delay or indecision in the movements of Sir Arthur Wellesley from the day when he set his foot on Portuguese ground. His business was first to drive the French from Oporto. On the 9th of May he moved with sixteen thousand British troops from Coimbra. On the 11th he crossed the Douro. To take sixteen thousand troops across a river is not an easy task under any circumstances; but "how to pass a river, deep, swift, more than three hundred yards wide, and in the face of ten thousand veterans guarding the opposite bank"—this is the question asked by the first of military historians. On the convent height stood "a great captain, searching with an eagle glance the river, the city, and the country around." Sir Arthur saw where he could force a passage, "his means being as scanty as his resolution was great, yet with his genius they sufficed."* On the 12th the British obtained a victory, which compelled Soult to retreat from Oporto, leaving many sick and wounded. The conqueror published a proclamation calling upon the inhabitants to be merciful to the wounded and prisoners. The French in their retreat were harassed and killed by the people of the villages; the roads were strewed with the carcasses of horses and men who were put to death before the British advanced guards could save them. "This last circumstance," says Sir Arthur, "is the natural effect of the species of warfare which the enemy have carried on in this country. Their soldiers have plundered and murdered the peasantry at their pleasure."†

Thus far had the British general accomplished his great task with surpassing skill. He told his story with his accustomed modesty, in his dispatch of the 12th of May. The praise is for his officers and his men: "They have marched in four days over eighty miles of most difficult country, have gained many important positions, and have engaged and defeated three different bodies of the enemy's troops."‡ The opposition in parliament, with few exceptions,

* "Diary," February 13.
† "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 575.
‡ Ibid., p. 579. § Ibid., p. 567.

* Napier. † "Dispatches," vol. iv. p. 344.
‡ Ibid., vol. iv. p. 325.

were, as they too long continued to be, so hopeless of success and so unjust and ungenerous in refusing to recognize the merits of the commander who was opening a new career for the army of England as glorious as the triumphs of her fleets, that we can scarcely wonder at the vexation of Sir Arthur Wellesley when he read the parliamentary proceedings of the 31st of May. * On the 21st of June he writes from Abrantes to the friend who had sent him the newspaper: "I am very indifferent what the opinion is of our operations. I shall do the best I can with the force given to me; and if the people of England are not satisfied they must send somebody else who will do better." As to one charge he felt that it was an imputation upon his honor: "I see that Mr. Whitbread accuses me of exaggeration, which is, in other words, lying." † His system in describing his operations was entirely opposed to that of Napoleon. "To lie like a bulletin" was an art of war which he had no ambition to acquire.

In the days before steam navigation, before railways, before electric telegraphs, the proceedings of statesmen and of warriors had to be regulated by the arrival of news rather than by the dates of occurrences in distant places which dispatches recorded. In 1809 "the posts come tiring on." Rumor goes before, "stuffing the ears of men with false reports." Parliament rose on the 21st of June, and soon after came official intelligence, in rapid succession, of great events on the Danube, on the Scheldt, on the Tagus. It is curious to compare the dates of arrival of intelligence in London and the dates of the events. The speaker writes in his diary, "While I was in the country news arrived—

"July 21.—Of Bonaparte passing the Danube, and defeating the Austrians." The final battle of the campaign, Wagram, took place on the 6th of July. The armistice, which took place on the 10th, was known in London on the 27th.

"August 8.—Of the descent on Walcheren and investment of Flushing." The disembarkation took place on the 30th of July, the expedition having sailed on the 27th.

"August 16.—Of Sir Arthur Wellesley's defeat of the French at Talavera." This victory was gained on the 27th of July.

In narrating these events we shall see how the knowledge of them bore upon the measures of the English government, or ought to have borne. Each event had a distinct relation to the others. The course of history is like the progress of a well-conducted fiction, in which no incident is without its bearing upon the plot. But we shall also see what amazing changes have been wrought by the rapidity of communication in our own day. Had steam and electricity proclaimed to the English Cabinet, in the middle of July, the news of the armistice between Austria and France, it is clear that the most rash administration would not have ordered an expedition to sail on the 27th, as a diversion to Austria, when Austria's war was ended. Assuming that the sailing of the expedition had been countermanded, and the news of the battle of Talavera on the 27th of July had travelled from the Tagus to the Thames at the beginning of August, it is clear that the most supine ministry would have sent to Portugal a large proportion of those troops which were shipped for the Scheldt: the necessary weakening of the British army by the sanguinary battle might thus have been speedily repaired. When the news did come the opportunity was gone. Earl Temple (afterward Duke of Buckingham) writes to his father, "We have not the means of reinforcing Wellesley. If half the troops which are now knocking their heads against Flushing were available, an important blow might still be struck in Spain." ‡ The victory of Talavera, most men thought, would have no permanent results for good, because the French were too strong. Living in the times which knew of no such triumphs of science as we enjoy, the government could form no certain combinations when they attempted large operations upon different points. They could only speculate upon results in detail, and they too often speculated wrongly. It was the folly of that day to attempt too much and too little; to make a show of activity in many quarters without directing a great effort upon one paramount object.

* See the Speeches of Mr. Whitbread and Mr. Ponsonby, in Hansard, vol. xiv.

† "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 292.

‡ "Court and Cabinets of George III.," vol. iv. p. 353.

CHAPTER CCV.

The nations of Europe roused to resistance against France—The battle of Eckmuhl—Napoleon retires to the island of Lobau—Insurrection of the Tyrolese—Battle of Wagram—Austria concludes a peace—The Tyrolese subdued—Expedition to the Scheldt—The British land in Walcheren—Flushing bombarded—Its surrender—The marsh fever breaks out—Fatal termination of the expedition—The battle of Talavera—Alarm in England—Disquiet of ministers—Duel between Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning—The Jubilee—Question of parliamentary privilege—Committal to the Tower of Sir Francis Burdett—Portugal—Lines of Torres Vedras—The campaign of 1810—Almeida—Battle of Busaco—Wellington retires within his lines.

When the session of parliament was closed on the 21st of June, 1809, events in Germany justified the assertion in the royal speech, that the resistance in Spain against the usurpation and tyranny of the French government had "awakened in other nations of Europe a determination to resist, by a new effort, the continued and increasing encroachments on their safety and independence." M. Thiers candidly says, "The odious act at Bayonne, the difficulties that had arisen in Spain, had all at once, throughout Germany as well as in Austria, excited indignation and restored hope." * Every man in Prussia, from the peasant to the noble, was ready to revolt. In the countries in alliance with France—in Saxony, in Westphalia, in Bavaria, in Wurtemberg, in Baden—the people, oppressed by the presence of troops, by conscriptions, and by taxes, complained that each of their sovereigns had sacrificed his country to his personal ambition. In the Tyrol the hardy mountaineers, who were attached by old hereditary ties to the house of Austria, bore impatiently the yoke of Bavaria, to which crown they had been annexed, and were ready to rise in insurrection. It was a crisis that was worthy of heroic efforts, if Europe were to be free.

The first great operations of the war gave no very decided advantage to Napoleon, although his bulletins spoke of partial victories as final triumphs. The battle of Eckmuhl, on the 22d of April, was followed by the entry of the French into Vienna on the 13th of May. But the Archduke Charles had reinforced his army, and was advancing rapidly along the left bank of the Danube, to prevent the enemy crossing from the right bank, on which Vienna is situated. In the great stream of the Danube is the island of Lobau, nearly three miles in length and nearly two miles in breadth. To this island Napoleon determined to transport his army. This was an operation of no common difficulty; but it was accomplished by incessant labor in constructing a great bridge upon boats, held in their places by anchors, or by the weight of cannon taken from the arsenal of Vienna. From Lobau there was a smaller stream to cross, by a similar bridge, before a landing could be effected on the open plain on the left bank. On the morning of the 21st of May the army of the Archduke Charles saw from wooded heights the army of Napoleon crossing the lesser branch of the river, and pouring into the great level called Marchfeld. As the French formed their line, the village of Aspern was on one flank, the village of Essling on the other flank. On the 21st and 22d of May, the most sanguinary contest of the war here took place. "It was a battle," says Thiers, "without any result but an abominable effusion of blood." Never before was the all-conquering emperor in so dangerous a position as when the day closed upon this horrible carnage. He could not return to Vienna; for the river had risen, and the Austrians had floated down the main stream great balks of timber and numerous fire-ships, which swept away the boats and their bridge. Napoleon could only return to the island of Lobau. Here he retreated, carrying with him thousands of wounded soldiers. The place afforded small means for their cure or comfort, and there was soon little difference between those who died in the battle-field and those who were borne from it to a lingering death.

Shut up in the island of the Danube, the French emperor was strengthening his position and waiting for events. They were of a mixed character. The heroic partisan, Colonel Schill, and the Duke of Brunswick, who had headed the German insurrection in Saxony, Westphalia, and Hanover, had failed. Schill was killed in Stralsund. The Duke of Brunswick, with a few troops, embarked for England. The Tyrolese were in active resistance to the Bavarians,

* "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tome x. p. 56.

and their first successes gave a new impulse to the sentiment that when the German people should rise against their oppressors, as "the herdsmen of the Alps" had risen, the day of deliverance was at hand. That day was for awhile postponed. Andrew Hofer, the innkeeper in the valley of Passeyr, and three other resolute friends, led the revolt which broke out on the 8th of April. The Bavarians entered the province with 25,000 men. From mountain to mountain the signal fires had been lighted, which called forth the bold peasants to seize their rifles and march to attack the Bavarians in the gorges of the hills, and even in the towns which they held in strength. Halle was taken; Innspruck surrendered after an obstinate defence. After the French occupied Vienna, the Tyrol was invaded by two French and allied armies. The Tyrolese fled not at their presence. They defeated the French and Saxons in the valley of the Eisach. The vanguard of four thousand Bavarians under the Duke of Dantzic was destroyed. A new mode of warfare spread dismay among the disciplined troops, who thought they were marching to an easy conquest. As they wended their way unsuspectingly through passes where perpendicular rocks rose on either side, voices would be heard from above, shouting, "Let go your ropes." Then would descend masses of rocks and timber, crushing and burying the columns, while the unerring rifles picked off the few who fled from the overwhelming ruin. The Duke of Dantzic speedily retreated from the dangerous mountains. But Hofer dared to encounter him in a pitched battle, and the innkeeper won the victory.

Such were the tidings that reached Napoleon in the island of Lobau. The inaction of mutual exhaustion was coming to an end. To Napoleon inaction was generally insupportable. He appeared busily employed in constructing massive bridges from the island to the left bank of the Danube; but he was secretly collecting the materials for another work. On the night of the 4th of July the whole of his army crossed the stream by a bridge hastily thrown over an unguarded point. On the morning of the 5th the French moved in order of battle toward the intrenched camp of the Austrians, which was to resist the passage over the Danube so ostentatiously prepared. The Archduke Charles quitted his intrenchments, abandoning the country between Enzensdorf and Wagram. He had lost the opportunity of attacking the French as they crossed the river in that one night, and confronted him as if by miracle. He now retired to a strong position on the elevated table-land of Wagram. From this locality the great battle of the 6th derives its name. The number of soldiers engaged in the work of mutual destruction was between three and four hundred thousand. The French historians claim to have killed or wounded twenty-four thousand Austrians, and admit to have lost eighteen thousand in killed or wounded. But the sturdy resistance of Austria had deranged some of Napoleon's grandest plans of ambition. "He had renounced the idea of dethroning the house of Hapsburg, an idea which he had conceived in the first movements of his wrath."* He would humiliate Austria by new sacrifices of territory and of money. The time was fast approaching when the conquering *parvenu* would demand a daughter of the house of Hapsburg in marriage, completing the triumph of his proud egoism by divorcing the woman who had stooped from her rank to wed the Corsican lieutenant of artillery. Austria sued for an armistice, and the armistice led to a peace. Two of the conditions of the peace of Vienna, which was signed on the 14th of October, were more degrading to Austria than the loss of territory. One was that she should give no succor to the Tyrolese who had so nobly fought for her independence. The other was, that she should unite with all the rest of the enslaved continent in the exclusion of the commerce of England—of England, her ally, that was affording the most effectual co-operation by exertions in Spain, and had attempted, by a small expedition to Naples, and a vast expedition to the Scheldt, to divert the levies of France from going to the aid of the French armies that were fighting against Austria on the Danube and in Italy. England was ill-timed in her assistance; she was unlucky; but her good-will was not the less sincere. Napoleon returned to Paris, and left his marshals to put down the spirit in Germany which a humiliating peace could not compromise, and which the system of terror could not wholly extinguish. Fifty thousand French and Bavarians marched into the Tyrol, hunted the peasantry from hill to hill, set a price upon the head of Andrew Hofer, and procured his arrest by treachery. He was tried by court-martial at Mantua and condemned to death. The majority of French officers were averse to the sentence being executed. There was a respite; but an order from Paris left no choice. He was shot on the 20th of February.

The history of the fatal expedition to Walcheren might be sufficiently traced in the papers presented to parliament, and in the minutes of evidence taken before a committee of the whole House of Commons.* But time has opened other sources of information. The materials are ample for a narrative, interesting in itself, and instructive for warning against official neglect, ignorance, and presumption. We are enabled to add a few details from an unpublished journal.†

Sir David Dundas succeeded the Duke of York as commander-in-chief, on the 18th of March. On the 24th he was called to a cabinet meeting. He was informed that an immediate attack on the island of Walcheren was contemplated; that there were nine or ten sail of the line in the harbor of Flushing, not in a state to proceed to sea; that our navy had a large disposable force; and that fifteen thousand land forces would be necessary for the operation. Could such a force be at once assembled? Sir David Dundas said that such a force could not at once be provided; that the corps which had returned from Spain were in very indifferent health, and their military equipment was in a very defective state. Preparations went on to complete the remains of Sir John Moore's army for service; and volunteers from militia regiments were gradually drafted into regiments of the line. But the scheme had assumed a more formidable character, when Lord Castlereagh, on the 29th of May, stated to Sir David Dundas that his majesty's government felt it their duty to investigate, having formidable means at their disposal, how far it was possible to strike a blow against the enemy's naval resources in the Scheldt, "including the destruction of their arsenal at Antwerp, and the ships of war stationed in different parts of the Scheldt between Antwerp and Flushing." The answer of the commander-in-chief on the 3d of June was not encouraging. He thought that an attack upon Antwerp was a service of very great risk. On the 18th of June Lord Castlereagh directed that 35,000 infantry and 1800 cavalry should be held in readiness for immediate embarkation. Sir David Dundas was not consulted as to the appointment of the commander of the expedition, although he knew that it was meant to appoint Lord Chatham. There were equally important persons with whom no consultation was held. Sir Lucas Pepys, the physician-general to the forces, was acquainted with the nature of the disorder to which soldiers were subject in the island of Walcheren. The medical officers of the army were not informed where the expedition was going, and therefore could not make any particular preparation. With Mr. Thomas Keate, surgeon-general of the army, there was no consultation. He knew perfectly well the nature of the complaint prevalent in Walcheren at the season when the expedition was about to sail; and had confidence been reposed in him he should have recommended precautions that might have lessened the malady. On the 16th of July "our trusty and well-beloved cousin and counsellor, John, Earl of Chatham," received his instructions, as the commander of a large division of his majesty's forces, to attack and destroy the naval force and establishments in the Scheldt, acting in conjunction with the commander of the naval portion of the armament, Sir Richard Strachan. The whole amount of the land-force, according to the list transmitted to Lord Chatham, was 39,143 infantry, cavalry, and artillery. The naval force comprised 35 sail of the line, 5 ships of 50 and 44 guns, 18 frigates, and 160 sloops, gun-brigs, bomb-vessels, gun-boats, etc. The army was encamped on South Sea Common and on the hills around Portsmouth. The ships of war were assembled at Spithead, ready to take a portion of the troops on board, while others were received by transports. The weather was the finest of a fine summer. Gazers from all parts came to look upon the most magnificent expedition that ever left the British ports. The ostentatious preparation was out of harmony with the affected

* Thiers, tome x. p. 478.

* See Hansard, vol. xv. Appendix, col. 1 to 639, and vol. xvi. Appendix, col. 1105 to 1130.

† "Narrative of the Expedition," by an officer employed—MS. of 200 pages, in the possession of the author of the "Popular History."

secret of its destination. The French and Dutch knew thoroughly well what was intended. The English army and navy were to be kept in the dark, so that the mystery should not be divulged and find its way to Flushing and Antwerp. Yet the first order issued, while the troops were embarking, was one against taking quarters "unsanctioned by the burgomaster."

On the 25th of July this great armament sailed from Portsmouth to the Downs. During the three days on which it ran down the English shore, every height was crowded with people. "Of all the displays that I have ever seen," says the writer of the MS. journal, "the finest was that which opened on us as we rounded the South Foreland. The sea was literally covered for miles with shipping, and all was animation. Upward of a thousand sail were rolling at anchor off Deal, and among them six enormous three-deckers that looked like castles. All England seemed to have collected on the coast. Boats were sweeping in all directions among the fleet. Hundreds of parties from the shore were rowing about among us. The bands of the regiments were playing, bugles sounding, and in the heavy swell of a north-east gale flag and cannon signals were perpetually busy. The whole had an incomparable look of spirit and triumph, and was an actual display of power that we proudly felt the world besides could not equal."

On the 28th of July, at daybreak, the first division of the fleet, with Sir Richard Strachan, and the Earl of Chatham on board, sailed from the Downs. A larger division followed on the 29th. On the 30th twenty thousand men landed on the isle of Walcheren. Middleburgh, the chief town, was immediately surrendered. The French troops were driven into Flushing. Other operations were attended with complete success. Every obstacle was quickly removed that would have prevented Antwerp being taken by a sudden and well-combined movement of the naval and military forces. The French ships at Flushing had withdrawn and had gone up the Scheldt. No English squadron pursued. The garrison of Antwerp had only 3000 men. Napoleon said to O'Meara that if a few thousand men had been landed at Wilhelmstadt and marched direct to Antwerp, it might have been taken by a *coup-de-main*. After the fleet had got up, that was impossible. Bahtz, the key to both the channels of the Scheldt, was taken by Sir John Hope on the morning of the 3d, and the whole of South Beveland was in his possession. All the energy of the first operations had no other ulterior object, in the eye of the commander-in-chief, than the taking of Flushing and the occupation of Walcheren. It would seem as if the Earl of Chatham had known that Napoleon held that Flushing was impregnable, and that it had become a point of honor with him to prove that the great emperor could be sometimes mistaken. From the palace of Schönbrunn, while negotiating a peace with Austria, Napoleon wrote on the 6th of October to his minister of war at Paris—who had apprised him of the appearance off Walcheren of the English armament—"They will not take Flushing, since the dykes can be cut; they will not take the squadron, for it can ascend to Antwerp."* Ten days later this provident administrator, who never suffered any circumstances in his vast empire to be indifferent to him, showed how much better he understood what our army would experience than the war minister who directed the expedition. Napoleon then wrote, "Before six weeks, of the fifteen thousand English who are on the isle of Walcheren not fifteen hundred will be left. The rest will be in the hospitals. . . . The expedition has been undertaken under false information, and has been ignorantly calculated."†

The enemy that was gathering around our troops—far more dangerous than the batteries of Flushing—was soon perceptible. The investment of the place was completed, before a bombardment commenced, on the 13th of August. The troops slept, for the most part, in the open air. In his MS. journal the officer writes: "Toward morning we found ourselves wrapped in that chill blue marshy mist rising from the ground that no clothing can keep out, and that actually seems to penetrate to the inmost frame. And this we always found the morning atmosphere of Walcheren—the island covered with a sheet of exhalation, blue, dense, and fetid." The positive orders which Napoleon had sent from Schönbrunn, that General Monnet, the commander of Flushing, should cut the dykes, were now carried into effect. On the 11th the sea-dyke extending from the right flank of Flushing on the land side to the canal of St. Joostland was cut. The water spread over the fields, filled the ditches, and forced the besiegers to abandon some parts of the trenches. There was no time to lose. The bombardment commenced upon a scale that was perhaps unequalled in any previous siege. Batteries of heavy ordnance fired incessantly night and day upon the devoted town. The Congreve rocket was employed with fearful effect. Ten line-of-battle ships on the morning of the 14th ranged along the sea line of defences, and kept up a cannonade for several hours. Flushing was on fire in every quarter. At last after three days the governor agreed to surrender, on the condition of the garrison becoming prisoners of war. The occupation of the Dutch fishing town was the prize that cost twenty millions of money. The siege operations were conducted by Sir Eyre Coote, Lord Chatham "having hoped, had circumstances permitted, to have proceeded up the river."* His lordship, whose vocation, according to an epigram not far from the truth, was to eat and to sleep, contrived to console himself for his disappointment in not going up the river to encounter Bernadotte, who had arrived at Antwerp with a great army. He rested happily at Bahtz, where his existence was proclaimed by two turtles sprawling upon their backs in his garden, ready for the art of the commander-in-chief of the kitchen who accompanied him.†

And now came the dread event which Napoleon had predicted. Lord Chatham wrote home on the 29th that he was obliged to close his operations with the capture of Flushing. He adds, "I am concerned to say, that the effect of the climate at this unhealthy period of the year is felt most seriously, and that the number of the sick already is little short of three thousand." The morning fogs began to be heavier and more penetrating. The soldiers who had been kept up by the animation of the siege now sank, exhausted and despairing. They were carried into close barracks at Middleburgh, where the fever raged more and more, and the barracks all became hospitals. The surgeons were unsupplied with bark and other necessary medicines. The medical officers themselves were seized, and either died or were disqualified for attendance. Proper supplies of medicine and of wine from England were coming as soon as routine could bestir itself. The main army was ordered home, and with them went Lord Chatham. But fifteen thousand men were left in Walcheren "for the protection of the island." The dispatches of Sir Eyre Coote, from the 31st of August to the 23d of October, contain the most distressing accounts of the progress of the fever. Thousands had died. Four thousand sick had been sent to England. Sixteen hundred more were about to be sent, and then the hospitals would still contain four thousand sick, who must have been abandoned to the French in the event of their landing. Every one who had thought or read knew what would be the consequence of sending forty thousand men to Zealand in August, and of their continuing there for two or three months. Every one suspected what might happen, except the ministry, and especially the secretary at war. Sir John Pringle's book on the "Diseases of the Army" was known to common readers, but it was unknown, or unheeded, in cabinet councils, where some members were assiduously engaged in the laudable endeavor to circumvent a colleague, yet leaving him to the consequences of his own incapacity; and others thought that whatever he did was right, as long as he did not go before his party in any large or liberal views. Mr. John Webb, the inspector of hospitals, reported to Lord Castlereagh, on the 11th of September—when the ravages had begun, and statesmanship at last had taken counsel of science—that, independent of the existing records of the unhealthiness of Zealand, every feature of the country exhibited it in the most forcible manner—the canals communicating with the sea covered with the most noisome ooze; every ditch loaded with matter in a state of putrefaction; the whole island little better than a swamp; scarcely a place where water of a tolerable quality could be procured; the children sickly, and many of the adults deformed. The endemic diseases of the country, remittent and intermittent fevers, says the inspector, begin to appear about the middle of August, and continue to prevail until the commencement of frosty weather. He adds one important fact, after describing how the disease had spread

* Thiers, tome xi. p. 452—"Lettres relatives à Walcheren."
† Ibid., p. 460.

* Dispatch, 16th August.
† "Court and Cabinets of George III.," vol. iv. p. 356.

in the army with a rapidity almost unexampled in the history of any military operation, that "those men who may be attacked with fever, and recover from it, will have their constitutions so affected by the shock that their physical powers, when called into action hereafter, will be very materially diminished." * The "Journal of an Officer" describes what was endured by thousands of the sick. After a month's suffering he was carried to Flushing; shipped on board of a frigate; when in the Downs the ship was telegraphed that the hospitals were full; went on to Spithead, and was borne ashore fainting. "My recovery was long doubtful, and when it at last commenced, it was long imperfect. The venom of the marsh fever had a singular power of permeating the whole human frame. It unstrung every muscle, penetrated every bone, and seemed to search and enfeeble all the sources of mental and bodily life. I dragged it about with me for years." Such was the end of the great armada that sailed from the Downs on the 28th of July, with a pomp and power that had never been equalled since another armada came to a like fatal termination of vain hopes and blind confidence. The calamity which England had sustained had a most serious effect upon the progress of the war in Spain and Portugal. In the summer of 1810 the operations of Lord Wellington were fatally crippled by the want of men to supply his losses. His earnest request for more aid from home was thus answered by Lord Liverpool on the 2d of August: "Now, with respect to reinforcements to your army, I am under the painful necessity of informing you that the effects of the fever contracted by our army last year in Walcheren are still of that nature that, by a late inspection, we have not at this time a single battalion of infantry, in Great Britain and Ireland, reported fit for service in the field, with the exception of the infantry of the Duke of Brunswick's corps." † Walcheren was evacuated on the 23d of December. Then came inquiries in parliament. The ministry made every effort to screen Lord Chatham from a vote of censure, which was prevented only by very small majorities. The character of the army and navy was not injured. The disgrace rested with the commander, with the secretary at war, and with the members of the cabinet, who believed him incapable, and had not the courage to enforce their belief.

After the retreat of Soult from Oporto, Sir Arthur Wellesley, at the beginning of July, entered Spain. On the 20th he made a junction with the Spanish army under Cuesta, at Oropesa. Marshal Victor was in position at Talavera. His outposts were attacked on the 22d by the Spanish and British; and Victor, retiring to Torrijos, was joined by Sebastiani, and afterward by King Joseph. Cuesta was obstinate and conceited. Taking his own counsel, he pushed on alone to attack the French, and was driven back to the British army on the Alberche. With the greatest difficulty he was persuaded not to fight in a position where he would have been destroyed. In a sulky mood he left to Sir Arthur Wellesley the command of the two armies. The British general retired six miles to Talavera, where he had previously chosen his field of battle, and which he had strengthened by some earthworks. On the 27th the French crossed the Alberche, and there was a partial contest, in which they were repulsed. On the 28th the French renewed the attack. From nine o'clock of that morning till noon the two armies reposed. It was the calm before the storm. The heat was excessive, and the French and English soldiers quitted their ranks and assuaged their thirst in the little stream that separated their several positions. The scene was suddenly changed. The French drums beat the *rappel;* the eagles were uplifted; the columns formed, and the battle commenced. They first attacked the left, which was weak; then fell upon the right, and later in the day threw their force upon the centre of the line. A formidable battery was making fearful havoc. The centre was giving way, when Sir Arthur Wellesley ordered the 48th regiment to descend from the height which they occupied and meet the brunt of the fight. The scattered masses rallied. The English general hurled a charge of cavalry upon the French columns, and the victory was won. In writing to a friend in India, Sir Arthur Wellesley said, "The battle of Talavera was the hardest fought of modern times. The fire at Assaye was heavier while it lasted; but the battle of Talavera lasted for two days and a night. Each party engaged lost a fourth of their numbers." * To another friend he writes, "We had certainly a most fierce contest at Talavera, and the victory which we gained, although from circumstances it has not been followed by all the good consequences which we might have expected from it, has at least added to the military reputation of the country, and has convinced the French that their title to be called the first military nation in Europe will be disputed, not unsuccessfully." ‡ "This battle," says Jomini, "recovered the glory of the successors of Marlborough, which for a century had declined. It was felt that the English infantry could contend with the best in Europe." Very few Spaniards were engaged. Sixteen thousand English, of which number many had been recently taken from the militia, repulsed thirty thousand French veterans. Napoleon was furious at the results of the battle of Talavera. He wrote from Schönbrunn to General Clarke that he should express to Marshal Jourdan the emperor's extreme displeasure at the inaccuracies and falsehoods in his report. "He says that on the 28th we were in possession of the British army's field of battle—that is to say, of Talavera, and of the table land on which their left flank rested; while his subsequent reports, and those of other officers, say the exact contrary, and that we were repulsed during the whole day. . . . Tell him that he might have put what he pleased into the Madrid newspapers, but that he had no right to disguise the truth to government." ‡ The next day the emperor wrote to his minister of police a memorandum, to be expanded into articles in the journals: "Lord Wellesley is beaten in Spain. Surrounded in his rout, he seeks his safety in a precipitate flight under excessive heat. In quitting Talavera he has recommended to the Duke of Belluno five thousand sick and wounded that he was obliged to leave there. If affairs had been properly conducted in Spain, not an Englishman would have escaped; but nevertheless they are beaten. Comment on these ideas in the journals. Demonstrate the extravagance of the ministers in exposing thirty thousand English, in the heart of Spain, against a hundred and twenty thousand French, the best troops in the world, while at the same time they sent twenty-five thousand others to come to grief (*se casser le nez*) in the marshes of Holland." § In these hints for his journalists of Paris, Napoleon exaggerated the painful facts which the English general readily admitted. He was obliged to retreat, for Soult had suddenly appeared with fifty thousand men. He was surrounded by immense armies; he did leave, to be guarded by Cuesta, fifteen hundred of his sick and wounded; when Cuesta marched away and left his charge, Sir Arthur did recommend them to the humanity of the French generals, who acted generously toward them, as Sir Arthur Wellesley had acted toward the French at Oporto. He had confided too much in Spanish generals and in Spanish troops. He had trusted too much to the zeal and activity of the commissariat to furnish him supplies. Admiral Berkeley, who commanded in the Tagus, says: "Twice has the army been stopped for money, and twice for provisions. The horses starved, while ships, loaded with hay and oats from England, enough to furnish all the cavalry, were rotting and spoiling in the Tagus. The medical staff is as bad, as our army were dying away for want of medicines, while more than sufficient were in ships in the river." ‖ Nearly half a century was to slide on before such results of "ignorance and delay" were to be counted as monstrous things, that could never again shake the public confidence in official sagacity. The experience of one campaign taught Sir Arthur Wellesley great lessons. In India he had acquired the power of regulating the commissariat upon the largest scale; in providing not only for men and horses, but for elephants and bullocks, and all the gorgeous cavalcades of an oriental camp. In his first campaign in Portugal he had somewhat too much relied upon the War Office, and the Victualling Office, and the Transport Office. Each department did its own work in parallel lines, and never thought that the division of labor was worthless without the union of forces. He soon came to look sharply after the most apparently trifling details. But he also came to rely upon himself, and to leave the Spanish generals to their jealousies, and the Spanish juntas to their own conceits. His brother, the marquis (then ambassador in Spain), seeing that he could not bring the native authorities to act "with

* Hansard, vol. xv. Appendix, col. xii.
† "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 568.

* "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 431. † Ibid., p. 387.
‡ "Correspondence with King Joseph," vol. ii. p. 66, August 21.
§ Thiers, tome vi. p. 461, "Lettres de Napoléon."
‖ "Court, etc., of George III.," vol. iv. p. 359.

common spirit, honesty, or decency," advised him to return home.* He remained to show how a resolute will and a clear head can surmount every difficulty.

The battle of Talavera won for Sir Arthur Wellesley the name by which we shall henceforth speak of him—Wellington: first viscount, then earl, then marquis, then duke. By what name he was to be called was almost a matter of chance.† "Talavera" was thought of. Of "Wellesley" his brother wore the honors. "Wellington" was chosen—the household word for all time. In December the British army had crossed the Tagus at Abrantes. When his headquarters were at Badajoz, in October, Lord Wellington had gone to Lisbon, "to arrange finally for the defence of Portugal." He had conceived the grand project of the lines of Torres Vedras. In January, 1810, his headquarters were at Viseu, and he was in constant communication with Lieutenant-Colonel Fletcher, an officer of engineers, on the execution of this gigantic work. The scheme was not to be paraded before the world. It was to be proceeded with steadily and unostentatiously. He would claim no merit with the English government, or the English people, for preparing a stronghold, from which he might go forth to do battle with armies four times as strong as his own, and retire thither on any emergency, to laugh at their efforts to dislodge him. During the spring of 1810 he steadily devoted himself to the organization of the British and Portuguese armies. He was wholly left to his own resources. The government at home could send him no reinforcements. He had no support in their confidence that he would surmount the difficulties by which he was encompassed. At the end of October four questions were put to him by Lord Liverpool,‡ which required all his prudence and sagacity to answer upon his own responsibility. Wellington thought: 1. That if the Spaniards were commonly prudent, the enemy would require a very large reinforcement before they could subjugate the country; 2. He thought that if the French did not make an immediate attack upon Portugal, they would require an army of seventy or eighty thousand men to succeed, but he believed they would make the attack; 3. He thought that if they made the attack at once they would be successfully resisted; 4. He was convinced that, if defeated, his army could embark.§ At the end of 1809 intelligence had arrived of the defeat of two Spanish armies; and then Lord Liverpool talks as if all the efforts of the British and Portuguese armies for the defence of Portugal would be unavailing.‖ In March Lord Liverpool apprises Lord Wellington "that a very considerable degree of alarm exists in this country respecting the safety of the British army in Portugal;" and that he "would rather be excused for bringing away the army a little too soon than, by remaining in Portugal a little too long, exposing it to those risks from which no military operations can be wholly exempt." ¶ He could not "recommend any attempt at what may be called desperate resistance." It must have been a satisfaction to Wellington, who cared very little for "alarm in England," and was not easily depressed by ministerial timidity, to have received the encouragement of the stout-hearted old king to persevere in the course which appeared right and safe in his own judgment. Colonel Herbert Taylor was then the official secretary to George III., who was nearly or totally blind. He had read to the king a private letter from Lord Wellington to Lord Liverpool, and he conveys to the minister his sovereign's sentiments upon the correspondence which had taken place. This letter of Colonel Taylor, dated April 21st, Lord Liverpool forwards to Lord Wellington. It contains the following passage: "The king observed that the arguments and remarks which this letter contains, the general style and spirit in which it is written, and the clearness with which the state of the question and of prospects in Portugal is exposed, have given his majesty a very high opinion of Lord Wellington's sense, and of the resources of his mind as a soldier; and that as he appears to have weighed the whole of his situation so coolly and maturely, and to have considered so fully every contingency under which he may be placed, not omitting any necessary preparation, his majesty trusted that his ministers would feel with him the advantage of suffering him to proceed according to his judgment and discretion in the adherence to the principles which he has laid down, unfettered by any particular instructions which might embarrass him in the execution of his general plan of operations."* The worry from Downing Street continued, especially from the treasury. In June Wellington asks this question of the ministry—"Are we at war with France for the existence and independence of the country? and is it advisable to maintain the contest as long as possible at a distance from home? . . . I see more, and must know more, of what is going on here than others; and I certainly have no prejudice in favor of the continuance of our exertions here, founded upon any partiality for the business of guiding them. But I sincerely feel what I write—that if the resources of Great Britain were fairly applied to this contest, as they have been to any other in which the country has been engaged, the French would yet regret the invasion of Spain." †

When two cabinet ministers meet to fight a duel, and one is wounded, the natural consequence is, that the house divided against itself must fall. Lord Castlereagh, the secretary at war, challenged Mr. Canning, the secretary for foreign affairs, and they had a hostile meeting on Wimbledon Common on the 22d of September. Canning was slightly wounded. It is scarcely possible to investigate the causes of this transaction without encountering the difficulties that arise from the partisanship of contemporary narratives. After the lapse of half a century the subject is scarcely worth investigation by a writer who has only to present a rapid view of the more important public affairs. Upon the surface it might appear that Canning had been intriguing for six months to remove Castlereagh from office for some motive of personal ambition. He "was much and unjustly blamed at the time."‡ The Duke of Portland, the prime minister, wrote to the chancellor in June, "The great object, and indeed the *sine quâ non* with Canning, is to take from Lord Castlereagh the conduct of the war." Lord Castlereagh, in his letter of challenge, complained that Mr. Canning, after receiving a promise that the seals of the War Office should be transferred from their holder, continued to act with him as his colleague, and permitted him to originate the Walcheren enterprise. There seems to be no doubt, however, that Canning several times tendered his own resignation, but was overpersuaded to remain in office—believing that Castlereagh had been apprised by the Duke of Portland and other members of the cabinet of the desire and the intention to make the change which so materially affected the public service. Both the secretaries of state were injured by the want of moral courage in the head of the government to do a disagreeable act—by telling the truth to take out of the hands of the war minister the completion of a great enterprise which he had devised. The end of the affair was that Canning and Castlereagh both quitted the administration. The Duke of Portland also resigned, and, long broken in health, died on the 29th of October. There were many difficulties in constructing a new administration. Mr. Perceval became premier; the Marquis Wellesley came from Spain to be secretary for foreign affairs; Lord Liverpool took Lord Castlereagh's post as secretary of state for the department of war and colonies; the secretary at war was Lord Palmerston.

The 25th of October was celebrated throughout the kingdom as "The Jubilee"—the fiftieth anniversary of the accession to the throne of George the Third. Romilly considered "this Jubilee as a political engine of ministers;" but the people fell into the proposal of the celebration with a very hearty spontaneity. Romilly also thought that when posterity should look at the measures of the king's government, his popularity for many years would appear unaccountable.§ The people were not only gay amid bell-ringing, and bonfires, and dinners in civic halls. There was a feeling of enthusiastic attachment to their old sovereign, manifested among the many who pitied his growing infirmities, who sympathized with his sturdy hatred to Bonaparte and French domination, and who were not quite sure that what the wiser called his prejudices were not great public virtues. One thing the people dreaded—that this reign should come to a close; that the example of the domestic virtues that prevailed at Windsor should be succeeded by the license of Carlton House; that the scandals about the Princess of Wales—which rival factions were constantly speculating upon as weapons of political offence or defence—should become a source of national danger and disgrace when

* "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 372.
† Ibid., p. 361. ‡ Ibid., p. 412. § Ibid., p. 423.
‖ Ibid., p. 465. ¶ Ibid., p. 493.

* "Supplementary Dispatches," p. 515.
† Ibid., vol. vi. p. 531.
‡ Brougham "Sketches of Statesmen." Canning.
§ "Diary," October.

the unhappy quarrel should be between a king and a queen. Caroline of Brunswick could not be put aside as easily as Josephine Beauharnais. If the time should come when the Fourth George should turn over the chronicles of the Eighth Harry to search for precedents, it would not suit the genius of representative government that he should proclaim his will to his assembled family that his wife should be divorced, as Napoleon proclaimed his will at the Tuileries on the 15th of December; that an obsequious senate should confirm the dissolution of the marriage; and that the ruler of England should be free to look around for a princess to share his throne, after the fashion in which the ambitious Corsican first threw the handkerchief at a grand duchess of Russia, and then—a slight hesitation being manifested—at an archduchess of Austria. Such a crisis was postponed in England by the life of George the Third being prolonged beyond another decade.

When parliament was opened on the 23d of January, the failure of the expedition to Walcheren naturally became a subject of grave inquiry. The opposition and the country were in ill-humor, and they mixed up their reproofs of the unhappy policy of the Scheldt enterprise with the operations of Sir Arthur Wellesley, contending that the government which had given him a peerage must stand or fall by him. They little knew how time would accomplish this result in a different manner from that which they anticipated. The pension which was proposed to be granted to Lord Wellington was carried by a very small majority. A constitutional question arose upon a motion of censure, moved by Mr. Whitbread, against Lord Chatham, in presenting to the king a narrative of his proceedings in the Scheldt, with a request of secrecy, and without communicating it to the other members of the cabinet. The motion was carried. Lord Mulgrave succeeded Lord Chatham in the office of master-general of the ordnance. The constitutional law was sufficiently asserted without any further proceedings.

A time of great popular excitement was coming in England. The old question of privilege, in which the House of Commons had manifested such an impotent tyranny in the case of John Wilkes, was about to be renewed in a struggle with a favorite of the democracy, who was bent upon asserting what he held to be popular rights. Sir Francis Burdett, the member for Westminster, was in 1810 the subject of a contest which had no real bearing upon the liberties of the people, but which gratified the vanity of one who aspired to be their leader. The interest of the war in the Peninsula; the marriage of Napoleon with a daughter of the Emperor of Austria, by which his complete ascendency over the continent appeared to be established; the commercial effects of the orders in council; the difficult problem of the depreciation of the currency which was under discussion—these matters became of small importance compared with the resistance of the member for Westminster to an order of the speaker for his arrest. The turmoil was soon over, and as it had no lasting consequences our relation must be very brief. John Gale Jones, the manager of a debating society, on the occasion of the enforcement of the standing order for the exclusion of strangers during the Walcheren inquiry, issued a handbill, announcing that the society had decided that the enforcement was "an insidious and ill-timed attack upon the liberty of the press, tending to aggravate the discontents of the people, and render their representatives objects of jealousy and suspicion." Jones was brought to the bar, confessed himself the author of the bill, and was committed to Newgate, the house resolving that he having published a paper containing libellous reflections upon the conduct and character of the house, was guilty of a high breach of its privileges. Sir Francis Burdett, having made an unsuccessful motion for the discharge of Jones, published a violent letter in Cobbett's "Register," in which he contended that the house had no authority to imprison for such an offence. Sir Thomas Lethbridge, on the 27th of March, moved "that the publication of which Sir Francis had acknowledged himself to be the author was a scandalous libel upon the rights of the house." There was a debate of two nights. Romilly doubted the right of commitment. The master of the rolls maintained the right, in which he was supported by some members of the opposition, but who nevertheless objected to the agitation of the question. During the violence of debate there was an amusing interlude. Sir Joseph Yorke angrily called Whitbread "a brewer of bad porter." There was a furious uproar. Whitbread, with perfect good humor, rose and said, "Mr. Speaker, I rise as a tradesman to complain of the gallant officer for abusing commodity which I sell;" and the house burst into laughter approbation.* On the 5th of April, in an adjourned debate, house divided at six in the morning upon the question whether paper by Sir Francis Burdett was a breach of privilege, an amendment for postponing the question for six months being rejected by large majority. But the question whether the baronet should be committed to the Tower or reprimanded was carried by 190 against 1 the same morning at half-past seven. In the course of that day t populace began to break the windows of members who had tak part against their favorite. The tumult became serious on the 7t when Sir Francis declared his determination to resist the warrant f his committal, and to defend himself in his own house in Piccadill The Riot Act was read, the guards were called out, several perso were wounded and troops arrived from the country. On Monda the 9th, the house of Sir Francis was broken open, and he was co veyed to the Tower, under a strong military escort. On the return the troops they were grossly insulted and attacked by a furious mo and several persons were killed, when the soldiers at length fired, ha ing had to fight their way through Eastcheap. The subsequent pr ceedings upon this question of privilege have been succinctly state by a recent constitutional historian: "Overcome by force, Sir Fran cis brought actions against the speaker and the sergeant, in the Cou of King's Bench, for redress. The house would have been justifie by precedents and ancient usage in resisting the prosecution of thes actions as a contempt of its authority; but instead of standing upo its privilege, it directed its officers to plead and the attorney-gener to defend them. The authority of the house was fully vindicated b the court; but Sir Francis prosecuted an appeal to the exchequer chamber and to the House of Lords. The judgment of the cour below being affirmed, all conflict between law and privilege w averted it. The authority of the house had indeed been questioned but the courts declared it to have been exercised in conformity with the law." † When parliament was prorogued on the 21st of June th imprisonment of Sir Francis came to an end. A procession was announced to convey him home in triumph, but he departed secretly by water, and the mob followed an empty car to Piccadilly.

When parliament was prorogued on the 21st of June the roya speech briefly alluded to the Peninsular War. It said that Portugal with the assistance of his majesty's arms, had exerted herself with vigor and energy, in making every preparation for repelling any renewed attack on the part of the enemy; and that in Spain, notwithstanding reverses which had been experienced, the spirit of resistance against France still continued unsubdued and unabated. The nation could scarcely have expected from this somewhat cheerless notice of the operations of the British army, with no mention of the British general, that he had been doing some useful work. His retreat to Portugal after Talavera had been denounced in parliament as having converted victory into defeat. The common council of London presented a petition to the House of Commons praying that a pension of 2000*l.* a year should not be granted to Viscount Wellington; conceiving it "to be due to the nation, before its resources shall be thus applied, that the most rigid inquiry should be made why the valor of its armies had been thus uselessly and unprofitably displayed." ‡ The impatient tax-payers, who fancied that Wellington and his army were idling in Portgual, and would soon be obliged to return home, could not readily have believed, even if they had been told, that he had been accomplishing the greatest design that was ever conceived by military genius, for resting the future operations of the war upon no sudden and casual triumphs, but upon a comprehensive plan upon which his army's safety might be assured, if decisive battles could not at once be won. There had been six months of comparative inaction, which appeared to superficial observation as six months lost. From January till the end of April Wellington remained in his headquarters at Viseu, watching the movements of the French in Old Castile and Leon, who were evidently preparing for an attack on Portugal. There was doubt at home, but there was no doubt in the mind of the sagacious and provident commander. On the 31st of March he wrote to Col-

* Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 242.
† May, "Constitutional History of England," vol. i. p. 450.
‡ Hansard, vol. xv. col. 601.

...uel Torrens, "I am in a situation in which no mischief can be done ...o the army or to any part of it. I am prepared for all events; and ... I am in a scrape, which appears to be the general belief in England, although certainly not my own, I'll get out of it."* The time would come when the correspondence of Lord Wellington would show how profound had been his views and how accurate his calculations—extorting from the somewhat prejudiced although the ablest of the French historians of this great crisis a striking eulogy, of which this is the substance: With a rare penetration he had formed a judgment upon the march of affairs in the Peninsula better than that of Napoleon himself. He had appreciated the force of resistance which national hatred, which climate and distance opposed to the French; the draining of their forces when they arrived in the heart of the Peninsula; the want of unity in their operations under various generals. He entertained the conviction that the vast scaffolding of the grandeur of the empire was undermined in all its parts; that if England could continue to excite and to maintain by her succor the hatred of the Portuguese and the Spaniards, Europe, sooner or later, would throw off the yoke of Napoleon. "This opinion," continues M. Thiers, "which is the highest honor to the military and political judgment of Lord Wellington, had become with him an invariable idea, and he persevered in it with a firmness of mind and an obstinacy of character worthy of admiration." All depended, says the historian, upon the resistance which he could oppose to the French, when he was driven into the extremity of the Peninsula. He had searched for, and had discovered with the rare accuracy of a *coup d'œil*, a position almost impregnable, from which he could brave all the efforts of the French armies. This position, which he has made immortal, was that of Torres Vedras, near Lisbon.†

But it was not alone the rare accuracy of a glance of the eye that determined upon these famous lines. Founded upon personal examination of every part of the ground, during a few weeks of October and November, 1809, the memorandum of Lord Wellington to Colonel Fletcher, commanding the Royal Engineers, is a masterpiece of large views and minute detail.‡ That memorandum, altered afterward in a few particulars derived from further personal surveys, was sufficiently exact for thousands of Portuguese laborers immediately to be employed, under British engineers, in the rapid construction of works, of which the cuttings of miles of railroad in a mountainous country can furnish but an imperfect idea of their colossal proportions. In one year these works, behind which the city of Lisbon, the roadstead, the transports, the munitions of war, would be safe from all attack, were sufficiently complete to test the practical grandeur of their conception. A line of intrenchments was first constructed, about twenty miles in advance of Lisbon, running completely across the promontory from Torres Vedras on the sea to Alhandra on the Tagus. The heights of Alhandra, rising perpendicularly from the river, ascended to Sobral, in the centre of the lines. The road to Lisbon on the bank of the Tagus beneath the heights was defended by barricades mounted with cannon. All the sides of the hills toward Sobral that were not sufficiently steep were cut into escarpments with prodigious labor. Their summits were crowned with forts, where heavy guns commanded all the avenues by which the enemy could approach. At Sobral, from which the hills descended on either side, was a plateau, where works of laborious construction supplied the place of natural inequalities of surface; and the whole of this position was strengthened by a citadel, which could only be taken by a regular siege. The chain of hills from Sobral to the sea was defended in a similar manner, by escarping the sides, by shutting up their gorges with redoubts, by connecting them with forts on their summits. The river Zizambre, which passed Torres Vedras to the sea beneath the chain of hills, was rendered impracticable by dams. All the fortifications of these works, stretching thus for twenty-nine miles across the whole breadth of the promontory of Portugal, had their own magazines. Some contained six pieces of cannon; others contained fifty pieces. The arsenal of Lisbon had chiefly furnished the prodigious quantity of ordnance that was required. Some of the garrisons, all of which were permanently occupied by Portuguese, contained a thousand men. All the disposable British forces were to occupy the points of encampment supposed to be most liable to attack. A system of signals along the whole extent of the lines would have brought all the force within them upon a given point in a few hours. A second line of works had been prepared, in case the first line had been forced; and a third series of defences also were formed at the extremity of the promontory to keep an enemy in check had he overcome these stupendous arrangements for an army's safety. These secondary means were unnecessary. The redoubts and guns in battery of the first line presented such an array of power that when the leader who had conceived this great work first tried its security in the autumn of 1810, Massena, who had been commanded by Napoleon to drive the English into the sea at all risks, looked with his fifty thousand men upon the lines of Torres Vedras for a month, saw that his proud course was stayed, and retired, with his starved and dispirited army, to know that effectual barriers could be raised even against the progress of the invincible legions of the republic and the empire.

The summer was approaching when Massena took the command of the French forces in Old Castile and Leon. He had seventy-two thousand men under arms in the field. The name by which they were called, "the Army of Portugal," indicated the special service to which they were devoted. Wellington had about fifty-four thousand British and Portuguese. By the great exertions of Marshal Beresford, the Portuguese had become valuable troops, and some were brigaded with the British army. In June the French invested Ciudad Rodrigo. It was bravely defended by the Spaniards till the 10th of July. Wellington was not strong enough to attempt its relief. He could only have advanced with thirty-two thousand men, having been obliged to leave nearly a third of his army to prevent the enemy in Estremadura from cutting him off from Lisbon. He saw Ciudad Rodrigo fall. The Spanish general, Romana, in whom the British general had great confidence, was as anxious as Wellington that Ciudad Rodrigo should be relieved; but neither of them could risk the attempt in the presence of a far stronger enemy. On the 15th of August Massena commenced the siege of Almeida. It was defended by a Portuguese garrison, under the command of an English officer. Wellington moved forward to be ready to seize any opportunity for its relief. On the second night of the bombardment a magazine, containing all the ammunition of the fortress, blew up, and the garrison were compelled to capitulate, the greater part of the town and the defences having been destroyed by the explosion. This accident disconcerted all the projected operations of the British army. Wellington had no fault to find with the unfortunate event of the surrender of Almeida, except that he was not informed by telegraph of the misfortune which had happened, when he would have made an effort to have saved the garrison. As it was, he had made all his preparations for falling back.*

On the 26th of September his army was collected upon the Serra de Busaco, in front of Coimbra. On the 27th the French attacked the right and left of the English position. They were repulsed; one column being driven down the hill by General Picton's division; another column compelled rapidly to retreat under a bayonet charge by General Crauford's division. The Portuguese fought well; and Wellington said, "They are worthy of contending in the same ranks with British troops in this interesting cause." † "This battle," says Napier, "was fought unnecessarily by Massena, and by Wellington reluctantly." It is scarcely possible that Massena should have received the instructions of a letter written at St. Cloud on the 19th of September, in which Napoleon says to Berthier, "Send off an officer to-morrow with a letter for the Prince of Essling, in which you will let him know that it is my wish that he attack and destroy the English. . . . I am too far off, and the position of the enemy changes too often, for me to give advice as to the way in which the attack should be conducted; but it is certain that he is not in a state to resist it." ‡ But Massena knew that his despotic master had become impatient of Wellington's pertinacity, and that he must risk something. Thiers holds that the British general, however prudent, was unwilling to enter his lines as a fugitive, and that, when he should find one of those strong positions against which the impetuous bravery of the French would

* "Dispatches," vol. v. p. 611.
† "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tome xii. p. 319 to 320.
‡ "Dispatches," vol. v. p. 234.

* "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 588.
† "Dispatches," vol. vi. p. 475.
‡ "Letters to King Joseph," vol. ii. p. 143.

be likely to fail, he would fight a defensive battle, and then tranquilly retire.* The French lost four thousand five hundred men; the British and Portuguese thirteen hundred.

On the 29th of September the allies, crossing the Mondego, began to retreat toward Lisbon. The sufferings of the inhabitants of a country in which two hostile armies are contending, and where the necessity for securing their own safety almost precludes compassion for the non-combatants, were never more forcibly displayed than in the course of the movements which followed the fall of Almeida. When the rear-guard of the British evacuated Coimbra, on the 1st of October, many of the inhabitants, who had remained—while Wellington was keeping the French at bay in the Serra de Busaco, instead of obeying his orders to remove out of the way of the enemy with their goods and provisions—now followed the army, incumbering the road with their sick and their aged and their children. But the great mass of the population in the line of the English march willingly obeyed the orders upon which the eventual safety of their homes depended, and fled toward Lisbon, leaving the towns and villages bare for the advancing French. Their losses and miseries were great; but England made a great effort to afford some compensation. Wellington continued steadily to retreat before his powerful opponent. There was no sacrifice of men by precipitate flight, no risks encountered by rash resistance. The loss in skirmishes was small. On the 10th of October the whole army was within the lines of Torres Vedras. Massena came up, wholly unprepared to find such an obstacle to his further progress. He spent some days in reconnoitring. He scoured the country for provisions; but the country was a desert, behind him and around him. The distresses of his army were most severe, for they had only carried bread for fifteen days. On the 15th of November he gave up all hope of forcing the lines, and began a retrograde movement. On the 8th of December Wellington wrote one of his unofficial letters, which best exhibits his character and habits of thought: "I have determined to persevere in my cautious system; to operate upon the flanks and rear of the enemy with my small and light troops, and thus force them out of Portugal by the distresses they will suffer, and do them all the mischief I can upon my retreat. Massena is an old fox, and is as cautious as I am. He risks nothing. . . . Although I may not win a battle immediately, I shall not lose one; and you may depend upon it that we are safe, for the winter at all events." †

CHAPTER CCVI.

Illness of the king—Interruption to the proceedings in parliament—The Regency Bill passed—The king's ministers continued in office—State of Europe at the commencement of the regency—Wellington and the ministry—Massena evacuates Portugal—The British army pursues—Battle of Fuentes de Onoro—Battle of Albuera—Restrictions on the prince-regent about to expire—His letter as to his choice of a ministry—The administration not altered—Resignation of the Marquis Wellesley—Character of the regent—Assassination of Mr. Perceval—Attempts to form a cabinet of which Lord Grey and Lord Grenville should be the heads—the Earl of Liverpool prime minister—Luddism—Repeal of the orders in council—The United States declare war against Great Britain.

The parliament, which had been prorogued to the 1st of November, was, by an order made in a council at which the king presided on the 17th of October, to have been further prorogued by commission to the 29th of November, and a proclamation to that effect appeared in the "Gazette." On the 29th of October Mr. Perceval wrote to the speaker that the calamitous situation of the Princess Amelia had so worked upon the king's mind that he was incapable of signing the commission, and that, according to all usage, such instrument never passes the great seal without the king's signature. Mr. Perceval had seen the king on that day. "His conversation was prodigiously hurried, and, though perfectly coherent, yet so extremely diffuse, explicit, and indiscreet upon all the most interesting subjects upon which he could have to open his mind, and, at the same time, so entirely regardless of the presence of all who were about him, that he was evidently laboring under a malady." * From that malady the king never recovered. The "interesting subjects upon which he had to open his mind" had, doubtless, more relation to domestic affairs than to public events. His favorite daughter was dying; and upon her death-bed she is said to have revealed to her father the circumstances of an attachment which, as was believed, had involved a violation of the Royal Marriage Act. The Princess Amelia died on the 2d of November. The king was then under restraint. When told of his daughter's death he "did not seem to feel or take much notice of it." He had been heard to count over the several times and occasions of his former attacks, and he ascribed this last to the illness of the princess. †

The meeting of parliament on the 1st of November could not be postponed. The chancellor met the Lords, informed them that there was no commission to open the session, and explained the circumstances which had prevented him affixing the great seal to such a commission. Mr. Perceval addressed the Commons, the speaker having stated that he had thought it his duty to take the chair, in order that the house might adjourn itself. The adjournment was to the 15th. When that day arrived the house again adjourned for another fortnight, the physicians having expressed a strong opinion as to the probability of the king's recovery. Another adjournment took place to the 13th of December. On that day a committee was appointed in both houses to examine the physicians. On the 20th the ministers proposed three resolutions, following the precedent of those of 1788. They affirmed the king's incapacity; they declared the right and duty of the two houses to provide for this exigency; and proposed to proceed by bills determining the powers to be exercised in the king's name and behalf, to which the royal assent should be given in some mode upon which the houses should determine. The mode which the ministers desired to adopt was a fictitious use of the king's name—the "Phantom," as it was called. The opposition contended, as in 1788, for addressing the Prince of Wales to assume the royal authority as regent. The seven dukes of the blood royal supported the measure of proceeding by address, when the subject came to be debated in the House of Lords. But the ministerial resolutions were adopted. They contained restrictions on the power of the regent which were offensive to the Prince of Wales, and to the party who were considered to be his friends. The limitations upon his authority were to continue only for twelve months; but they were sufficiently stringent to produce great debate and many divisions, in which the ministers had small majorities. The resolution which was considered most obnoxious was that which gave the queen very extensive powers over the king's person and the royal household. It was finally determined that the queen should have "such direction of the household as may be suitable for the care of his majesty's person and the maintenance of the royal dignity." The parliament having been opened on the 15th of January, by a commission under the great seal, the Regency Bill was passed on the 5th of February. During these proceedings the Prince of Wales had been negotiating with Lord Grenville and Lord Grey as to the arrangement of a new administration. On the 1st of February he sent to acquaint these peers that "it was not his royal highness's intention to make any change at present." It had begun to be confidently expected that the king would recover. He had become "much alive to what was passing, and was quite sure," as he told Mr. Perceval, "that it could never enter into the prince's mind to change the ministry." ‡ On the 4th the prince announced to Mr. Perceval his intention not to remove from their situations those whom he finds there as his majesty's official servants, lest "any act of the regent might, in the smallest degree, have the effect of interfering with the progress of his sovereign's recovery. The letter added, "This consideration alone dictates the decision now communicated to Mr. Perceval." On the 6th the prince-regent took the oaths before a privy council assembled at Carlton House. During several months the king appeared to be occasionally convalescent. His bodily health was good, and he talked more naturally. But it soon became sufficiently clear, whatever might be the expectations that his life might be prolonged, that he was not likely to be able ever to resume the royal functions. The

* "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tome xii. p. 365.
† "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vii. p. 2.

* Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 262.
† Ibid., p. 287. ‡ Ibid., p. 315.

reign of George III. had been virtually closed on the 5th of February, 1811.

At the commencement of the regency it would have appeared the most extravagant expectation to have believed that within three years the gigantic power of Napoleon would have been crumbling into ruin —that, like the ice-palace of the Empress of Russia,

> "'Twas transient in its nature, as in show
> 'Twas durable; as worthless as it seemed
> Intrinsically precious." *

In March, 1811, the Empress Maria Louisa presented to the French nation a son, who was saluted by his father as King of Rome. Rome and the southern papal provinces were annexed to France, and the pope was a prisoner at Savona. Louis Bonaparte, having refused to concur in the tyrannical projects of his brother for enforcing the continental system upon his Dutch subjects, had surrendered his mockery of sovereignty, and had come to reside at Powys Castle, in Montgomeryshire, upon his parole. The kingdom of Holland was then formally annexed to France. This annexation of the territory of the Zuyderzee was not enough in that direction. Ten additional departments were added to France on the 13th of December, 1810, which comprehended Holland, Friesland, Oldenburg, Bremen, and all the line of coast to Hamburg and all the country beyond Hamburg to Lubeck. The French empire now consisted of a hundred and thirty departments, containing forty-two millions of people. The millions that were dependent upon the will of the mighty emperor—a godhead with some infatuated English, a "restless barbarian" † with others not wholly given up to party—can scarcely be numbered. The kingdom of Italy, which was under his sway, contained six millions. The kingdom of Naples, in which his brother-in-law, Joachim Murat, now ruled, contained five millions. The kingdom of Westphalia, of which his brother Jerome was the sovereign, submitted to the law that was enforced upon his other satellites, that "everything must be subservient to the interests of France." Protector of the confederation of the Rhine, he had at his feet the kings of Saxony, Bavaria, and Würtemberg, and a train of minor German princes. Prussia was wholly at his mercy. Denmark would obey any command of Napoleon since Copenhagen was bombarded and her fleet carried off. Marshal Bernadotte, Prince of Ponte Corvo, had been elected by the states of Sweden as successor to the aged and childless Charles XIII., who had succeeded the deposed Gustavus. The French marshal was installed crown prince on the 1st of November, 1810. There only wanted the quiet possession of Spain and Portugal, under his brother King Joseph—Austria being his own by family ties, and Russia his ally in the sworn friendship of her emperor —to make the world his own. England was to perish in the great league of Europe against her commerce, and in the resistance of America to her maritime claims. When Wellington stood within the lines of Torres Vedras, and Massena was without, preparing to attack him, the fate of the nations of Europe rested upon the successful defence of this promontory. "The English," says Thiers, "once expelled from Portugal, all would tend in Europe to a general peace. On the contrary, their situation consolidated in that country, Massena being obliged to retrace his steps, the fortune of the empire would begin to fall back before the fortune of Great Britain, to sink in the midst of an approaching catastrophe." ‡ In his place in parliament, about this time, the Marquis Wellesley proclaimed a great truth, which he repeated in 1813: "As Bonaparte was probably the only man in the world who could have raised his power to such a height, so he was probably the only man who could bring it into imminent danger. His eagerness for power was so inordinate, his jealousy of independence so fierce, his keenness of appetite so feverish in all that touched his ambition, even in the most trifling things, that he must plunge into desperate difficulties. He was of an order of mind that by nature make for themselves great reverses." § There was no one who had a more absolute conviction of this truth than the brother of the Marquis Wellesley, who had to enforce, by his unerring sagacity and his indomitable perseverance, the realization of the change of fortune so eloquently predicted.

The regent had not been appointed more than a fortnight when his ministers threw in the way of Lord Wellington whatever obstacles a weak government could present to a strong mind. The British general had informed Lord Liverpool of the probability that the command of the Spanish armies would be offered to him. The secretary of war answers him that "it is the unanimous opinion of every member of the government, and of every person acquainted with the finances and resources of the country, that it is absolutely impossible to continue our exertions in the peninsula for any considerable length of time;" and that "we see no adequate advantage that would result from the command of the Spanish armies being conferred upon you." * The answer of Wellington, however, conceived in the most respectful terms, was the answer of a statesman. It implied his contempt for the whining over expense of a government that was continually frittering away its resources in petty undertakings—a government that had not the courage to do right for its own sake, but made the war in the Peninsula more a party question than a national object; yielding to the clamors of the opposition instead of rendering their objections futile by a vigorous policy that would have commanded success. Wellington said that the ministers had it not in their power to form an opinion of the real expenses of the war in the Peninsula; that the first step should be to analyze the charge, and see what the same army would cost elsewhere, at home for instance; that the transports formed a large item of expense, and that if he had been furnished with ten thousand more men in 1810 he would not have kept the transports; that he had sent them away now, because he thought that the events of the campaign had brought the enemy to such a situation that the necessity for an embarkation was very remote. He told the ministry that if the army were withdrawn from the Peninsula, and the French government were relieved from the pressure of military operations on the continent, Napoleon would incur all risks to land an army in his majesty's dominions. His indignation at the thought gives him eloquence. "Then, indeed, would commence an expensive contest; then would his majesty's subjects discover what are the miseries of war, of which, by the blessing of God, they have hitherto had no knowledge; and the cultivation, the beauty, and prosperity of the country, and the virtue and happiness of its inhabitants, would be destroyed, whatever might be the result of the military operations. God forbid that I should be a witness, much less an actor, in the scene." † Lord Liverpool had ventured upon some childish babble about Wellington determining between an offensive or defensive system, and he was thus answered: "In respect to offensive or defensive operations here, if they are left to me, I shall carry on either the one or the other, according to the means in my power, compared at the time with those of the enemy." With this key to his operations, we shall understand, what the public of that time could not understand, why after gaining a victory he was sometimes obliged to retreat. Far less could they understand the nature of the difficulties he had often to encounter: "The people of England," he said after the retreat from Burgos in 1812, "so happy as they are in every respect, so rich in resources of every description, having the use of such excellent roads, etc., will not readily believe that important results here frequently depend upon fifty or sixty mules, more or less, or a few bundles of straw to feed them." ‡

When Massena retired from before Torres Vedras he took up a defensive position at Santarem. He was now really blockaded by the British forces, and had to depend for his supplies upon the bare country behind him. During this state of inaction in Portugal General Graham, with three thousand English and seven thousand Spaniards, had attacked the French who were blockading Cadiz, and had won the battle of Barrosa on the 5th of March. On the 6th of March Wellington, who had long maintained, contrary to the opinion of every person in the army, that Massena would be compelled to retire for want of provisions, received information that he had retired, and immediately put his troops in motion, in three columns. § The pursuit of the enemy was conducted with skill equal to that displayed by the French general in ordering his retreat. The course of the French army was marked by the most fearful cruelties.

* Cowper, "Task," book v.
† Francis Horner, Letter to Hallam, "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 115.
‡ "Le Consulat et l'Empire," tome xii. p. 412.
§ Hansard, vol. xxv. col. 46.

* "Supplementary Dispatches," p. 69.
† "Dispatches," vol. vii. p. 329. ‡ Ibid., vol. ix. p. 574.
§ "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vii. p. 85, letter of an officer.

An officer of the English army writes, "There are no enormities, however great, and no wanton barbarities, that have not been committed by Massena's order on people of all classes and ages; nor have they neglected to destroy a single town or village through which they have passed." * The invasion of Portugal was terminated on the 6th of April, when the French crossed the Agueda into Spain. The allied armies now commenced the blockade of Almeida. The Spaniards had not been able to make a stand against Soult at Badajoz, which was surrendered on the 11th of March. Connected with the possession of these two fortresses were fought the two great battles of the campaign of 1811. Massena, powerfully reinforced, had returned to raise the blockade of Almeida. The battle of Fuentes de Onoro, in the neighborhood of Almeida, was fought on the 5th of May. Wellington says of this battle, "It was the most difficult one I was ever concerned in, and against the greatest odds. We had very nearly three to one against us engaged; above four to one of cavalry; and, moreover, our cavalry had not a gallop in them, while some of that of the enemy were fresh and in excellent order. If Boney had been there we should have been beaten." † On the 15th of May, while Marshal Beresford was besieging Badajoz, very insufficiently provided with the means of carrying on a great siege, Soult came to its relief, and the sanguinary battle of Albuera was fought the next day. The British and Portuguese had to sustain the brunt of that terrible contest. No one who has read the description of the battle of Albuera by Sir William Napier can forget the terrible struggles in which "was seen with what a strength and majesty the British soldier fights." ‡ On the 18th of May Soult retired toward Seville. The siege of Badajoz was recommenced when Wellington arrived at Albuera with two other divisions. But the *matériel* of a siege was still wanting. Early in June Wellington heard that Marmont was marching from Salamanca to join Soult. He hastened back to the frontier of Portugal which was thus menaced. The two French generals united their forces, but they did not venture upon an attack. The British took up their old position upon the Coa, and there was no more fighting in 1811.

The session of parliament was opened on the 7th of January, 1812. On the 16th Mr. Perceval proposed resolutions with regard to the royal household, which were framed in the belief that the king's recovery was very improbable, although not altogether hopeless. The prince-regent, on the 13th of February, addressed a letter to the Duke of York, explaining his views with regard to the choice he desired to make of his official servants. The restrictions of the Regency Bill were to expire on the 18th, and it was generally expected that great changes would take place—that the party long supposed to be in the special interest of the prince would return to the possession of that power which they had lost in 1807. These expectations came to an end when the regent's letter was made public—the letter which Moore parodied so wittily that even the most devoted Tory could scarcely forbear to smile. The sentence, "I have no predilections to indulge, no resentments to gratify, no objects to attain but such as are common to the whole empire"—which implied that the regent would make no sweeping alterations in his cabinet—was followed up by a wish that some of those persons with whom the early habits of his public life were formed would strengthen his hands and constitute a part of his government. These sentiments were to be communicated to Lord Grey, who would make them known to Lord Grenville. The answer of those peers, addressed to the Duke of York, said, "All personal exclusion we entirely disclaim; we rest on public measures; and it is on this ground alone that we must express, without reserve, the impossibility of our uniting with the present government. Our differences of opinion are too many and too important to admit of such an union." In the case of Ireland, especially, they were firmly persuaded of the necessity of a total change in the system of government, and of the immediate repeal of the civil disabilities on account of religious opinions.

On the 19th of February the Marquis Wellesley resigned the seals as secretary of state for foreign affairs. He had tendered his resignation in January. The main point of difference between Lord Wellesley and his colleagues was that they pursued half measures in Spain—that "their efforts were just too short." These dissensions had been going on for two years. "Lord Liverpool usually agreed with Lord Wellesley on the necessity and policy of extending our efforts, if practicable, but submitted entirely to Mr. Perceval's statement of the impracticability." * Lord Castlereagh succeeded Lord Wellesley as foreign secretary.

Three months had passed without the ascendency of Mr. Perceval's ministry being shaken by the fact that it was not founded upon "the most liberal basis," such as the regent had affected to desire. It was founded upon court favor, and that influence was powerful enough to insure the support of parliament. A tragical event for awhile opened the question whether the Tory party or the Whig party should conduct the affairs of the state. Neither party would be perfectly free to conduct them upon principles that would insure the support of the reflecting portion of the public, complicated as was the position of the responsible advisers of the crown, by what was denounced in parliament as "a base system of unprincipled favoritism known to prevail in the court. It was notorious," said Mr. Lyttelton, "that the regent was surrounded with favorites, and, as it were, hemmed in by minions." † The safeguard of a ministry was to be found in the luxurious indolence of the regent, who did not care to govern with incessant and laborious interference, such as his father had always exerted; who, having the pomp of power to amuse him, did not care what manner of men did the work—always provided that nothing occurred to disturb his egoistic solicitude for his own personal interest, convenience, or pleasure. The ministers he had chosen had espoused the cause that was most obnoxious to his feelings. The ministers he had not been able to unite in his service had taken a different side. If the question that the people were continually agitating about the wrongs of the Princess of Wales could be settled by some bold measure of any ministers, it was possible that his "predilections" might be fixed for the future. As it was, matters were going on smoothly enough, though commercial distress was pressing heavy upon capitalists; though workmen were rising in insurrection against the use of machinery; though perseverance in the orders in council was on the point of producing a rupture with the United States, as it had already destroyed the greatest trade which England possessed; though the finances of the kingdom were held to be so crippled that the fight for national independence could not much longer be maintained. A sudden catastrophe in a moment broke up the official calm.

On the 11th of May the House of Commons was in committee in the afternoon, hearing evidence on the orders in council. Mr. Brougham had examined a witness, and the cross-examination was proceeding when a noise was heard from the lobby like the report of a pistol. That lobby was a large, shabby room, with four pillars marking a gangway to the door of the house. The space on each side of the pillars was generally occupied by persons who came to speak to members or to gratify their curiosity. On the left side, generally crowded, was a fireplace and benches. A stone staircase led up to the lobby, which staircase was common to members and to the public. About five o'clock Mr. Perceval, with his habitual light step, was entering the lobby door when a shot was fired in the inside of the lobby, and he fell. Mr. William Jerdan, then a reporter of the debates, was close by the minister as he entered, having preceded him up the staircase, but had pushed open the swing door of the lobby to give him precedence. Mr. Jerdan's relation is more interesting than the ordinary accounts: "I saw a small curling wreath of smoke rise above his head, as if the breath of a cigar; I saw him reel back against the ledge on the inside of the door; I heard him exclaim, 'Oh God!' or 'Oh, my God!' and nothing more or longer, for even that exclamation was faint; and then, making an impulsive rush, as it were to reach the entrance to the house on the opposite side for safety, I saw him totter forward, not half way, and drop dead between the four pillars which stood there in the centre of the space, with a slight trace of blood issuing from his lips. All this took place ere with moderate speed you could count five." ‡ There were about a score of people in the lobby, and the confusion was necessarily extreme. The body was lifted up by Mr. William Smith,

* "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vii. p. 88.
† Ibid., p. 176, letter to Wellesley Pole.
‡ "Peninsular War," vol. iii.

* Memorandum in "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vii. p. 257.
† Hansard, vol. xxii. col. 1163, May 4.
‡ "Autobiography of William Jerdan," vol. i. p. 134.

the member for Norwich, and it was carried into the office of the speaker's secretary. The assassin was now recognized and seized. The discharged pistol was found on him, and another loaded and primed was taken from his pocket. "Except for his frightful agitation," he was as passive as a child. Mr. Perceval had been shot through the heart, and when the unhappy murderer knew that he was dead, he exclaimed, "I am sorry for it." He mentioned that he had received wrongs from government. He was ascertained to be a bankrupt Liverpool merchant, John Bellingham. Examined by three magistrates, he was committed to Newgate. On the next day a message from the regent was presented to the House of Commons, recommending that a provision should be made for Mr. Perceval's family. "By common consent no other business was done. Lord Castlereagh presented the message, and moved the address. In most faces there was an agony of tears; and neither Lord Castlereagh, Ponsonby, Whitbread, nor Canning could give a dry utterance to their sentiments." * Friends and political adversaries united in a tribute of honest feeling to the private worth of Perceval. "As a private man," writes Romilly, "I had a very great regard for Perceval. We went the same circuit together, and for many years I lived with him in a very delightful intimacy. No man could be more generous, more kind, or more friendly than he was. No man in private life had a nicer sense of honor. Never was there, I believe, a more affectionate husband or a more tender parent." † The regret at his death led to two great public mistakes. The unhappy Bellingham was tried at the Old Bailey on the fourth day after he had fired the fatal shot. The law authorities would not postpone the trial to receive evidence of his insanity that it was stated could be produced; he was hanged a week after the assassination. The feelings of the House of Commons carried extravagant grants to Perceval's family, beyond the proper measure of his services as a public man.

And now was to come another struggle for power. No man was more busy behind the scenes than the chancellor. He was authorized by the regent to learn the sentiments of the cabinet, whether they thought they could carry on the government with any one of their own members at the head of it. They doubted. Could they carry on the government with Wellesley and Canning? Some said No; some said it was difficult; some said it was very improbable; one said it was very dangerous both to prince and country. But they thought that they should have less chance of "public support for a government of their own, if office should not previously have been offered either to Lords Grey and Grenville, or to Lord Wellesley and Mr. Canning." ‡ The chancellor believed that Wellesley and Canning would "bite." "If they don't, we shall try what we can do without them." They did not bite. Wellesley suggested that a cabinet should be formed "on an intermediary principle regarding the Roman Catholic claims, exempt from the dangers of instant unqualified concession, and from those of inconsiderate peremptory exclusion." This would not suit the intolerance of the majority. He further required that "the entire resources of the empire might be applied to the great objects of the war." This would not suit those who were hankering after little objects, with their due provision of profitable employment for carpet warriors. The existing ministry then resolved to keep the work in their own hands. Another authority stepped in. The House of Commons determined upon an address to the prince-regent, praying him to take measures for forming "a strong and efficient administration." The cabinet now tendered their resignations. The regent confided to Lord Wellesley the formation of a government of which he should be the head, suggesting an application to those still holding office to join him. They had all agreed in a refusal. He was then permitted to apply to Lords Grey and Grenville; but there were certain limitations proposed to them to which they could not assent. Lord Wellesley then resigned the commission which he had received, and negotiations were opened direct from the court with Lord Grey and Lord Grenville. They were somewhat too peremptory in requiring that the appointment of the officers of the household should form part of the ministerial arrangements. There was then called into play an amount of political intrigue which it is quite needless for us to unravel. The attempt to change the government was at an end. Lord Eldon, for three weeks, nearly deserted the duties of the court of chancery, to be closeted with the Duke of Cumberland. Their business was to devise how that influence could be rendered permanent whose leading principle was to oppose the slightest amelioration of cruel laws; to keep the press in subjection by *ex-officio* prosecutions and harsh punishments for what was called libel; to resist or to discourage the progress of general education; to encourage commerce by restrictions and prohibitions; to encourage agriculture by keeping food dear; to maintain a paper currency that was a transparent delusion; to support the religion of the state by oppressing all who differed from it; to believe "that all advances toward improvement are retrogradations toward Jacobinism;" * to regard, in a word, the interests of government and of people as conflicting. The regent was stimulated into hatred of the Whigs. Tory politics were triumphant. Though the ministry still mismanaged the war, they derived their almost sole popularity from the successes of Lord Wellington, in the only operation of the war that was founded upon a great principle. They preserved their ascendency in parliament, not by eloquence and courage, as Pitt had maintained his ascendency, but by that safe mediocrity which, whether in politics or in literature, is a good marketable commodity, in spite of the Horatian belief in its worthlessness. The Earl of Liverpool, on the 8th of June, declared in parliament that he had been that day appointed by the prince-regent as first commissioner of the treasury. He maintained his position for many years, during which the intellect of the community was gradually undermining the system which first gave him power; till the wiser of his associates proclaimed their renunciation of that system; till England was becoming a different world from the world of George the Third and the regency.

The premiership of the Earl of Liverpool did not commence under auspicious circumstances. On the 27th of June a message was sent to parliament from the prince-regent, on the disturbed state of the country. In Lancashire, parts of Cheshire, and the West Riding of Yorkshire, there was an organized system of conspiracy for the destruction of machinery. This was known as Luddism—a name derived from that of a poor idiot, Ned Lud, who, thirty years before, in a fit of irritation, had broken two stocking frames. In the autumn and winter of 1811 these riots had commenced at Nottingham, where the hosiers, from the stagnation of trade, had been obliged to discharge many of the weavers. But a new frame had also been introduced, wider than the one which had long been in use, and which consequently required less manual labor. To destroy these frames was the object of the rioters, whose operations had become truly dangerous at Nottingham, in November, 1811. On February 14th, 1812, Mr. Secretary Ryder moved for leave to bring in a bill "for the more exemplary punishment of persons destroying or injuring any stocking or lace frames." As the law stood, the breaking of frames was punishable with fourteen years' transportation. It was now proposed to make the offence capital. The bill passed both houses very rapidly—nothing easier than to enact the punishment of death as a ready solution of every difficulty in legislating against crime. Murders had now accompanied the destruction of machinery. But the offences did not cease, even when Luddites, not murderers, were hanged under the new law. In June, as we learn from the regent's message, the riots had become insurrections. Lord Sidmouth was home secretary, and he recommended the measures which parliament adopted, to give powers to the magistracy to search for arms; to provide for the instant dispersion of tumultuous assemblies; and to allow magistrates of neighboring counties a concurrent jurisdiction, so that the escape of offenders might be more difficult. Gradually the disturbances ceased. A special commission was held at York, in November, 1812, when many Luddites were convicted, and sixteen were executed.

The insurrections of workmen were essentially connected with the general depression of industry consequent upon the commercial position of England. For four or five years the Berlin and Milan decrees of Napoleon and the orders in council of the ministry of Mr. Perceval had not acted as separate cutting instruments for maiming the trading intercourse of all nations; but they had become terrible

* Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 380
† Romilly, "Diary," May, 1812.
‡ Twiss, "Life of Eldon," vol. ii. p. 210.

* Canning's speech, February, 1826.

shears for the destruction of the only commerce, that of neutrals, by which the subjects of the two great belligerent governments could have their wants supplied by the interchange of their productions. The orders in council of November, 1807, which declared France and all its tributary states to be in a condition of blockade, made all vessels subject to seizure which should attempt to trade with any parts of the world thus blockaded; and all neutral vessels, either going to or clearing out from a hostile port, were required to touch at a British port and pay custom dues. Their effects are thus described in one of a series of papers on this question: "Taken in combination with the Berlin decree, they interdict the whole foreign trade of all neutral nations; they prohibit everything which that decree had allowed; and they enjoin those very things which are there made a ground of confiscation." * In a subsequent article it is maintained that the diminution of our foreign trade in 1808 amounted to fourteen millions sterling. America was the only great neutral power, and had been a large purchaser of British commodities previously to the Berlin decree. But when the orders in council made the prohibition of the neutral trade still more difficult to be overcome, the complaints of the Americans became loud against our government. France saw the advantage of stimulating their hostility to England, and gave an unofficial assurance that the Berlin decree should not apply to American vessels. The British government would not on that account relax the orders in council, insisting that America should demand from France a formal renunciation of the decree. In March, 1808, the legality of the orders was contested in parliament. In April the merchants of London, Liverpool, and other towns were heard at the bar of the House of Commons, through their counsel, Mr. Brougham. This occasion was the true commencement of the great career of the orator and statesman who flourished with undiminished energy in a generation which read of what he did at the beginning of the century as part of the history of another age. His masterly speech made a sensible impression upon the country. His exertions on this occasion speedily brought Brougham into parliament. In April, 1809, a new order in council was issued, by which the blockade was confined to France itself, to Holland, to part of Germany, and to the north of Italy. A system of licensing vessels to proceed to foreign ports was also introduced. But the position of America was very threatening. Napoleon was too much enamored of his continental system frankly to allow her flag to enter his ports, lest it should cover British merchandise. Had he not clung to this policy—had he not endeavored to make America the enemy of England without an official abandonment of his own decrees—the Democratic party of the United States would have probably compelled a declaration of war against us in 1811. There had been serious quarrels also with regard to the right of search for British sailors serving on board American ships of war. Mutual ill-will was growing up between the two governments. The continued pressure of the orders in council appeared likely to lead to immediate hostilities; but the opposition could not readily produce any effect on parliament. A motion of Lord Lansdowne, which contemplated the entire removal of the orders, was rejected in the House of Lords on the 28th of February, 1812. A similar motion made by Mr. Brougham was rejected in the House of Commons. On the 3d of April an order appeared in the "Gazette," which revoked the orders as regarded America, on the condition that she should revoke an order which excluded British armed vessels from her ports, while those of France were admitted. This was not sufficient. During May and part of June committees of inquiry into the effect of the orders were sitting in both houses. On the 16th of June, the examinations being closed, Mr. Brougham moved in the Commons that the crown should be addressed to recall or suspend the orders unconditionally. Ministers then conceded the question, and on the 23d of June an unconditional suspension of the orders, as far as America was concerned, appeared in the "Gazette." The concession was too late. On the 18th of June the American government had declared war against Great Britain.

This most unhappy quarrel produced conflicts at sea and on land, some of which were honorable to our arms, and others somewhat disgraceful to the mode in which war was conducted toward brethren of the same common stock. Hostilities were not at an end till six months after the period to which the general narrative of this volume extends. We prefer, therefore, to relate the incidents of this war consecutively, in a separate chapter of our concluding volume.

The historian of the empire pours forth his deep regrets that Napoleon, by timely concessions and courtesies toward the United States in 1811, had not urged the congress then to sanction such a measure of hostility against Great Britain as was resolved upon in 1812. "Let us figure to ourselves," he says, "what would have been the effect of such a declaration of war a year before, when England, finding herself without allies in Europe, should have seen a new enemy rise up beyond the seas; when the Americans, the only violators of the continental blockade, should have given it their ardent co-operation; when it would have been then impossible to reproach Russia with her encouragement of them in this violation, and the war with her would have been without a pretext; when France might have sent twenty thousand men with a new La Fayette, in one of the many squadrons resting idle in our ports; when, in fine, our intact force would have been able, by a last blow struck in Spain, to bring the maritime war to an end! In 1812, after the disaster of Moscow, the war of America with England was nothing but a useless piece of good fortune for France." *

We may add that the American war of three years, painful as it was, produced no interruption of our resistance to Napoleon; and it excited very little interest in the British public, in comparison with the greater events of that extraordinary time.

* "Edinburgh Review," vol. xii. p. 229.

CHAPTER CCVII.

Campaign of 1812 in the peninsula—Siege of Ciudad Rodrigo—Siege of Badajoz—Difficulties of Lord Wellington—Advance into Spain—Battle of Salamanca—Siege of Burgos—Retreat from Burgos—Invasion of Russia—Smolensk and Borodino—Conflagration of Moscow—Retreat of the French—Pursued by the Russians—Continual battles—Horrors of the retreat—Destruction of the French army—Napoleon's flight.

"How vast will the events of our day appear to those who shall be at a sufficient distance from them to see their real magnitude." Thus thought Francis Horner in December, 1812.† Nearly half a century has passed since the author of this history trusted with "undoubting mind" the new promise of the time that the nations should be free, that his country should be safe. Journalism, in which he then took a humble part, was generally exultant; and the more so when evil foreboders were confident and clamorous. The imaginations of the young and ardent were, however, then too powerfully stirred by the great incidents of the war to see the essential connection of one event with another—how the persistence of the sagacious captain of the peninsula had roused the resistance of Russia to the all-grasping tyranny of France; how the deliverance of Germany was kindled by the fires of Moscow. We now see clearly, what was then only dimly seen, that 1812 was the inevitable "beginning of the end"—that the end would have been universal empire if England had quailed. The great image, whose brightness was excellent, whose form was terrible, whose head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay, was smote upon his feet, and they were broken to pieces: "Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor; and the wind carried them away that no place was found for them." ‡

On the 1st of January, 1812, Lord Wellington announced to Lord Liverpool that he proposed to make an attack upon Ciudad Rodrigo. He was about once more to undertake an offensive war in Spain. He was about to lead his army, in the depth of winter, from their cantonments on the Coa, to make a sudden rush upon the strong fortress of Ciudad Rodrigo; and then, if successful, to make a similar assault upon Badajoz. The time was favorable for so bold an

* Thiers, tome xv. p. 38.

† "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 137.

‡ Daniel, chap. ii. v. 33, 34. We quote the words of the prophet, not with the least reference to their theological interpretation, but as presenting a grand image of a sudden ruin, when the heterogeneous extremities of a gigantic fabric were shivered.

enterprise. Napoleon, contemplating the possibility of a war with Russia, had withdrawn sixty thousand troops from Spain. The French marshals, who had separate commands, and were each jealous of the other, were carrying on distinct operations in various provinces, without any paramount unity of plan. The emperor wrote to them precise and peremptory instructions which often were impossible to carry into effect. Their correspondence with King Joseph at Madrid, with each other, and with their own generals, whose divisions were spread over a large extent of country to obtain subsistence, were constantly intercepted by bands of guerillas, who stopped the couriers, and often cut off the communications for successive weeks. It was difficult, if not impossible, to find a Spaniard who would undertake, for any bribe, to carry a dispatch, much less to become a spy. Wellington, apparently inert in his winter quarters, had made all the preparations in his power for the reduction of the two great fortresses that were essential to the progress of a successful campaign. He was still without the necessary means of carrying on a regular siege, but he organized all the resources within his reach, and relied upon the valor of his troops to accomplish what he had not the means otherwise of performing. He wanted abundant artillery ; he wanted officers and men experienced in the attack and defence of fortified places. Colonel Jones, one of his most skilful engineers, says that his comrades in the Peninsular war were not more advanced in the art of taking towns than the soldiers of Philip II. To attack places by battering them in breach at a great distance, and then to hazard all in trusting to the bravery of the storming parties, who were unprotected by works, was the system pursued in the British armies. It was the system, says Colonel Jones, of the sieges of the Low Countries, under the Duke of Alba and the Prince of Parma. We may add that it was the system of the first siege by Englishmen in which we hear of cannon being used—that of Harfleur. Shakespeare makes Henry exclaim,

"Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more."

The like cry might have gone through the ranks on those terrible nights when Crauford led his division to the ramparts of Ciudad Rodrigo, and Picton scaled the walls of the castle of Badajoz.

Marmont had withdrawn a large portion of the garrison from Ciudad Rodrigo, in the confidence that Wellington would not move out of his quarters in an inclement season. The country was covered with snow. The means of transport were insufficient. The dispatches of our untiring general show how he was occupied in collecting carts, and ordering their loading with engineering stores and with shot and shells. His perplexities were great with Portuguese and Spanish carters and muleteers. "What do you think," he wrote to Lord Liverpool, "of empty carts taking two days to go ten miles on a good road!"* At last the preparations were complete. Part of Wellington's army passed the Agueda on the 8th of January. The same day Ciudad Rodrigo was invested, and an external redoubt on a hill was stormed and taken. On the 13th and 14th two convents outside the walls were surprised and carried by assault. Two breaches having been effected on the 19th, and Marmont being known to be advancing to relieve the garrison, orders were given to storm that evening. Wellington had arranged all the necessary dispositions for the assault. At seven o'clock three columns under the direction of General Picton, and a fourth column under General Crauford, marched toward the breaches, while a false attack was made by the Portuguese brigade, commanded by General Pack, on the other side of the river. This became a real attack. Picton's division, which attacked on the north, where the chief breach had been made, was twice repulsed before it could penetrate into the town. Crauford attacked the smaller breach, and was successful, but he was mortally wounded. General Mackinnon, who had led his brigade to the assault, was blown up by the explosion of one of the French magazines on the ramparts. In less than half an hour from the time of the attack the garrison surrendered. The capture of Ciudad Rodrigo was among the most brilliant actions of the British army. Their coolness and firmness overcame every obstacle presented by a brave and skilful enemy. It is painful to relate that the troops disgraced their victory by the most frightful excesses. They set fire to some houses ; they sacked others with a pitiless fury. They were mad with excitement and with drink. In the capture of Ciudad Rodrigo a thousand of the British and Portuguese were killed and wounded.

In six weeks from the fall of Ciudad Rodrigo the army of the allies was on its march southward from the Coa to the Guadiana. It would have been sooner on its march had the means of transport been more effective and the roads more practicable. Time was of the utmost importance to Wellington, and secrecy in his plans was not less important to be preserved. He was to attack a place for the deliverance of which three French armies might have been expected to cooperate. His own counsels were well kept, but he had to endure the most vexatious delays from the ignorance and obstinacy of the Portuguese authorities. At Evora he could not obtain a single carriage, and he was thus obliged to postpone the investment of Badajoz for several days beyond the term he had assigned. In the mean time General Philippon, the French commander, had become aware of the approach of the allied army, and had applied himself to strengthen the works, and to prepare the most deadly means of defence. On the 16th of March the Guadiana was crossed by Wellington, and Badajoz was invested. On the 26th the Pecurina, a strong fort in advance of Badajoz, was taken by storm. The Pecurina became a position for firing on the works of the town. Regular parallels were formed, and batteries were established to fire upon every assailable point. Forty-eight pieces of artillery were in constant play, and the sap against the outward works was steadily advancing. The corps of Royal Sappers and Miners was then being organized, but at Badajoz they had not assumed the dignity of that name, but were called "Royal Military Artificers."* There were of this corps only a hundred and fifteen, of all ranks, present at this siege. It was the 6th of April before three breaches were practicable, so as to justify the assault. On that evening eighteen thousand men were ready to march to the attack. The night set in dismally, as if to draw a curtain over the sanguinary deeds that were then to be done. The darkness was so great that at ten o'clock, when the columns began to advance for an assault upon all points at once, they could not be seen at twenty paces distant. The men advanced, most of them with each a sack of hay on his back to throw into the ditch to diminish its height. Some carried ladders. They were at the foot of the glacis when a sudden explosion was succeeded by an avalanche of fiery missiles which descended into the ditch, where the English columns appeared to be in the midst of a volcano. Great was the destruction, but the undaunted men rallied, and again hurried to the breaches. Again they are encountered with bursting shells, hand-grenades, and exploding powder-barrels. The summit gained, they are met by a *chevaux-de-frise* formed of sabre-blades. At each of the three breaches were the same terrible defences. At the breach of the bastion of the Trinity the struggle endured for two hours, when three thousand of the besiegers were killed or disabled. One who was present has described "the horror and grandeur of the scene" during two hours : "The constant explosion of shells, mines, and trains of powder ; the vivid illuminations caused by the light-balls thrown every five or ten minutes ; the incessant peals of musketry and roar of cannon, added to the huzzas of our fine fellows, all united, formed a scene only to be compared to Pandemonium."† At midnight Wellington was watching the terrible scene which was passing. His face was pale, when an officer came to inform him how ill the attack was proceeding. He was anxious, but he was cool. He calmly gave his orders that the troops should be formed again for a fresh assault. But another officer came to say that the division under the orders of Picton, which had been charged to escalade the castle, had taken it. On another side Walker's brigade had also scaled the walls and entered the town. Again were the other divisions led to the attack of the breaches. The defence was feebly conducted after this reverse which the besieged had sustained. The French troops became disorganized. The British advanced to the breaches with the confidence of victory, and found that resistance had ceased. At six in the morning General Philippon capitulated, the garrison surrendering without conditions. The loss of the British and Portuguese was estimated at five thousand men. "When the

* "Dispatches," vol. viii. p. 536.

* See Quartermaster Conolly's interesting history of the "Royal Sappers and Miners," 1857.

† "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vii. p. 311—Letter of Colonel Jones (then Major).

extent of the night's havoc was made known to Lord Wellington, the firmness of his nature gave way for a moment, and the pride of conquest yielded to a passionate burst of grief for the loss of his gallant soldiers." * He had more still to endure. He had in some degree to be mixed up with the disgrace of the enormities which these soldiers committed, after the town was in their power, during two days and two nights. But there can be no doubt that he endeavored to restrain their excesses, however ineffectually. On the day after the assault he issued an order which says, "It is now full time that the plunder of Badajoz should cease. . . . . The commander of the forces has ordered the provost marshal into the town, and he has orders to execute any men he may find in the act of plunder, after he shall arrive there." A Spanish historian, Count Toréno, says, "The exhortations of the officers were powerless, and Lord Wellington himself was menaced with the bayonets of the soldiers, who prevented him entering the place to restrain their disorders." † What he could not prevent he severely punished.

On the 13th of April Lord Wellington began his march back to the north with the main body of his army. On the 22d he was at Penamacor. From this place he wrote a very remarkable letter to Lord Liverpool, which explains some of the difficulties with which he had to contend. He should have been in Andalusia, he says, at this moment, at the head of forty thousand men, and should have obliged Soult to withdraw from thence, if Don Carlos de España had acted as he was desired in respect to Ciudad Rodrigo. That place was now safe. He should determine upon his line of operations during the summer, when Ciudad Rodrigo should have been fully provisioned, and when he should have intelligence of the state of Marmont's preparations to endeavor to take it by other means beside blockade. "When I say I shall determine upon the line of operations which I shall follow, I ought to add, provided I shall have money to follow any operations at all." The treasury and the commissary-in-chief had disapproved of his sanctioning bargains for importing specie from Gibraltar, for bills to be granted at a more disadvantageous rate of exchange than the market rate of Lisbon. For a small difference in the percentage the government left the army to starve. The engagements for the payment of meat for the troops it was thought could not be met. "If we are obliged to stop that payment, your lordship will do well to prepare to recall the army, as it will be quite impossible to carry up salt meat, as well as bread, to the troops from the seacoast." ‡ If the evidence of the indecision and supineness of the government were not conclusive, we could with difficulty believe that, after the tremendous loss incurred in the capture of Ciudad Rodrigo and of Badajoz, no measures whatever were taken to send Wellington reinforcements. There were then sixty-five thousand regular troops at home.§ It was at that period perfectly clear that there would be war between France and Russia, and that if any decisive effort was ever to be made in the Peninsula the time had arrived for strengthening the hands of the one general who had sagacity and firmness to hold his ground, and to achieve great triumphs with the smallest means. There seems to have been a constant desire to let Lord Wellington experiment upon the possibility of obtaining the maximum of success with the minimum of power.

But Lord Wellington went on his course, in no wise disheartened even by neglect and coldness, by evil prognostications in England and by violent jealousies in Spain, but, most of all, by being promised assistance which never came. Lord William Bentinck was to have come from Sicily, with a large body of troops, and to have landed on the eastern coast of Spain, so as to have drawn off some of the French armies that were gathering round the allies. "We are to find money as we can," writes Wellington on the 15th of July, "at the most economical rate of exchange; and then comes Lord William Bentinck to Gibraltar, and carries off four million of dollars, giving one shilling for each more than we give; and, after all, he sends his troops upon some scheme to some part of Italy, and not to the eastern coast of the Peninsula, as ordered by government, and arranged with me." ‖ Surely the fortitude which could meet such disappointments and difficulties with an equal mind is as greatly to be admired as the military skill which, by an union of boldness with caution, could encounter great risks and achieve victory in the face of danger. Wellington had advanced into Spain on the 13th of June. On the 17th he appeared before Salamanca, had been received in the town with great enthusiasm, and on the 29th had captured the forts by which the interior of the place was defended. Marmont expected that these forts would have detained Wellington fifteen days. They were taken on the fifth day. For the first fortnight of July the French army and the allied army were on opposite banks of the Douro —Marmont on the northern bank, Wellington on the southern. It was a singular interval of rest in that eager warfare. The French and English soldiers bathed together in the stream, or swam over each to the opposite bank, and talked and interchanged civilities as comrades rather than as deadly foes. On the 16th two of Marmont's divisions crossed the Douro, and Wellington concentrated his army on the Guareña, an affluent of the Douro. There were various manœuvres of Marmont till the 20th, by which he established his communications with King Joseph and the army of the centre, which was advancing from Madrid to join him. On that day he crossed the Guareña, and advanced toward the Tormes, Wellington closely following his movements. At one time the French and English were moving in parallel lines, within half cannon-shot of each other. On the 21st Lord Wellington wrote to Lord Bathurst that the enemy's object was to cut off his communication with Ciudad Rodrigo and Salamanca; that he had no superiority of numbers over the single army that was opposed to him; that the French possessed double his own force of artillery; that the army of the king was expected to join that of Marmont. "I have therefore determined to cross the Tormes, if the enemy should, to cover Salamanca as long as I can; and, above all, not to give up our communication with Ciudad Rodrigo, and not to fight an action unless under very advantageous circumstances, or it should become absolutely necessary." *

On the 21st of July both the hostile armies crossed the Tormes. Wellington took up a position with his left resting on the southern bank of the river, and his right on one of the two hills called Dos Arapiles. The battle fought on the next day is thus sometimes called the battle of Salamanca, and sometimes the battle of Arapiles.† On the morning of the 22d the contest was begun with some sharp skirmishing. The French had been in motion since daybreak. By their first movements they gained a great advantage in obtaining possession of the more distant Arapiles. They there established a battery, which commanded the road to Ciudad Rodrigo. At this point, which commanded a view of the various operations of the field, Marmont placed himself. Wellington, in the same manner, saw from a height behind the village of Arapiles, to which he had moved, the evolutions of the French, which went on till two o'clock in the afternoon. At that hour, under cover of a heavy cannonade, Marmont "extended his left, and moved forward his troops, apparently with an intention to embrace, by the position of his troops and by his fire, our post on that of the two Arapiles which we possessed, and from thence to attack and break our line, or at all events to render difficult any movement of ours to our right. The extension of his line to his left, however, and its advance upon our right, notwithstanding that his troops occupied very strong ground, and his position was well defended by cannon, gave me an opportunity of attacking him." ‡ These are the plain words of a business-like narrative. Words describing the same circumstances, which have all the fire of poetry, move the heart as with a trumpet: "Marmont's first arrangements had occupied several hours, but as they gave no positive indications of his designs, Wellington, ceasing to watch them, had retired from his Hermanito; but when he was told the French left was in motion, pointing toward the Ciudad Rodrigo road, he returned to the rock, and observed their movements for some time with a stern contentment. Their left wing was entirely separated from the centre; the fault was flagrant, and he fixed it with the stroke of a thunderbolt. A few orders issued from his lips like the incantation of a wizard." § Pakenham's division, which was on the extreme right, was directed, with two brigades of artillery and some squadrons of cavalry, against the left of the French. The divisions of Cole and Leith and the divisions of Clinton and Hope were sent

* Napier. † Quoted in Brialmont, tome i. p. 469.
‡ "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vii. p. 318. § Ibid., p. 512.
‖ "Dispatches," vol. ix. p. 288.

* "Dispatches," vol. ix. p. 298.
† These hills were also called the Hermanitos.
‡ Dispatch to Earl Bathurst, July 24. § Napier.

against the French front. The Portuguese brigade of Pack was to retake the more distant Arapiles which the French had occupied. When Marmont saw all these troops come spontaneously to surprise him in the midst of his evolutions, he comprehended the extent of his error, and sought to repair it by ordering his left to fall back immediately on the centre. "The time was passed; for Wellington, remembering the fine manœuvres of Frederick at Rosbach and of Napoleon at Austerlitz, had sent half of his troops to engage the left wing while the other half engaged the centre." * The left wing of the French made a disorderly retreat toward their right, leaving three thousand prisoners. Their centre was driven in, but their right remained unbroken. Marmont had been wounded, and General Clausel, who had joined him with his reinforcements, took the command. He rallied the scattered French, formed them into a new position, and made a determined stand, until a fresh attack ordered by Wellington compelled them to abandon the ground, and to retreat toward Alba de Tormes. Night stopped the pursuit. The victory of Salamanca was one of the triumphs of genius—of its power instantly to seize the opportunity; to watch, and to wait, and then to strike—the power of taking the flood-tide which leads on to fortune. In Wellington this power was not a sudden impulse. It was the concentrated effort of a mind which had previously calculated all the circumstances of his own position and of that of his adversary. "Late in the evening of this great day," says Napier, "I saw him behind my regiment then marching toward the ford. He was alone. The flush of victory was on his brow, his eyes were eager and watchful, but his voice was calm and even gentle." On the morning of the 23d three battalions of the French rear surrendered to the British cavalry, who had come up with them. "The battle of Salamanca was incontestably the most decisive that the allies had then fought in the Peninsula. It established the reputation of the British army, and especially manifested, beyond the possibility of doubt, the brilliant qualities of its general—a solid judgment, a *coup d'œil* prompt and certain, a vigorous execution, and a rare skilfulness in moving his troops. Thibaudeau has said with truth that the day of the Arapiles marked the end of the French occupation of Spain." †

Napoleon received the news of the battle of Salamanca on the 2d of September, when he was at Ghiast, about twenty miles from Borodino. He was enraged against Marmont, the unfortunate Duke of Ragusa. Wait, he said to the minister at war, till his wounds are cured, and his recovery is nearly complete, and then ask him, Why did he offer battle without the orders of his commander-in-chief? Why did he not ask for orders as to his conduct, dependent as that ought to have been on the general system of my armies in Spain? "His insubordination has caused all these disasters." ‡ Having entered upon the greatest enterprise of his ambitious career, the Emperor of the French thus attempted to regulate the most distant movements of the great machinery with which he had thought to govern the world. This letter was written five days before the battle of Borodino, and twelve days before Napoleon entered Moscow. The intelligence which he had received would also have reached, at the beginning of September, the Emperor Alexander. That it would have produced a sensible influence upon the determination of the Russians to resist their invaders there can be no doubt. The Duke of Wellington in later years said, "Salamanca relieved the whole south of Spain at once, changed the character of the war there, and was felt even in Russia." § The indignation of Napoleon against Marmont was in the proportion in which he felt that the moral effects of Wellington's victory were damaging to the prestige of his power It appeared to him a gloomy presage. It was hailed throughout Germany and in other parts of Europe as the dawn of a new era.

The official account of the victory of Salamanca reached London on the 15th of August. On the 19th Lord Liverpool wrote to Lord Wellington to offer his congratulations. He says, "I have never in my life seen anything equal to the enthusiasm which the knowledge of this event has excited throughout the town, and throughout every part of the country from which accounts of its reception have yet been obtained." The news of Wellington having entered Madrid on the 12th of August arrived in London on the 6th of September. On the 17th the triumphant general writes to his friend Colonel Malcolm in England, "I am among a people mad with joy for their deliverance from their oppressors. God send that my good fortune may continue, and that I may be the instrument of securing their independence and happiness." * There was a cloud coming over that bright day. He was without money, for drafts upon the English treasury could not be realized at Madrid. No reinforcements had reached him, to fill up the gap of his loss at Salamanca. Clausel's army in the north had been largely reinforced. Soult, Suchet, and King Joseph might form a junction in the south, and come upon him with forces three times as great as his own. To linger at Madrid was impossible. Leaving two divisions in the capital, Wellington marched on the 1st of September for Valladolid, and, continuing his northward movement, on the 19th entered Burgos. The castle of Burgos, a place of great natural strength, had been carefully fortified, and had a garrison of two thousand men. It was immediately invested, the possession of the fort being absolutely necessary for the security of Wellington's army. For a month the siege proceeded with very doubtful success. Breaches were effected in the first line of works, but the garrison made sorties and occasioned great loss. A breach by mining was also made in the second line, and on the 18th of October orders were given to storm it. The attack failed. The army of the north and the armies of the south were advancing to raise the siege. To continue the investment of Burgos would have been fatal. On the 21st Wellington retired in good order to Placentia. His rear was repeatedly attacked, but there was no serious engagement. The sufferings of the army from the difficulty of obtaining provisions were immense. Their disorganization was proportionate. The failure at Burgos—according to Wellington's own account, written with the noble candor that was ready to acknowledge mistakes—was chiefly caused by one circumstance: he took there the most inexperienced instead of the best troops, and he had not sufficient means of transport. "I see," he says, in a letter to Lord Liverpool, "that a disposition already exists to blame the government for the failure of the siege of Burgos. The government had nothing to say to the siege. It was entirely my own act. In regard to means, there were ample means both at Madrid and Santander for the siege of the strongest fortress. That which was wanting at both places was means of transporting ordnance and military stores to the place where it was desirable to use them." By the middle of November the allied forces were in their old stations within the frontiers of Portugal. Wellington's headquarters were at Ciudad Rodrigo. The campaign of 1812 in the Peninsula was at an end. There will be six months of apparent inaction, and then the results of another campaign, after five years of incessant struggle, will cause the British general's labor and anxiety to be properly appreciated.

The eternal friendship between Napoleon and Alexander which had been sworn at Tilsit was threatened to be dissolved by causes of which the two emperors at first took little heed. Princes might submit to the continental decrees of France, but nations were more difficult to persuade or to coerce. The Russian people, and especially the Russian landholders, who were deprived of the usual markets for the produce of their estates, compelled the government to issue a ukase by which commodities were to be introduced into Russian ports unless they should appear to belong to subjects of Great Britain. This restriction was easy to be evaded, and the trade between the two countries became really opened. Napoleon was haughty and indignant. But Alexander dared not impose any severer law upon his subjects; and he had now the support of Bernadotte, the Crown Prince of Sweden, who also refused to submit to the dictator, who had seized and confiscated fifty Swedish merchantmen, on the ground of their contraband trade with England. In March, 1812, a treaty of alliance was signed between Russia and Sweden. Napoleon had been gradually collecting large bodies of troops on the Vistula. He had levied the conscription of 1812, although that of 1811 was only just completed. It was clear that an offensive war was in preparation. At the beginning of May the Russian minister at Paris presented an official note, to the intent that the differences between the two governments might be easily settled if the French troops were withdrawn from Pomerania and the Duchy of Warsaw, where they were evidently stationed to threaten the Russian frontier. Bonaparte said he

* Brialmont, tome ii. p. 32.
† Ibid., p. 35.
‡ "Letters to Joseph," vol. ii. p. 236.
§ "Quarterly Review," vol. xcii. p. 526.

* "Supplementary Dispatches," vol. vii. p. 384.

would not be dictated to by any foreign sovereign, and he sent the ambassador his passports. On the 9th of May he left Paris with his Austrian empress. At Dresden he received the homage of his tributary princes, and there, too, came the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia to offer their contingents for the invasion of Russia. Splendid were the ceremonials with which the vassals did fealty to their liege lord. The numbers of the confederated army which, on the 24th and 25th of June, passed the Niemen, the boundary of the Russian Empire, have been variously stated. The lowest estimate places them at half a million of men. A detailed return, extant in the French War Office, gives the numbers as 651,358 infantry, cavalry, artillery, and engineers; 187,121 horses, and 1372 pieces of ordnance. To meet this mighty force the Russian armies only comprised 254,356 men.* But there was something stronger than these mighty masses of invaders—the determination of the Russian people to resist to the last extremity. It was in this spirit that the officers and soldiers of Alexander's army held that to ruin the invader they must retire before him into the heart of Russia without giving battle, and, destroying everything before him in their retreat, to leave nothing but ravaged fields, so that the modern Pharaoh and his hosts should perish in the immensity of the void, as the ancient Pharaoh perished in the immensity of the waters.†

The French armies entered Lithuania without encountering any opposition. They ravaged the country, feeding their horses on green corn; and when the main bodies left it, entirely devastated, they left behind them a hundred thousand men, dead or in hospitals, or marauding in scattered parties through the districts where the locusts who had passed over had left nothing to be consumed. On the 16th of August they were under the walls of Smolensk, about two hundred and eighty miles from Moscow. The Russians were there in force, and a great battle took place. When the French entered the city it had been evacuated, and they found only burning ruins. The Russians continued their retreat toward Moscow, Napoleon following them. On the 7th of September was fought the sanguinary battle of Borodino. The sun had risen with extraordinary brilliancy, and Napoleon hailed it as the twin sun of Austerlitz. The fighting lasted two days. On each side there were forty thousand killed and wounded. Each army imagined itself lord of the field, but the Russian army continued its retreat to Moscow.‡

On the 14th of September before day dawn the Russian troops commenced filing through the city. They were soon accompanied by all the inhabitants and populace who could find any means of conveyance. "The incidents and the whole scene of the evacuation of a great capital may be conceived better than described. The Russians, however, have preserved so much of their nomad habits that they were much more quickly packed and equipped for their emigration than the inhabitants of any other European city would have been. The army indeed, since the first day's retreat from Smolensk, had been accompanied by a wandering nation. All the towns, villages, and hamlets were abandoned as the columns appeared. The old and infirm, the women and children were placed with the movable effects, and the 'Dii Penates' on their kabitgas or telegas—one and two horse carts which no peasant is without." § On the same day Napoleon arrived at Moscow with his guards, and was astounded at the solitude which reigned everywhere. "His feelings had been excited to the highest degree of pride and glowing expectation. He had anticipated his reception by a submissive magistracy and humbled people, imploring clemency, and dreamed that in the palace of the czars he would have it in his power to promise pardon, protection, and peace to themselves and their sovereign." ‖

Napoleon took up his residence in the suburb of Moscow. He had commanded his soldiers to bivouac outside the city, but at night many entered, and sought in plunder and riot some compensation for their long endurance of severe privations. That very night the alarm of fire was given in various quarters. The great bazaar with its ten thousand shops was in a blaze. The crown magazines, with vast stores of wine and spirits, were in a blaze. Not a fire-engine, not a bucket, could be procured. They had all been carried off.

* These returns are in Sir Robert Wilson's "Invasion of Russia," p. 10 and p. 21.
† Thiers, tome xiii. p. 403.
‡ Wilson, "Invasion of Russia," p. 130 to 155.
§ Ibid., p. 165.
‖ Ibid., p. 167.

The next day the French emperor transferred his quarters to the Kremlin. Day after day the astonished soldiers saw the canopy of smoke and flame spreading over the city of a thousand domes and minarets. On the 21st the Russian army was established within twenty-five miles of Moscow. They knew that the progress of their invader had been stayed. The conflagration went on till, of forty thousand houses in stone, only two hundred escaped; of eight thousand in wood, five hundred only were standing; of sixteen hundred churches, eight hundred were consumed.* The Kremlin itself, on the 16th, had become uninhabitable, and Napoleon left it to take up his quarters outside the city. A furious wind carried showers of sparks far and near. On the 20th, when Napoleon returned, a heavy rain had extinguished the flames, but only one tenth of the city was left unconsumed. Only those provisions had escaped being burned which were left in the cellars of the houses. What was the cause of this terrible destruction? Was it the resolved purpose of a patriotic devotion producing a havoc more awful than any event which history records, or was it accident? There can be no doubt that it was part of the same determined system of resistance which had driven the whole population from the burning villages on the road from Smolensk; and had led forth the inhabitants of Moscow, with the exception of the miserable thousands who were unable to move, to seek for other shelter than in the homes of the devoted city. Rostopchin, the Governor of Moscow, "could neither deny nor adopt the act." But that he had a strong conviction of what was public virtue may be gathered from the fact that he afterward set fire with his own hands to his magnificent palace in the village of Woronow, when a division of the French were approaching on the 4th of October, and that he affixed upon a pillar these ominous words: "The inhabitants of this property, to the number of seventeen hundred and twenty, quit it at your approach, and I voluntarily set the house on fire that it may not be polluted by your presence. Frenchmen, I abandoned to you my two houses at Moscow, with their furniture and contents, worth half a million of roubles. Here you will only find ashes." † The French evacuated Moscow on the 19th of October. Snow had begun to fall. An early winter was setting in.

Adequately to describe the incidents of that terrible destruction of the French grand army which occurred from the 19th of October to the 13th of December, when a miserable remnant recrossed the Niemen, would require a volume—as indeed several separate volumes have been written on that fearful catastrophe. The march of the French was a succession of battles with the pursuing Russians. The troops were skilfully led; their courage rarely failed even when starving and perishing by the wayside with the extremity of cold. Clouds of Cossacks hung upon their path, leaving them not an hour's safety. The most popular narrative, that of the Count de Ségur, has been held to contain many exaggerations. That of Sir Robert Wilson has many striking details of horror amid a critical military view of the operations of the Russians, in which he is not sparing of blame. There is a brief account by Desprez, the aide-de-camp of King Joseph, who was sent to Napoleon to propitiate his anger against his brother and against Marmont for the defeat at Salamanca. The emperor kept him at Moscow, and when the evacuation took place he accompanied the division of Marshal Mortier, till it reached Wilna, where the French had stayed till the 16th of December, when the Russians were coming upon them. The aide-de camp, in a letter to King Joseph, dated from Paris on the 3d of January, says that the army when he quitted it was in the most horrible misery. For a long time previously the disorder and losses had been frightful; the artillery and cavalry had ceased to exist. The different regiments were all mixed together, the soldiers marching pell-mell and only seeking to prolong existence. Thousands of wandering men fell into the hands of the Cossacks. The number of prisoners was very great, but that of the dead exceeded it. During a month there were no rations, and dead horses were the only resource. The severity of the climate rendered hunger more fatal.‡ The truth could not be wholly hidden, even by Napoleon. He could not conceal that of four hundred thousand Frenchmen who had crossed the Niemen in May, with the persuasion of their invincibility, not twenty thousand had returned to the Vistula. The destruction could not be concealed

* Wilson, p. 172.
† Idem, p. 180.
‡ "Letters to King Joseph," p. 245.

from the bereaved families who mourned their sons and their husbands. On the 3d of December the emperor issued his twenty-ninth and last bulletin, which made France and the world comprehend in some degree how the invasion of Russia had ended. For the first time he then spoke of his retreat; he avowed such part of his misfortunes as he could not wholly deny; he attributed his calamities to the severity of the weather. On the 5th, in the middle of the night, he quitted his army at Smorgoni, travelling in a sledge accompanied by Caulaincourt, a Polish interpreter, his Mamlook Rustan, and a valet. He arrived in Paris on the night of the 18th of December.

CHAPTER CCVIII.

German spirit—The campaign—Armistice—The battle of Vittoria—Battle of Dresden—Death of Moreau—Battle of Leipzig—Napoleon's retreat—Wellington on the Pyrenees—San Sebastian—The British army in France—Battles of Wellington and Soult—Napoleon prepares for a campaign in France—Battles with Blücher and Schwarzenberg—Paris capitulated to the allies—Toulouse—Abdication of Napoleon—Peace of Paris—Public joy in England—The allied sovereigns—Wellington thanked by parliament—The speaker's harangue.

THERE is a description of the state of public feeling in Germany at the beginning of 1813 which shows how the continent was awakening from its torpor. The writer was a professor in the University of Breslau: "The 29th bulletin had appeared; every artful expression in it seemed to endeavor vainly to conceal the news of a total defeat. The vision of a wonderful agitated future rose in every mind, with all its hopes and terrors; it was breathed out at first in tones scarcely audible; even those who had believed that unbridled ambition would find its check in the land which it had desolated could not realize the horrible destruction of a victorious army—an army which had for fifteen years with growing might excited first the admiration, then the terror, and lastly the paralyzed dismay of all the continental nations, and which had at length been overtaken by a fearful judgment more wonderful than its conquests. But the strange event was there; reports no longer to be doubted crowded in upon us—the distant voice approached—the portentous words sounded clearer and clearer—and at last the loud call to rise was shouted through the land. Then did the flood of feeling burst from hearts where it had been long pent up—fuller and freer did it flow; then the long-hidden love to king and country flamed brightly out, and the dullest minds were animated by the wild enthusiasm. Every one looked for a tremendous crisis, but the moment was not yet come for action, and while resting in breathless expectation, thousands and thousands became every hour stronger still to meet it." *

The passionate impulses of the people of Prussia were powerful enough to make their sovereign resolve to endure no longer his state of ignominious vassalage. He first made a proposal to Napoleon, with the consent of Alexander, whom he met at Breslau, that the French should evacuate Dantzic and all the Prussian fortresses on the Oder, and retire behind the Elbe into Saxony. The Russian army should in that case remain behind the Vistula. Napoleon contemptuously spurned the proposition. Frederick William and Alexander then concluded an alliance, offensive and defensive. Austria decided to remain neutral. Hostilities immediately began. The French quitted Berlin and Dresden. The old spirit of Germany—the spirit of Arminius, which eighteen centuries before had driven the Roman legions beyond the Rhine—had again awakened. Secret societies had cherished this spirit, and now it no longer needed to be secret. The preacher called upon his congregation to arm; the professor told his class that they must now learn to fight. At nightfall in every city bands of young Germans shouted forth the songs of Arndt, and every student and every apprentice could join in the chorus of "Was ist der Deutschen Vaterland." In the mean time France, weeping for her children, still crouched at the feet of her master.

The senate were now called upon to place at the disposal of the emperor half a million of conscripts. He took the field in the middle of April. He could reckon upon collecting 250,000 troops before Russia and Prussia could concentrate an equal force. But of his forces four fifths were young soldiers; the other fifth were Germans. He left Erfurt to march upon Leipzig. On the 2d of May he fought the battle of Lützen, and defeated the combined Russian and Prussian army. His victory gave him possession of Leipzig and of Dresden. On the 20th and 21st of May the two armies renewed the struggle at Bautzen. The slaughter on each side was nearly equal. The allies retreated; but Napoleon did not attempt to follow up the success which he had achieved at a prodigious loss, which told him that such days as Austerlitz and Jena were not likely to recur. An armistice was agreed upon, to extend from the 5th of June to the 22d of July. Bonaparte spent this period at Berlin throwing dust into the eyes of politicians, by pretending to devote himself to ease and pleasure. Talma and Mademoiselle Georges and Mademoiselle Mars were ordered to come from Paris to amuse the emperor. The armistice was agreed to be prolonged to the 10th of August, during which time a conference was to be held to discuss terms of pacification. The negotiations of the Russian, Prussian, and French plenipotentiaries were to commence on the 29th of July at Prague.

It was on the 3d of July that a "London Extraordinary Gazette" appeared, containing a dispatch to Earl Bathurst from the Marquis of Wellington, dated the 22d of June, telling of a great event in plain and unboastful words. It told how the French, commanded by Joseph Bonaparte, having Marshal Jourdan as the major-general of the army, had on the night of the 19th taken up a position in front of Vittoria. Wellington described the position, which he reconnoitered on the 20th, "with a view to the attack to be made on the following morning, if they should still remain in it." They did remain, and the allied army did make the attack on the 21st of June. This was the result: "I am happy to inform your lordship that the allied army under my command gained a complete victory, having driven them from all their positions, having taken from them 151 pieces of cannon, 415 wagons of ammunition, all their baggage, provisions, cattle, treasure, etc., and a considerable number of prisoners." Rapid were the operations which led to this event.

Toward the end of the month of May the rains had ceased; the roads which had been broken up became practicable for the march of troops; and seventy thousand British and Portuguese and twenty thousand Spaniards commenced their march toward Spain. Wellington had no longer to lament over the sluggishness and mistakes of Spanish generals. The Cortes had conferred upon him the entire command of the Spanish forces. He was commander-in-chief of all the armies in the Peninsula. There was jealousy among the Spanish generals that their separate commands, which had been so calamitous, were superseded by the power of one capable man. He was about greatly to dare. Usually so undemonstrative, he gave vent to the hopes that his plan of a campaign would be successful—that he would never again have to seek in retreat the defences of Torres Vedras: "Strong of heart and strong of hand his veterans marched to the encounter, the glories of twelve victories playing about their bayonets, and he, their leader so proudly confident that in crossing the stream which marks the frontier of Spain he rose in his stirrups and waving his hand, cried out, *Adieu Portugal.*" * On the 3d of June the French retired to Burgos; on the 12th they abandoned the fortress which had cost such a sacrifice of English life. On the 13th the allied army passed the Ebro. Wellington had now a base for his operations, which rendered an open communication with Portugal no longer necessary. An English fleet was at Santander, and in that city the commissariat established a depôt, and there were military hospitals formed. On the 18th in the evening it was known in the French camp that the allies had passed the Ebro, and in the night their army undertook a forced march to retire, and there was alarm and confusion in their ranks. On the 21st the great victory was gained. The battle of Vittoria dissipated the doubts and overcame the reluctance of Austria to join the coalition. It broke up the congress at Prague, where the negotiators were disposed to treat with Napoleon. It prepared the great day of Leipzig, upon which depended the deliverance of Germany and the fall of the French emperor.

On the 18th of July Soult arrived in Spain to take the command of

* "Memoirs of Henry Steffens."

* Napier.

the French army. On the 25th he attacked the British right at Roncesvalles. From that day to the 31st there was a series of conflicts between the two armies which are known as "The battles of the Pyrenees." On the last morning of July the French armies were in full retreat to France by the various passes of the mountains.

On the 14th of June Great Britain had become a party to the treaty concluded between Russia and Prussia. She had promised assistance in this great struggle; but no aid could have been more effectual than that which she was rendering in the Peninsula. The allies at Prague had offered terms to Napoleon, which he hesitated to accept till the 10th of August had arrived and the term of the armistice was out. Then came war, in as tremendous a form as the art of destruction ever assumed. On the 24th, 25th, and 27th of August three battles were fought about Dresden, in which the French had the advantage. General Moreau had been invited to come from America to take part against his old rival. In his first battle, in the presence of Bonaparte, he came to his end. Sir Robert Wilson has recorded this event:*

"As the emperor, General Moreau, Lord Cathcart, myself and suite were passing on the right of the centre in the wake of a French battery which still played, a ball came and struck something about us. For a few seconds no effect was seen or heard, but then General Moreau cried 'Oh!' and I perceived him, for I was next on his left, struggling and endeavoring to dismount. I immediately said, 'Sire, General Moreau is wounded.' And almost at the instant I saw him throw himself from his horse, with one leg shattered, and the inside of the left knee all mangled. His horse, which had stood firm till the general fell, now staggered, and threw himself down close to his master. The violent struggles of the horse alarmed General Moreau, who said, 'Keep the horse down;' but the horse died before any one could get near him. Moreau then lifted himself up a little, looked at his legs, and said, '*C'est passé avec moi! mon affaire est faite.*' The emperor, on riding away, ordered him to be carried off the field. Some Cossacks lifted him on their pikes and removed him to the nearest village. The operation of amputating both legs was performed by the emperor's surgeon, Wiley. Moreau bore it as a soldier, and during the whole day kept a cheerful serenity that proved the possession of extraordinary powers of mind."

Napoleon had achieved at Dresden the last of his great victories. That triumph was followed within a very few days by signal reverses sustained by his marshals. On the 26th of August Blücher routed Macdonald in the battle of the Katzbach, where the French lost 25,000 men. This battle was fought in a tremendous storm of rain. The river had overflowed, and the two armies contended in the rapid stream and on the inundated banks. The muskets would not go off, and consequently it was an affair of bayonets, in which the heavy Germans had the advantage over the nimble French. On the 30th of August Vandamme, who had been sent by Napoleon in pursuit of the army which had retired from Dresden, was totally defeated, and was taken prisoner. Bernadotte, who had joined the campaign, and now headed Swedes, Prussians, and Russians, won the victory of Gross-Beeren on the 23d of August, drove back Oudinot, and saved Berlin. Again Bernadotte was successful against Ney in the battle of Dennewitz on the 6th of September. These defeats had materially weakened the large French armies that had marched into Germany in April. They were still more weakened by sickness and by starvation. They had exhausted the resources of Saxony, and men and horses were without food.

On the 8th of October the King of Bavaria, surrounded by Russians and Prussians, was compelled to join the allies. Napoleon saw that these reverses were not transitory misfortunes that could easily be retrieved. When he heard of the defeat of Vandamme he exclaimed, "This is war: high in the morning, low at night." The morning had now little sunshine. He determined to fight his way to the Rhine, though all Germany was rising against him. To Leipzig he directed his march. He arrived in its neighborhood on the 15th of October. The Russians and Prussians were advancing to the same point. On the 16th he was attacked at the village of Wachau, near Leipzig. The action was not decisive, but for Napoleon not to win triumphantly was in itself defeat. On that day Bernadotte had not come up. There was a doubt at the Prussian headquarters whether the Crown Prince of Sweden would be stanch. The amateur soldier, Professor Steffens, was sent to search for him after the battle of the 16th had begun. "It was not till night," he says, "that I made him out at Landsberg, in miserable quarters, surrounded by Swedish officers. He lay on a mattress spread on the floor of a desolate, nearly empty room. The dark Gascon face with the prominent nose and the relaxing chin was sharply relieved against the white bed-clothes and the laced night-cap." Steffens explained the object of his mission. Bernadotte promised to march directly, and he kept his promise. On the 17th there was a pause. Napoleon had been secretly making propositions for an armistice. His father-in-law and Alexander returned no answer. The great issue must be tried under the walls of Leipzig.

At nine o'clock in the morning of the 18th this tremendous conflict began. One of the Prussian generals called it "Nation's Battle" (Völkerschlacht). The struggle lasted till night. It was decisive of the fortunes of Napoleon. An important incident of that day has been strikingly told: "We discerned a large body of cavalry advance from the enemy's lines in perfect order. There were no troops immediately near the point they advanced upon, and we waited quietly for their coming up; no doubt Blücher was advised of their intentions. They proved to be the Saxon cavalry, who had left the enemy and come over to us. They stood looking resolved, but, as I thought, humbled before us. The commander came forward and approached Blücher, who received him with dignity. The Saxon officer stated that they had long waited for the moment when they might free themselves from the compulsion of bearing arms against their countrymen; it had come at length. Yet they craved one indulgence; they wished not to fight in that battle. Their unhappy king was in Leipzig, in a house in the great market-place, which would soon be in our power. Blücher addressed them shortly, but very kindly granted their request, and appointed them a position behind the army." *

The morning of the 19th had not dawned when the French were marching out of Leipzig. Napoleon had directed a bridge to be blown up after his troops had passed. It was blown up too soon, and twenty-five thousand French surrendered as prisoners of war. At two o'clock the sound of cannon and of musketry was no longer heard. The bells of Leipzig were ringing; the people were shouting. The allied sovereigns entered the city by different gates; and in the great square Alexander and Frederic William met, and could now feel a confident belief that their great adversary was fallen, never to rise again. He felt himself that his days of unlimited power were over. He must be content with a restricted dominion—to rule France with the Rhine and the Alps for its boundary. He had thought to have carried her sway beyond the Pyrenees, but that hope was passing away as a dream. "Perfidious Albion" had been too strong; the "general of sepoys" had been too skilful. When he reached Freiburg he waited some hours there. He was seen sitting at a window, "his head resting on his arm in silent despair. Berthier sat opposite to him in a similar state. Neither spoke; and officers who entered were silently ordered by a wave of the hand to leave the room." † He won the battle of Hanau against the Bavarians, who had endeavored near Frankfort to intercept his retreat. It was his last success on German ground. He rested six days at Mayence, having crossed the Rhine with about one sixth of the army that he had led forth to conquer.

When Napoleon passed the Rhine on the 22d of November, to escape from the pursuing armies of the allies, Lord Wellington had planted his foot on the soil of France. His army was in cantonments between the sea and the river Nive. His headquarters were at St. Jean de Luz. When Soult had crossed the Pyrenees, and Wellington was in possession of the passes, the French marshal addressed a proclamation to his army, in which he said that his orders from the emperor were, "to chase the enemy from those lofty heights which enabled him proudly to survey our fertile valleys, and drive them across the Ebro." A sergeant of the 42d has written a pleasing description of the view from the Pyrenees at sunrise, when the British army exultingly looked upon "the gay regions of France:"

"The view from the summits of these mountains at that early hour, when the sun began to gild their tops, and to throw his cheer-

* "Private Journal," vol. ii. p. 97.

* "Memoirs of Steffens."

† Steffens.

ing rays on the white canvas which speckled their sides, was grand beyond description. The valleys below were hidden under an ocean of white wreathing mist, over which the hills, like a thousand islands, raised their rocky summits amid the pure serenity of a cloudless atmosphere; the white tents of a British army spotted their sides, while ten thousand bayonets glittered around. The drums, fifes, bugles, and wild warlike strains of the Highland bagpipe drowned the notes of a hundred useless instruments that offered their softer sounds to the soldiers' ears. Flocks of vultures hovered around to feed on the bodies of men who had fallen in sequestered spots by the hostile bullet, and were left to wolves and birds of prey, along with the carcasses of the exhausted animals that had failed in bearing their oppressive burdens to the expectant camp." *

Before the British army had left its position on these heights and had descended into France, there had been serious business accomplished. One place of great strength was to be theirs before the allies could feel secure in their advance. On the 31st of August the town of San Sebastian was taken by storm by our troops under the command of General Graham. The loss to our forces amounted to 2500 men. Cruelly was the army neglected previous to this siege, and much of the loss incurred may be attributed to the mismanagement of the departments, in not providing adequate *matériel*, and in refusing naval assistance. The admiralty, of which Lord Melville was the head, was especially blamable. The remonstrance of Lord Wellington must have sent a shiver through the board-room at Whitehall. "I complain," he writes, "of an actual want of necessary naval assistance and co-operation with the army. . . . I know nothing of the cause of the evil. It may be owing to a general deficiency of naval force for all the objects to which it is necessary to attend on an extended system of war. It may be owing to a proper preference of other services over this." It is almost impossible to believe that Lord Melville should have had the astounding effrontery to write to Wellington that *his* needs were the last thing upon which he—the great manager of Scottish corruption—cared to occupy himself. On the 8th of September the castle of San Sebastian, which had held out after the town was taken, capitulated. General Rey, who had nobly defended the place, saw that a longer resistance would have been useless, when preparations were making for its assault. He displayed the white flag upon the walls, and sent an officer to propose terms. Write down what you please, said Sir Thomas Graham—a garrison that has made such a defence is not conquered. The French officer demanded the honors of war, and that the wounded should be sent by transports to France.

On the 31st of October the French garrison of Pamplona, having lost all chance of relief, surrendered as prisoners of war. Their number amounted to 4000. Wellington could now safely move his whole army into France. His proclamation previous to this step was distinguished by that rectitude which is the highest prudence. He told his officers and soldiers "to remember that their nations were at war with France solely because the ruler of the French nation would not allow them to be at peace, and wanted to force them to submit to his yoke; and not to forget at the same time that the worst of the evils suffered by the enemy in his profligate invasion of Spain and Portugal had been occasioned by the irregularities of his soldiers and their cruelties toward the unfortunate and peaceful inhabitants of the country. To avenge this conduct on the peaceful inhabitants of France would be unmanly and unworthy of the allied nations."

On the 18th of November, before Wellington could effect the passage of the Nivelle, he had to fight. The French were driven beyond the river, and then the allied armies took up their position at St. Jean de Luz. Soult withdrew to his intrenched camp at Bayonne. The justice and moderation of the British commander, as exhibited in his proclamation to his troops; in his determination to pay for every supply, and to punish every attempt at plunder, had produced the best results. The troops, British and Portuguese, had behaved well. Their dreadful excesses after the capture by assault of a fortified town—of which San Sebastian had afforded one of the worst instances—were no longer exhibited in their quiet cantonments. "The natives of this part of the country," Wellington writes, "are not only reconciled to the invasion, but wish us success, afford us all the supplies in their power, and exert themselves to get for us intelligence. . . . The inhabitants, who had at first left their habitations, have in general returned to them, and they are living very comfortably and quietly with our soldiers cantoned in their houses." * Lord Wellington, in the course of a month, became straitened for room, in his position on the right bank of the Nivelle. He determined to cross the Nive, and establish himself between that river and the Adour. General Hill forded the river on the 9th of December, and the French posts were withdrawn to Bayonne. Then Soult resumed the offensive, and a series of obstinate engagements took place on the 10th, 11th, and 13th, in which all the attacks of the French were repulsed. In these engagements Soult first brought force to bear on the British left, under Hope, and then threw all his strength upon the British right, under Hill. Wellington was ready to give aid to this brave and skilful general, in the battle of the 13th, when 13,000 men were opposed to 30,000. But the aid was not required. Soult withdrew to his camp at Bayonne; and Wellington, well pleased, exclaimed, "Hill, the day is all your own." From the middle of December, 1813, to the middle of February, 1814, there was an interval of rest in the hostile camps at the feet of the Pyrenees.

On the 14th of November the Senate of France presented an address to Napoleon at the Tuileries. In his answer he said, "A year ago all Europe marched with us: now all Europe is marching against us. It is because the opinion of the world is formed by France or by England. We should have everything to fear but for the energy and power of the nation." The senate placed at the emperor's disposal 300,000 conscripts. From September, 1805, to this 15th of November, the senate had given him authority to devote to what was called the glory of France no less a number than two million one hundred and three thousand of her sons.† In the year 1813 the senate had granted to Napoleon one million one hundred and forty thousand conscripts. In a declaration of the 1st of December the allied powers said, "They did not make war on France, but against that preponderance which, to the misfortune of Europe and of France, the Emperor Napoleon has too long exercised beyond the limits of his empire." On the 21st of December the first corps of Prince Schwarzenberg crossed the Rhine at Bâle. Blücher crossed the Rhine on the 31st. On the 29th Napoleon's brother Joseph wrote to him, "The violation of the Swiss territory has laid France open to the enemy." He wished the emperor to be persuaded that his heart was wholly French. He was also aware of what he owed to Spain. He saw his duties, and he wished to fulfil all of them. Napoleon put a crushing hand upon Joseph's maudlin epistle: "France is invaded: all Europe is in arms against France, and above all against me. You are no longer King of Spain. I do not want Spain either to keep or to give away. I will have nothing more to do with that country except to live in peace with it, and have the use of my army." ‡ He had found out the full truth of what he himself said, "Spain is the cancer of the empire." He had concluded a treaty on the 11th of December with the ex-King Ferdinand, recognizing him as King of Spain and the Indies, on the condition that he should make the English abandon his territories. He knew the character of that weak and treacherous Bourbon. He saw in his restoration to the crown of Spain that future of superstition and tyranny which would produce civil war, destroy the seeds of liberty and patriotism that had been sown, and give France at some not distant day the power of destroying the boundary of the Pyrenees. He made other arrangements with reference to the future. He released the pope from his confinement at Fontainebleau. He made a pretence of calling out the national guard, but he was afraid of them. The people showed no disposition to resist the invaders of their country, as in the first days of the revolution. If the invaders were to be driven back it must be by the mere military strength which he could still wield, and by his own wondrous energy. In the third week of January he made his preparations for a final struggle. He appointed the empress as regent, and his brother Joseph as his lieutenant. He had 70,000 men in the field, and he set out for Paris on the 25th of January to put himself at their head at Chalons.

* "Retrospect of a Military Life," by James Anton, p. 61.

* "Dispatches," vol. xii. p. 300.
† "Histoire Parlementaire," vol. xxxix. p. 526.
‡ "Correspondence with Joseph," vol. ii. p. 255.

There were two columns of the allies marching on Paris—one by the valley of the Seine, the other by the valley of the Marne. On the 29th of January he fought the battle of Brienne with Blücher—a battle which cost him 5000 killed and wounded, and 3000 prisoners. This battle decided nothing. He wrote to his brother, "Since the battle of Brienne the allies have had great respect for our armies. They did not believe we had any." He thought that this opinion might hasten the peace.* A congress was to be held at Chatillon. Negotiations went on while Napoleon, placing himself between Blücher and Schwarzenberg, could prevent their junction, and attack either of them as he saw that opportunity might favor him. Never did he display more activity. The greatness of the stake stirred him into almost preternatural energy to win the game. His confidence in his good destiny led him to reject the terms which he probably might have obtained at Chatillon. Lord Aberdeen, the negotiator for England, was anxious for peace. But Napoleon would not forego the condition that the Rhine should be the frontier of France. The four powers saw that only a firm agreement among themselves would prevent a peace which would throw away all the successes which they had obtained. They bound themselves by the treaty of Chaumont, of the 1st of March, to continue the contest with Napoleon if he should not agree to their conditions. He would still have been the sovereign ruler of France—emperor; or king, as Talleyrand wished him to be called. The succession of the throne would have been guaranteed to his family. Some in England thought him mad to hesitate. Others, and those the majority, feared that he would become reasonable. Lord Colchester enters in his diary of the 22d of March, "General apprehension of preliminaries of peace having been already signed at Chatillon; an almost universal dread of any pretended peace with Bonaparte." Those who hoped for peace through negotiation with him and those who dreaded it were not long kept in suspense. By a rapid and daring movement Napoleon placed himself in the rear of the allied forces. But they marched boldly for the capital. They fought a hard battle, and on the 30th of March occupied the entire line of defence which protected Paris on the north-east. On the 31st of March Paris capitulated. Marmont and Mortier had fought in vain outside the barriers. The people within had neither the means nor the inclination to defend themselves.

While this final struggle was proceeding in the north, Wellington was making head against Soult in the south. On the 27th of February was fought the battle of Orthez. Soult was beaten, and was pursued to the Adour. His losses in fight were great, but desertion thinned his ranks more extensively than the charges of the English bayonets. The conscripts threw away their arms. The spirit of the French was broken, for their enthusiasm had long ceased to be national, and the pride of conquest had faded away since the charm had been broken. On the 8th of March two divisions of the army of Wellington were to occupy Bordeaux, which was laid open by the battle of Orthez. When Marshal Beresford marched to that city, his prudent chief gave him especial caution not to commit himself to any premature adoption of the cause of the Bourbons. These were Wellington's words on the 7th of March: "If they should ask you for your consent to proclaim Louis XVIII., to hoist the white standard, etc., you will state that the British nation and their allies wish well to Louis XVIII.; and as long as the public peace is preserved where our troops are stationed, we shall not interfere to prevent that party from doing what may be deemed most for its interest: nay, further, that I am prepared to assist any party that may show itself inclined to aid us in getting the better of Bonaparte. That the object of the allies, however, in the war, and above all in entering France, is, as is stated in my proclamation, peace; and that it is well known that the allies are now engaged in negotiating a treaty with Bonaparte. That however I might be inclined to aid and support any set of people against Bonaparte while at war, I could give them no further aid when peace should be concluded; and I beg the inhabitants will weigh this matter well before they raise a standard against the government of Bonaparte, and involve themselves in hostilities." †

Soult had retreated to Toulouse. On the 9th of April Wellington crossed the Garonne. On the 10th he attacked Soult in his intrenched camp on a range of heights on the eastern side of the city. It was a battle in which the two great commanders put forth all their strength against each other, with no adequate results for the loss of eight thousand men. It was a useless battle, for the war was ended. The senate had declared that Napoleon had forfeited the throne. A provisional government had been formed. The Emperor of the French had abdicated on the 4th of April. The Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia had been in Paris four days. National guards were not there to make a last desperate effort for national independence. The fickle Parisians shouted with white cockades in their hats, and ladies from every window waved white handkerchiefs, as Alexander and Frederick William rode slowly along the boulevards. Soult has been unjustly accused of having fought at Toulouse, out of mere pride and obstinacy, when he knew that the fate of Napoleon was decided. Wellington in the House of Lords absolved him from the odious charge that he knew of the abdication. News did not then travel quickly to the French provinces. There was then no uninterrupted line of railways from the Seine to the Garonne.

But was any one of those conflicts useless, which Wellington had sustained so gloriously since he passed the Nive in the beginning of December? Was there any one of that series of battles and marches without a sensible effect upon the great issue of the war? Wellington was as effectually fighting against Bonaparte as if he had met him face to face upon the heights of Montmartre. The tyranny would have been far more difficult to put down—it would have been perhaps impossible even to limit its range—had not Wellington held two of France's greatest generals in check, with their large number of fighting men, in the south, while Blücher and Schwarzenberg were engaged in a very difficult struggle with the masterly strategy of Napoleon in the north. If Soult and Suchet had been free to fly to the relief of their emperor, in all probability he would not have set out on his journey to Fréjus on the 20th of April, there to embark for the island of Elba, of which he was to be the ruler in full sovereignty. It was a change from the magnificent empire which he might have possessed in peace, had his mind been of that lofty character which "makes ambition virtue." He stood upon one of the hills of Elba, and could behold at once the whole extent of his sea-girt dominions. "Ah," said he, "it must be confessed that my island is somewhat small."

On the 23d of April, three days after Napoleon had left Fontainebleau, a convention between Count d'Artois and the allied powers was signed at Paris, by which it was stipulated that all hostilities should cease, that the foreign armies should evacuate the French territory, and that the boundaries of France should be the same as on the 1st of January, 1792. On the 3d of May Louis the Eighteenth entered Paris. "Vive le Roi!" was shouted as loudly for the unwarlike king as "Vive l'Empereur!" had been shouted during ten years for the magnificent conqueror. Louis was to give the French a representative government. His was not to be so showy a career as that which looked to the glory of accomplishing the universal monarchy. The peace of Paris between France and the allied powers was ratified on the 30th of May. A congress to be held at Vienna was to confirm its conditions, and to reorganize Europe.

There were three months of public joy in England, such as never had been witnessed—we will not say in a generation or in the memory of man, but to parallel which we must look back to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when Henry the Fifth rode into London after the battle of Agincourt, and Elizabeth went in a chariot to St. Paul's to return thanks for the destruction of the armada. The weather was of extraordinary beauty. The spring had put forth its earliest blossoms, when intelligence reached London that the allied armies were in Paris, and that Napoleon had abdicated. There were illuminations for three nights. Most men said, with Wilberforce, "This hath God done." * Some, and those of the most temperate, were, with Horner, "of the small minority of those who dread the consequences of the restoration of the Bourbons." † Others, stronger in their opinions, thought, as Robert Hall thought after Waterloo, that these events had "put back the clock of the world six degrees." ‡

* "Correspondence with Joseph," vol. ii. p. 258.
† "Dispatches," vol. xi. p. 557.

* Letter in "Life." April 9th, vol. iv.
† "Memoirs," vol. i., 25th of February.
‡ "Works," vol. i. p. 170.

A few, even more extreme in their views, said, with Sir Robert Wilson, "The good old cause, as it is called, triumphs. Its insignia of victory are the fetters of tyranny and superstition. The power of Bonaparte could, at the farthest, not have continued more than thirty years. Death assured the termination of his iron rule at that period." * The question is, Were not the unreflecting multitude right? They shouted at the top of their voices when Louis the Eighteenth made his solemn entry into London, previous to his departure for France on the 23d of April, when the prince regent accompanied him to Dover. They shouted with redoubled ardor on the 7th of June, when the Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia had arrived in the capital, endeavoring to be private, but hearing from their residences the tumultuous greetings of a people who had never been accustomed to restrain their feelings. The first public assemblage to which they went was Ascot races. They saw the English in their holiday garb, and they thought that there was no poverty in the land. They had a day's respite from ceremonial. † Then came the grandeur. Degrees conferred at Oxford, in which Blücher was included—a speech in Latin, and recitations in Greek. Civic banquets in London followed; then grand reviews; and after three weeks of feasting and uproar, a return to the continent, to see how the Peace of Paris was to be best worked for their individual advantage. Dumouriez, who had seen the beginning of this crisis, but had not quite seen the end, wrote to Wilberforce, "We must wait till the bustle is past to behold men wise, and to hear them speak reasonably." ‡ There was one public demonstration which the coldest reasoning could not despise. The Duke of Wellington landed at Dover on the 28th of June, and he was borne on the shoulders of the men of Kent to his inn. The conqueror was uplifted, like an ancient hero upon his shield.

There was a more solemn recognition of the feelings of the nation for which Wellington had fought, which he had perhaps saved by his sagacity and endurance. The House of Commons resolved upon an address of thanks and congratulation. He was to be thanked and congratulated by a committee of fifteen members, as in the case of the Duke of Marlborough. He expressed his desire to come to the house in person, and there to tender the expression of his gratitude. He came on the 1st of July. The house was crowded. The lobby was filled. Universal huzzas were heard as he approached. As he came within the bar the whole house rose. A seat was put for him, and the members resumed their places. Modestly, as was the nature of the man, he expressed his gratitude. They had animated his exertions by their applause; they had filled up the measure of their favors by conferring upon him the noblest gift that any subject had ever received. The confidence of the government, his own reliance on the support of his gallant friends, the general officers of the army, and on the bravery of his officers and troops—these had enabled him to carry on the operations of the war, so as to acquire the approbation for which he now made his humble acknowledgments. Then the speaker stood up and said:

"My lord: Since last I had the honor of addressing you from this place a series of eventful years has elapsed, but none without some mark and note of your rising glory.

"The military triumphs which your valor has achieved upon the banks of the Douro and the Tagus, of the Ebro and the Garonne, have called forth the spontaneous shouts of admiring nations. These triumphs it is needless on this day to recount; their names have been written by your conquering sword in the annals of Europe, and we shall hand them down with exultation to our children's children.

"It is not, however, the grandeur of military success which has alone fixed our admiration or commanded our applause. It has been that generous and lofty spirit which inspired your troops with unbounded confidence, and taught them to know that the day of battle was always a day of victory; that moral courage and enduring fortitude which, in perilous times, when gloom and doubt had beset ordinary minds, stood nevertheless unshaken; and that ascendency of character which, uniting the energies of jealous and rival nations, enabled you to wield at will the fate and fortunes of mighty empires.

"For the repeated thanks and grants bestowed upon you by this house, in gratitude for your many and eminent services, you have thought fit this day to offer us your acknowledgments. But this nation well knows that it is still largely your debtor. It owes to you the proud satisfaction that amid the constellation of great and illustrious warriors who have recently visited our country, we could present to them a leader of our own, to whom all, by common acclamation, conceded the pre-eminence; and when the will of Heaven and the common destinies of our nature shall have swept away the present generation, you will have left your great name and example as an imperishable monument exciting others to like deeds of glory, and serving at once to adorn, defend, and perpetuate the existence of this country among the ruling nations of the earth.

"It now remains only that we congratulate your grace upon the high and important mission on which you are about to proceed; and we doubt not that the same splendid talents, so conspicuous in war, will maintain with equal authority, firmness, and temper our national honor and interests in peace."

* "Private Journal," May, 1810, vol. ii. p. 363.

† The author of this history, then at the height of a young man's excitement, went early to the course, and observed a melancholy-looking foreigner walking alone before the arrival of the regent's cavalcade, and having bought a roll and a piece of cheese at a booth, was munching it with satisfaction. In half an hour he was in the royal stand—the King of Prussia.

‡ "Life of Wilberforce," vol. ii. p. 172.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF TREATIES.

(Continued from page 1040.)

1802 June 25: Definitive treaty between France and the Ottoman Porte.
1802 September 11: Piedmont united to France.
1803 March 14: Hostilities renewed between Great Britain and France.
1803 May 18: War declared by Great Britain against France.
1803 June 17: Great Britain declared war against the Republic of Batavia.
1803 August 1: A treaty ratified between Great Britain and Sweden.
1804 December 12: Spain declared war against Great Britain.
1805 January 24: War declared against Spain by Great Britain.
1805 April 8: The *Treaty of Petersburg* entered into for a third coalition against France, England and Russia being the contracting parties.
1805 August 9: The Emperor of Austria acceded to the Treaty of Petersburg.
1805 August 31: An alliance, offensive and defensive, entered into at Beekaskog, between Great Britain and Sweden.
1805 September 8: *Third Coalition* against France, the parties being Great Britain, Russia, Austria, Sweden, and Naples.
1805 September 21: A treaty of neutrality signed between France and Naples.
1805 December 26: *Peace of Presburg* between France and Austria, by which the ancient states of Venice were ceded to Italy; the Principality of Eichstett, part of the bishopric of Passau, the city of Augsburg, the Tyrol, all the possessions of Austria in Suabia, in Brisgau, and Ortenau, were transferred to the Elector of Bavaria and the Duke of Würtemberg, who, as well as the Duke of Baden, were then created kings by Napoleon; the independence of the Helvetic Republic was also stipulated for.
1806 April 7: War between Great Britain and Prussia.
1806 July 12: The Germanic *Confederation of the Rhine* formed under the auspices of Napoleon.
1806 July 20: *Peace of Paris* between France and Russia, which Alexander subsequently refused to ratify.
1806 August 1: The treaty of the 12th July notified to the Diet at Ratisbon, when German princes seceded from the Germanic empire, and placed themselves under the protection of Napoleon.
1806 October 6: The *Fourth Coalition* formed against France, by Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, and Saxony.
1806 November 21: The *Berlin Decree*, issued by Bonaparte after the battle of Jena, declaring the British Islands in a state of blockade, and interdicting the whole world from any communication with them.
1806 November 28: War declared against France by Russia.
1806 December 11: A treaty of peace and alliance signed at Cosen, between Napoleon and the Elector of Saxony, who then assumed the title of king.
1806 December 17: War declared against Russia by Turkey.
1806 December 31: A treaty of commerce entered into between Great Britain and the United States of America, which the latter state afterward refused to ratify.
1807 July 2: The President of the United States ordered all British ships to evacuate the ports of America, in consequence of the capture of the Chesapeake by an English ship-of-war.
1807 July 7: *Peace of Tilsit* concluded between France and Russia, when Napoleon restored to the Prussian monarch one half of his territories, and Russia recognized the Confederation of the Rhine, and the elevation of Napoleon's three brothers, Joseph, Louis, and Jerome, to the thrones of Naples, Holland, and Westphalia; this treaty was ratified on the 19th.

1807 August 16 : A Danish declaration published against Great Britain.
1807 October 8 : The Prince Regent of Portugal ordered all his ports to be shut against the British, which order was speedily revoked, and on the French approaching Lisbon, he embarked, on November 27th, for the Brazils.
1807 October 31 : A treaty of alliance entered into between France and Denmark.
1807 November 1 : Russia declared war against England.
1807 November 10 : A treaty ratified at Paris between France and Holland, whereby Flushing was ceded to the French.
1807 December 17 : *Milan Decree* issued by Napoleon ; England declared in a state of blockade.
1808 February 8 : Treaty of peace between Great Britain and Sweden.
1808 February 18 : A declaration issued by Austria breaking off all connection with England.
1808 February 29 : Denmark declared war against Sweden.
1808 March 30 : A treaty of alliance and subsidy entered into between England and Sicily, whereby the latter was to be garrisoned by 10,000 British troops, and to receive an annual subsidy of 300,000*l.*
1808 May 1 : The Regent of Portugal declared war against France.
1808 May 5 : *Treaty of Bayonne*, whereby Charles IV. ceded all his titles to Spain and its dependencies to Napoleon, expressly resigning to him the right of transmitting the crown to whomsoever he should think fitting.
1808 May : On the festival of St. Ferdinand insurrections broke out in several parts of Spain ; at Cadiz in particular.
1808 June 6 : War commenced between the Spanish insurgents and France.
1808 June 16 : Insurrection of the Portuguese at Oporto, which spread so rapidly as to occasion the evacuation of the northern provinces by the French troops.
1808 June 25 : A Spanish proclamation of peace with England and Sweden, her ally, published at Oviedo.
1808 August 30 : The *Convention of Cintra* signed, the French agreeing to evacuate Portugal.
1808 November 5 : The *Convention of Berlin* entered into, whereby Napoleon remitted to Prussia the sum due on the war debt, and withdrew his troops from many of the fortresses in order to reinforce his armies in Spain.
1809 January 5 : Peace ratified between Great Britain and the Ottoman Porte.
1809 January 14 : A treaty of alliance ratified between England and the Spanish insurgents.
1809 April 6 : War declared against the French by the Austrians.
1809 April 9 : The *Fifth Coalition* against France by Great Britain and Austria.
1809 May 3 : Russia declared war against Austria.
1809 July 25 : Armistice between Sweden and Norway.
1809 September 17 : A treaty of peace signed between Russia and Sweden.
1809 October 14 : *Peace of Vienna*, between France and Austria ; Austria ceding to France the Tyrol, Dalmatia, and other territories, which were shortly afterward declared to be united to France under the title of the Illyrian provinces, and engaging to adhere to the prohibitory system adopted toward England by France and Russia.
1810 January 6 : *Peace of Paris*, between France and Sweden, whereby Swedish Pomerania and the island of Rugen were given up to the Swedes, who agreed to adopt the French prohibitory system against Great Britain.
1810 February 19 : Treaties of alliance and commerce signed between Great Britain and the Brazils.
1810 April 13 : Sweden interdicts all commerce with England.
1810 April 19 : The South American provinces of Caraccas, etc., form a federative government, under the title of the federation of Venezuela.
1810 May 1 : All French and English vessels prohibited from entering the ports of the United States.
1810 May 29 : The Dey of Algiers declared war against France.
1810 July 9 : Holland incorporated with France on the abdication of Louis Bonaparte.
1810 November 19 : Sweden declared war against Great Britain.
1812 March 14 : Treaty of alliance signed at Paris between France and Austria.
1812 March 24 : Treaty of alliance, signed at St. Petersburg, between Bernadotte, Prince Royal of Sweden, and the Emperor Alexander ; the former agreeing to join in the campaign against France, in return for which Sweden was to receive Norway.
1812 April 1 : The Berlin Decree revoked as far as respected America.
1812 May 28 : Preliminaries of peace ratified at Bucharest between Russia and Turkey, it being stipulated that the Pruth should form the boundary of those empires.
1812 June 18 : The United States of America declare war against Great Britain.
1812 June 22 : Napoleon, having assembled an immense army in Western Prussia, declared war against Russia.
1812 July 6 : A treaty of peace between Great Britain and Sweden ratified at Orebo.
1812 July 20 : Treaty signed between the Emperor Alexander and the Regency of Cadiz, in the name of Ferdinand the Seventh of Spain.
1812 August 1 : Treaty of peace and union ratified at St. Petersburg between Great Britain and Russia, renewing their ancient relations of friendship and commerce.
1813 January 25 : *Concordat at Fontainebleau*, between Napoleon and Pius VII.
1813 March 1 : The *Sixth Coalition* entered into between Russia and Prussia against France, the treaty being ratified at Kalisch.
1813 March 3 : The *Treaty of Stockholm* entered into between England and Sweden.
1813 April 1 : France declared war against Prussia.
1813 June 14 : A treaty of alliance concluded between Great Britain, Russia, and Prussia.
1813 July 8 : The *Convention of Peterswalden* took place between Great Britain and Russia.
1813 July 10 : A reciprocal treaty of alliance and guaranty entered into between France and Denmark, ratified at Copenhagen.
1813 September 3 : War declared by Denmark against Sweden.
1813 September 9 : A triple *Treaty of Alliance* ratified at *Töplitz* between Russia, Austria, and Prussia.
1813 October 3 : A preliminary treaty of alliance signed at *Töplitz*, between Austria and Great Britain.
1813 December 8 : *Treaty of Valençay*, between Napoleon and Ferdinand the Seventh of Spain, whereby the latter was put in full possession of that kingdom, on agreeing to maintain its integrity.
1814 January 14 : *Treaty of Kiel*, between Great Britain, Sweden, and Denmark. Norway ceded to Sweden.
1814 February 5 : The Cortes of Spain renounce the treaty ratified at Valençay.
1814 February 5 : Congress of Chatillon between the four great powers allied against France, at which Caulaincourt attended on the part of France. The congress broke up on the 19th of March.
1814 March 1 : *Treaty of Chaumont* between Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia.
1814 April 11 : The *Treaty of Paris* ratified on the part of Napoleon and the allies, by which Napoleon renounced his sovereignty over France, etc., stipulating that the island of Elba should be his domain and residence for life, with a suitable provision for himself and Maria Louisa, who was to have vested in her the Duchies of Parma and Placentia , the same to descend to her son.
1814 April 23 : A convention signed at Paris between the Count d'Artois on the one part, and the allied powers on the other, stipulating that all hostilities should cease by land and sea ; that the confederated armies should evacuate the French territory, leaving its boundaries the same as they were on the 1st of January, 1792.
1814 May 30 : *Peace of Paris* ratified between France and the allied powers, in a supplemental article, of which Louis XVIII. stipulated that he would exert his endeavors with the continental powers to insure the abolition of the slave trade, in conjunction with Great Britain.
1814 July 20 : A treaty of peace signed between France and Spain at Paris, confirming the stipulations of previous treaties which had existed on the 1st of January, 1792.
1814 July 26 : Norway and Sweden commence hostilities. Norway opposing her separation from Denmark, but eventually submitting in the following August.
1814 August 13 : Convention between Great Britain and the Sovereign Prince of the Low Countries respecting the Dutch colonies.
1814 September 28 : A convention ratified at Vienna, whereby Saxony was placed under the control of Prussia.
1814 December 24 : *Peace of Ghent* between Great Britain and the United States of America.

CHAPTER CCIX.

War with the United States—Federal government—States composing the Federal Union—The Democratic party—War declared—Remonstrance of Massachusetts — Popular violence — Extravagant hopes—Effects of the war upon American commerce—Cotton — Two invasions of Canada defeated—Employment of Indians by the British—Naval successes of the Americans—Larger build of the American frigates—The single combat of the Shannon and the Chesapeake—Campaigns in Canada—Barbarous system of warfare —American difficulties—Threats of secession by New England States — Prophetic fears of Jefferson—Peninsular troops sent to America—Attack upon Washington—Non-warlike buildings destroyed—Failure of Sir John Prevost at Plattsburg—Sir Edward Pakenham's attack on New Orleans—His defeat and death—Retreat of the British—The war ended by the news of the peace of Ghent.

THE diary of Mr. Abbot, the speaker, for the month of March, 1815, contains brief but remarkable entries which may suggest some-

notion of the agitation of the public mind when the news came of two most unexpected and untoward events.

"March 8th.—News arrived this day of the failure of the attack on New Orleans, and the loss of General Pakenham, General Gibbs, and 2500 men killed and wounded."

"March 10th.—News arrived of Bonaparte having escaped from Elba, and landing at Antibes, with 1000 men."

The second startling piece of intelligence, following so close upon the announcement of a great defeat of the British army in America, might have suggested to many a belief that the treaty of peace and amity between Great Britain and the United States, signed at Ghent on the 24th of December, had not been ratified; that the escape of Bonaparte had been anticipated by his democratic friends in America; and that a war in both hemispheres would make the peace as perishable as "The Temple of Concord," splendid with lamps and fireworks for a few hours, upon which the people had gazed in the Green Park on the night of the 1st of August. The peace of Ghent had nevertheless been duly ratified. In the days before steam communication, news from Europe did not reach the United States in less than seven or eight weeks. Fort Mobile, at one of the mouths of the Mississippi, had been surrendered to the British on the 11th of February. The news of the conclusion of peace between the plenipotentiaries at Ghent was received in the States on the 14th of February.

We now propose, as intimated in our previous volume, to review the progress of this unhappy war with the United States.* To render this narrative more intelligible, we shall take a brief view of the position of the union at the period of the rupture with Great Britain, in June, 1812.

The Federal government as then constituted, and as still subsisting, entered upon its functions in 1789. On the 21st of February, 1787, Congress had declared that it was unable to conduct the government under the articles of the first confederation of 1777. Each of the thirteen States had then its separate legislature, each being, in fact, an independent republic assuming an absolute sovereignty. There was no sufficient central authority to act for the whole of the States as composing one nation. An assembly of fifty-five members, with Washington as its president, framed the second constitution, by which the authority is divided between the Federal government and the States. The object aimed at was that each State should continue to govern itself in whatever concerned its internal affairs, but that the union should represent one compact body, providing for the general exigencies of the people. The constitution did not attempt to prescribe the government of the separate States, each of which had its own constitution. The nature and duties of the Federal government were defined with an exactness which shows how comprehensive was the prevision of the able men who drew up the articles which during a very long period maintained so many conflicting interests in tolerable harmony. The Federal government was endowed with legislative, executive, and judicial powers. All legislative authority was vested in a Congress of the United States, consisting of a Senate and a House of Representatives. The Senate was composed of two members from each State, whether large or small. The House of Representatives was composed of a varying number from each State according to the amount of population. With the Congress abided the power of raising an army and navy, of declaring war, of making peace, of levying taxes for the common defence and welfare of the United States. The executive power was vested in an elective President of the United States, who, in some particulars, was to act under the advice and with the consent of the Senate. The judicial power of the Federal government was vested in one supreme court, in district courts, and in circuit courts.

The sovereignty of the people, which had been nurtured among the original settlers, became the guiding principle of the revolution which established the independence of America. The most conspicuous leaders of that revolution were men of old family and of competent fortunes; but the democratic element, progressively increasing in power, gradually weakened and finally destroyed the influence derived from property and from ancient associations. The English laws of entail enabled estates, especially in Virginia, to be transmitted from generation to generation. Estates tail were abolished in Virginia in 1776; in other States the English entail laws were wholly suppressed, and in others were greatly modified. The desire for free circulation of property, in accordance with the general principles of equality which pervaded the American government, caused the rejection of the English laws respecting descent. "If a man dies intestate his property goes to his heirs in a direct line. If he has but one heir or heiress, he or she succeeds to the whole. If there are several heirs of the same degree, they divide the inheritance equally among them, without distinction of sex." *

In 1790 the Federal Union comprised the New England States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut; the Middle States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland; the Southern States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. Vermont had been added to the original federation of thirteen States—indicated by the stripes of the American flag. These States, with about 100,000 settlers in Tennessee and Kentucky, had, in 1790, according to the census, a population of about four millions; in 1800 the population was nearly five and a half millions; in 1810 it was nearly seven and a half millions. The rate of increase in twenty years was very large in the States composing the union in 1790; but a million of people had been added in 1810 by the families that had penetrated into the wilds of the west and south-west. Communities rose up, in regions almost unknown to the founders of the American Republic, to claim their place in the union as independent States, having a sufficient amount of population to entitle them to that distinction. Kentucky was admitted to the union in 1792; Tennessee in 1796; Ohio in 1803. Louisiana, which had been purchased from France in 1803, became a member of the federation in 1812. These States added largely to the democratic element in the government. In 1790 there were nearly 700,000 slaves in the union; in 1800 they approached 900,000; in 1810 they amounted to nearly 1,200,000. Of the old States, the four southern, with Maryland, contained almost exclusively the slave population. The colored race were soon abundantly found among the swarms of the new Western States, particularly in Kentucky and Tennessee. In the ratio of representatives to population, three fifths of the slaves were added to the whole number of free persons in each State. The slaves, uncared for by legislation, augmented the legislative power of the slave-owners. Universal suffrage had one exception—"Blacks excluded."

Such was the community that, in 1812, declared war against Great Britain.

John Adams, the second President of the United States, was elected upon the retirement of Washington after his eight years' service, at the end of 1796. According to the American constitution, the president might be once re-elected on the expiration of his first term of four years. Adams was not so re-elected, although he had filled the office of vice-president for eight years under Washington. Each of these eminent men was opposed to the extreme Democratic party, of which Jefferson was the most distinguished representative. The contest between the Federalists and the Democrats was the most violent that the union had beheld, and it ended by the election of Jefferson as president by a majority of one vote of the electoral body. Jefferson himself described this event of 1801 as a pacific revolution, as real as that of 1776—a revolution not in the form of the powers, but in the principles of the government, which had compelled the vessel of the state to float out of the monarchical current in which a faction, as if possessed—a faction composed of Anglicized royalists and aristocrats—had detained it during the sleep of the people. The revolution of 1801, he held, had carried the vessel of the state into its natural course—the Republican and Democratic course.†

During the presidency of Washington it was with great difficulty that he could prevent the sympathies of the people with republican France from plunging America into a war with England. There had been a French and an English party since the union of the States in 1789. It is pointed out as remarkable, that most of the veterans who bore arms against England during the revolution had become of the English party. This party included the majority of the wealthy and the educated. But the universality of suffrage more and more com-

* *Ante*, vol. vii. p. 1084.

* Kent's "Commentaries," quoted in De Tocqueville, "Democracy in America," vol. i. p. 283.

† Cornelis de Witt, "Thomas Jefferson, Étude Historique," Paris, 1861.

pelled every candidate for power to become the partisan of France. * When the Democratic party became supreme under Jefferson from 1801 to 1809, and afterward under James Madison, although it might have been conceived that the despotism of the consulate and the empire would have revolted the genuine friends of liberty, the commercial derangements arising out of Bonaparte's Milan and Berlin decrees were tenderly dealt with, while the results of the counter-measures of the British orders in council created in the majority an exclusive bitterness of feeling against this country. † The injuries inflicted upon American commerce by the decrees of Napoleon called forth no warlike manifestation of American resentment. The orders in council of England, in connection with the assertion of our claim to a right of search for British sailors in American trading vessels, produced a hostile message to Congress of the American president on the 1st of June, 1812. This was the prologue to the act of the 18th of June of the Senate and House of Representatives, by which war was declared "to exist between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the dependencies thereof, and the United States of America and their territories." Five days after the date of this declaration of war, and before the message of Madison could have been known in England, our government had unconditionally suspended the orders in council as regarded America. A conditional revocation of the orders had appeared in the "London Gazette" of the 3d of April. This holding out the hand of fellowship did not produce a corresponding demonstration. The great Democratic party were bent upon war. ‡

To attempt to arrive at an impartial estimate of facts from the counterpleas of two parties in a civil cause, is a very difficult and unsatisfactory task. To judge between two angry nations by the accusations and recriminations of their manifestoes, would be an attempt still more embarrassing to the historian. The message of the American president of the 1st of June is such an ex-parte manifesto; § the declaration of the prince regent, relative to the causes and origin of the war with America, of the 9th of January, 1813, is a state paper of a similar character.‖ There is, however, a very remarkable document of American origin, which, although coming from a community whose interests were deeply opposed to the war, may furnish some evidence to test the value of the rival pleas of the two belligerent governments. ¶ On the 14th of June, 1813, the legislature of the State of Massachusetts addressed a remonstrance to the Senate and Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, in which it was contended that "the promptness with which Great Britain hastened to repeal her orders, before the declaration of war by the United States was made known to her, and the restoration of an immense amount of property, then within her power, can leave but little doubt that the war, on our part, was premature; and still less, that the perseverance in it, after that repeal was known, was improper, impolitic, and unjust." The legislature of Massachusetts maintained that the United States had never induced Great Britain to believe that the impressment of her own seamen on board of American ships was a reasonable ground of war. It held that the evil of impressment had been grossly exaggerated **; and that an honest and fair proposal to exclude the subjects of Great Britain from the American service would have produced an honorable and advantageous arrangement of the whole question. The prince regent, in his declaration, avers that the complete subserviency of the government of the United States to the ruler of France was the real cause of the war; that "from their common origin, from their common interests, and from their professed principles of freedom and independence, the United States was the last power in which Great Britain could have expected to find a willing instrument and abettor of French tyranny." The remonstrance of the legislature of Massachusetts echoes this charge in words of glowing eloquence: "If war must have been the portion of these United States; if they were destined by Providence to march the downward road to slavery, through foreign conquest and military usurpation; your remonstrants regret that such a moment and such an occasion should have been chosen for the experiment; that while the oppressed nations of Europe are making a magnanimous and glorious effort against the common enemy of free states, we alone, the descendants of the Pilgrims, sworn foes to civil and religious slavery, should voluntarily co-operate with the oppressor to bind other nations in his chains."

The policy of Jefferson during the eight years of his presidency, and that of Madison during the first three years of his tenure of office, was not to draw the sword against either of the two great belligerents who interfered with the peaceful course of American commerce by their decrees and counter decrees. Their weapons were embargoes and tariffs. Gradually the war party in the States became irresistible. Six months only were wanting to the completion of the term of Madison's presidency; he would not be re-elected if he did not yield to the popular voice, whose passionate expression, in the slave States especially, was no evidence against its real strength. In a mixed government the violence of the multitude has a counterpoise in the sagacity and prudence of the more educated classes. In America, when two generals, friends of Washington, who had advocated peace, were conveyed to prison to shelter them from the mob, and when the mob broke open the prison fractured the skull of one, and killed another on the spot, the lesson was very intelligible to waverers between war and peace. Jefferson himself dreaded going to war, because "the licentious and lying character of our journals, but more than this, the marvellous credulity with which the members of Congress received every current lie," would produce constant embarrassment to the government in the conduct of the war. The newspapers had become a new power in the federation, "indispensable to the existence of freedom, and nearly incompatible with the maintenance of public order." * Yet their rapid and excessive multiplication had neutralized their influence. In 1775 there were 37 newspapers in the thirteen States; in 1810 there were 358 in the union. Jefferson, however "Quaker" was his general policy, looked upon the probable issue of the war of 1812 with an almost childish confidence. The United States had only to create a marine to free the seas from the ascendency of Great Britain. Upon American ground they would be irresistible. The invasion of Canada would be only a march. To carry Halifax would be merely an affair of a few months. New York might be burned by the British fleet, but could not the government of the union, in its turn, cause London to be burned by English mercenaries, easily recruited from a starving, corrupt population? No truce, no intermission, before Canada was obtained as an indemnity for a thousand ships seized by British cruisers, and for six thousand seamen carried off by impressment. No sheathing the sword before full security for the future was obtained for every man sailing under the American flag. All this accomplished—peace with Great Britain, and war with France. Such were the dreams of the man who drew the first Declaration of Independence, and who believed that nothing was beyond the power of a democratic government. † The warlike impulses of this democracy were sensibly mitigated by the sudden pressure of taxation for the general purposes of the Federal government, in addition to the local taxation of each State. In the four years ended 1811 the expenditure upon the military and naval establishments was about 24 millions of dollars. In the four years ended 1815 they had reached 102 millions of dollars. The public debt had been more than doubled between 1813 and 1816, as compared with the four previous years.

The injurious effects to the commerce of both countries which resulted from the British Orders in Council, the American Embargo Acts, and the war, are manifest in the returns of exports of British produce to the United States, and of the total exports from American ports to all countries. In 1807 the United States imported nearly twenty-nine millions of pounds' worth of foreign merchandise, and exported twenty-two millions and a half of home and foreign produce. In 1811 the imports and the exports were less by one half. In

* Simond, "Tour in Great Britain," vol. i. p. 329.
† *Ante*, vol. vii. p. 1066.
‡ *Ante*, vol. vii. p. 1084.
§ "Annual Register" for 1812, p. 424.
‖ Hansard, vol. xxiv. p. 363.
¶ "Annual Register," 1813, p. 409 (State Papers).
** Simond says that one half of the crews of American ships were British seamen, having false protections, and yet not one in a hundred was impressed. He himself owned twenty-four American vessels, and had not ten sailors impressed out of them during the war, although a great number were British-born. ("Tour," vol. i. p. 334.)

* De Tocqueville, vol. ii. p. 20.
† These opinions are supported by a reference to five letters of Jefferson, of January, June, and August, 1812, to be found in "Works of Jefferson," vol. vi. See De Witt, "Thomas Jefferson," p. 356.

1814 the total imports from all parts of the world amounted only to 2,700,000*l.*, and the total exports to 1,440,000*l.* The internal resources of America were indeed very great, in her unlimited amount of territory, in the adventurous industry of her people, and in the rapid multiplication of the communications between the several States. In 1790 there were under 2000 miles of post routes, with 75 post-offices. In 1815 there were nearly 44,000 miles of post routes, with 3000 post-offices. But the American population would never have quadrupled in half a century without the stimulus of foreign commerce. The great cotton cultivation of the Southern States was at the period of this war very imperfectly developed, and their slave population was consequently less identified with the ruthless tyranny of the demand for labor than with the milder servitude under the original planters. It might have been supposed that the interruption of our cotton supply by the war of 1812 would have produced an essential derangement of that great branch of our manufacturing industry which had enabled us in a considerable degree to support the pressure of the continental war. But at that period the imports of American cotton were comparatively trifling. The first arrival of cotton wool from America was one bag from Charleston delivered at Liverpool in 1785. In 1791 only 2,000,000 lbs. of cotton were grown in the United States; in 1801 the crop was about 40,000,000 lbs.; in 1811 the crop was estimated at 80,000,000 lbs. The exports of cotton, which had been 62,000,000 lbs. in 1811 were reduced to 28,000,000 lbs. in 1812, and to 19,000,000 lbs. in 1813 When we compare these figures with the 961,707,264 lbs. of raw cotton imported into the United Kingdom from the United States in the year ending 31st of December, 1859, we may estimate the danger and difficulty of a diminished supply now, as compared with the period when the commercial intercourse of the two countries was wholly suspended, except through the extensive operation of that contraband trade which no blockade or embargo could prevent.* It is a singular fact, as showing the notions of commercial policy which prevailed at that period in the legislative mind, that Earl Darnley, in the House of Lords, on May 14th, 1813, complained that "American cotton, on a system that could not be too severely reprobated, had, until lately, been allowed to be imported, to the great detriment of our own colonies, and to the great advantage of the territory of our enemies." † The cotton spinners of York at that time addressed a petition to the House of Commons, in which they said, that having learned that petitions had been presented to the house in favor of a prohibition on the exportation of cotton-wool, the growth of America, they prayed the house not to adopt any measures which could assist the efforts of foreign nations to supplant our cotton manufacture, and which would prove the entire ruin of the trade of the petitioners.‡

In the remonstrance of Massachusetts the Congress is asked, "Must we add another example to the catalogue of republics which have been ruined by a spirit of foreign conquests? . . . Were not the territories of the United States sufficiently extensive before the annexation of Louisiana, the projected reduction of Canada, and the seizure of West Florida?" Within a fortnight after the declaration of war, the American General Hull set out for the invasion of Canada with a force of 2800 men. On the 12th of July he crossed the River Detroit, and captured the small open town of Sandwich. From this place he issued a proclamation threatening a war of extermination if the savages were employed in resisting his advance. The English commander, Major-General Brock, had, however, collected a force of 700 British regulars and militia, and 600 Indians, with which he repulsed Hull in three attempts against Fort Amherstburg, and compelled him to recross the river to Detroit. On the 16th of August Hull capitulated with 2500 men to Brock and his little army. A second attempt to invade Upper Canada was made by the American General Wadsworth, who, on the 13th of October, carried Queenstown with a large force. In the defence of Queenstown General Brock, the gallant English commander, fell; but reinforcements of English troops having arrived, Wadsworth was totally defeated, and surrendered with 900 men. At the time of Hull's capitulation to Brock, the American fort in the small island of Michillimackinac was taken by a force of English, of Canadians, and of Indians.

The employment of Indians in the first American war had aroused the eloquent wrath of Chatham, when he exclaimed, "Who is the man who will dare to authorize and associate to our arms the tomahawk and scalping-knife of the savage?" Not only American but English writers denounce their employment in the war of 1812 as a stain upon our national reputation. Certainly it is to be apprehended that whenever the Indians were acting in detached bodies, as allies of the British and Canadians, their warfare was marked by the reckless destruction of life and property, and by their accustomed cruelty to the vanquished enemy. It is not clear, however, that the charge is unexceptionably just that the British brought into the conflict "savages of too low an order to be under military command."* It is but fair to state that in the last dispatch of General Brock, addressed to Sir George Prevost, governor in chief of the British Provinces of North America, he says, that many of the Indian nations had been engaged in active warfare with the United States, notwithstanding the constant endeavors of the British government to dissuade them from it; that from the breaking out of the war they took a most active part; and that they were led in the attack upon Hull at Detroit by an English colonel and an English captain. "Nothing," adds General Brock, "could exceed their order and steadiness. A few prisoners were taken by them during the advance, whom they treated with every humanity. Such was their forbearance and attention to what was required of them, that the enemy sustained no other loss in men than what was occasioned by the fire of our battery." † This might have been an exceptional case, in which the common ferocity of Indian warfare might have been controlled by one of the most honorable and the most lamented of the British officers in America. The savages fighting under him cannot be described as of "too low an order to be under military command." The British authorities undoubtedly put arms into the hands of the Indian chiefs when the war broke out. The crime was not in arming these daring warriors, with the intent to bring them under the common subjection of the soldier to his officer, but in leaving them when they were armed to their own uncontrolled action, in which "forbearance" would have been accounted by them weakness and not virtue.

The early successes of our land forces could scarcely have been expected. The number of regular British troops in Canada was about 4500 men; the militia of the two provinces was not more in number. The American regular army was equally small. But the prowess of the American militia had been capable in the former war of gaining victories over the disciplined troops of Burgoyne and Cornwallis. The politicians of London were surprised at the victories of 1812. They saw a great host of the militia of the Northern States ready to fight with the warlike enthusiasm of democratic populations. They were unacquainted with the philosophical demonstration, "that when a democratic people engages in a war after a long peace, it incurs much more risk of defeat than any other nation." The first successes of our armies in America begat a confidence that the duration of the war would be attended with similar triumphs. There was surprise when our troops in Canada were beaten. There was universal indignation when, in the last year of the war, the choicest of the Peninsular troops were routed at New Orleans. It was not understood that the chances of success for the army of a democratic people are necessarily increased by a prolonged war; and that such an army, if not ruined at first, would become the victors.‡

At the commencement of the war of 1812 the naval force of the United States consisted of four frigates and eight sloops, manned by 6000 seamen. The British navy comprised, of ships in commission for sea service, a total of 621; of these, 102 were ships of the line; of frigates, from 44 guns to 32, there were 111; of smaller frigates, sloops, gun-brigs, and cutters, there were more than 300.§ What, thought the people of this country, could the petty American navy effect against such a force? The "London Gazette," of the 6th of October, announced the capture of Detroit and the capitulation of

* For the preceding statistical facts regarding the United States at the time of the war, we have consulted "Geography of America," published by the Society for Diffusion of Useful Knowledge; Porter's "Progress of the Nation;" Macgregor's "Commercial Statistics," vol. iii.; the "English Cyclopædia," art. United States; and the "American Almanac" for 1861.

† Hansard, vol. xxvi. col. 180.

‡ Ibid., p. 203.

* H. Martineau, "Introduction to History of the Peace."

† "London Gazette," October 6th, 1812, in "Annual Register."

‡ See De Tocqueville, vol. iv. chap. xxiv.

§ See Tables to James's "Naval History."

Hull. The "London Gazette," of the 10th of October, contains a dispatch from Vice-Admiral Sawyer, inclosing "a letter from Captain Dacres, of his majesty's *late* ship Guerrière, giving an account of his having sustained a close action of near two hours, on the 19th ult., with the American frigate Constitution, of very superior force both in guns and men (of the latter almost double), when the Guerrière, being totally dismasted, she rolled so deep as to render all further efforts at the guns unavailing, and it became a duty to spare the lives of the remaining part of her valuable crew by hauling down her colors." The American frigate Constitution, which captured the Guerrière, was of 1533 tons, while the English frigate was of 1092 tons. On the 16th of October the American brig Wasp captured the British sloop Frolic, each being of 18 guns, but the American vessel much superior in tonnage. Both these small vessels were captured soon after the action by the British ship of the line Poictiers. Another disaster quickly followed the loss of the Guerrière. The British frigate Macedonian, after a most gallant fight, was captured by the American frigate United States. As in the case of the Guerrière, the tonnage of the Macedonian was nearly a third less than the tonnage of the enemy's frigate. Again, on the 29th of December, the Java, of 1092 tons, was captured by the Constitution. The British sloop Peacock, which struck to the American brig Hornet on the 14th of February, 1813, was the fifth ship of our navy, numbering 621 vessels in commission for sea service, which had hauled down its colors in engagements with four ships of that navy which comprised only four frigates and eight sloops. The people of this country were in astonishment, and almost in despair at this unexpected result. The glory of our navy had departed. "The charm of its invincibility had now been broken; its consecrated standard no longer floated victorious on the main."* France and other nations rejoiced, saying that England's maritime tyranny was at an end. The admiralty was assailed by denunciations of its incapacity and neglect. It was answered that our naval force on the American stations at the commencement of the war was in no degree insufficient; that from Halifax to the West Indies there were stationed ships seven times more powerful than the whole of the American navy. Our government was evidently ignorant of the great inequality in the comparative size of what were called American frigates. The Constitution, the United States, and the President were intended for line-of-battle ships. Although only single-decked vessels, they had the same tonnage and capacity for carrying men as the greater number of British two-deckers. They were ships of the line in disguise. The Americans no doubt knew that the captain of a British 32-gun frigate was bound to fight any single-decked ship, and that he would be liable to a court-martial if he shrank from such an engagement. Our government, which prescribed the rule, shut its eyes to the inevitable danger. Scarcely a frigate of our navy in the Atlantic was sailing with a consort. As in the outset of every other war, and too often during its continuance, the British admiralty was the slave of routine. It neither built frigates nor cut down line-of-battle ships capable of meeting these enormous American vessels called frigates. It sent the captains and crews of ordinary frigates to fight single-handed against such disparity of force. There were numerous fast two-deckers that might have been employed on the American stations, ready for meeting these vessels on equal terms. The admiralty believed that a frigate was a frigate, and ought to contend with any other frigate. The government was, in truth, too busy with the European war to pay much attention to an enemy regarded with an official feeling approaching to contempt.

Seven years only had elapsed since the glories of Trafalgar, when the British navy felt degraded and humiliated by these unforeseen triumphs of an enemy with whom that generation of seamen had never measured their strength. A spirit of emulation was quickly roused. The commanders and crews of ships in the Atlantic knew that it would not be enough to make prize of merchant vessels and sweep privateers from the seas, but that the honor of the British flag would be impaired unless some achievement could restore its old prestige. There was a captain of a frigate on the Halifax station whose chivalrous feeling prompted him to some exploit in which, with an equal enemy, he might rely upon a sound ship and upon well-trained men. Captain Broke, of the Shannon, had, by careful training, brought his crew into the highest state of efficiency. He had been long watching the frigate Chesapeake in the harbor of Boston. These frigates were of nearly equal strength in their weight of metal and their number of men. Captain Broke, in his desire to fight a duel with the American frigate, had sent away his consort, the Tenedos, and had then dispatched a courteous challenge to Captain Lawrence of the Chesapeake, in which he says: "I request you will do me the favor to meet the Shannon, ship to ship, to try the fortunes of our respective flags. All interruption shall be provided against." This challenge was sent on the 1st of June, and immediately afterward the Shannon lay to under Boston lighthouse. Captain Lawrence had not received Broke's letter when he sailed out of the harbor, followed by many seamen and other inhabitants of Boston in barges and pleasure-boats, who expected that this daring demonstration of the hostile frigate would be followed by its speedy capture. At half-past five in the afternoon the American hauled up within hail of the Englishman on the starboard side and the battle began. After two or three broadsides had been exchanged, the Chesapeake fell on board the Shannon, her mizzen chains locking in with her adversary's fore-rigging. Broke immediately ordered the two ships to be lashed together, and the select men to prepare for boarding. His own pithy narrative tells the result more effectively than any amplification. "Our gallant bands appointed to that service immediately rushed in, under their respective officers, upon the enemy's decks, driving everything before them with irresistible fury. The enemy made a desperate but disorderly resistance. The firing continued at all the gangways, and between the tops, but in two minutes' time the enemy were driven sword in hand from every post. The American flag was hauled down, and the proud old British union floated triumphant over it. In another minute they ceased firing from below, and called for quarter. The whole of this service was achieved in fifteen minutes from the commencement of the action." This single combat, fought on the anniversary of Howe's great victory, had as much effect in restoring the confidence of England in her naval arm as if an enemy's squadron had been brought captured into her ports. Captain Broke sailed off with his prize for Halifax, where Captain Lawrence, who had fought his ship with real heroism, died of his wounds, and was followed to the grave by the officers of the Shannon.

The details of the campaigns in Canada would have small interest for the present generation. The vicissitudes of this warfare, the advance of the Americans one week and their retreat the next, the skirmishes, the surprises, scarcely excited the attention of the public of this country, coming close upon the stimulating narratives of the retreat of Napoleon from Moscow, or the march of Wellington from Torres Vedras to Madrid. The battle of "Chrysler's Farm" could scarcely compete in interest with the victory of Salamanca. In 1813 the British were compelled to evacuate York (now Toronto), the capital of Upper Canada. The Americans there burned the public buildings, which act was alleged as the justification for a more memorable and more disgraceful act of retaliation by the British at Washington. In an attack upon Burlington the Americans were compelled to fall back upon Niagara, and lost a great part of their army in a series of unsuccessful actions. The British on the Detroit frontier were forced to retreat in confusion. On Lake Ontario our troops, under Sir George Prevost, were repulsed in an attack upon Sackett's Harbor. On Lake Erie the superior force of the enemy destroyed our flotilla; and the Americans, obtaining the command of the lake, became masters of Upper Canada. Ten thousand men then marched from different points upon Lower Canada, where the action near Chrysler's Farm took place, and the American army, totally routed, precipitately crossed the St. Lawrence. General Hull sustained another severe defeat on the 25th of December. In this campaign, when the American general evacuated Fort St. George, by the express orders of his government he burned the Canadian village of Newark. The order said, "The exposed part of the frontier must be protected by destroying such of the Canadian villages in its front as would best shelter the enemy during the winter." When the British troops under Colonel Murray defeated the Americans at Buffalo, that village was burned as well as the village of Black Rock, and the Indians were let loose on the surrounding country to take vengeance for the conflagration of Newark. Sir George Prevost then issued a proclama-

* Earl Darnley in the House of Lords, May 14th, 1813. (Hansard, vol. xxiv. col. 182.)

tion lamenting the necessity which had compelled these reprisals, and deprecating a continuance of so barbarous a system of warfare. His retaliation had some effect upon the Americans in putting a stop to what an officer of that government called the "new and degrading system of defence, which, by substituting the torch for the bayonet, furnished the enemy with both motive and justification for a war of retaliation."* The disgrace remained to both sides. The retaliatory spirit was strangely exhibited during this year in another form. Twenty-three prisoners of war were sent to England to be dealt with as British subjects. The American general then ordered into close confinement twenty-three British soldiers, as hostages for the safety of the twenty-three who were liable to be dealt with as traitors. Our government selected forty-six officers and non-commissioned officers—prisoners in England—to be regarded as hostages for the safety of the twenty-three prisoners in America. The affair went off with menaces, and, on an exchange of prisoners, the British who had fought against their country, and the hostages, were silently released.

The desultory, indecisive, and useless fightings in Canada had produced not the slightest effect upon the relative positions of Great Britain and America. The English, however, had learned not to underrate the courage and enterprise of their enemy; the Americans had learned that Canada could not be conquered in a day's march, and that a handful of disciplined troops might defend the country against numerous bands imperfectly organized. The naval successes of the United States were almost wholly at an end after the first year. Our government learned a little caution and providence, and gave up the false confidence that any English frigate could fight a vessel whose tonnage was as three to two. The merchant service of both countries sustained severe losses; but American commerce suffered still more from the restrictive measures of the American government. The interruption to the dealings of North and South with neutral States was so serious, that in March, 1814, the president proposed to Congress the repeal of the Embargo and Non-Importation Acts. The British government proclaimed a blockade of the whole Atlantic coast of the United States, nearly 2000 miles in extent, and abounding in harbors and navigable inlets. The president, on the 29th of June, proclaimed that such blockade was not a regular or legal blockade, as defined and recognized by the law of nations, and that it formed no lawful prohibition or obstacle to friendly and neutral vessels to trade with the United States. We have shown that in 1814 the total exports of the United States had fallen to less than a million and a half in value. The government had almost wholly lost, in the excessive falling off of imports, its great source of revenue—the customs. It resorted in 1814 to taxes on excisable articles, to licenses, and to stamps. The system of loans, coupled with the issue of treasury notes, was also adopted, and the public debt was very quickly doubled. The Democratic party was depressed and almost hopeless. Jefferson himself began to speak with bitterness of the ruin of the planters, of the weight of taxes, of the silly boasts of the press.† The personal lot of this distinguished man was truly pitiable. He said that, as for himself, this state of things would compel him to make the sacrifice of all tranquillity, of all comfort, for the rest of his days. From the total depreciation of the products which ought to procure him subsistence and independence, he should be, like Tantalus, dying of thirst, with the water up to his shoulders. The New England States began openly to complain of that preponderance of the Southern States which had forced the Union into war. Very early in the contest Massachusetts and Connecticut had refused to send their contingents to the army of the Union; and now Massachusetts proposed to confer with delegates from other New England States, "to take measures, if they think proper, for procuring a convention of delegates from all the United States, to revise the constitution"—in other words, to break up the Union. Six years later the question of preponderance between the North and South was again agitated, upon the discussions on the admission of Missouri to the Union; in which struggle the great question was involved, whether slavery should be established in that State or excluded by the terms of admission. The confidence of many thoughtful persons in the United States in the duration of the Union had been shaken by the divisions of Federalists and Republicans, which had reached a climax in the war of 1812. Jefferson, one of the most foreseeing of the founders of the republic, did not regard these divisions with alarm, because they existed in the bosom of each State. What he regarded with alarm was the coincidence of a line of demarcation, moral and political, with the geographical line. The views of a sagacious statesman are sometimes prophetic. The idea of a line of geographical demarcation involving a different system of politics and morals, once conceived, he thought could never be effaced. He believed that this idea would appear on every occasion, renewing irritation, and kindling in the end hate so mortal that separation would become preferable to eternal discord. He had been, he said, of those who had had the firmest confidence in the long duration of the Union; he began much to doubt it.*

On the 31st of May, 1814, two thousand four hundred gallant troops, the soldiers of Wellington in the Peninsula, were on board a fleet in the Garonne, waiting a favorable wind to sail for America. They consisted of the Forty-fourth and the Eighty-fifth regiments, and had marched from Bayonne when the white flag hoisted on the citadel had announced that the war with France was at an end. The squadron sailed for Bermuda, where they were joined by other forces. The troops, amounting to about 3500 men, were under the command of General Ross. Admiral Cockburn commanded the fleet. These officers were experienced and energetic. Their political discretion may be doubted, although their first dangerous and unjustifiable measures might have been under the positive direction of the government at home. Having taken possession of the Tangier Islands in the Bay of Chesapeake, they invited the negroes in the adjoining provinces, with a promise of emancipation, to join the British forces. Seventeen hundred men fled from their plantations, and were marshalled in the English ranks. This incitement of the negro population to revolt was a measure that the most uncompromising hostility and the nearest danger could scarcely justify. The British government had to pay a heavy fine to the owners of the slaves, the amount of which was referred at the Treaty of Ghent to the Emperor of Russia. He awarded a compensation of 250,000*l*. On the 14th of August Admiral Cockburn officially announced to Mr. Monroe, the American secretary of state, that it was his purpose to employ the force under his direction "in destroying and laying waste such towns and districts upon the coast as may be found assailable." He added that this was in retaliation for a wanton destruction committed by the army of the United States in Upper Canada.† The announcement was afterward withdrawn. The spirit of it was unhappily preserved, to diminish the lustre of a brilliant attack upon the capital of the United States.‡

The British squadron having ascended the river Patuxent, the army was disembarked at the village of Benedict, with the intention of co-operating with Admiral Cockburn in an attack on a flotilla of gunboats. The army commenced its march on the 20th of August, and in three days had advanced to within sixteen miles of Washington. Admiral Cockburn had during this time taken and destroyed the whole of the flotilla. On the 23d General Ross determined to make an attempt to carry Washington. He put his troops in motion on the evening of the 23d, and on the 24th defeated the American army, amounting to between eight and nine thousand men. The catastrophe is related in few words by General Ross: "Having halted the army for a short time, I determined to march upon Washington, and reached that city at eight o'clock that night. Judging it of consequence to complete the destruction of the public buildings with the least possible delay, so that the army might retire without loss of

* Armstrong (American Secretary at War), quoted by Alison.

† Letters of Jefferson, in the sixth volume of his works.

* Works, vol. vii., quoted by De Witt. See Miss Martineau, "History of the American Compromises."

† Alison, in quoting this announcement, makes Admiral Cockburn say, that it became his duty to do this "under the new and imperative character of his orders."

‡ The Duke of Wellington had ever scrupulously respected private property, and had spared defenceless places. When the Prince de Joinville, in 1844, suggested the bombardment of Brighton in the event of a war, the duke wrote to Mr. Raikes, "What but the inordinate desire of popularity could have induced a man in his station, a prince of the blood royal, the son of the king, of high rank and pretensions in that profession of the service, to write and publish such a production—an invitation and provocative to war, to be carried on in a manner such as has been disclaimed by the civilized portions of mankind." (Raikes' "Correspondence," p. 366.)

time, the following buildings were set fire to and consumed: the Capitol, including the Senate House and House of Representatives, the Arsenal, the Dockyard, Treasury, War Office, President's palace, Rope-walk, and the great bridge across the Potomac: in the dockyard a frigate nearly ready to be launched and a sloop-of-war were consumed. The object of the expedition being accomplished, I determined, before any greater force of the enemy could be assembled, to withdraw the troops, and accordingly commenced retiring on the night of the 25th."

The indignation of the American people was naturally extreme at an event which was not unjustly characterized in a proclamation issued from Washington on the 1st of September. The president therein accuses the invading force, that during their possession of the capital of the nation, though only for a single day, "they wantonly destroyed the public edifices, having no relation in their structure to operations of war, nor used at the time for military annoyance; some of these edifices being also costly monuments of taste and of the arts, and others repositories of the public archives, not only precious to the nation, as the memorials of its origin and its early transactions, but interesting to all nations, as contributions to the general stock of historical instruction and political science." In England there was a general feeling that, however brilliant had been the attack upon Washington, the destruction of non-warlike buildings was something more than a mistake. It was an outrage inconsistent with civilized warfare, which was not likely to produce "on the inhabitants a deep and sensible impression of the calamities of a war in which they have been so wantonly involved." Such was the thoughtless and undignified language of the prince-regent's speech on opening the session of parliament on the 8th of November. A more sober view of this demonstration of the calamities of war was taken by a high military authority at the Horse Guards. "It may tend to disunite and to spread alarm and confusion, but I incline to think that it will give eventually more power to the Congress. A nation may be overpowered and compelled to peace, but it must be a most contemptible set to be frightened into one."* Lord Grenville, with dignified earnestness, lamented a departure from a system of forbearance which had been pursued even by Napoleon during a conflict of twenty years, in whose hands nearly all the capitals of Europe had been, and in no instance, except in that of the Kremlin of Moscow, were any unmilitary buildings destroyed.† We had done, said Mr. Whitbread, what the Goths had refused to do at Rome, when Belisarius represented to them that to destroy works of art was to erect a monument to the folly of the destroyers.‡ He maintained that the outrage at Washington had conciliated to the American government those parts of the United States which were before hostile to it; had put in motion battalions of militia which before were not allowed to march. It had united all. It had made determined opposition to England a common interest.§

Whether to the destruction of the public buildings of Washington may be attributed the extraordinary vigor which seemed now to be infused into the military character of the American democracy, it is certain that after that event the course of the war was one of almost unvarying success to their arms. In a battle on the 11th of September, which was the prelude to an attack upon Baltimore, General Ross was mortally wounded; and Colonel Brooke, who succeeded to the command, although gaining a victory, was compelled the next night to retreat to the ships which were intended to cooperate in the assault. The Americans had sunk twenty vessels in the Patapsco River, which effectually prevented the British squadron rendering any aid. But a more serious blow was inflicted upon the army in Canada. Our forces there, under Sir George Prevost, had been augmented till they had reached sixteen thousand regular troops, who had arrived from the south of France, with the full conviction on the part of our government that the war would be speedily concluded by this array of veterans against undisciplined masses. Nine thousand of the soldiers of the Peninsula were to act in co-operation with a flotilla on Lake Champlain. This little fleet of a frigate, a brig, a sloop, and twelve gun-boats, was ill-manned and equipped. The American squadron on the lake was very superior in strength. The troops under Prevost were to attack the redoubts of Plattsburg, while our flotilla was engaged with the vessels in the bay. Captain Downie led his ship, the Confiance, gallantly into action; but when a heavy fire opened from the American line the gun-boats, which had few British sailors on board, took flight like scared wild fowl. The frigate, brig, and sloop were left to bear all the brunt of the contest. The Confiance made a brave fight, as did the brig and sloop; but they were finally compelled to strike. Meanwhile, Prevost lingered in making the land attack, and his troops did not reach the point of assault till the fleet had surrendered. He had been thus instructed by Earl Bathurst: "Take care not to expose his majesty's troops to being cut off, and guard against whatever might commit the safety of the forces under your command." He obeyed his instructions to the letter. The command of the lake was lost, and therefore it was useless to attack Plattsburg. A violent outcry was raised against our commander of the forces in Canada. He resigned, and demanded a court martial. Wellington thought Prevost was right to retire after the fleet was beaten.* He died before the court-martial commenced. His defence of Canada, with a small force, against repeated incursions of an enemy whose numbers were long thought by the Americans to be irresistible, ought to have saved his memory from the obloquy which has been attempted to be thrown upon it by some writers.†

On Christmas day, 1814, General Sir Edward Pakenham, one of the most brave and skilful of the officers who had served under Wellington in Spain, joined the army that was encamped a short distance from New Orleans preparing for an assault upon that city. The British government had not unjustly deemed that the capture of a place situated within a hundred miles of the mouth of the Mississippi, and which therefore was the chief emporium of the commerce of the "great water," would be an important success, and have a material influence on the favorable conclusion of a peace. Sir Edward Pakenham, accompanied by General Gibbs, had arrived from England to take the chief command of the army, which, after the fall of General Ross, had been under the orders of General Keane. Pakenham found this army, having achieved no final success at Baltimore, now placed in a situation of considerable danger and difficulty. On that Christmas day the officers dined together, but their festivity was not cheered by any pleasant retrospect of a past triumph which could give them confidence in an approaching victory. New Orleans was an unfortified town, then containing only about 17,000 inhabitants—one tenth of its population in 1860. The forts on the Mississippi were too strong to enable an armament to sail up from its mouth in the Gulf of Mexico. But a hostile force having passed from Lake Borgne into Lake Pontchartrain, might land at either of two creeks. The Bayou of St. John was too well guarded to render a landing easy. The Bayou of Catiline, about ten miles from the city, was more practicable; but an army having landed would find itself planted on open swampy ground, with the Mississippi on the one side of the city and a morass on the other side, preventing any assault except from the unfavorable ground on the bank of the lake.

On the 13th of December the troops embarked in small boats, and began to enter Lake Borgne. They had here to encounter a powerful American flotilla, which was finally defeated. A portion of the troops was now landed on a barren place called Pine Island, where it was determined that the whole army should assemble. It was the 21st before all were got on shore in this wretched desert, where without tents or huts, and unable to find fuel, the troops were exposed to rain by day and to frost by night. Pine Island was eighty miles distant from the creek where it was proposed to disembark. Only about one third of the troops could be conveyed at once in the open boats which only could navigate those shallow waters. It was necessary therefore to arrange for the landing in divisions. The advanced division, consisting of 1600 men, successfully disembarked at the Bayou of Catiline, having surprised the American sentinels. General Keane was in command of this division. No enemy was to

* Sir Willoughby Gordon, letter to the speaker, October 1st, 1814. Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 520.
† Hansard, vol. xxix. col. 17.
‡ See Gibbon, chap. xliii., A.D. 506.
§ Hansard, vol. xxix. col. 47.

* "Dispatches," vol. xii. p. 224.
† A writer in the "Quarterly Review," No. LIV., is among the bitterest of his accusers. Alison has ably and generously defended him.

be seen. Deserters came in, saying that the inhabitants of New Orleans were favorably disposed toward the British. Everything appeared to promise safety, and General Keane marched into the open country without waiting, as had been arranged, for the other divisions to join him. He ordered the troops to encamp near the Mississippi. The men had eaten their supper in the belief that their rest would not be disturbed, when a large vessel dropped her anchor in the river and furled her sails opposite the camp. A cry was at last heard, "Give them this for the honor of America!" and a broadside of grape swept down numbers of our unprepared soldiers. The night was dark as the schooner continued to fire from the river. On the land side the rattle of musketry was now heard. Our troops had found some shelter from the fire of the schooner, but now they were surrounded by a superior land force. After a severe struggle, without any possibility of forming the men, the enemy retreated. We had lost five hundred killed and wounded in this deadly strife. The second division of the army, which had embarked about twelve hours after the first division, heard the firing in the stillness of the night, as the boats were crossing the lake. By great exertions the whole army had been brought into position on the evening of the 24th. The next day Pakenham arrived to take the command, and was received with such hearty cheers as manifested the confidence of the soldiers in a Peninsular commander.

The first object of the general was to construct a battery, by which, firing red-hot shot, he destroyed the schooner on the river. On the 27th he advanced his whole force to attack the American army. It was advantageously posted, being defended in front by a broad canal and by formidable breastworks. The road by which the army marched was not only commanded by batteries, but by a flotilla on the Mississippi. The British ranks were greatly thinned by this conjoint fire. It was thought necessary to pause before further operations. All this effectual resistance had been evidently planned by some officer of high military talent. That officer was General Jackson, who became President of the United States in 1829. The British army was inactive on the 28th, 29th, and 30th. The enemy was strengthening his lines, which were so formidable that Pakenham resolved to construct breaching batteries, mounted with heavy cannon, brought up from the vessels on the lake. During the night of the 31st six batteries had been completed, the material of which was not earth, but hogsheads of sugar taken out of the warehouses on the plantations. One of the other great products of Louisiana was employed by the Americans. Their parapets were constructed of earth and bags of cotton. It was soon found that our defences of sugar-hogsheads were wholly unavailing. In the first six days of January a bold and ingenious attempt was made by the British commander to deepen a canal which ran across the neck of land lying between the Bayou of Catiline and the Mississippi, so that boats might be brought up from the lake, and a portion of the troops carried across the river to attack the battery on its right bank. The morning of the 7th was arranged for a general attack. The army had been reinforced by the arrival of two battalions under General Lambert, and its whole number was now little short of 8000 men. A series of disasters disturbed, at the critical moment, the arrangements which appeared to have been made with a tolerable certainty of success. As the boats went up the canal, its banks crumbled in, blocked up the passage, and permitted only a few of the smaller boats to reach their point of destination. The main body of the army was to have attacked the works on the left bank at five o'clock on the morning of the 7th, simultaneously with the projected attack on the right bank. Pakenham waited till his patience was exhausted, and then determined to commence the assault without this support. The advantage of a sudden storming in the darkness of a January morning had passed away. It was broad daylight when the Americans saw the British column of three regiments marching on to the edge of the glacis. They were halted at the moment when a dash might have succeeded; for the scaling-ladders and fascines had been forgotten. A terrible fire drove them back in disorder. Pakenham, seeing that nothing but daring and endurance would carry the day, rallied his troops, and leading them again to the attack, fell mortally wounded. General Gibbs and General Keane were also struck down. The command devolved upon General Lambert, who prudently resolved to draw off the troops. Our loss had amounted to two thousand men, killed, wounded, and prisoners. An armistice of two days was agreed upon, for the purpose of burying the dead. On the 18th of January the retreat of the British army commenced, and was so safely effected that the troops re-embarked on the night of the 27th, with all the artillery and stores, except eight heavy guns. An insignificant triumph, in the capture of Fort Boyer, near Mobile, closed our military operations on the 12th of February. The news of the conclusion of peace at Ghent arrived the next day.*

The Peace of Ghent was concluded by three British commissioners, Lord Gambier, Mr. Goulburn, and Mr. Adams; and by four American plenipotentiaries, Mr. John Quincy Adams, Mr. Henry Clay, Mr. J. A. Bayard, and Mr. Jonathan Russell. The objection made in October by Mr. Madison to the terms proposed by Great Britain had led the negotiators on each side to effect a compromise. It was fortunate that it had been effected before the American people, intoxicated by the triumph at New Orleans, should have lost their anxious desire that hostilities should come to an end. The American government, by this peace, had not obtained a concession upon the two principles for which it went to war—that the flag covers the merchandise, and that the right of search for deserters is inadmissible. It was agreed that each government should use their efforts to put down the slave trade. Difficult questions of boundary were left unsettled to give rise to future disputes. But in this war of three years the people of both countries had learned by their commercial privations how desirable, if not indispensable, was a free intercourse between two great communities, having each so much to offer for the satisfaction of the other's wants, and both associated by natural ties of blood and language which the coldest politicians cannot wholly ignore. The mistakes in the conduct of the war were pretty equal on both sides. The defeats of the Americans in the invasion of Canada had in some degree lowered the European opinion of their military qualities. Plattsburg had shaken the confidence of the English public in the effect likely to be produced by a large employment of regular forces against imperfectly disciplined troops. The final disaster of our arms led to a more impartial estimate of what a democratic people is capable of effecting after a few years of rash and ill-understood warfare. A calm and sagacious writer has said, "The success, which was too late to affect the negotiations at Ghent, was sufficiently striking to be worth more to the American people than a good peace. It is in reality to the victory of New Orleans that a great part is due of the moral impression which has been left upon the world by the war of 1812—a war imprudently engaged in, feebly conducted, rarely successful, very costly, perfectly sterile in diplomatic results, and, nevertheless, finally as useful to the prestige of the United States as fruitful for them in necessary lessons." †

CHAPTER CCX.

The hundred days—Landing of Napoleon near Cannes—Retrospect of the restoration of the Bourbons—The Charter—The French army—The Treaty of Paris published—The escape of Napoleon from Elba—Declaration of the powers assembled in congress—Advance of Napoleon—He is joined by Labedoyère and Ney—Flight of Louis XVIII.—Napoleon at the Tuileries—British parliament declares for war—Napoleon organizes his army—Crosses the frontier—Joins his army at Charleroi—Wellington's position—He marches from Brussels—Battle of Ligny—Battle of Quatre Bras—The field of Waterloo—Positions of the two armies on the night of the 17th and morning of the 18th of June—The battle of Waterloo.

On the high road, midway between Cannes and Antibes, and close to a lane leading to a landing-place in the Gulf of St. Juan, are two cabarets, one on the left side of the road, the other on the right, which have set up rival claims to immortality. The cabaret on the left bears this inscription, "Napoléon I., au Golfe de Jouan—débarqua 1 Mars, reposa dans cette même propriété." The cabaret on the right thus asserts its pretensions: "Chez moi se reposa Napoléon I. Venez boire passants, célébrez son nom." In the year whose great event these signs pretend to record neither of the wayside public houses had been built. A miserable column, erected a few years

* These unfortunate operations are detailed with great spirit in "A Narrative of the Campaigns at Washington and New Orleans, by an Officer who served in the Expedition" (Rev. G. R. Gleig).

† Cornelis de Witt, "Thomas Jefferson," p. 359.

since, repeats the one inscription which is the nearest approach to truth—that Napoleon rested "in this property." He had sat down under an olive-tree of this estate. He had successfully achieved his perilous voyage from Elba, from which he had embarked on the morning of the 26th of February, with his guards, in seven small vessels. He once more stood on the soil of France, at three o'clock in the afternoon of that memorable 1st of March. The little army bivouacked that evening on some land that was then outside the town of Cannes on the east. An attempt was made to seduce the garrison at Antibes, but the commander of the fortress arrested the soldiers who had been employed on this mission, and threatened to fire upon any others who should approach. Cambronne, one of the generals who accompanied Napoleon, went into the town of Cannes to demand of the maire six thousand rations for the troops. The demand was very unwillingly complied with, for the presence of the ex-emperor excited the hatred of the people, who were tired of wars and revolutions. 'Some said if he came into the town they would shoot him. At four o'clock on the morning of the 2d of March the troops, in number about eight hundred, with Napoleon at their head, attended by his old companions in arms, Bertrand, Drouet, and Cambronne, commenced their march north on the road to Grasse, and possibly skirted Cannes on the east side, which quarter has been almost entirely built since 1815.*

This landing in the Gulf of St. Juan on the 1st of March was the introductory scene to the great drama called "The Hundred Days." These count from the 13th of March, when Napoleon assumed the government, to the 22d of June, when he abdicated.

The secret departure from Elba was not known to the sovereigns of Austria, Prussia, and Russia, and to the representatives of the other European powers assembled in Congress at Vienna, till the 7th of March, when the Duke of Wellington received a dispatch from Lord Burghersh, the British minister at Florence, announcing the astounding fact. It was some days afterward before the landing near Cannes and the march toward Grasse were known at Vienna.† Such was the slowness of communication that on the 5th of March it was not known in Paris that the ex-emperor had quitted the territory all too narrow for his ambition. Let us, before proceeding to relate the progress and issue of this great adventure, take a retrospect of the events that had followed Napoleon's abdication of the 4th of April, 1814—eleven months of false confidence and hollow peace.

The 4th of June, 1814, was an exciting day for Paris; an important day for the future tranquillity of France and of Europe. A constitutional charter was that day to be promulgated by the restored king, and on the same day the last of the allied troops were to quit the capital. Louis XVIII. was to be left in the midst of his subjects without the guarantee for his safety which some associated with the continued presence of the armed foreigners. The charter created a chamber of peers, of about one hundred and forty members, named for life by the king. These took the place of the servile flatterers of Napoleon, called the Senate. The composition of this new body was an approach to impartiality in the union of members of the old noblesse with a remnant of the senate, and of generals of the army before the revolution, with marshals of the empire. By the charter a representative body was also created, with very sufficient authority, and especially with the power of determining the taxes to be levied on the people. But if the value of a representative system was held to be in some degree proportionate to the amount of population by which it is elected, some might have doubted if the limitation of electors to those who paid 300 francs direct taxes yearly, thus restricting the nomination wholly to the more opulent class, was a guarantee for the impartial working of the constitution. The charter also provided for civil and religious freedom, for trial by jury, for the liberty of the press. The exclusive privileges of the old monarchy—the inequalities before the law—which produced the revolution of 1789, were no more. The letter of the ancient feudalism had perished. But its spirit lingered in the very date of this charter. It was held that Louis XVIII. began to reign when Louis XVII., the unhappy son of Louis XVI., was released by death from his miseries. The charter, "given at Paris in the year of grace 1814, in the nineteenth year of our reign," was an emanation of the royal bounty. The king was declared by the chancellor, in his speech of the 4th of June, to be "in full possession of his hereditary rights," but that he had himself placed limits to the power which he had received from God and his fathers. The compromise was as distasteful to the republicans as the real advantages of the charter to the people were hateful to the royalists. An acute observer, who was present at the ceremony of the promulgation of the charter, writes, "In England such a government would be held to be an execrable despotism, impudently mocking the forms of freedom. I am inclined to believe, however, that it contains nearly as much liberty as the French can bear."* The dissatisfaction which very soon followed the government of Louis, "the desired," did not arise out of the greater or lesser amount of liberty bestowed by the charter, but out of the manifold contradictions between the acts of the government and the character and habits of the French people. All had been changed since 1792, but the notions of the restored royalists had undergone no change.

The constitutional charter was in some degree the work of the king himself, inasmuch as he had greatly modified a charter presented to him by the senate, which he found busy upon a constitution after Napoleon's abdication. The substance and even the forms of liberty having perished during the consulate and the empire, the change was great when freedom of speech and of writing were possible; when a senate and a representative body could debate without reserve and vote without compulsion. But a quarter of a century of revolution and military despotism had really unfitted the French to comprehend the value of the partial liberty which they had regained. The desire for liberty had almost wholly disappeared in the passion for equality which the revolution had generated. A constitutional monarchy, represented by a gouty old man who could not mount his horse—who had been brought back by foreign armies—was a poor compensation to the national vanity for the glory of living under a ruler who, for the greater period of his power, had only gone forth to new conquests—who led kings captive, and who filled France with spoils of subject cities. The one surpassing folly of the restored government was the belief that France, and especially Paris, could forget Napoleon. When our Charles II. returned to St. James's, under the protection of the army of Monk, it was held that his reign commenced on the terrible 30th of January, on which his father had perished before the banqueting house at Whitehall. It was in England determined to ignore the twelve years of the commonwealth. But it was easier for the Stuarts to take their place as a matter of absolute right and necessity—for the loyalists had always been an enduring power even during the supremacy of Cromwell—than for the Bourbons to re-enter the Tuileries as if they had been excluded for twenty years by a mere dominant usurpation which had died out. The very existence of Monsieur and of the Comte d'Artois had been as completely forgotten by the people as they had become alienated from the emigrant nobility, who had fled from their ancient chateaux, and whose lands had passed into the hands of small proprietors who hated the name of seigneurs in the dread that the quiet possession of what they had bought as national domain might be disturbed. The egregious folly which believed that a nation could altogether forget was exhibited in the attempt to destroy every symbol of the rule of Bonaparte. The Parisians laughed at the littleness which set the upholsterers to work in defacing the N which was multiplied on the carpets and hangings of the Tuileries, but they were angry when the white flag took the place of the tricolor. The anger of the bourgeoisie was perhaps of little consequence. They grumbled and sneered at the ordinances of the police which forbade shops to be opened on Sundays and fête days. Wine-sellers, restaurateurs, and billiard-table keepers thought that no tyranny could be equal to that of closing their establishments during the hours of divine service. The government was right in its desire that a decent show of respect for religion should take the place of the old license; yet it was not so easy to change the habits of a generation. The discontent of the idle pleasure-seeking Parisians would not have brought back Napoleon had not offence been given to a much more powerful and united body. The army felt more acutely than the people the suppression of the tricolor. The men hid their old cockades in their

* We are indebted for these particulars to a friend resident in Cannes, and we give them to clear up the obscurity which prevails in some accounts as to the localities of that eventful debarkation.

† "Wellington's Dispatches," vol. xii. p. 266. Dispatch to Castlereagh, 12th of March.

* "Lord Dudley's Letters," p. 42.

knapsacks; the officers, when the cockades and the standards were required to be given up, concealed the eagles or burned the standards which they had followed to victory. Thousands of old soldiers were pouring into France, released as prisoners of war, or turned out from the fortresses of provinces once annexed to the empire. The distinctive numbers of the regiments were entirely changed, so that the peculiar glory and heroism of each regiment were lost in the renown of the general mass. The army was reduced with imprudent haste; officers of the regiments retained by the restored government were put upon half pay, and their places were supplied by young men who had seen no service, or by ancient gentlemen, whose only merit was to have emigrated. Numerous invalids were turned out from their refuge in Paris to exhibit their wounds and proclaim their wrongs in the provinces. The power which had so long dominated over France was not judiciously reduced; its vanity was outraged by unnecessary affronts. The head of that wondrous military organization which had so long kept Europe in terror was his own master, in an island within two days' sail of the shores of France, unwatched and uncared for, as if he had utterly gone out of the minds of his idolaters. The symbols of his authority had disappeared from the palaces and public buildings of France; but a symbol was invented to indicate that with the return of spring the hero would come back to chase the Bourbons from their throne, and to repair the disasters of the last year of the empire. Little prints of groups of violets were handed from hand to hand, in which the outline of a well known face might be traced in the arrangement of the flowers. *Père la violette* was the name by which the expected one was now recognized; and before the violets were come this sign had passed from soldier to soldier. As they looked proudly and significantly around them, and talked mysteriously in spite of the police, men fancied that a crisis was approaching, and that the bee might once more replace the lily on robes of state and on chairs of sovereignty. The army might gain in a renewed power to dominate at home and to plunder abroad. But what would the people gain who, in less than a year after they had rejected Napoleon, had begun to sympathize with the desire of the army for his return? Some of the more sober among Frenchmen saw, in spite of the ultra-monarchical tendencies of such as the Comte d'Artois and his faction, an almost certainty that genuine liberty and real prosperity would be established when false glory had lost its charm; that a spirit of Christian tolerance would take the place of the irreligion which the restored priestcraft had thought to supplant by a bigoted formality. These reasoners did not understand the nation whose restless propensities had been confirmed by fifteen years of aggressive despotism, succeeding ten years of sensitive democracy—a nation most difficult to govern, because "always deceiving its masters, who fear it either too little or too much." *

The Treaty of Paris, ratified between France and the allied powers on the 30th of May, was published at the same time that the charter was promulgated. Thiers describes with a touching sensibility the pain produced among all classes by a knowledge of the terms of this treaty: "They recognized the cruel hand of the stranger, above all, in the limitation of our frontiers." The maledictions of the nation, he says, "fell chiefly upon England and upon Austria." † It could have been no matter of surprise to any Frenchman of ordinary intelligence that the prolonged resistance of Napoleon to the moderate demands of the allied powers, in 1813 and 1814, had ended in the limitation of France to her ancient frontiers. While Bonaparte was at the head of a powerful army, and the event of a conflict on the soil of France was full of uncertainty, the allied powers published their celebrated declaration of Frankfort of the 1st of December, 1813, in which they said, "The allied sovereigns desire that France may be great, powerful, and happy. . . . The powers confirm to the French empire an extent of territory which France under her kings never knew." Lord Aberdeen had concurred with Metternich in approving this declaration. Lord Castlereagh, on the contrary, thought this gratuitous engagement previous to the opening of a negotiation was most inconvenient and blamable.‡ In the conferences of Chatillon, of March, 1814, the final terms proposed to Napoleon as the conditions on which he should be recognized as emperor, were the session of the whole of the conquests made by France since 1792. Napoleon rejected these terms, and was compelled to abdicate. While these negotiations were pending, Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia concluded the "treaty of union, concert, and subsidy," known as the treaty of Chaumont, which declared, that if the French government should refuse the conditions contained in proposals for a general peace, the solemn engagement thus entered into was intended "to draw closer the ties which unite them, for the vigorous prosecution of a war undertaken for the salutary purpose of putting an end to the miseries of Europe, by re-establishing a just balance of power." The restoration of the ancient dynasty was naturally associated with a return to the ancient territorial limits of France. It was this association that, in addition to other grievances, real or imaginary, made the Bourbons obnoxious to a generation incessantly familiar with conquest, and proportionately stimulated into a belief that France was the inevitable arbitress of the destinies of the world

The Duke of Wellington succeeded Lord Castlereagh as the British minister at Vienna, when the labors of the congress were approaching their termination. The main points were concluded.* There were only some formal acts to be done. The sovereigns and the ministers of the larger states were about to separate when their departure for their several countries was arrested by the news of the great event of the return of the ex-emperor to France.

The position of Napoleon at Elba was that of an independent sovereign. He had many soldiers around him devoted to his interests. He had cruisers by which he could keep up a correspondence with Italy and with France. During the sitting of the congress, the evident danger arising out of his vicinity to the continent was constantly present to the minds of some of the diplomatists; although they heard that the monarch of the little island appeared not only resigned to his fate, but interested in the improvement of his dominions and the prosperity of his people. His occupations of directing new buildings and of planning new roads did not deceive every one; and there was serious talk of conveying him to some more secure place—some inaccessible island of the Atlantic—where the shadow of the eagle's wing would cease to frighten the timorous birds. The Emperor of Russia, however, insisted upon the literal fulfilment of the Treaty of Fontainebleau. It was with him a point of honor to leave Napoleon undisturbed; to surround him with no spies; to let him feel that he was in no sense of the word a prisoner. Sir Neil Campbell was sent, in April, 1814, by the British government to Elba, with instructions to "pay every proper respect and attention to Napoleon, to whose secure asylum in Elba it is the wish of his royal highness the prince regent to afford every facility and protection." He was to remain there as long as Napoleon might desire his presence. Sir Neil Campbell lived on the most friendly and familiar terms with the ex-emperor; occasionally went away to Florence or to Leghorn; and having no apprehensions of danger, did not consider that he was called upon to exercise any peculiar watchfulness. But in the middle of February his suspicions were excited, and he went to Florence to consult with the British ambassador there as to the necessity of having some adequate naval force about the island. French historians have generally some recondite theory at hand to account for very natural occurrences. M. Capefigue thinks that there was a complicity on the part of England in the return of Napoleon. He believes that England, which had been an absorbing power in Europe during the imperial epoch, now seeing that Russia was too paramount, conceived that she might recover the first rank in a new struggle with Napoleon. The English cruisers therefore shut their eyes during the passage of Bonaparte to the Gulf of St. Juan.† Always, *perfide Albion*.

Upon the 13th of March "the powers who signed the Treaty of Paris assembled in congress at Vienna, being informed of the escape of Napoleon Bonaparte, and of his entrance into France with an armed force," published a declaration which at once put an end to all possibility of terminating this issue without a trial of strength more or less severe. The declaration contained these emphatic words: "By thus violating the convention which had established him in the island of Elba, Bonaparte destroys the only legal title on

* De Tocqueville, "Society before the Revolution."
† "Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire," tome xviii. p. 192.
‡ Letter from the Hague, December 14.

* See Chapter CCXI. † "Les Cent Jours," tome i. p. 128.

which his existence depended; by appearing again in France with projects of confusion and disorder, he has deprived himself of the protection of the law, and has manifested to the universe that there can be neither truce nor peace with him. The powers consequently declare, that Napoleon Bonaparte has placed himself without the pale of civil and social relations, and that, as an enemy and a disturber of the tranquillity of the world, he has rendered himself liable to public vengeance."

In a dispatch of the Duke of Wellington of the 12th of March, he writes: "It is my opinion that Bonaparte has acted upon false or no information, and that the king will destroy him without difficulty, and in a short time. If he does not, the affair will be a serious one, and great and immediate effort must be made."* On the 4th of April Wellington had arrived in Brussels to devise measures for the defence of the Netherlands. The "affair" had become "a serious one." Napoleon had marched from Cannes to Grenoble without encountering any opposition in the thinly-populated mountainous regions of Dauphiny. He had been in communication with Labedoyère, who was an officer of the garrison at Grenoble, and this young colonel was ready with the men he commanded to hoist the tricolor. General Marchand, the governor of Grenoble, who was firm in his allegiance to the sovereign of the restoration, sent out a detachment to observe the force that was approaching. Napoleon alone advanced to meet them, exclaiming, "I am your emperor; fire on me if you wish." The soldiers threw themselves on their knees, and amid shouts of "*Vive l'Empereur*," joined his ranks. Labedoyère and his men swelled the number, and Napoleon entered Grenoble amid the cheers of the soldiery and the citizens. On the 12th of March he was at Lyons. From this city he issued decrees which assumed that he was already in possession of the supreme authority. By these the Chambers of Peers and Deputies were dissolved; the returned emigrants were banished; titles of honor, except for national services, were abolished, and emigrant officers who had received commissions from the restored government were struck off the list of the army. On the 14th of March Marshal Ney, who on the 7th had taken leave of the king with the assurance that he would bring back Bonaparte in an iron cage, published a proclamation to the army at Auxerre, which thus begins: "Officers and soldiers, the cause of the Bourbons is irrevocably lost: the legitimate dynasty which the French nation has adopted is about again to mount the throne." It was in vain that in the two chambers at Paris Napoleon was denounced as a public enemy, and that the benefits of a charter under a constitutional monarch were set forth in contrast with the principles of a military despot. The troops could no longer be relied upon. On the 19th of March the king, by proclamation, dissolved the chambers. On the 20th, after midnight, Louis and the royal family left the Tuileries. On the 25th his court was established at Ghent. Napoleon was at Fontainebleau on the 19th. On the 21st he slept in the Palace of the Tuileries, having been borne up the grand staircase by an enthusiastic crowd, and welcomed in the familiar saloons by ladies of his old court, who showered upon him bouquets of violets. The wives and daughters of his marshals and generals had been neglected or openly affronted by those who had come to the levées of the restored monarch with an imprudent contempt of a revolutionary aristocracy: the ladies of the imperial court had now their revenge.

On the 6th of April the prince-regent sent a message to the two houses of parliament, that the events which had recently occurred in France had induced his royal highness to give directions for the augmentation of the land and sea forces. It was also announced that the prince-regent had lost no time in "entering into communication with the allied powers for the purpose of forming such a concert as might most effectually provide for the general and permanent security of Europe." The Treaty of Vienna of the 23d of March had bound the allied powers to make war together upon Napoleon, and to conclude no separate peace with him. The resistance in the British parliament to the determination to engage in this war was very feeble. In the debate on the address for arming and acting in concert with our allies, Mr. Whitbread moved an amendment, to implore the regent to use his utmost endeavors to preserve peace. It was rejected by a majority of 220 against 37. A second motion for an address, praying the crown not to involve the country in a war upon the ground of excluding a particular person from the government of France, was rejected by a majority of 273 against 72. The enormous sums demanded by the government were voted almost without inquiry. When a budget was brought forward on the 14th of June, which included a total charge of eighty-one millions, of which thirty-six millions were a loan, there were "not more than seventy persons present in the house, though late in the evening."*

Napoleon, on the 30th of April, had issued a decree convoking the electoral colleges for the nomination of deputies to the chamber of representatives. The greater number of the people abstained from voting. It was necessary to do something striking, and Napoleon determined to revive the old revolutionary fête of the Champ de Mai. It was in this assembly of two hundred thousand of both sexes that he announced that the wishes of the nation having brought him back to the throne, his whole thoughts were turned to the "founding our liberty on a constitution resting on the wishes and interests of the people." This constitution was called "Acte additionel aux Constitutions de l'Empire." It was a very literal copy of the charter of Louis XVIII., and had been forced upon the emperor by a party who believed that a limited monarchy, with representative institutions, might be a successful experiment, whether under a Bourbon or a Bonaparte. Napoleon had addressed letters to the European potentates, professing his moderate and peaceful intentions. No faith could be placed in his professions, and his letters were unanswered. There could only be one solution of the question between Napoleon and the allied powers. In the Champ de Mai he exclaimed, "The princes who resist all popular rights are determined on war. For war we must prepare." The chambers commenced their functions, not in the old spirit of the empire, but as if they were really trusted with power, as portions of that constitution to which the emperor had sworn in the Champ de Mai. His real security depended little upon the state of public opinion and upon the subservience of the legislature, but upon the efficiency with which he could reorganize his army. Devoting all his energies to this task, he was very soon prepared with a bold plan of operation. He would not wait for the attacks of his enemies, but would pass the French frontiers, and engage with some portions of the allied armies before they could unite. On the 11th of June, having appointed a provisional government to act in concert with the chambers, he left Paris in the evening. On the 13th he was at Avesnes. On the 15th he had crossed the frontier, and was at the head of 122,000 men, at Charleroi in the Netherlands.

Most of the garrisons of the Netherlands had been strengthened by the vigilance of the Duke of Wellington; Charleroi was among the weakest. In addition to the general belief that Napoleon would remain on the defensive, the uncertainty as to the line of operations which he would choose if he determined on the offensive by an invasion of the low countries, forbade a concentration of force upon any one of the assailable points of the frontier. It was open to Napoleon to attack the Prussians by the Meuse, to enter by Mons, to drive back Wellington upon Antwerp, or to advance by the Sambre upon the point of junction of the two armies. The four Prussian corps of Blücher were at Charleroi, at Namur, at Dinant, and at Liège. The army of Wellington, consisting of British, Netherlanders, and Hanoverians, was distributed in cantonments, a reserve occupying the environs of Brussels, where the duke had established his headquarters. The troops under his command, however separated, could easily unite, and they had the most precise directions how to act in the case of the French passing the frontier. The statement that Wellington had received false information from Fouché upon Napoleon's movements, and was therefore surprised when Napoleon was upon the Sambre, is thus contradicted by the duke's intimate friend, Lord Ellesmere: "I can assert on the duke's personal authority, and on that of others in his confidence at headquarters, that the duke neither acted on nor received any such intelligence as that supposed, from Fouché or any one else, that he acted on reports received from his own outposts and those of his allies, the Prussians, and on these alone." The surprise is supposed to be confirmed by the fact that Wellington attended a ball at Brussels after hostilities had begun. Upon this, Lord Ellesmere says, "It is only necessary to state that Napoleon's advance was known to the duke long before the period

* "Dispatches," vol. xii. p. 268.

* Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 546.

fixed for that festivity; that the question whether it should be allowed to proceed had been fully discussed and decided in the affirmative. It was held that a recall of the invitations would create premature alarm among the population of Brussels, and premature encouragement to a pretty numerous party in its walls disaffected to the cause of the allies." The dispatches of Wellington sufficiently prove that he was perfectly aware of the advance of Napoleon when he went to the ball. At half-past nine on the evening of the 15th he wrote to the Duke de Berri that the enemy attacked the Prussian posts at Thuin that morning, and appeared to threaten Charleroi. "I have ordered our troops to prepare to march at break of day." The duke had issued the most precise directions for the several positions which the whole of his army were to take up that night; every separate direction concluding with the emphatic words, "to be in readiness to move at a moment's notice."* For the troops, who were immediately under his eye, the order was "to be in readiness to march from Brussels at a moment's notice;" that moment arrived even before the break of day. The duke quietly supped with the gay assembly at the Duchess of Richmond's; he and his generals gradually retired; the drums beat the alarm; the bugle-call gave the signal for "mounting in hot haste;" the bagpipes summoned the Highlanders; the artillery was rumbling through the streets; the measured tread of infantry and the sharp rattle of cavalry were heard in every quarter of the old town. The whole scene was changed from revelry to war before the "last light had fled" from that "banquet-hall." The reserve at Brussels were all on the march through the forest of Soignies, on the road to Quatre Bras, in the morning twilight. The Duke of Brunswick had gone forth, heading his gallant countrymen in their sombre livery of grief for his father's death at Jena. The Prince of Orange had marched to the front the moment he left the ball-room. The Duke of Wellington was soon up with his men, who cheered him as he passed. He well knew the ground where his great struggle was to be made. He could calculate with exactness the moment when the divisions would join him upon the road toward the enemy.

There was an interval only of a few hours before the march from Brussels and the gathering of other divisions on the roads which led to Quatre Bras were succeeded by a battle. The Prussians, under General Ziethen, who had been driven from Charleroi on the 15th, had retired upon Fleurus. Marshal Blücher had concentrated the Prussian army upon Sombref, with the villages of St. Amand and Ligny in front of his position. If Wellington is considered by some to have been tardy in concentrating his troops in the neighborhood of the Sambre, Napoleon is equally liable to reproach in having believed that Blücher was concentrating his troops about Namur, and in having neglected to attack the separate corps early in the morning of the 16th, before they had nearly all united. Bulow's corps, however, had not come up to join Blücher, when Napoleon attacked him in front, expecting that Ney would also have attacked him in the rear. The movement of Ney was interfered with by the timely arrival of Sir Thomas Picton's division at Quatre Bras, in company with the Brunswickers and the contingent of Nassau. Wellington had himself ridden to Sombref, and had conferred with Blücher before the battle known as that of Ligny had begun. He had returned to Quatre Bras by four o'clock, and then took the command of his own army. The battle between the French and the Prussians lasted for three or four hours. Although Blücher maintained his position, he was so weakened by the severity of the contest that he marched in the night and concentrated his army upon Wavre. The British also maintained their position, "and completely defeated and repulsed," says the duke, "all the enemy's attempts to get possession of it." Our loss was severe, amounting in killed, wounded, and missing, to more than 2500 men. The duke was very composed after this first trial of strength. The Spanish general, Alava, saw at the close of that day his old companion in the Peninsular War sitting by the roadside; and to his surprise was asked, "Were you at Lady ——'s party last night?" †

The movement of Blücher rendered a correspondent movement necessary upon the part of Wellington. At ten o'clock on the morning of the 17th he retired from Quatre Bras upon Waterloo, a distance of about seven miles. Between Waterloo and Wavre was a distance of about ten miles, through a country of difficult defiles. On the 17th the French made no attempt to pursue Blücher. A large body of French cavalry followed the English cavalry under Lord Uxbridge, and at Genappe they were charged by the first Life Guards. In the course of the day Napoleon moved forward his army upon the same road over which Wellington had marched earlier in the morning. Wellington had taken up his position in advance of the village of Waterloo, near Mont St. Jean, where the high roads from Charleroi and Nivelles crossed. On the night of the 17th, and early in the morning of the 18th, Napoleon collected his whole army, with the exception of a corps which had been sent under Grouchy to observe Blücher, on a range of heights in front of the British position.

The battle-field of Waterloo has been described again and again by observers capable of impressing us by the spirit or the accuracy of their pictures. The poet, the historian, and the tactician have made every point in some degree familiar to us. Byron says, "I went on horseback twice over the field, comparing it with my recollection of similar scenes. As a plain, Waterloo seems marked out for the scene of some great action, though this may be mere imagination. I have viewed with attention those of Platea, Troy, Mantinea, Leuctra, Chæronea, and Marathon; and the field around Mont St. Jean and Hougoumont appears to want little but a better cause, and that undefinable but impressive halo which the lapse of ages throws around a celebrated spot, to vie in interest with any or all of these except perhaps the last mentioned."* Before Byron had gone over the field it had been called "this modern Marathon."† During the lapse of nearly half a century it is not the "undefinable but impressive halo which the lapse of ages throws around a celebrated spot" which has made this ground such an object of curiosity to English visitors of the continent. Neither are there many who think that its interest requires "a better cause." So many of our countrymen have traversed this battle-field, and have thus acquired a knowledge which no description can convey, that we shall only attempt briefly to indicate a few of its peculiar aspects in connection with a very general narrative of the leading events of the great day of the 18th of June.

On the ground which we call the field of Waterloo (although the battle was fought about a mile and a half in advance of that village), Wellington had taken up his position, with a certain knowledge, derived from several previous examinations, of its capabilities for defence. "He used to describe the line of ground between the farm of La Haye Sainte and Hougoumont as resembling the curtain of a bastion, with these two positions for its angles."‡ The first care of the duke was to occupy with sufficient force these two angles, Hougoumont, near the Nivelles road, in front of the right centre, and La Haye Sainte, close to the Genappe road, in front of the left centre. The right of his position was thrown back to a ravine near Braine Merbes, which was occupied; and its left extended to the chateau of Frichermont, situated on a height above the hamlet of La Haye. The undulating plain upon which the army of English, Belgians, and Germans looked from the ridge on which they stood on the evening of the 17th was covered with crops of grain, of potatoes, and of clover. It had rained incessantly through the day; as night advanced the torrents of rain were accompanied with thunder and lightning. The troops had to bivouac upon the wet crops, while the generals and their staff obtained shelter in the adjacent villages. Wellington had his headquarters in a house opposite the church at Waterloo. At three o'clock in the morning of the 18th he was writing to Sir Charles Stuart at Brussels, with a calm confidence in the result of the almost inevitable struggle of that day. "The Prussians will be ready again in the morning for anything. Pray keep the English quiet if you can. Let them all prepare to move, but neither be in a hurry or a fright, as all will yet turn out well." At the same hour he wrote a long letter in French to the Duke de Berri, in which he says, "I hope, and moreover I have every reason to believe, that all will go well." At the time of writing this letter only a portion of the French army had taken up their ground on the opposite side of the valley, and he thought it possible that the main attack might be made at Hal, on the great road from Mons to Brussels. He had there stationed 7000 men, in addition to a large number of troops un-

* "Dispatches," vol. xii. p. 472.
† Lord Ellesmere, "Life of Wellington."

* Notes to "Childe Harold," canto iii.
† Lord Dudley's "Letters," p. 152.
‡ Lord Ellesmere.

der the command of the Prince of Orange. The possible success of the enemy there appeared to him "the only risk we run." * His army was a little superior in number to that of Napoleon, but it was inferior in artillery. There was, however, a far greater disparity. Wellington commanded an army of various nations, who had never before fought together; and even some of his British troops were new levies. In the summer of 1814 a large number of his famous Peninsular soldiers had been sent to America. Napoleon, on the contrary, had an army which he could wield with the most perfect assurance of unity of action, composed in great part of veterans who had returned to France at the peace. When Napoleon saw the English in position before the forest of Soignies, he exclaimed, "At last I have them; nine chances to ten are in my favor." He was of opinion, in which his generals agreed with him, that it was contrary to the most simple rules of the art of war for Wellington to remain in the position which he occupied; that having behind him the defiles of the forest of Soignies, if he were beaten all retreat would be impossible. Extensive and compact as that forest was, Wellington knew that there were many roads through it, all converging upon Brussels, most of which were practicable for cavalry and for artillery, as well as for infantry. "The duke," says Lord Ellesmere, "was of opinion that his troops could have retired perfectly well through the wood of Soignies, which, like other beech woods, is open at bottom, and he was still further satisfied that if driven from the open field of Waterloo he could have held the wood against all comers till joined by the Prussians, upon whose co-operation he throughout depended and relied." The greater number of military authorities agree that the position of Mont St. Jean was well chosen and suitably occupied.†

General Jomini has described as one of the advantages of the position of Wellington, that all the movements of the French could be seen from it. There was a drizzling rain on the morning of the 18th, but occasionally the sun broke through the clouds and displayed the French columns deploying to take up their ground. Amid the inspiriting airs of the numerous bands which in the French armies were always ready to encourage the spirits of the soldier, three lines were formed, of infantry and cuirassiers and lancers, with the artillery on the crest of the ridge. To the French the British army offered no such magnificent spectacle, the greater number being concealed by the undulations of the ridge on which they stood. They had taken their ground silently in two lines, with the artillery in front and the cavalry in the rear. They stood noiselessly, except when one loud hurra was raised as the duke rode along the lines between nine and ten o'clock. Large detachments were in the inclosures of Hougoumont and La Haye Sainte.

The bells of the neighboring churches were summoning to worship on that Sabbath morn when 150,000 men were thus preparing to destroy each other. The clock of Nivelles struck eleven as the first cannon was fired from the French centre. On the left of their line the quick fire of musketry was soon heard from the column advancing to attack Hougoumont. This property (the Château-Goumont—corrupted into Hougoumont) was a comfortable residence of a Flemish yeoman, with farm buildings, and a garden extensive enough to be misnamed an orchard, which was inclosed by a wall on the east and south sides. This inclosure of about two acres was laid out in straight walks and planted with well-trimmed trees. The formal garden is now laid down to grass. The ruins of the château, which was burned, with the exception of a chapel attached to it, have been cleared away. A humble dwelling, formerly the gardener's house, now stands amid some sheds and other rough buildings, the inclosed space being entered by a pair of wooden gates closing up the passage to the yard. There is not much here to see, if we look cursorily upon this dilapidated residence. If we examine it carefully there is abundant evidence of the nature of the struggle which here took place during seven or eight hours of that eventful day. The loop-holed walls show where the defenders of Hougoumont fired upon the attacking enemy; the dints of the assailing shot are still visible on many a brick. One portion of the gate, too injured for repair, is now hung up as a memorial. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say, "This Belgian yeoman's garden wall was the safeguard of Europe, and the destiny of mankind perhaps turned upon the possession of his house." * Six thousand French, under the command of Jerome Bonaparte, commenced their attack upon the English light troops which were in the wood around the château. This wood was defended with an obstinacy which was attested by the bullet-marks upon every tree. The wood was, however, carried by the French, and the light troops had now to defend the walls of the garden and the gates of the yard. Some preparation had been made for this in the loop-holes which had been knocked out, and by scaffolding from which the defenders could fire. This deadly contest was prolonged without any result till two o'clock, when Napoleon ordered that a battery of howitzers should play upon the building. It was soon in flames, but there was no relaxation in the resolute defence of the farm-yard by the 1st and 2d Foot-Guards. By a vehement rush the French had burst open the gates; but they were finally closed by a prodigious exertion of personal strength, in which Colonel Macdonnell was among the most efficient of the stalwart heroes. The prolonged defence of Hougoumont had a decided influence in deranging the plans of Napoleon. "The general opinion was, that after having taken the post of Hougoumont he would then render himself master of La Haye Sainte, and afterward decide the battle by a violent attack of his reserve upon the enemy's centre." †

The difficulties attending the attempt to give an intelligible description of a great battle, such as that of Waterloo, have been well set forth by Wellington himself. He had been applied to by one whom he evidently held in great respect—probably Walter Scott—to give him information as to particular events and instances of personal heroism, for the purpose of a connected narrative description. "The object which you propose to yourself is very difficult of attainment, and, if really attained, is not a little invidious. The history of a battle is not unlike the history of a ball. Some individuals may recollect all the little events of which the great result is the battle won or lost; but no individual can recollect the order in which or the exact moment at which they occurred, which makes all the difference as to their value or importance." ‡ Wellington's own official description of the progress of the contest is in the most general terms. He says that the attack upon the right of our centre (Hougoumont) was accompanied by a very heavy cannonade upon our whole line. Repeated attacks of cavalry and infantry, either mixed or separate, were made upon us. In one of these the enemy carried the farm-house of La Haye Sainte. The enemy repeatedly charged our infantry with his cavalry, but these attacks were uniformly unsuccessful. They were repeated till about seven in the evening, when a desperate effort to force our left centre was defeated. Having observed that the French retired from this attack in great confusion, that the arrival of General Bulow's corps had begun to take effect, and that Marshal Blücher had joined in person with the corps of his army, he (Wellington) determined to attack the enemy, and immediately advanced the whole line of infantry, supported by the cavalry and artillery. The attack succeeded in every point. These official generalities have far less interest than some of the familiar and pithy sentences addressed by the duke to personal friends. To Lord Beresford he writes, on the 2d of July, "You will have heard of our battle of the 18th. Never did I see such a pounding match. Both were what the boxers call gluttons. Napoleon did not manœuvre at all. He just moved forward in the old style, in columns, and was driven off in the old style. The only difference was, that he mixed cavalry with his infantry, and supported both with an enormous quantity of artillery. I had the infantry for some time in squares, and we had the French cavalry walking about us as if they had been our own. I never saw the British infantry behave so well." § It has been truly said, "There is nothing in the history of battles more sublime than the generalship which could order, and the patient valor that could sustain such a method of fighting as this." ‖ The desperate attempts to pierce our line were defeated by that unequalled firmness of the British infantry which, it is reported, led Soult to say to the emperor, "Sire, I know these English; they will die on the ground before they will leave it."

* "Dispatches," vol. xii. pp. 476, 477.
† Brialmont, "Histoire de Wellington," tome ii. pp. 412, 413.

* "Lord Dudley's "Letters," p. 134.
† Brialmont (quoting French authorities), tome ii. p. 415.
‡ "Dispatches," vol. xii. p. 590. § Ibid., p. 529.
‖ Miss Martineau, "Introduction to the History of the Peace," p. cccxcv.

This devoted endurance during seven or eight of the most trying hours was sustained throughout by the presence of the duke at every point of danger, and by his constant care to spare his troops as much as possible, by repressing the natural anxiety of men in battle to be actively employed. The character of a part of the ridge upon which the British line was placed has been materially altered by removing the earth for a considerable distance to form the materials for an enormous mound, on the top of which is the Belgian lion. Behind this natural parapet the duke had placed several regiments, the men lying down concealed from the French, who were advancing to attack. "Up, guards, and at them!" were the words that in a moment presented a wall of bayonets to the confident French. For four or five hours the British commander had to endure the agony of disappointed expectation. He had counted upon being joined by Blücher about one in the afternoon, according to a message which he had received when the battle had begun. Two o'clock—three o'clock—four o'clock—five o'clock—six o'clock—came, but no sign of the expected aid on his left; there was nothing for it but to endure. General Picton had been killed before the battle was half over. When Wellington was told that of Picton's division of 7000 men only 1500 remained, he replied, "They must stand in their place till the last man," and they did stand. A general officer asked that his brigade, reduced to a third, should be relieved. "It is impossible," said the duke; "he and I, and all of us, are called upon to die in the place which we occupy at this moment." Surrounded by his men in a square charged by the French cavalry, he exclaimed, "Stand fast, 95th! we must not be beaten, my friends. What would they say of us in England?" This stoical fortitude it was difficult for him always to sustain. Looking upon the carnage around him, he said, "There are yet some hours left for cutting these brave fellows in pieces: please God that the night or the Prussians would arrive before that is effected!"

The official dispatch of Wellington contained these words: "I should not do justice to my own feelings, or to Marshal Blücher and the Prussian army, if I did not attribute the successful result of this arduous day to the cordial and timely assistance I received from them." Blücher had arrived precisely at the time when his co-operation in another part of the field was a warranty for the success of the attack by Wellington which produced the final result. Brialmont cites these words as an example of the perfect equity and noble disinterestedness of which the duke had given so many proofs; but he protests against the injustice by which some historians have attempted to rest upon this avowal an opinion that to Blücher is to be attributed the honor of the victory. When the corps of Bulow, Brialmont says, arrived, the position of Wellington was serious, but it was not desperate. If Blücher had not debouched upon the left of the position, fortune might have declared against the allies. If the Prussians arrived in the nick of time, and decided the victory, that was owing rather to Wellington than to the initiative of their own general. It is impossible to refuse to Wellington the title of the conqueror at Waterloo, for it was he who settled the joint measures for the day of the 18th, who chose and who occupied the field of battle, who directed during seven hours the whole of the operations, and who ordered the decisive attack at the moment when the Prussians, according to their promises, debouched on the right of the enemy.*

At six o'clock in the evening there was no point at which the allied army had yielded, or which had not been recovered from the possession of the French. It was seven o'clock when the emperor made his great attack upon our left centre. It was at this moment that the issue of the conflict was doubtful. The duke, however, rapidly collected his men from all points, to meet this apparently overwhelming force. An observer of the scene says, "To the most dinning and continual roar of cannon and musketry I have ever known there succeeded a sudden pause and silence. It was but momentary—they had turned, and now fled, pursued by our troops." † The Prussians had outflanked the movements of the reserve corps acting against them, and were now pressing on the main body of Napoleon's army. It was then that he was convinced of the worthlessness of the fatal delusion in which he had indulged throughout the day—that Grouchy, with his thirty thousand men, was at hand, and that the Prussians could not come up before he had beaten "that Wellington." The rout and panic of the French became universal. For a moment Napoleon hoped to arrest this flight by forming a square of the last regiment of his guards, and by raising a battery with some dismounted cannon. A ball from this battery carried off the leg of Lord Uxbridge. In the obscurity of the twilight the fugitives saw not this rallying-point, and hurried on, a disorganized and helpless crowd. In the last square formed by the guards, Napoleon was about to throw himself, there in all likelihood to die. Soult turned Napoleon's horse, exclaiming, "Ah, sire! our enemies are already too fortunate." The emperor fled with the mass. The square, however, held firm, to allow time for their leader to escape. Cambronne and other officers remained in the square. "Surrender!" was the cry of their assailants. Cambronne threw himself into the ranks of his enemies and perished. One last cry of "Vive l'Empereur" was heard amid the smoke and clash of arms. "Nothing more is heard; the guard is dead, the empire is finished." ‡

At nine o'clock Wellington and Blücher met near La Belle Alliance, which was in the centre of the French position. The Prussian General Gneisenau pursued the flying French, to whom all chance of rallying was impossible. Wellington joined in the pursuit, but the fatigue of his men compelled him to stop between Rossomme and Genappe. It was at Genappe that the carriage of the emperor was taken, to form a show in London. During the pursuit Wellington rode with the advanced guard. Colonel Hervey, who was with him, advised him to desist, as the country was growing less open, and he might be fired at by some stragglers from behind the hedges. "Let them fire away," he replied, "the battle is won, and my life is of no value *now*." § Under the brilliant moon which succeeded the lowering day, Wellington rode across the battle-field to his quarters at Waterloo. As the heaps of dying and dead lay around him, the emotions must have rushed upon him which he so beautifully expressed the next day, in a letter to the Duke of Beaufort: "The losses I have sustained have quite broken me down, and I have no feeling for the advantages we have acquired." To the Earl of Aberdeen, in a letter dated the same day, he said, "I cannot express to you the regret and sorrow with which I look around me and contemplate the loss which I have sustained, particularly in your brother. The glory resulting from such actions, so dearly bought, is no consolation to me." ‖

The total loss of both armies in this tremendous battle is thus stated: British and Hanoverians, 11,678; Netherlanders, 3547; troops of Brunswick, 1000; of Nassau, 1000; Prussians, 7454. Total, 24,679. Of the French army, 18,500 were killed or wounded and 7800 made prisoners. ¶

CHAPTER CCXI.

Napoleon's return to Paris—His abdication—On board the Bellerophon, at Plymouth—Sails for St. Helena—Specimens of the truth of history—The allies take possession of Paris—Return of Louis XVIII.—Definitive treaty with France—Settlement of Europe previously arranged by the Congress at Vienna—Holy Alliance—Treaty for the abolition of the slave trade—Execution of Labedoyère—Escape of Lavalette—Execution of Ney—The battle of Algiers.

After the fatal night of the 18th of June Napoleon had travelled with all haste to Paris, where he arrived at four o'clock on the morning of the 21st. The Chamber of Representatives met at noon on that day, and declared its sitting permanent. Its manifest intention was to assume the executive power, and to compel Napoleon to abdicate. Lucien Bonaparte appeared at the bar of the chamber to urge the claims of his brother upon the gratitude of France. La Fayette replied that "during the last ten years three millions of Frenchmen had perished for a man who would still struggle against all Europe. We have done enough for him. Now our duty is to save our coun-

* "Histoire de Wellington," tome ii. pp. 440–445.
† Letter from Sir Robert Gardiner, in "Ward's Memoirs," vol. i. p. 493.

* Brialmont, tome ii. p. 429.
† Lord Dudley's "Letters," p. 134.
‡ "Dispatches," vol. xii. pp. 488, 489.
§ Brialmont, tome ii. p. 431.

try." During the 22d Napoleon was urged to abdicate. He resisted for some time, exclaiming, "The chamber is composed of nothing but Jacobins and ambitious men. I ought to have driven them away." He yielded at last, and dictated his abdication in favor of his son Napoleon II.; and in this document, in which he said, "My political life is ended," he invited the chambers to organize a regency. The chambers sent a deputation to tham Napoleon for the sacrifice which he had made to the independence and happiness of the French nation; but he replied that he had only abdicated in favor of his son, and that if the chambers did not proclaim him, his own abdication would be null. Instead of appointing a council of regency, it was determined by the chambers that the government should be put into the hands of a commission of five members. This was indirectly to set aside Napoleon the Second. The provisional government required that Napoleon should leave France, and embark at Rochefort for the United States. He demanded that the government should give him two frigates for his passage there. The frigates were placed at his disposal, and their commanders were ordered to set sail within twenty-four hours after he was on board, if the English cruisers were not in the way. Bonaparte arrived at Rochefort on the 3d of July. Finding that he had no chance of escaping by sea, he sent Las Cases and Savary to Captain Maitland, who commanded the Bellerophon, to ask for leave to proceed to America, either in a French or a neutral vessel. The reply of Captain Maitland was, that his instructions forbade this, but that if Napoleon chose to proceed to England, he would take him there, without entering into any promise as to the reception he might meet with.

In the house of a gentleman at Plymouth we have looked with no common interest upon a portrait of Napoleon Bonaparte, painted under very extraordinary circumstances. At the end of July, 1815, the British ship-of-war Bellerophon is at anchor in Plymouth harbor. On board is the ex-Emperor of the French, who, on the 13th of July, had addressed a letter to the prince-regent from Rochefort, in which he said, "I come, like Themistocles, to throw myself upon the hospitality of the British nation" (*m'asseoir sur les foyers*). The Bellerophon, with Napoleon and his suite, had sailed from Rochefort on the 14th of July. While the British government was in a state of indecision as to the final disposal of its fallen enemy, he was not permitted to land, nor was any person from the shore allowed to enter the vessel. But round the Bellerophon numerous boats, filled with curious observers, were perpetually rowing, and to these gazers Bonaparte seemed rather disposed to show himself than to remain in the privacy of his cabin. The opportunity of making a portrait of this remarkable man was not lost upon a young artist, a native of Plymouth. Charles Eastlake, late President of the Royal Academy, was sketching that stout figure and superb head from one of the boats surrounding the ship-of-war; and when Napoleon perceived the object of the artist he would stop his walk upon the deck, so as to afford him the opportunity of proceeding successfully with his work. The Bellerophon remained a fortnight in Plymouth Roads, and then Napoleon was removed to the Northumberland, which sailed for St. Helena.

On the 31st of July Lord Keith, with Sir Henry Bunbury, the under-secretary of state, had announced to Napoleon the resolution of the British government, that the island of St. Helena should be his future residence. He protested that he was not a prisoner of war, although he subsequently acknowledged that he had made no conditions on coming on board the Bellerophon. The question as to the *status* of the ex-emperor under the law of nations gave rise to very grave discussions among English jurists. Lord Campbell says, "I think Lord Eldon took a much more sensible view of the subject than any of them—which was, 'that the case was not provided for by anything to be found in Grotius or Vattel; but that the law of self-preservation would justify the keeping of him under restraint in some distant region, where he should be treated with all indulgence compatible with a due regard for the peace of mankind.'" * The probability is, that if Napoleon had fallen into the hands of the Prussians, who were near Paris on the 29th of June, the question of his fate would have been disposed of in a much more summary way than could arise out of any discussion upon the law of nations. On the 28th of June Wellington wrote to Sir Charles Stuart, "General —— has been here this day, to negotiate for Napoleon's passing to America, to which proposition I have answered that I have no authority. The Prussians think the Jacobins wish to give him over to me, believing that I will save his life. —— [Blücher] wishes to kill him; but I have told him that I shall remonstrate, and shall insist upon his being disposed of by common accord. I have likewise said, that, as a private friend, I advised him to have nothing to do with so foul a transaction; that he and I had acted too distinguished parts in these transactions to become executioners; and that I was determined that, if the sovereigns wished to put him to death, they should appoint an executioner, which should not be me." * The Prussians there was no relaxation in the resolute defence [illegible] appointed by the 1st and 2d Foot-Guards. Remembering rush the Blücher [illegible] Napoleon should be shot in the place where the Duke d'Enghien had been killed, Wellington had replied, "Such an act would disgrace our names in history, and posterity would say of us, 'They were not worthy to have been the conquerors of Napoleon.'" The prisoner of St. Helena repaid this conduct by bequeathing ten thousand francs to the man who had attempted to assassinate Wellington, during his residence in Paris as the commander of the Army of Occupation. French historians have attempted to justify this odious testamentary expression of Napoleon's hatred of his victor by attributing to Wellington that he instigated the banishment to St. Helena. It is now known that as early as May, 1814, the plenipotentiaries at the Congress of Vienna decided, in a secret conference, that if Napoleon should escape from Elba, and should fall into the power of the allies, a safer residence should be assigned him, at St. Helena or at St. Lucia.

The assumption that the sovereigns wished to put Napoleon to death was the interpretation which, in the excitement of that time, many persons attached to the declaration of the allied powers of the 13th of March, that he had placed himself without the pale of civil and social relations; adding, "As an enemy and a disturber of the tranquillity of the world, he has rendered himself liable to public vengeance." Lord Eldon, referring to this declaration, says that the allies have "considered him as out of the pale of the law of nations, as the *Hostis humani generis*, as an outlaw (without knowing very well what they mean by that word), as a robber and freebooter, who might be put out of the world." † M. Thiers, in a spirit very different from that of the impartial historian, argues, with regard to the words of the 13th of March, that "the obvious conclusion is that whoever could seize Bonaparte ought immediately to shoot him, and would be considered as having rendered to Europe a signal service." ‡ The declaration of the allies was signed by the plenipotentiaries of eight powers, who had been parties to the Treaty of Paris of the previous year. Talleyrand and three others signed on the part of France; Wellington and three others on the part of Great Britain. When Wellington insisted, against the opinion of Blücher, that Bonaparte should "be disposed of by common accord," he rightly interpreted the words of the declaration of the 13th of March: "Comme ennemi et perturbateur du repos du monde, il s'est livré à la *vindicte publique*." It is established by the papers of Talleyrand that the precise words of the declaration were proposed by Talleyrand himself. Yet M. Thiers attributes to Wellington that he was the instigator, upon his own responsibility, of the measures which the allies took in this crisis, including, of course, this declaration against Napoleon. This eminent writer, in a mistaken view which we are unwilling to characterize by any harsher name, further represents the Duke of Wellington as plunging the British nation into a war without the authority of his government, for the gratification of his own personal ambition. Lord Wellington, he says, who had replaced Lord Castlereagh, relying upon his great services and his popularity in England, hesitated not to take his resolution. Although he had received no instructions, he judged that it was worth while to renew the war, to maintain the state of things that England was about to establish in Europe. "He had a confused hope of increasing his own glory in this new war; and he was not afraid of involving his government, convinced that no one would dare to disavow him in

* "Lives of the Chancellors," chap. ccii.

* Wellington's "Dispatches," vol. xii. p. 516.

† "Life of Eldon" (letter to Sir William Scott), vol. ii. p. 279.

‡ "Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire," tome xix. p. 275. 1861.

England, whatever might be thought of his conduct." * One of the duke's objects in going to Belgium in April, says M. Thiers, was that he might be nearer London "to uphold the courage of his own government, and to compel it to ratify the engagements which he had made without being authorized." † The English cabinet, he concludes, if it had been present at Vienna, would not have engaged in the war as easily as the Duke of Wellington, for they were aware that public opinion was opposed to it. The opinions thus expressed by M. Thiers, that the war against Napoleon was urged on by the personal ambition of the Duke of Wellington, that the British government was reluctant to engage in it, and that the British people presented a wall of bayonets to the confident French. For [illegible] of the same historian, that Bonapar[illegible] had to endure the agony of [illegible]irely changed—a lover of peace, an upholder of liberty, a friend to the free expression of opinion, a ruler who would vindicate the choice of the people by equity and moderation. Of his good faith no one ought to have doubted. "He gave to the world, after so many spectacles of such instructive grandeur, a last spectacle, more profoundly moral and more profoundly tragic than any which had gone before: genius vainly though sincerely repentant." ‡ When statements and opinions such as these are boldly put forward, we may give their author the benefit of that charitable scepticism which thinks that "the historian, affirming many things, can, in the cloudy knowledge of mankind, hardly escape from many lies." §

On the 7th of July the English and Prussian armies entered Paris, and took military possession of all the principal points, under a convention signed on the 3d of July, by which the French army was to evacuate Paris and to retreat beyond the Loire. Louis the Eighteenth made his public entrance, escorted by the national guards, on the 8th of July. To the firm moderation of Wellington it is wholly due that the Parisians were not doomed to suffer any humiliation beyond that of the presence of foreign armies. He calmed Blücher's thirst for vengeance by exhortation, and even by stronger modes of remonstrance. When the Prussian general had begun to mine the bridge of Jena, with the intention to blow it up, because that monument proclaimed a defeat of the Prussian arms, "the Duke of Wellington," says a French historian, "interfered by placing an English sentinel on the bridge itself. A single sentinel. He was the British nation; and if Blücher had blown up the bridge the act was to be held as a rupture with Great Britain." ‖

The definitive treaty between France on the one part and Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, on the other, was signed on the 20th of November, 1815. Its object was declared to be for the "restoring between France and her neighbors those relations of reciprocal confidence and good-will which the fatal effects of the revolution and of the system of conquest had for so long a time disturbed." This treaty left the boundaries of France, with a very slight alteration in her frontier lines, the same as agreed at the peace of 1814. It was, nevertheless, resolved to keep possession of the frontier fortresses for a term not exceeding five years, and to maintain an army of occupation, to be paid and supported by France during the same period. The greatest mortification which the French had to endure was the determination of the allied powers that the works of art which had been plundered from various countries during the wars of the republic, the consulate, and the empire, should go back to the churches and the museums from which they had been forcibly taken. This act of retribution provoked them, as it still provokes, the lamentation of pretended lovers of the fine arts, whose selfish convenience would be more gratified by seeing the greatest masterpieces of sculpture and painting in the Louvre than in their proper sites at Rome, at Florence, at Antwerp, at the Hague. The honest national pride of the true owners of such works is accounted as nothing in these lamentations.

To France alone did the treaty of the 20th of November apply. The settlement of Europe, as it was hopefully called, had been effected by the general treaty signed in congress at Vienna on the 9th of June. When the peace of 1814 was concluded with the restored monarchy of France, there were an immense number of political questions left undetermined, which were almost of as much importance to the tranquillity of the future as the overthrow of the gigantic power of the French Empire. The convulsions of twenty years had left Europe in a chaotic state, out of which order and harmony could scarcely be evolved even by any exercise of political wisdom based upon an unselfish moderation. In the reorganization of Europe there would unquestionably be a struggle for aggrandizement, which might present as great dangers as the military supremacy which had been overthrown. On the 25th of September, 1814, the Emperor of Russia, the King of Prussia, the Kings of Bavaria, Denmark, and Würtemberg; princes of small states, German and Italian; princesses, among whom the Duchess of Oldenburg, the sister of Alexander, was the most influential; great plenipotentiaries, such as Lord Castlereagh and M. Talleyrand, and lesser diplomatists, who came to get something, if possible, out of the general scramble—all assembled at Vienna to debate, to dine, to vary the tedious discussions of the morning with the enlivening festivities of the night. Ambassadors vied with sovereigns in the splendor of their entertainments. Castlereagh gave as sumptuous dinners and as attractive balls as Alexander:

> "Now this mask
> Was cry'd incomparable; and the ensuing night
> Made it a fool and beggar." *

Nevertheless, the slightest survey of the map of Europe would show that there was serious work to be accomplished. It had been agreed by secret articles of the Treaty of Paris that a kingdom, under the title of the Netherlands, should be formed by the union of Belgium with Holland; Prussia was to obtain the Rhenish provinces; Sweden and Norway were to be united; Hanover was to be restored to the King of England, with an accession of territory taken from Westphalia; Lombardy and Venice were to return to the rule of Austria; Savoy to that of Piedmont. The congress had been sitting two months when rumors of the probable destiny of Saxony and of Poland roused the spirit of inquiry in the British parliament. Mr. Whitbread, on the 28th of November, protested against the reported annexation of Saxony to the kingdom of Prussia. The chancellor of the exchequer, Mr. Vansittart, could not believe that the fate of Saxony was yet fixed, much less could he believe that any British minister would have been a party to such a decision as was supposed to have been made. Nevertheless, it is now certain that up to the end of October Lord Castlereagh had been a consenting party to the annexation of Saxony, which he defended by referring to the tergiversations of the king; of the people no mention was made by our minister. Mr. Whitbread further said, "The rumors were that the Emperor Alexander had strenuously contended for the independence of Poland, and that he had been opposed by the British minister." The chancellor of the exchequer replied that "he did not believe that a British minister had been the author of the subjugation of that country" There is now no doubt that the very reverse of the rumors with regard to Poland marked the conduct of the Emperor Alexander and of Lord Castlereagh. As recently as July 2d, 1861, Lord John Russell, founding his opinion upon the correspondence of the time, declared in the House of Commons that everything that could be done by British diplomacy for Poland was done by Lord Castlereagh at the Congress of Vienna; that our minister wished, when Europe was to be reconstructed, that Poland should rise from her ashes, and should again possess an independent government; and that thus desiring the independence of Poland, he could not conceive that such independence was consistent with Poland being placed under the dominion of the Emperor of Russia. In the debate of the 28th of November Mr. Whitbread said, "We now lived in an age when free nations were not to be sold and transferred like beasts of burden; and if any attempt of the kind was made the result would be a bloody and revengeful war." The attempt was made, and successfully, in too many instances; but it was not without the immediate risk of a war that the designs of Russia for the transference of nations were encountered in the Congress of Vienna. The policy of Lord Castlereagh with regard to Saxony was changed as the negotiations advanced. Talleyrand, as a representative of France, had been admitted, after great hesitation, to take a part in the deliberations of the congress. The annexation of Saxony to Prussia was op-

* "Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire," tome xix. p. 361.
† Ibid., p. 366. ‡ Ibid., p. 629.
§ Sir P. Sidney, "Defence of Poesy," p. 33, "Poetical Works," ed. 1720.
‖ Capefigue, "Les Cent Jours," tome ii. p. 365.

* Shakespeare, "Henry VIII.," act i. sc. 1.

posed by Austria and by France. It had become evident that Prussia and Russia were assuming a dangerous preponderance in the partition of states, and that Great Britain must join with France in opposing them. These three powers before the end of 1814 had agreed that Russia should not say to Prussia, "Secure me Poland," and that Prussia should not say to Russia, "Secure me Saxony," and that they should shake hands upon this compact. On the 3d of February, 1815, a secret treaty was concluded between Austria, England, and France, to act in concert, each with an army of 150,000 men, to carry into effect the Treaty of Paris, "holding it necessary, in consequence of pretensions recently manifested, to look to the means to resist every aggression." M. Thiers assumes that Lord Castlereagh, having received, at the beginning of January, the news of the conclusion of peace with America, had taken a higher attitude toward Russia and Prussia. "His heart relieved of an enormous weight, that of the American war, he was ready to brave the most extreme consequences rather than to cede to the arrogance of the Prussians and the Russians. . . . He had said to them that England was not made to receive the law from any one." The attitude of Lord Castlereagh, and the fact, which could not be concealed, of negotiations going on between him, Talleyrand, and Metternich, apart from the other powers, probably produced some concessions from Alexander and Frederick William, although they yielded little in reality. Prussia obtained one half of Saxony, with a portion of the duchy of Warsaw. Russia secured the kingdom of Poland in undisputed sovereignty. The new kingdom of Poland was to have a constitution, with national institutions and national representation. But these promised advantages were to be bestowed upon the people in the manner which the government should think most suitable. "That, of course, left a very wide scope for interpretation; but beyond that there was a feeling which acted from that time, and which is acting at the present time—namely, that while the Emperor Alexander I. wished to retain his power over Poland, at the same time he wished to grant to Poland large privileges, and to make it, at all events, a flourishing province, under the name of the kingdom of Poland; but the general feeling at St. Petersburg, the seat of power, was that Poland ought not to be indulged with privileges more large and more liberal than were granted to Russia." *

While Austria was opposing the acquisitions of territory desired by Russia and by Prussia, she herself was acquiring new dominions and extended sovereignty, however unsuited were her annexed subjects for the yoke of her absolute power. The four millions of the Lombardo-Veneto kingdom would be as difficult to rule as those of the old provinces of the Low Countries which were severed from her empire. Little objection was made at this time to the anomaly of a German rule over Italian people. The only hostile voice in the British parliament was one raised against the annexation of Genoa to Piedmont. By the final arrangement the hope was at an end which England had stimulated, when Lord William Bentinck, in 1814, entered Genoa at the head of a British army, on whose banners was inscribed "Italian independence." Italy returned to its old condition of disunion. Murat, who had been placed by Napoleon upon the throne of Naples when Joseph Bonaparte had become the "intrusive king" of Spain, had deserted the cause of his great fellow-soldier after the battle of Leipzig. Joining the allied powers, he appeared to have secured his position as an independent sovereign. But in the congress there was no advance toward his recognition, as in the case of Bernadotte. He entered into correspondence with the ex-emperor at Elba, thus precipitating his own fall. Murat made it impossible for the allies to believe in Napoleon's professions of a desire for peace by rashly plunging into hostilities against Austria. The old misrule of the Bourbons in Naples and Sicily was no impediment to the determination of the allies to restore that miserable dynasty. The Grand Duchy of Tuscany was restored, as well as smaller states. A quarter of a century passed away before the hollowness of these arrangements was tested by the revolt of some portion of the people of the Italian peninsula against their rulers, and by the loudly expressed desire of the whole for a common nationality.

While the prosaic destinies of Europe had been settled amid a conflict of jarring interests, the Emperor of Russia had assiduously labored to obtain converts to a political union which should be founded upon principles very different from those which ordinarily guide the councils of diplomatists. In a manifesto from St. Petersburg, dated "on the day of the birth of our Saviour, 25th December, 1815," the emperor commanded that there should be read in all the churches a "convention concluded at Paris on the 26th of September, 1815, between the Emperor of Russia, the Emperor of Austria, and the King of Prussia," in which "they solemnly declare that the present act has no other object than to publish in the face of the whole world their fixed resolution, both in the administration of their respective states and in their political relations with every other government, to take for their sole guide the precepts of the holy religion of our Saviour—namely, the precepts of justice, Christian charity, and peace, which, far from being applicable only to private concerns, must have an immediate influence on the councils of princes, and guide all their steps, as being the only means of consolidating human institutions, and remedying their imperfections." This was the famous declaration of "the Holy Alliance." When asked to sign it, the Duke of Wellington said that the English Parliament would require something more precise. Whenever, in after years, either of the three sovereigns manifested symptoms of disregard for "the precepts of justice, Christian charity, and peace," the Holy Alliance was held, perhaps somewhat unjustly, to be a cloak under which their violation of pledges to their own subjects and their desire for territorial aggrandizement might be best concealed. Denunciations of this convention were long heard in the British Parliament.

The peace of Europe was settled, as every former peace had been settled, upon a struggle for what the continental powers thought most conducive to their own advantage. The representatives of Great Britain manifested a praiseworthy abnegation of merely selfish interests. Napoleon, at St. Helena, said to O'Meara, "So silly a treaty as that made by your ministers for their own country was never known before. You give up everything and gain nothing." We can now answer that we gained everything when we gained a longer period of repose than our modern annals could previously exhibit. We gained everything when, after twenty years of warfare upon the most extravagant scale, the spirit of the people conducted that warfare to a triumphant end. The gains of a great nation are not to be reckoned only by its territorial acquisitions or its diplomatic influence. The war which England had waged, often single-handed, against a colossal tyranny, raised her to an eminence which amply compensated for the mistakes of her negotiators. It was something that they did not close the war in a huckstering spirit—that they did not squabble for this colony or that *entrepôt*. The fact of our greatness was not to be mistaken when we left to others the scramble for aggrandizement, content at last to be free to pursue our own course of consolidating our power by the arts of peace. There were years of exhaustion and discontent to follow those years of perilous conflict and final triumph. But security was won; we were safe from the giant aggressor.

If the plenipotentiaries of this country might return home a little imbued with the temper of despotic cabinets—if they could be accused of having too strenuously asserted the principle of legitimacy—if they had appeared to have contended too much for the claims of kings, and too little for the rights of the people—in one respect they had done their duty, and truly upheld the moral supremacy of England. They had labored strenuously, and they had labored with tolerable success, for the abolition of the slave trade. In the Treaty of Utrecht England protected her commercial interests—despicable protection—by stipulating for a monopoly of the slave trade for thirty years. In the Treaty of Paris England wrested from France an immediate abolition of the traffic, and a declaration from all the high contracting powers that they would concert, without loss of time, "the most effectual measures for the entire and definitive abolition of a commerce so odious." At the peace of 1814 the restored government of France—restored by our money and our arms—refused to consent to the immediate abolition. Bonaparte, amid his memorable acts of the Hundred Days, abolished the hateful traffic by a stroke of his pen. The Bourbon government, a second time restored, dared no longer refuse this one demand of Great Britain. Other nations had promised. But where we might have commanded there alone was resistance. Spain and Portugal still maintained the traffic.

After great revolutions, such as those of France in 1814 and 1815—such as England had witnessed in the restoration of the Stuarts—it is

* Lord John Russell, Debate in the Commons, July 2, 1861.

almost impossible that a triumphant party should altogether have the magnanimity to pardon political offences. But history looks with a just indignation upon any unreasonable severities, and especially upon any signal want of clemency in the ruler who has the unquestioned power to exercise the divine prerogative of mercy. Louis XVIII. can scarcely be accused of blood-thirstiness; yet his character would have stood better, not only with the French people but with the British, had he not sanctioned the condemnation and capital punishment of three, who had indeed betrayed the trust which the restored government had reposed in them, but who had some excuse in their inability to resist the fascinations of Napoleon. Talleyrand had been unable to accomplish by negotiation as favorable terms for France as he had expected, and he resigned his office as president of the council. He was succeeded by the Duc de Richelieu, who signed the treaty of the 20th of November. While Talleyrand remained in power he, as well as Fouché, was anxious that no capital punishments should be inflicted upon any of those who were proscribed by an ordonnance of the 24th of July, for the part they had taken in the return of Bonaparte in March. Ney, Labedoyère, and Lavalette were advised to place themselves in safety by leaving France. They were tardy and irresolute; the friendly warning was useless. Labedoyère was tried by court-martial, and was shot. Lavalette, who had been condemned to death by the Cour d'Assise, escaped through a stratagem of his wife, who, having visited him in prison, was able to disguise her husband in her own dress, remaining herself as an object for the possible vengeance of the royalists. Lavalette was assisted to pass the frontier by the generous friendship of three Englishmen, Sir Robert Wilson, Mr. Bruce, and Mr. Hutchinson, who were tried for this offence, and sentenced to three months' imprisonment. The proceeding which most commanded public attention in England was the trial and execution of Ney, for it was held to involve the honor of the Duke of Wellington. While the trial was proceeding before the Chamber of Peers, Ney was advised to rely for his defence on the capitulation of Paris. His wife had an interview with Wellington, who had previously expressed his opinion, in a letter to the Prince de la Moskwa, to the effect that the capitulation related exclusively to the military occupation of Paris; that the object of the 12th article was to prevent the adoption of any measures of severity, under the military authorities of those who made it, toward any persons on account of the offices which they filled, or their conduct or their political opinions. "But it was never intended, and could not be intended, to prevent either the existing French government, under whose authority the French commander-in-chief must have acted, or any French government which should succeed to it, from acting in this respect as it might deem fit."* When the bravest of the French marshals was executed, party spirit blamed the Duke of Wellington for not regarding the capitulation as an amnesty. It would have been generous in the King of France to have spared Ney's life, but the capitulation of Paris offered no legal obstacle to that infliction of punishment which the king had threatened to the guilty before the capitulation.

"One day of dreadful occupation more"† before England could be held to be at peace with foreign foes. At the Congress of Vienna the aggressions of the Barbary States formed a natural subject of deliberation. It was proposed that a general European crusade should be undertaken against the infidel corsairs, who for three hundred years had been the terror of Europe, warring against every flag in the Mediterranean, and carrying off Christian slaves from every shore. In 1815 the government of the United States, whose ships had been plundered by the Algerines, captured a frigate and a brig belonging to the Dey, and obtained a compensation of sixty thousand dollars. In the spring of 1816 Lord Exmouth, with a squadron under his command, proceeded to Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, where he effected the release of seventeen hundred and ninety-two Christian slaves, and negotiated treaties of peace and amity on behalf of the minor powers in the Mediterranean. From Tunis and Tripoli a declaration was obtained that no Christian slaves should in future be made by either of those powers. The Dey of Algiers, however, refused to agree to the abolition of slavery without permission from the Sultan. Lord Exmouth acceded to a suspension for three months of the Dey's decision, and returned to England. One condition of the treaty with Algiers, then concluded by Lord Exmouth, was that the governments of Sicily and Sardinia should pay ransom for the release of their subjects; and, in point of fact, they did so pay, to the extent of nearly four hundred thousand dollars. This clause of the treaty was justly denounced in the British Parliament as an acknowledgment of the right of depredation exercised by the barbarians.

The fleet of Lord Exmouth was dismantled, the crews were paid off and disbanded. A sudden outrage which occurred even before Lord Exmouth quitted the Mediterranean, but which did not then come to his knowledge, was the obvious cause of the change in the determination of our government. Under a treaty of 1806 we occupied, for the protection of the coral fishery, Bona, a town in the regency of Algiers. On the 23d of May the fishers who had landed were massacred by a large body of troops, the British flag was torn down and trampled under foot, and the house of our vice-consul was pillaged. It was alleged that this outrage was a fanatical movement of the licentious Algerine soldiery. An expedition against Algiers was instantly determined upon by the British cabinet. A formidable fleet was equipped, with the least possible delay, at Portsmouth, and crews were collected from the different guard-ships, and volunteers invited to serve upon this particular enterprise. For once a British fleet went to sea without recourse to the disgraceful practice of impressment. Lord Exmouth left Plymouth on the 28th of July, with a fleet consisting of twenty-five sail of large and small ships. At Gibraltar he was joined by the Dutch admiral, Van Cappellan, with five frigates and a sloop, and he finally set sail for Algiers on the 14th. The winds being adverse, the fleet did not arrive in sight of Algiers till the 27th of August. During his course Lord Exmouth learned that the British consul had been put in chains.

A most interesting and graphic narrative of the expedition to Algiers was published by Mr. Abraham Salamé, a native of Alexandria, who was taken out by Lord Exmouth to act as his interpreter. On the morning of the 27th, as the fleet was nearing Algiers, Salamé was sent forward with a letter to the Dey, which demanded the entire abolition of Christian slavery, the delivery of all Christian slaves in the kingdom of Algiers, the restoration of all the money that had been paid for the redemption of slaves by the King of the Two Sicilies and the King of Sardinia, peace between Algiers and the Netherlands, and the immediate liberation of the British consul and two boats' crews who had been detained with him. At eleven o'clock the interpreter reached the Mole, in a boat bearing a flag of truce, and, delivering his letters to the captain of the port, demanded an answer to the letter addressed to the Dey in one hour. He was told that if answer were returned at all, it should be delivered in two hours. Salamé waited for his answer till half-past two, but no answer came. During this time a breeze sprung up, the fleet advanced into the bay, and lay to within half a mile of Algiers. The interpreter then hoisted the signal that no answer had been given, and the fleet immediately began to bear up, and every ship to take her position. Salamé reached the Queen Charlotte, Lord Exmouth's ship, in safety, but, he candidly acknowledges, almost more dead than alive. Then he saw the change which comes over a brave and decided man at the moment when resolve passes into action. "I was quite surprised to see how his lordship was altered from what I left him in the morning, for I knew his manner was in general very mild; and now he seemed to me *all-fightful*, as a fierce lion which had been chained in its cage and was set at liberty. With all that, his lordship's answer to me was, 'Never mind—we shall see now;' and at the same time he turned toward the officers, saying, 'Be ready!'" There is, perhaps, nothing in the history of warfare more terrific in its consequences than the first broadside that the British fired at Algiers. The Queen Charlotte passed through all the batteries without firing a gun, and took up a position within a hundred yards of the Mole-head batteries. At the first shot which was fired by the Algerines at the Impregnable Lord Exmouth cried out, "That will do; fire, my fine fellows!" The miserable Algerines who were looking on, as at a show, with apparent indifference to the consequences, were swept away by hundreds by this first fire from the Queen Charlotte. From a quarter before three o'clock till nine the most tremendous firing on both sides continued without intermission, and the firing did not cease

* "Despatches," vol. xii. p. 694.
† Southey, "Ode on the Battle of Algiers."

altogether until half-past eleven. During this engagement of nine hours the allied fleet fired a hundred and eighteen tons of gunpowder and five hundred tons of shot and shells. The Algerines exclaimed that hell had opened its mouth upon them through the English ships. That the Algerines had plied their instruments of destruction with no common alacrity is sufficiently shown by the fact that eight hundred and fifty-two officers and men were killed in the British squadron, and sixty-five in the Dutch. Lord Exmouth himself says, in his dispatch, "There were awful moments during the conflict, which I cannot now attempt to describe, occasioned by firing the ships so near us." The Algerine batteries around Lord Exmouth's division were silenced about ten o'clock, and were in a complete state of ruin and dilapidation; but a fort at the upper angle of the city continued to annoy our ships, whose firing had almost ceased. This was the moment of the most serious danger to our fleet. Our means of attack were well-night expended; the upper batteries of the city could not be reached by our guns; the ships were becalmed. "Providence, at this interval," says Lord Exmouth, "gave to my anxious wishes the usual land-wind common in this bay, and my expectations were completed. We were all hands employed warping and towing off, and by the help of the light air the whole were under sail, and came to anchor out of reach of shells about two in the morning, after twelve hours' incessant labor." Nine Algerine frigates and a number of gun-boats were burning within the bay; the storehouses within the Mole were on fire. The blaze illumined all the bay, and showed the town and its environs almost as clear as in the day-time; instead of walls, the batteries presented nothing to the sight but heaps of rubbish; and out of these ruins the Moors and Turks were busily employed in dragging their dead. When the fleet had anchored a storm arose—not so violent as the storm which here destroyed the mighty fleet of Charles the Fifth, and left his magnificent army, which had landed to subdue the barbarians, to perish by sword and famine, but a storm of thunder and lightning, which filled up the measure of sublimity at the close of the twelve awful hours of battle and slaughter.

On the morning of the 28th Lord Exmouth wrote a letter to the Dey, who had himself fought with courage, in which the same terms of peace were offered as on the previous day. "If you receive this offer as you ought, you will fire three guns," wrote Lord Exmouth. The three guns were fired, the Dey made apologies, and treaties of peace and amity were finally signed, to be very soon again broken. The enduring triumph of this expedition was the release, within three days of the battle, of a thousand and eighty-three Christian slaves, who arrived from the interior, and who were immediately conveyed to their respective countries.

KNIGHT'S POPULAR HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

A HISTORY OF SOCIETY AND GOVERNMENT FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO OUR OWN TIMES.

By CHARLES KNIGHT.

VOLUME VIII.

CHAPTER CCXII.*

Meeting of parliament—Reception of Lord Castlereagh—Debates on the address—Government defeated on the proposed renewal of the property-tax—Marriage of the Princess Charlotte—Unpopularity of the prince-regent—Complaints of agricultural distress—Depression of commerce and manufactures—Causes assigned for the depression of industry—Reduction of the circulating medium—Unfavorable season—Riots and outrages in agricultural districts—Renewal of Luddism—Private benevolence—Progress of legislation for social improvement—Criminal laws—Forgeries of bank-notes—Police of London—Gas-light—Mendicity and vagrancy—Law of settlement—General administration of Poor Laws—Inquiry into the state of education—Savings banks—Game Laws.

The Imperial Parliament assembled on the 1st of February, 1816. At this opening of the session the ministry met the representatives of the people with all the pride and confidence of a success beyond hope. The march to Paris, twice over, says a conspicuous actor in the politics of that hour, was sufficiently marvellous; "but it appeared, if possible, still more incredible that we should witness Lord Castlereagh entering the House of Commons, and resuming, amid universal shouts of applause, the seat which he had quitted for a season to attend as a chief actor in the arrangement of continental territory."† Why incredible? Lord Castlereagh in the House of Commons was the impersonation of a great national triumph. The parliamentary majority cheered the minister for foreign affairs as he would have been cheered by any other assembly, when he came home flushed with success. For a little while the nation might bear even the presumption of those who claimed all the merit of the triumph. On the first night of the session it was clearly seen that there was to be a limit to what parliament would bear. The chancellor of the exchequer declared his intention to continue the property or income tax, on the modified scale of five per cent. This avowal was the signal for one of the chief battle-cries which were to lead on the scanty forces of opposition.

In a debate in the Committee of Supply, Lord Castlereagh used a memorable expression which roused a spirit in the country of deep hostility, almost of disgust: "He felt assured that the people of England would not, from an ignorant impatience to be relieved from the pressure of taxation, put everything to hazard, when everything might be accomplished by continued constancy and firmness."* From the moment of this offensive declaration the income tax was doomed. The people had not borne the taxation of so many years of war with a heroism such as no people had ever before shown, to be taunted with ignorant impatience of taxation, now that they had won peace. The presumption of the government at this period was calculated to produce a violent reaction throughout the land. Men really thought that the old English spirit of freedom was about to be trampled upon when the debates on the treaties took place, in which Lord Liverpool moved the address. Lord Grenville proposed an amendment, which deprecated in the strongest language "the settled system to raise the country into a military power." In the House of Peers the government had a majority of sixty-four. Lord Holland entered a protest against the address, in terms which embodied his speech upon the treaties, and expressed the opinions of that section of the opposition: "Because the treaties and engagements contain a direct guarantee of the present government of France against the people of that country, and, in my judgment, imply a general and perpetual guarantee of all European governments against the governed." In the House of Commons the foreign secretary moved the address upon the treaties. An amendment was proposed by Lord Milton, which deprecated the military occupation of France and the unexampled military establishments of this country. The debate lasted two nights, the address being finally carried by a majority of a hundred and sixty-three. What was said on both sides was, to a considerable extent, the regular display of party conflict. The exultation of the government at the settlement of their war labors look now scarcely more inflated than the fears of some members of the opposition that the confederated arms of the despots of Europe might be turned against the liberties of England. The practical business that was at hand—the enforcement of economy, the alleviation of distress—was the matter of real importance that was to grow out of these debates.

The corporation of London took the lead in the national expression of opinion against the property tax. It was not only the anti-ministerial party of the city that joined in the petition of the corporation; the judgments of mercantile men against the continuance of the tax were almost universal. The dislike of the rural population was as fixed as that of the inhabitants of towns. The battle against this tax was one of the most remarkable examples of parliamentary strategy that was ever displayed. For six weeks the opposition, headed by Mr. Brougham, availed themselves of all the means of delay afforded by the forms of the house. As petitions against the tax were presented night after night, debates on the petitions prevented debate and division on the reading of the bill. It was the 17th of March before the resolutions for the continuance of the tax were presented to the house. The division of the 18th of March, upon the motion of the chancellor of the exchequer in a Committee of Ways and Means, was terminated in half an hour by the impatience of the house. For the continuance of the property tax 201 members voted; against it, 238. This defeat of the government dispelled the belief that resistance to taxation was "ignorant impatience." The

* The period comprised in this chapter and in Chapter CCXIII., embracing the annals of 1816 and 1817, has been previously treated of by the author of "The Popular History" in "The History of the Peace," published in 1846. This work, begun by him, was continued and completed by Miss Martineau, and therefore bears her name. Although in the present history the author proposed only to occupy about half the space of what he had previously written, he felt the extreme difficulty of relating the same events and expressing the same opinions altogether in new words. Having stated his difficulty to Messrs. Chambers, who are now the proprietors of the copyright of "The History of the Peace," he has received from them a very kind permission to condense the original narrative, or adopt any passages, at his own discretion. While this license relieves the author from an obvious embarrassment, he has nevertheless been desirous to avoid a mere transcript of any large portion of what he had previously written. But he has not made the useless attempt to distinguish between the new matter and the old, hoping that he has amalgamated the separate parts so as to produce a harmonious result.

† Brougham's "Speeches," vol. i. p. 634; Introduction to Speech on Holy Alliance.

* Hansard, vol. xxxiii. p. 455.

chancellor of the exchequer took a somewhat remarkable course after this defeat. He voluntarily abandoned the war duties upon malt, amounting to about 2,700,000*l.* The decision of the house would compel him to resort to the money market—in other words, to raise a loan. "It was of little consequence that the loan should be increased by the amount of the calculated produce of the malt duty." Lord Castlereagh said, "It was a matter of indifference whether they took a loan of six or eight millions." This was the "indifference"—the result of a long course of unbounded expense—that required all the efforts of the people and of their friends, during many years, to change into responsibility.

The inquisitorial character of the property tax had some influence in producing the popular hostility to its continuance. The returns of the tax-payers were then scrutinized with a severity which has been wisely put aside in the present times. But during the pressure of war expenditure, and long afterward, the imposition and collection of other taxes were rendered as odious as possible to the people. The government employed, to an extent which scarcely seems credible now, an army of common informers, through whose agency the system of surcharges and penalties was enforced. Southey attacked this disgrace of our nation as being ten times more inquisitorial than the Holy Office of Spain. "This species of espionage has within these few years become a regular trade; the laws are in some instances so perplexing and in others so vexatious that matter for prosecution is never wanting." He describes how "a fellow surcharges half the people in the district—that is, he informs the tax commissioners that such persons have given in a false account of their windows, dogs, horses, carriages, etc.—an offence for which the tax is trebled, and half the surplus given to the informer." Harassed and perplexed—summoned from distant parts to appear before the commissioners—the persons informed against give up the trouble and expense of seeking justice; pay the penalty and bear the surcharge.*

The debates upon the army estimates, which eventually caused some reduction—the rejection of the property tax—the searching inquiry into the civil list—the agitation of the question of sinecure offices—were indications of the feeling which any government would have to encounter that did not resolutely determine that a season of peace should be a season of economy. When the details of the civil list exhibited items of wanton and ridiculous luxury, the members of the administration themselves were pained and humiliated. When the same ministers proposed the magnificent establishment for the Princess Charlotte and Prince Leopold, upon their marriage, not a dissentient voice was heard in parliament. The nation saw in this marriage of the presumptive heiress of the crown—a marriage of affection—some assured hope that public duties might be fitly learned in the serenity of domestic happiness. The private virtues were felt to be the best preparation for the possession of sovereign power. The idea of a patriot queen discharging all her high functions with steady alacrity, confident in the affections of her people, of simple habits, of refined and intellectual tastes, her throne sanctified by the attributes of womanly affection—such hopes were something to console the nation for the present endurance of authority that claimed only "mouth honor," without love or respect. The marriage of the Princess Charlotte was hailed as a public blessing. It took place at Carlton House, on the evening of the 2d of May.

One of the most painful circumstances of this period, and one pregnant with danger, was the general contempt for the character of him who now wielded the sovereign authority. The military triumphs of the regency made the nation only consider how strongly in contrast to the elevation of that heroic time were the cravings for ease and indulgence, the reckless expenditure upon childish gratifications, of the regent. The attacks of the press upon his sensual follies made him hate the expression of public opinion. That voice was heard in a place where the character and actions of the sovereign are usually unnoticed, even in the greatest freedom of parliamentary debate. The Prince of Wales was in "all but name a king." Romilly describes a scene in the House of Commons, which took place in a debate on the 20th of March, in which Brougham, he says, made a violent attack upon the regent, "whom he described as devoted, in the recesses of his palace, to the most vicious pleasures, and callous to the distresses and sufferings of others, in terms which would not have been too strong to describe the latter days of Tiberius." He adds, "It is generally believed that, but for the speech of Brougham's, the ministers would again have been in a minority. . . . Brougham's speech was very injudicious as well as very unjust, for, with all the prince's faults, it is absurd to speak of him as if he were one of the most sensual and unfeeling tyrants that ever disgraced a throne."* Nevertheless, although satire ran riot in ridicule of the unbounded and effeminate luxury of Carlton House, in spite of *ex-officio* informations, there was wanting some authoritative voice to proclaim that the mightiest of the earth are unworthy of their high station when they live for their own pleasures alone. The declamation of Mr. Brougham might be unstatesmanlike, but it was not without its use.

When the government, in the name of the prince-regent, informed parliament that "the manufactures, commerce, and revenue of the United Kingdom were in a flourishing condition," the exception of agriculture was a sufficient announcement that the cry of "Distress" was near at hand. Amid the best and the worst species of opposition—the power of argument and the weakness of tumult—a bill was in 1815 hurried through parliament which absolutely closed the ports till the price of wheat rose to 80*s*. This law was passed during a season of wonderful abundance. It produced the immediate good to the landed interest of preventing the abundant supply being increased by importation; but the effect which it produced to the nation was to dry up the resources in years of scarcity which the foresight of other countries might have provided. The war-and-famine price of 1812 was again reached in the latter part of 1816, in 1817, and in 1818. The golden days of the deity that is found in no mythology, the anti-Ceres, were returned. But the people were starving. Misery and insurrection filled the land.

A year after the hasty enactment of a corn law in 1815, amid riots in the metropolis and the provinces, a majority of the landed interest came to parliament to ask for the remission of peculiar burdens, and to demand fresh protection. The landed interest of 1816 had but one remedy for every evil—unequal remission of taxation conjoined with protection. They desired themselves to pay less to the state than their fellow-subjects; they required the state to limit their fellow-subjects, to that exclusive market for the necessaries of life which should dry up the sources of profitable industry, and thus make their taxation doubly burdensome. On the 7th of March Mr. Western laid upon the table of the house a series of fourteen resolutions, which declared the "unexampled distress" of those whose capitals were employed in agriculture. They demanded the repeal of so much of the act of 1815 as should allow foreign corn to be warehoused, so that only British corn should be stored, and urged an advance of money by the government to such individuals as might be inclined to buy up our native produce. The principle upon which all this was advocated was a sufficiently broad one, "That excessive taxation renders it necessary to give protection to all articles the produce of our own soil against similar articles the growth of foreign countries not subject to the same burdens;" and "that it is therefore expedient to impose additional duties and restrictions on the importation of all articles the produce of foreign agriculture." It is a remarkable example of the power of the landed interest in the House of Commons that these assertions and unconditional demands were received not only with tolerance but respect. The day-spring of economical politics had scarcely yet dawned. The strength either of the ministry or the opposition essentially depended upon the numerical force of the country gentlemen. The commercial and manufacturing interests were most imperfectly represented. The landed aristocracy had retained official power in association with a few "clerkly" workers from the earliest feudal times. The admission of a merchant to the councils of the sovereign would have been deemed pollution. The mill-owners had carried us through the war; yet as a political body they were without influence, almost without a voice. There was no one in the House of Commons who had either the courage or the ability to probe the wounds of the agricultural interests which were thus paraded before the nation. The resolutions of Mr. Western in 1816 came to no practical result; for the chief reason that the forced abandonment of the property tax and the voluntary relinquishment of the war malt duty

* "Espriella's Letters"—Letter xvi.

* Romilly's "Life."

had really left very little within the reach of government to be offered as a further boon to the landed interest.

"Manufactures and commerce," said the speech of the prince-regent, "are in a flourishing condition." This was to rely upon the bare figures of custom-house returns. In 1815 the declared value of British and Irish produce and manufactures exported was fifty-one millions, being six millions more than in 1814. Well might the commerce of the country seem to be flourishing. Those who knew the real workings of that commerce were not so deceived. Mr. Baring, on the second night of the session, declared that "he saw more loss than gain in this great increase of export." When the destruction of the power of Napoleon in 1814 had opened the ports of the continent to our vessels, when the consumption of our exports no longer depended upon a vast system of contraband trade, it was universally thought that there could be no limit to the demand for British manufactures and colonial produce. If, under the anti-commercial decrees of our great enemy, the shipments to European ports had been twelve millions in 1811, why should they not be doubled in 1814? And accordingly they were doubled. The most extravagant profits were expected to be realized. The ordinary course of trade was forsaken, and small capitalists as well as large, at the outports as well as in London, eagerly bought up colonial produce, and looked for golden returns. "The shippers found to their cost, when it was too late, that the effective demand on the continent for colonial produce and British manufactures had been greatly overrated; for whatever might be the desire of the foreign consumers to possess articles so long out of their reach, they were limited in their means of purchase, and accordingly the bulk of the commodities exported brought very inadequate returns."* A very slight consideration will explain the causes of this enormous mistake. In the first place the continent was wholly exhausted by the long course of war; by the prodigious expenditure of capital that the war had demanded; by the wasteful consumption of mighty armies embattled against the oppressor; by the rapine of the predatory hordes that were let loose upon their soil; by confiscation. The people had necessarily the greatest difficulty to maintain life; they had little to spare for the secondary necessaries—nothing for indulgence. The merchants of our own country—the nation in general—had been so accustomed to the outward indications of prosperity at home during the course of the war that they had no adequate idea that war was the great destroyer of capital, and that it essentially left all mankind poorer. In the second place, what had the continent to give us in exchange for our coffee and our sugar, our calicoes and our cutlery? The old mercantile school still existed among us, who thought that the perfection of commerce was to exchange goods for money, and that a great commercial nation might subsist without barter. But the continent had no money to exchange for English products, even if the exploded theories of the balance of trade could have found any realization. The continent, exhausted as it was, had its native commodities, but those we refused. We doggedly held on in a course of commercial regulation which belonged only to the infancy of society. We perpetuated foreign restrictions and exclusions of our own manufactured produce, by persistence in a system which other nations of necessity regarded as the cause of our manufacturing superiority. We did not then know how essentially this system retarded our own national progress. We listened to those who, on every side, clamored for exclusive interests. Agriculturists and manufacturers, landowners and shipowners, equally shouted for protection.

The state of the American trade of 1816 was described by Mr. Brougham, after speaking of the disastrous results of the continental speculations, "The peace with America has produced somewhat of a similar effect; though I am very far from placing the vast exports which it occasioned upon the same footing with those to the European markets the year before; because ultimately the Americans will pay; which the exhausted state of the continent renders very unlikely."† Let us remark that we did not prevent the Americans paying in the only way in which one great people can pay another—by the interchange of commodities which each wants, in return for commodities of which each can produce a superfluity. We shut out their corn, but we did not shut out their cotton. But we went further with the United States in the recognition of just commercial principles than with any European nation. By the Treaty of Ghent, in 1814, both countries agreed to repeal their navigation laws, and "the ships of the two countries were placed reciprocally upon the same footing in the ports of England and the United States, and all discriminating duties chargeable upon the goods which they conveyed were mutually repealed."

The distresses of the agricultural and the commercial interests were coincident, for the means of purchase among all classes were exhausted. The capital which was to impel their profitable industry was dried up. There was "a very general depression in the prices of nearly all productions, and in the value of all fixed property, entailing a convergence of losses and failures among the agricultural, and commercial, and manufacturing, and mining, and shipping, and building interests, which marked that period as one of most extensive suffering and distress."* Some proclaimed that the depression and the distress were caused, not by the exhaustion of war, but by "the transition from a state of war to a state of peace." The theory upon which this delusion was upheld was this: "The whole annual war expenditure, to the amount of not less than forty millions, was at once withdrawn from circulation. But public expenditure is like the fountain-tree in the Indian paradise, which diffuses in fertilizing streams the vapors which it was created to collect and condense for the purpose of more beneficially returning and distributing them."† According to this logical imagery, or imaginative logic, the capital of a nation in the pockets of its proprietors is "vapor;" it becomes a "fertilizing stream" when it condenses into taxes. It assumes that there is more demand when the capital of a country is expended by government than when the same capital is expended by individuals. It assumes that the expenditure of capital by government in subsidies, in the wasteful consumption of armies, in all the tear and wear of war, is more profitable than the expenditure of capital in the general objects of industry which create more capital. It assumes that the partial expenditure of capital by government in its victualling offices is more profitable than the regular expenditure of the same capital left in the pockets of the tax-payers, to give them an additional command over food and raiment—over the comforts and elegancies of life. This fallacy, as well as many others connected with the depression of industry at the close of the war, has been disproved by the long experience of peace. We had arrived in 1816 at the highest point of war exhaustion. The expenditure of government in the eleven years between 1805 and 1815 was very nearly 900,000,000*l.* In 1815 the revenue raised by taxation was 72,000,000*l.* Upon a population of fifteen millions in the United Kingdom this was a rate per head of 4*l.* 16*s.* The rate of taxation per head upon the population of the United Kingdom in 1860 was 2*l.* 8*s.* There was the same aggregate amount of taxation, but the burden was divided between twice the number of tax-payers.

The partial return to a real standard of the currency at the period of peace was considered by many to have been a main if not the sole cause of the distress and embarrassment which we have described. Nevertheless, the Bank of England at the peace scarcely contracted its issues at all. In August, 1813, the circulation of bank-notes was nearly twenty-five millions; at the same season in 1814 it was twenty-eight millions; in 1815, twenty-seven millions; in 1816, only half a million less. The utmost amount of the depreciation of bank-notes was in 1814, when a hundred pounds of paper would only buy 74*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.* of gold—a depreciation of about 25 per cent. In 1815 and 1816 a hundred pounds of paper would buy 83*l.* 5*s.* 9*d.* of gold—a depreciation of nearly 17 per cent. Thus the rise in the value of money, which Cobbett, and many others of less violent politics, declared had produced the wide-spreading ruin of 1816, by causing a proportionate fall of the prices of commodities exchanged for money, was not more than 8 per cent, as compared with the period when the value of an unconvertible paper-money was at the lowest. It is no less true that a vast amount of paper-money was withdrawn from circulation at this period, by the failure of many country banks, and the contraction of their advances by all who were stable. This was a consequence of the great fall of agricultural produce—a consequence of the diminished credit of the producers. When the restriction

* Tooke's "History of Prices," vol. ii. p. 8.
† Brougham's "Speeches," vol. i. p. 519.

* Tooke's "History of Prices," vol. ii. p. 12.
† "Quarterly Review," July, 1816.

upon cash payments by the Bank of England was, in 1816, agreed to be renewed for two years, the bearing of the continuance of the restriction upon the state of prices was not overlooked. On the 1st of May, 1816, Mr. Horner, on his motion for a committee to inquire into the expediency of restoring the cash payments of the Bank of England, said that, "from inquiries which he had made, and from the accounts on the table, he was convinced that a greater and more sudden reduction of the circulating medium had never taken place in any country than had taken place since the peace in this country, with the exception of those reductions which had happened in France after the Mississippi scheme, and after the destruction of the assignats. The reduction of the currency had originated in the previous fall of the prices of agricultural produce. This fall had produced a destruction of the country bank-paper to an extent which would not have been thought possible without more ruin than had ensued. The Bank of England had also reduced its issues, as appeared by the accounts recently presented. But without looking to the diminution of the Bank of England paper, the reduction of country paper was enough to account for the fall which had taken place."* William Cobbett, in November, 1816, maintained, not unreasonably, although he exaggerated the extent of the diminished issue of bank-paper, that if, with reduced prices of commodities, the debt and taxes had come down too, there would have been no material injury.†

That the paralysis of industry which marked the latter months of 1815 and the beginning of 1816 was most felt by those whose voices of complaint were least heard by the working population, was soon made perfectly manifest. There was a surplus of labor in every department of human exertion. Mr. Brand declared in parliament, at the end of March, speaking especially of the agricultural population, that "the poor, in many cases, abandoned their own residences. Whole parishes had been deserted, and the crowd of paupers, increasing in numbers as they went from parish to parish, spread wider and wider this awful desolation."‡ Discharged sailors and disbanded militiamen swelled the ranks of indigence. If the unhappy wanderers crowded to the cities, they encountered bodies of workmen equally wretched, wholly deprived of work, or working at short time upon insufficient wages. But another evil, of which we find no parliamentary record, amid debates on the prevailing distress, had come upon the land to aggravate discontent into desperation. While the landowners were demanding more protection and passing new laws for limiting the supply of food, the heavens lowered; intense frosts prevailed in February; the spring was inclement; the temperature of the advancing summer was unusually low; and in July incessant rains and cold stormy winds completed the most ungenial season that had occurred in this country since 1799. In January the average price of wheat was 52*s.* 6*d.*; in May it was 76*s.* 4*d.* The apprehensions of a deficient crop were universal in Germany, in France, and in the south of Europe. The result of the harvest showed that these apprehensions were not idle. The prices of grain in England rapidly rose after July, and at the end of the year rye, barley, and beans had more than doubled the average market price at the beginning; wheat had risen from 52*s.* 6*d.* to 103*s.*

"The matter of seditions is of two kinds," says Lord Bacon, "much poverty and much discontentment." Both causes were fully operating in Great Britain in 1816. The seditions of absolute poverty—"the rebellions of the belly," as the same great thinker writes—were the first to manifest themselves. Early in May symptoms of insubordination and desperate violence were displayed among the agricultural population of the eastern counties. These "poor dumb mouths" soon made themselves audible. They combined in the destruction of property with a fierce recklessness that startled those who saw no danger but in the violence of dense populations, and who were constantly proclaiming that the nation which builds on manufactures sleeps upon gunpowder. In Suffolk nightly fires of incendiaries began to blaze in every district; threshing-machines were broken or burned in open day; mills were attacked. At Brandon, near Bury, large bodies of laborers assembled to prescribe a maximum price of grain and meat, and to pull down the houses of butchers and bakers. They bore flags with the motto, "Bread or blood." At Bury and at Norwich disturbances of a similar nature were quickly repressed. But the most serious demonstration of the spirit of the peasantry arose in what is called "the Isle of Ely." When we regard the peculiar character of this portion of the country we may easily understand how a great fall in the prices of grain had driven the land out of cultivation, and cast off the labor of the peasantry, to be as noxious in its stagnation as the overcharged waters of that artificially fertile region. That country was then very imperfectly drained, and the rates for the imperfect drainage being unpaid by many tenants, the destructive agencies of nature were more active than the healing and directing energies of man. It is well known, too, that in the fen countries the temptation of immediate profit had more than commonly led the farmer to raise exhausting crops, and that the nature of the land, under such circumstances, is such, that a more provident tillage and abundant manure cannot for a long time restore it. The high prices of wheat from 1810 to 1814 had supplied this temptation. The Isle of Ely, in 1816, had become somewhat like Prospero's isle, where there was "everything advantageous to life, save means to live." It was under such circumstances that, on the 22d of May, a great body of insurgent fen men assembled at Littleport, a small town on the river Lark. They commenced their riotous proceedings by a night attack on the house of a magistrate. They broke into shops, emptied the cellars of public-houses, and finally marched to Ely, where they continued their lawless course of drunkenness and plunder. For two days and nights these scenes of violence did not cease, and the parish of Littleport was described as resembling a town sacked by a besieging army, the principal inhabitants having been compelled to abandon their houses in terror of their lives, leaving their property to the fury of this fearful band of desperate men. There could, of necessity, be but one termination. The military were called in, and a sort of skirmish ensued, in which blood flowed on both sides. A large number of the rioters were finally lodged in Ely jail. Then came the sure retribution of the offended laws. A special commission was issued for the trial of the culprits. Thirty-four persons were convicted, and sentenced to death, on charges of burglary and robbery, of whom five were executed.

Incendiary fires, attempts at plunder, riots put down by military force, spread alarm through districts chiefly agricultural. The distress which had fallen upon the manufacturing and other non-agricultural portions of the population was manifested in many signal ways. At the beginning of July a body of colliers, thrown out of employment by the stoppage of iron-works at Bilston, took the singular resolution of setting out to London, for the purpose of submitting their distresses in a petition to the prince-regent, and presenting him with two wagons of coals, which they drew along with them. One party advanced as far as St. Alban's, and another reached Maidenhead Thicket. The home office took the precaution of sending a strong body of police, with magistrates, from London, to meet these poor fellows, and induce them to return; and they were successful. The distresses of the workmen in the iron trade were quite appalling. Utter desolation prevailed in districts where iron-works had been suspended. The workmen in these districts used to be surrounded with many comforts. They had saved a little money. The factories were shut up, the furnaces blown out, the coal-pits closed. Then the neat cottages, where hundreds of families had lived in comfort, were gradually stripped of every article of furniture; the doors of these once cheerful dwellings were closed; the families were wandering about the country, seeking for that relief from private charity which the parishes could not supply them. Depredation was very rare. Later in the year the miners and colliers connected with the great iron-works in the neighborhood of Merthyr assembled in a tumultuous manner, and their numbers gradually swelling till they reached ten or twelve thousand, they finally extinguished the blast at several works, but did little other damage. These men were on very reduced wages, but their distress does not seem to have been nearly so great as the utter destitution of the Staffordshire colliers.

The Luddite insurrection of 1812 had never been wholly put down.* In 1816 it broke forth with new violence. At Loughborough, in July, many frames employed in the manufacture of lace

* Hansard, vol. xxxiv. p. 143.
† "Political Register," November 30, 1816.
‡ Hansard, vol. xxxiii. p. 671.

* *Ante*, vol. vii. p. 1083.

were destroyed, with the same secrecy as in 1812. Armed bands, under the orders of a chief, held the inhabitants in nightly terror, commanding them to put out their lights and keep within their houses under penalty of death. Their ravages were not confined to the towns; they would march with suddenness and secrecy to distant villages, and rapidly effect their purposes of destruction. The General Ludd who led on these armed and disguised desperadoes would address his forces in a short speech, divide them into parties, and assign their respective operations. Then, in the silence of night, would houses and factories be broken open, frames and other machines be demolished, unfinished work be scattered on the highways, furniture be wholly destroyed. The ignorance which has more or less prevailed at all times on the subject of machinery, coupled with the want of employment produced by the depression of every branch of industry, was the cause that, undeterred by the terrible penalties of the law, the Luddites still pursued the course which had well-nigh driven the lace manufacture from their district, and converted temporary distress into permanent ruin.

The sufferings of the poor in 1816 were too manifest not to call forth an unusual amount of public sympathy, displayed in subscriptions for relief and in schemes for providing employment. However local charity may have mitigated the intensity of the evil arising out of the general exhaustion of capital, the more ostentatious exertions of that period were economic mistakes, which would have become fatal delusions if they had not quickly broken down. Every scheme to provide unprofitable employment by what is called charity must necessarily be fallacious. Affording no returns to produce continued employment, it soon comes to an end. The higher benevolence which goes to the root, as far as possible, of the evils of society, was then little understood and less practised. Let us endeavor to trace the operation, during the first year in which parliament had leisure to attend to the condition of the people, of that legislation which seeks to remove evil laws and to amend worn-out institutions.

The notion that had been engendered by the French Revolution, that to innovate was to destroy, that to reform was to revolutionize, was the creed of the majority from the close of the war to the end of the reign of George the Fourth. The reaction, which in 1816 had commenced, of a more enlightened public opinion, finally produced the remarkable progress in social improvement which is the great characteristic of the happier eras of William the Fourth and of Victoria. This reaction acquired efficiency and permanence from the very obstinacy with which it was resisted. It grew up during an incessant conflict, in which the roughest weapons of controversy were freely used by speakers and by writers. The amount of acrimony and intolerance which we may trace in the periodical press of that time now appears ludicrous to the few who have survived what Sydney Smith calls "an awful period for those who had the misfortune to entertain liberal opinions." A later generation turns with loathing from the mode in which educated men denounced those who differed from them in the notion that the English constitution, as then understood, was the best possible form of government, and that what those who were sneered at as enthusiasts called social evils were really blessings in disguise. When the enthusiasts attempted to repeal or modify laws wholly unsuited to the advanced opinions of the age, and which appeared unlikely to provoke the hostility of mere selfish interests, there was always some formidable adversary to stand in the breach, ready to defend the crumbling outer walls of our time-honored institutions, as if they constituted the strength and glory of the citadel. Wise men looked upon English life, and thought,

> "'tis an unweeded garden
> That grows to seed; things rank and gross in nature
> Possess it merely."

They were levellers—they were visionaries—they would make government impossible, said an overwhelming majority. A type of the class who resisted every approach to improvement was the lord chancellor, Eldon. His thought by day, his dream by night, was to uphold what he called the constitution—that indefinable compound of principles and expedients that to him was as sacred as the commands of Holy Writ. Whoever approached to lay his hands on that ark, whether he came to blot out a cruel statute or to mitigate a commercial restriction, or to disfranchise a corrupt borough, or to break down a religious disability, was his enemy. It has been truly observed that he confounded every abuse that surrounded the throne, or grew up within the precincts of the altar, with the institutions themselves—"alike the determined enemy of all who would either invade the institution or extirpate the abuse." Romilly was the foremost among the courageous spirits who risked something for the amelioration of the lot of their fellow-men. His perseverance was an example to other earnest laborers, who, amid much suspicion and some ridicule, rested not till they had secured a neutral ground on which the benevolent and wise of each party might labor without any compromise of their political consistency. Criminal laws, police, poor-laws, education—these offered themselves, when the excitement of the war had passed away, as subjects that might be dealt with in the same spirit which had finally carried the abolition of the slave trade. Tory might unite with Whig in measures whose necessity was proclaimed in many forms of misery, of oppression, of neglect. Resistance to change gradually became feebler and feebler. There was a wide gulf between the land of promise and the land of reality; but it was first bridged over with a single plank, and then a solid structure arose, across which the advocates of "things as they should be" securely passed to an enduring triumph, of which the wisest of the adherents of "things as they are" came, in the fulness of time, to share the honor.

The name of reform in the criminal laws had not been heard in the House of Commons for fifty-eight years, when, in 1808, Romilly carried his bill for the abolition of the punishment of death for privately stealing from the person to the value of five shillings—in other words, for picking pockets. His friend Scarlett advised him to attempt at once to repeal all the statutes which punish with death mere thefts unaccompanied by any act of violence, or other circumstance of aggravation; but Romilly, seeing that he had no chance of being able to carry through the house a bill, which was to expunge at once all those laws from the statute-book, determined to attempt the repeal of them one by one. Upon this prudential principle Romilly carried his first reform in 1808. Nevertheless, the House of Commons, which consented to pass the bill, forced upon him the omission of its preamble: "Whereas, the extreme severity of penal laws hath not been found effectual for the prevention of crimes; but, on the contrary, by increasing the difficulty of convicting offenders, in some cases affords them impunity, and in most cases renders their punishment extremely uncertain." The temper with which too many persons of rank and influence received any project of amelioration at the beginning of this century is forcibly exhibited in an anecdote which Romilly has preserved for our edification. The brother of a peer of the realm, fresh from a debauch, came up to him at the bar of the House of Commons, and stammered out, "I am against your bill; I am for hanging all." *

In 1810 Romilly brought in three bills to repeal the acts which punished with death the crimes of stealing privately in a shop goods of the value of five shillings, and of stealing to the amount of forty shillings in a dwelling-house, or on board vessels in navigable rivers. The first bill passed the House of Commons, but was lost in the Lords. The other two were rejected. In 1811 the rejected bills were again introduced, with a fourth bill, abolishing the capital punishment for stealing in bleaching-grounds. The four bills were carried through the House of Commons, but only that on the subject of bleaching-grounds was sanctioned by the Lords. The constant argument that was employed on these occasions against the alteration of the law was this—that of late years the offences which they undertook to repress were greatly increased. Justly did Romilly say, "A better reason than this for altering the law could hardly be given." On the 24th of May, 1811, when three of the bills were rejected in the House of Lords, Lord Ellenborough declared, "They went to alter those laws which a century had proved to be necessary, and which were now to be overturned by speculation and modern philosophy." † The lord chancellor, Eldon, on the same occasion stated that he had himself early in life felt a disposition to examine the principles on which our criminal code was framed, "before observation and experience had matured his judgment. Since, however, he had learned to listen to these great teachers in this important science, his ideas had greatly changed, and he saw the wisdom of the principles and practice by which our criminal code was regulated." ‡ In

* Romilly's "Diary," June, 1808.
† Hansard, vol. xx. p. 299.
‡ Ibid., vol. xx. p. 300.

1813 Sir Samuel Romilly's bill for the abolition of capital punishment in cases of shoplifting was carried by the Commons in the new parliament, but it was again rejected in the House of Lords. No further attempt was made toward the amelioration of this branch of our laws till the year 1816.

On the 16th of February Sir Samuel Romilly obtained leave to bring in a bill repealing the act of William the Third which made it a capital offence to steal privately in a shop to the value of five shillings. He described this act as the most severe and sanguinary in our statute-book. As recently as 1785 no less than ninety-seven persons were executed in London for this offence alone, and the dreadful spectacle was exhibited of twenty suffering at the same time. The capital sentence was now constantly evaded by juries committing a pious fraud, and finding the property of less value than was required by the statute. The consequence, if severe laws were never executed, was, that crime went on to increase, and the crimes of juvenile offenders especially. On moving the third reading of the bill, on the 15th of March, Sir Samuel Romilly called attention to the great number of persons of very tender age who had recently been sentenced to death for pilfering in shops. At that moment there was a child in Newgate not ten years of age under sentence of death for this offence, and the recorder of London was reported to have declared that it was intended to enforce the laws strictly in future, to interpose some check, if possible, to the increase of youthful depravity. The bill passed the Commons, but was thrown out in the Lords on the 22d of May. On this occasion the lord chief justice agreed with the lord chancellor, "that the effect of removing the penalty of death from other crimes had rendered him still more averse to any new experiment of this kind. Since the removal of the vague terror which hung over the crime of stealing from the person, the number of offences of that kind had alarmingly increased." * Thus, with the absolute certainty of experience that bloody laws rigorously administered did not diminish crime, the legislators of the beginning of the nineteenth century believed, or affected to believe, that the same laws scarcely ever carried into execution would operate through the influence of what they called "a vague terror." The inefficiency of this system is forcibly demonstrated by a comparison of the number of forged notes presented at the Bank of England with the number of persons convicted of forging and uttering such notes, and the number of these executed for forgery. In 1816 there were 17,885 forged notes presented at the Bank of England; 104 persons were convicted of forgery; 18 were executed. The capital punishment for forgery was not abolished till 1833, but there was no execution for that offence after 1829. The crime had decreased by removing the temptation to its perpetration upon a large scale. In 1820 there were 29,035 forged notes presented at the bank; the convictions were 352; the executions were 21. In 1823 the forged notes presented were 1648; the convictions were 6; the executions were 2. The resumption of cash payments had extinguished the notes for one pound and two pounds, which had previously constituted the chief circulating medium.

In 1816 our system of police had arrived at its perfection of imbecile wickedness. The machinery for the prevention and detection of crime was exactly accommodated to the machinery for its punishment. On the 3d of April, on the motion of Mr. Bennet, a committee of the House of Commons was appointed to inquire into the state of the police of the metropolis. The committee was resumed in 1817, and two reports were presented, which were among the first causes of the awakening of the public mind to a sense of the frightful evils which were existing in what we flattered ourselves to be the most civilized city in the world. There was no unity of action among the petty jurisdictions into which the metropolis was divided. The notion of a preventive police was utterly unknown. The "thief-taker," as the police officer was called, was the great encourager of crime. The suppression of crime would have taken away the chief profits of his occupation. Flash-houses, known in the scientific phraseology of the police as "flash-cribs," "shades," and "infernals," were filthy dens where thieves and abandoned females were always to be found, riotous or drowsy, surrounded by children of all ages qualifying for their degrees in the college of crime. "There," says a Middlesex magistrate examined before the committee of 1816, "they (the children) see thieves and thief-takers sitting and drinking together on terms of good-fellowship; all they see and hear is calculated to make them believe they may rob without fear of punishment, for in their thoughtless course they do not reflect that the forbearance of the officers will continue no longer than until they commit a forty-pound crime, when they will be sacrificed." A forty-pound crime!—the phraseology is as obsolete as if it were written in the peddler's French of the rogues of the sixteenth century. A forty-pound crime was a crime for whose detection the state adjudged a reward to be paid, on conviction, of forty pounds, and as a necessary consequence the whole race of thieves were fostered into a steady advance from small offences to great till they obligingly ventured upon some deed of more than common atrocity which should bestow the blood-money upon the officers of the law who had so long petted and protected them. The system received a fatal blow in 1816, in the detection of three officers of the police who had actually conspired to induce five men to commit a burglary for the purpose of obtaining the rewards upon their conviction. The highwaymen who infested the suburbs of the metropolis had been eradicated—they belonged to another age. Offences against the person were very rarely connected with any offences against property. But the uncertainty of punishment, the authorized toleration of small offenders, and the organized system of negotiation for the return of stolen property, had filled the metropolis with legions of experienced depredators. The public exhibitions of the most profligate indecency and brutality can scarcely be believed by those who have grown up in a different state of society. When Defoe described his Colonel Jack, in the days of his boyish initiation into vice, sleeping with other children amid the kilns and glass-houses of the London fields, we read of a state of things that has long passed away. But as recently as 1816 in Covent Garden Market and other places affording a partial shelter, hundreds of men and women, boys and girls assembled together and continued during the night in a state of shameless profligacy which is described as presenting a scene of vice and tumult more atrocious than anything exhibited even by the lazzaroni of Naples.

The brilliantly lighted, carefully watched, safe, orderly, and tranquil London of the present day presents as great a contrast to the London of 1816 as that again contrasted with the London of 1762, the year in which the Westminster Paving and Lighting Act was passed. Street robberies, before that period, were the ordinary events of the night. Security was the exception to the course of atrocity, for which the government applied no remedy but to hang. For half a century after this the metropolis had its comparative safety of feeble oil-lamps and decrepit watchmen. The streets were filled with tumultuous vagabonds, and the drowsy guardians of the night suffered every abomination to go on in lawless vigor, happy if their sleep were undisturbed by the midnight row of the drunken rake. In 1807 Pall-Mall was lighted by gas. The persevering German who spent his own money and that of subscribers to his scheme had no reward. The original gas company, whose example was to be followed, not only by all England but by the whole civilized world, was first derided, and then treated in parliament as rapacious monopolists intent upon the ruin of established industry. The adventurers in gas-light did more for the prevention of crime than the government had done since the days of Alfred. We turn to the parliamentary debates, and we see how they were encouraged in 1816—nine years after it had been found that the invention was of inappreciable public benefit. "The company," said the Earl of Lauderdale, "aimed at a monopoly, which would ultimately prove injurious to the public, and ruin that most important branch of trade, our whale fisheries." * Alderman Atkins "contended that the measure was calculated to ruin that hardy race of men, the persons employed in the southern and Greenland whale fisheries, in each of which a million of money and above a hundred ships were engaged. If the bill were to pass it would throw out of employ ten thousand seamen, and above ten thousand rope-makers, sail-makers, mast-makers, etc., connected with that trade." † Who can forbear to admire the inexhaustible fund of benevolence that for ages had been at work in the advocacy of the great principle of protection?

A committee of the House of Commons was appointed in 1815 to

* Hansard, vol. xxxiv. p. 684.

* Hansard, vol. xxxiv. p. 1280. † Ibid., p. 1072.

inquire into the state of mendicity and vagrancy in the metropolis and its neighborhood; and they continued their sittings in 1816, reporting minutes of the evidence in each year. Beyond these reports no legislative measure was adopted. The evidence went rather to show the amount of imposture than of destitution. To collect such evidence was an amusing occupation for the idle mornings of members of parliament. To inquire into the causes of destitution and its remedies would have been a far heavier task. The chief tendency of the evidence was to show how the sturdy beggar was a capitalist and an epicure; ate fowls and beefsteaks for supper, and depised broken meat; had money in the funds, and left handsome legacies to his relations. The witnesses, moreover, had famous stories of a lame impostor who tied up his leg in a wooden frame, and a blind one who wrote letters in the evening for his unlettered brethren; of a widow who sat for ten years with twins who never grew bigger, and a wife who obtained clothes and money from eleven lying-in societies in the same year. But the committee had also some glimpses of real wretchedness amid these exciting tales of beggar-craft—as old as the days of the old Abraham men. They heard of Calmel's Buildings, a small court of twenty-four houses in the immediate vicinity of Portman Square, were more than seven hundred Irish lived in the most complete distress and profligacy; and they were told that the court was totally neglected by the parish; that it was never cleaned; that people were afraid to enter it from dread of contagion. In George Yard, Whitechapel, they were informed that there were two thousand people, occupying forty houses, in a similar state of wretchedness. Much more of this was told the committee; but the evil was exhibited and forgotten. Legislation for public health was unknown till 1848, except in the old laws of quarantine. Very much of what was called the vagrancy of the metropolis was a natural consequence of the administration of the Poor Laws throughout the kingdom. A large proportion of the money raised for the relief of the poor was expended in shifting the burden of their relief from one parish to another; and Middlesex kept a number of functionaries in active operation, to get rid of the vagrants that crowded into London, by passing them out of the limits of the metropolitan county, to return, of course, on the first convenient occasion. As Middlesex worked under the law of settlement, so worked the whole kingdom. An intelligent foreigner, who travelled in England in 1810, saw how the poor were repulsed from one parish to another "like infected persons. They are sent back from one end of the kingdom to the other, as criminals formerly in France, *de brigade en brigade*. You meet on the high roads, I will not say often, but too often, an old man on foot with his little bundle—a helpless widow, pregnant perhaps, and two or three barefooted children following her—become paupers in a place where they had not yet acquired a legal right to assistance, and sent away, on that account, to their original place of settlement." * This Law of Settlement was in full operation, playing its fantastic tricks from the Channel to the Tweed, when the peace filled the land with disbanded seamen and other servants of war, and agricultural laborers, who could find no employ at home, were wandering, as it was called, to search for capital in some unknown region where capital was seeking for labor. The statute of 1662, the foundation of the Law of Settlement,† forbade this wandering, and gave a very amusing explanation of the ground of its prohibitions: "Whereas, by reason of some defects in the law, poor people are not restrained from going from one parish to another, and therefore do endeavor to settle themselves in those parishes where there is the best stock." The great natural law of labor seeking exchange with capital was to be resisted by a law which declared that those who sought to effect this exchange were "rogues and vagabonds." In this spirit agricultural parishes very generally came to the resolution of employing none but their own parishioners. "The immediate consequence of this determination was, the removal of numbers of the most industrious families from homes where they had lived in comfort, and without parish relief, all their lives, to a workhouse in the parish to which they belonged." ‡

It was not till 1861 that the wedge was introduced that might break up the selfish and ignorant laws for the removal of the poor. One of the greatest evils attending the parochial terror of new settlers was the filthy and ruinous state of the dwellings of agricultural laborers. The evil has been remedied in some degree, but in too many districts it exists now as it existed when Simond "asked proprietors of land, or farmers, why they did not build houses for their laborers;" and was told that "far from building, they would rather pull down such houses." The laborers were crowded in hovels of the adjacent town or village. Cottages were not built or properly upheld in agricultural parishes, for what capitalist would speculate in houses for the laborers, when the most industrious might be hurried away at the bidding of the overseer? The tyranny seems likely to be destroyed by the intelligence which, sooner or later, sweeps away the great or the petty tyrant.

On the 28th of May Mr. Curwen, an intelligent agriculturist, brought the subject of the Poor Laws before the House of Commons, on a motion for the appointment of a committee of inquiry. Mr. Curwen had a plan—as many others had their plans. His scheme formed small part of the deliberations of the committee which reported in 1817. Their recommendations for the remedy of the enormous evil of the existing Poor Laws did not penetrate beneath the surface. In 1816 the amount of poor rate levied was 6,937,425*l.* This charge was at the rate of 12*s.* 4¼*d.* per head upon the population of England and Wales.* The average annual expenditure for the relief of the poor had gradually increased from about two millions at the commencement of the war to seven millions at its close. A very large portion of the money that had been spent in fostering pauperism during the war years, by parish allowances in aid of wages, represents the amount of degradation and misery which the laborers endured, as compared with their unallowanced forefathers. The national debt represents, in a great degree, the money expended in unprofitable wars—the waste of capital upon objects that can only be justified by the last necessity, and which are the result of those evil passions which the improved knowledge and virtue of mankind may in time root out. In the same way, had the money expended upon fostering pauperism been raised upon loan, we should have had an amount of some two hundred millions, representing, in a like degree, the waste of capital expended in drying up the sources of industry and skill, and paying the alms of miserable indigence instead of the wages of contented labor. It is difficult to conceive a more complete state of degradation than the allowanced laborers exhibited in 1816. With the feudal servitude had passed away the feudal protection. The parish servitude imposed the miseries and contumelies of slavery, without its exemption from immediate care and future responsibility. The old workhouse system was as productive of evil in principle, though not in amount, as the allowance system. In the parish workhouses the consequences of want of classification and bad management operated with the greatest hardship upon children. Habits were formed in the workhouse which rendered the path to respectability almost inaccessible. These children were disposed of under the apprenticing system, and were doomed to a dreary period of servitude, under some needy master who had been tempted in the first instance to take them by the offer of a small premium. The parochial plan of putting out children, with its attendant evils, was a necessary consequence of the want of training while in the workhouse.

In 1807 Mr. Whitbread proposed to the House of Commons a very large and comprehensive measure of Poor Law reform. The principles which he advocated were those of real statesmanship. To arrest the constant progress of pauperism he desired to raise the character of the laboring classes. He called upon the country to support a plan of general national education; he proposed a method under which the savings of the poor might be properly invested in a great national bank. At the period when Mr. Whitbread brought forward his plan of Poor Law reform the system of mutual instruction, introduced by Lancaster and Bell, was attracting great attention. Too much importance was perhaps at first attached to the mechanical means of education then recently developed; but the influence was favorable to the establishment of schools by societies and individuals. The government left the instruction of the people to go on as it might, without a single grant, for more than a quarter of a century.

From 1807 to the close of the war the legislature heard no word

* Simond, "Tour in Great Britain," vol. i. p. 293.
† See *ante*, vol. iv. p. 544.
‡ Answers from Sussex to Commissioners of Poor Law Inquiry.

* Purdy, "On the English Poor Rate.'

on the education of the people. The man who for forty-five years has devoted much of his untiring energy to this great question had in 1816 come back to the place in the councils of the nation which he won in 1812 by a combination of industry and talent almost unprecedented. Henry Brougham had not been in parliament for three years. On the 21st of May, 1816, he moved for the appointment of a select committee "to inquire into the state of the education of the lower orders of the people in London, Westminster, and Southwark." The motion, which was brought forward with great caution by the mover, was unopposed. The committee made its first report on the 20th of June, having conducted its inquiries with more than usual activity. The energy of Mr. Brougham, who acted as chairman, gave a remarkable impulse to this important investigation. It was found that in the metropolis there were a hundred and twenty thousand children without the means of education. The principal labors of the committee had consisted in their examination of evidence as to the number and condition of the charity and parish schools destined for the education of the lower orders. The number of such institutions exceeded anything that could have been previously believed; but the expenditure of the funds was, in many cases, neither pure nor judicious. A few were educated and brought up—the many were neglected. In the country instances of flagrant abuses had been heard of. Mr. Brougham's report produced no hostile feelings on this occasion. In 1818 the powers of inquiry granted to the committee were no longer confined to the metropolis. Then the larger question of the extension of education was merged in a furious controversy as to the amount of abuses in endowed charities, and the propriety of subjecting the higher schools, such as Eton and Winchester, and also colleges in the universities, to a searching inquiry into the nature of their statutes, and their adherence to the objects of their foundation. An act was subsequently passed, in consequence of the labors of the committee, to appoint commissioners to inquire concerning the abuse of charities connected with education, and by a second act the right of inquiry was extended to all charities, the universities and certain great foundation schools excepted. The education commission was thus merged in the charity commission. Of the great national benefits that resulted from that commission no one can doubt. But it may be doubted whether the controversial shape which the question of education assumed in 1818 did much to advance the disposition which prevailed in 1816 to provide a general system of popular instruction. From some unhappy prejudice—from apathy or from cowardice—the education of the people made small legislative progress for twenty years. Perhaps the old fable of the sun and the wind experimenting upon the removal of the traveller's cloak may afford us some solution of this problem. But the reports of the education committee were of the highest value in showing us the extent of instruction at the time of its labors. There were 18,500 schools, educating 644,000 children; of this number 166,000 were educated at endowed schools, and 478,000 at unendowed schools, during six days of the week. This number was independent of Sunday-schools, of which there were 5100, attended by 452,000 children; but of course many of these Sunday scholars were included in the returns of other schools.

In the plan of Poor Law reform brought forward by Mr. Whitbread in 1807, he earnestly advocated the consideration of a mode by which the savings of the poor might be safely and profitably invested. Three or four years previous Mr. Malthus, in his "Essay on Population," had argued that "it might be extremely useful to have county banks, where the smallest sums would be received, and a fair interest granted for them." Mr. George Rose had, as early as 1793, legislated for the encouragement of friendly societies. In 1798 a bank for the earnings of poor children was established at Tottenham, and this was found so successful that a bank for the safe deposit of the savings of servants, laborers, and others was opened at the same place in 1804. Interest was here allowed to the depositors. A similar institution was founded at Bath in 1808. But the greatest experiment upon the possibility of the laboring poor making considerable savings was tried in Scotland. "The Parish Bank Friendly Society of Ruthwell" was established by the Rev. Henry Duncan in 1810. The first London savings bank did not commence its operations till January, 1816. In the parliamentary session of 1816 Mr. Rose brought in a bill for the regulation of savings banks, which was subsequently withdrawn for revision. Of the possible benefits of these institutions there could be no doubt in the minds of all men who were anxious to improve the condition of the people. "What a bubble!" wrote Cobbett.

In the session of 1816 one step was made toward some improvement on that code which Blackstone termed "a bastard slip of the old forest laws; . . . both productive of the same tyranny to the Commons, but with this difference—that the forest laws established only one mighty hunter throughout the land; the game laws have raised a little Nimrod in every manor." The attention of the House of Commons was called to this subject in consequence of the murder of Colonel Berkeley's gamekeeper by a gang of armed poachers; and a committee was appointed "to take into consideration the laws relating to game."* They came to the resolution, "that it is the opinion of this committee that all game should be the property of the person upon whose lands such game should be found." They contemplated the removal of the qualification to kill game—that law which had its beginning in the reign of Richard II., and which, perfected by the aristocratic legislators of the time of Charles II., required "fifty times the property to enable a man to kill a partridge as to vote for a knight of the shire."† The committee of 1816 evidently pointed to the necessity of "removing the restraints upon the sale of game." It was not till after fifteen years of controversy that the statute of William IV. dispensed with the qualification for killing game, and legalized its sale. The statute of the 9th of George IV. and that of William IV. rendered the law more stringent and effective against poaching, especially by night. The number of convictions under the acts for the preservation of game furnish no uncertain test, not only of the state of morals among the agricultural laborers, but of the presence or absence of those qualities which make the landed proprietor a blessing or a curse to his humble neighbors. In the more daring and depraved of the population of the rural districts the severe administration of the game laws produced a spirit such as was displayed in January, 1816, by the Berkeley poachers, who cried out, "Glory! glory!", when they had killed one gamekeeper and wounded six others.‡

CHAPTER CCXIII.

Parliamentary reform taken up by the ignorant and uneducated—Extended circulation of the writings of Cobbett—The Hampden Clubs—The Spenceans—Orator Hunt and the Spafields meeting—Riot in the city—Meeting of parliament—Outrage on the prince-regent—Secret committees—Habeas Corpus Act suspended, and other stringent measures—Oliver, the spy—The Derbyshire insurrection—Lord Sidmouth's circular letter—Prosecutions for libel—The three trials of William Hone—The government and the people—Eulogies on Francis Horner in the House of Commons.

The call for parliamentary reform seems to have made itself very feebly heard in the Lower House in the session of 1816. With the exception of some four or five petitions that produced very slight discussion, it would scarcely be thought, from an inspection of the parliamentary debates, that such a question agitated any part of the nation at all. On one occasion in June, some members spoke very briefly upon the subject. One complained of the apathy with which the question was regarded in England, and another (Mr. Brougham) mentioned the cause as "opposed by some, deserted by others, and espoused by persons whose conduct excited no small degree of disgust out of doors." But from this time the name of parliamentary reform became, for the most part, a name of terror to the government—to the elevated by rank and wealth—to the most influential of the middle classes. It became fearful from the causes which would have made it contemptible in ordinary times. It was "espoused by persons whose conduct excited no small degree of disgust out of doors." It passed away from the patronage of a few aristocratic lovers of popularity, to be advocated by writers of "twopenny trash," and to be discussed and organized by "Hampden Clubs," of hungering philanthropists and unemployed "weaver-boys."

Samuel Bamford, who thought it no disgrace to call himself "a Radical"—a man of real native talent, and of honest intentions—

* Hansard, vol. xxxiv. col. 586. † Blackstone.
‡ "Annual Register," 1816—Chronicle, p. 11.

says, "At this time [1816] the writings of William Cobbett suddenly became of great authority; they were read on nearly every cottage hearth in the manufacturing districts of South Lancashire, in those of Leicester, Derby, and Nottingham; also in many of the Scottish manufacturing towns. Their influence was speedily visible."

Cobbett advocated parliamentary reform as the corrective of whatever miseries the lower classes suffered. A new order of politicians was called into action—"The Sunday-schools of the preceding thirty years had produced many workingmen of sufficient talent to become readers, writers, and speakers in the village meetings for parliamentary reform; some also were found to possess a rude poetic talent, which rendered their effusions popular, and bestowed an additional charm on their assemblages; and by such various means, anxious listeners at first, and then zealous proselytes, were drawn from the cottages of quiet nooks and dingles to the weekly readings and discussions of the Hampden Clubs."* But let it be remembered that though the Sunday-schools of the preceding thirty years had made some workingmen readers, writers, and speakers, the mass of the laboring population were in the lowest state of ignorance, and were consequently ready to accept the crude and violent opinions of a few of their own class as the only true maxims of political action. The speakers at the village meetings echoed the strong words of Cobbett, without the qualifying prudence which generally kept that master of our language pretty safe in argument and phraseology. He was not the man to tempt a prosecution by a rash sentence that could have been construed into sedition.

Up to the 2d of November, 1816, "Cobbett's Weekly Political Register" was a publication not addressed to the "cottage hearth," but to persons who could afford to pay a shilling and a halfpenny weekly for a single octavo stamped sheet, printed in open type. His writings, singularly clear and argumentative, strong in personalities, earnest, bold, never halting between two opinions, powerful beyond all anonymous writing from their rare individuality, would have commanded an extensive influence under any form of publication. But at the beginning of November he announced his intention to print "The Twopenny Register." We see, therefore, why at the end of 1816 "the writings of William Cobbett *suddenly* became of great authority, and were read on nearly every cottage hearth in the manufacturing districts." Never before had any single writer in England wielded such a power. That his cheap registers gave the discontent of the laboring classes a new direction cannot be doubted; that they did much to repress riot and outrage may fairly be conceded. But that they were scattering the seeds of a greater danger than the outrage and plunder of infuriated mobs cannot be denied. Their object was suddenly to raise up the great masses of laborers and mechanics into active politicians; to render the most impatient and uncontrollable materials of our social system the most preponderating. The danger was evident; the means of repression were not so clear. The effect of Cobbett's writings may be estimated by the violence of his opponents, as well as by the admiration of his disciples. From the date of his twopenny registers he was stigmatized as a "firebrand"—"a convicted incendiary." "Why is it that this convicted incendiary and others of the same stamp are permitted, week after week, to sow the seeds of rebellion, insulting the government, and defying the laws of the country? . . . We have laws to prevent the exposure of unwholesome meat in our markets, and the mixture of deleterious drugs in beer. We have laws also against poisoning the minds of the people, by exciting discontent and disaffection; why are not these laws rendered effectual, and enforced as well as the former?"† The answer is very obvious. The laws, as they stood at the end of 1816, when this was written, could not touch William Cobbett. He knew well how to manage his strength. He risked no libels. He dealt with general subjects. He called upon the people to assemble and to petition. He exhorted the people against the use of force. He sowed the dragons' teeth, it is true, but they did not rise up as armed men. They rose up in the far more dangerous apparition of the masses without property, without education, without leaders of any weight or responsibility, demanding the supreme legislative power—the power of universal suffrage. The idea ceased to be a theory—it became a tremendous reality.

In a report of the secret committee of the House of Commons, presented on the 19th of February, 1817, the Hampden Clubs are described as "associated professedly for the purpose of parliamentary reform, upon the most extended principle of universal suffrage and annual parliaments;" but that "in far the greater number of them, and particularly in those which are established in the great manufacturing districts of Lancashire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, and Derbyshire, and which are composed of the lower order of artisans, nothing short of a revolution is the object expected and avowed." The testimony of Samuel Bamford shows that, in this early period of their history, the Hampden Clubs limited their object to the attainment of parliamentary reform—a sweeping reform indeed, but not what is understood by the term "revolution." They contended for the right of every male above eighteen years of age, and who paid taxes, to vote for the election of members of parliament, and that parliaments should be elected annually. These demands Bamford describes as "the moderate views and wishes of the reformers of those days."* He adds, "It was not until we became infested by spies, incendiaries, and their dupes—distracting, misleading, and betraying—that physical force was mentioned among us. After that our moral power waned, and what we gained by the accession of demagogues we lost by their criminal violence and the estrangement of real friends." It would appear, however, that in Scotland, at a very early stage of the proceedings of reform clubs, that is in December, 1816, the mode in which large masses of men ordinarily look for the accomplishment of political changes was not so cautiously kept out of view.

Of the Hampden Club of London, Sir Francis Burdett was the chairman. Vanity, as well as misery, "makes a man acquainted with strange bedfellows." Bamford, at the beginning of 1817, came to London as a delegate from the Middleton Club, to attend a great meeting of delegates to be assembled in London. The Crown and Anchor Tavern was the scene of these deliberations. There was Major Cartwright in the chair—a placid enthusiast, sincere in his belief that unmingled good would be the result of the great experiment which he had so long advocated. The chief supporters were Cobbett, with his shrewd self-possession and "bantering jollity;" and Hunt—"Orator Hunt," as he was called—the incarnation of an empty, blustering, restless, ignorant, and selfish demagogue. The great baronet was absent, and his absence provoked no little comment. But he was accessible in his own mansion. Samuel Bamford was awestruck by the passionate bellowing of Hunt, frozen by the proud condescension of Sir Francis Burdett, but charmed by the unaffected cordiality of Lord Cochrane. These were the chief actors in the procession scenes of the popular drama that was then under rehearsal. Other and more important parts were filled quite as appropriately.

The Middleton delegate was introduced, amid the reeking tobacco fog of a low tavern, to the leading members of a society called the "Spencean Philanthropists." They derived their name from that of a Mr. Spence, a schoolmaster in Yorkshire, who had conceived a plan for making the nation happy, by causing all the lands of the country to become the property of the state, which state should divide all the produce for the support of the people. Socialism, in its extremest principles, is not a new doctrine. The schoolmaster was an honest enthusiast, who fearlessly submitted his plan to the consideration of all lovers of their species, and had the misfortune to be prosecuted for its promulgation in 1800. In 1816 "Spence's plan" was revived, and the Society of Spencean Philanthropists was instituted, who held "sectional meetings," and discussed "subjects calculated to enlighten the human understanding." This great school of philosophy had its separate academies, as London was duly informed by various announcements, at "the Cock, in Grafton Street, Soho;" and "the Mulberry Tree, Moorfields;" and "the Nag's Head, Carnaby Market;" and "No. 8 Lumber Street, Borough." At these temples of benevolence, where "every individual is admitted, free of expense, who will conduct himself with decorum," it is not unlikely that some esoteric doctrines were canvassed, such as, that "it was an easy matter to upset government, if handled in a proper manner."† The committee of the Spenceans openly meddled

* "Passages in the Life of a Radical," by Samuel Bamford, vol. i. p. 8.

† "Quarterly Review," vol. xvi. p. 275.

† "Passages in the Life of a Radical," vol. i. chap. ii.

* "State Trials," vol. xxxii. pp. 215, 216; Watson's trial.

with sundry grave questions besides that of a community in land, and, among other notable projects, petitioned parliament to do away with machinery. Among these fanatics some dangerous men had established themselves, such as Thistlewood, who subsequently paid the penalty of five years of maniacal plotting, and some also who were clearly in communication with the police, and hounded on the weak disciples of the Cock in Grafton Street and the Mulberry Tree in Moorfields to acts of more real danger to themselves than to the public safety. If we are to believe the chief evidence in these transactions, John Castle, a man of the most disreputable character, who became a witness against the leading Spencean Philanthropists, they had murderous designs of sharp machines for destroying cavalry, and plans for suffocating quiet soldiers in their barracks, destroying them as boys burn wasps' nests; and schemes for taking the Tower and barricading London Bridge, to prevent the artillery coming from Woolwich.* And there were to be five commanders to effect all these great movements of strategy—Mr. Thistlewood, Mr. Watson the elder, and Mr. Watson the younger, Mr. Castle, and Mr. Preston, who came the last in dignity "because he was lame." And then there was to be a committee of public safety, who were to be called together after the soldiers were subdued—twenty-four good and true men. And then they calculated at what amount of public expense they could buy the soldiers, by giving them each a hundred guineas; and, upon an accurate computation, it was found that the purchase money would be somewhere about two millions, which would be nothing in comparison with the national debt, which would be wiped off. † With this preparation, if we may believe the very questionable evidence of Mr. Castle, a meeting was held in Spa Fields on the 15th of November.

The district known as Spa Fields, now covered with dwellings of industry and comfortable residences of the middle classes, was, at the beginning of the present century, and for some years afterward, a large uninclosed space, utterly neglected and useless. A public-house was there, called by the mysterious name of Merlin's Cave, and thither Mr. Hunt came in a chariot with the Watsons and harangued a mob from the chariot roof, attended with a flag and cockades, and "everything handsome." After adjourning the meeting for a fortnight, Mr. Hunt and the chariot went away, drawn by the mob; and the mob running the chariot against a wall, they all got out and walked. So innocently passed the first Spa Fields meeting—innocently, save that at a dinner at Mr. Hunt's hotel in Bouverie Street, where, as he represented the matter, the philanthropists having thrust themselves upon him very much against his will, the betrayer, Castle, gave a toast, which is too infamous to be repeated here, and was threatened to be turned out of the room, but quietly remained, and went into what was described as "a fox-sleep." But the 2d of December, the day to which the first meeting was adjourned, closed not so peaceably. Mr. Hunt came to town from Essex in his tandem, and as he passed along Cheapside, at "twenty minutes to one o'clock," he was stopped by Mr. Castle, who was moving along with a considerable crowd; and the worthy man told him that the meeting had been broken up two hours, and that they were going to the Tower, which had been in their possession for an hour. The country squire, to whom "the boisterous hallooing of multitudes was more pleasing than the chinkling of the plough-traces, the bleating of lambs, or the song of the nightingale"—(in these terms Cobbett defended his friend for his aspirations after mob popularity)—was not weak enough to believe the tempter; and his tandem went on to Spa Fields, where the greatest number of people were collected together that he had ever beheld. But more active reformers were in Spa Fields before Mr. Hunt. The Spencean Philanthropists had provided a wagon for their own operations, and arrived on the ground considerably before the appointed hour of meeting, with banners and inscriptions, one of which was, "The brave soldiers are our friends!" These men also brought arms and ammunition, which they deposited in their wagon. Mr. Watson the elder commenced a sufficiently violent address, and then his son followed him. The young madman, after declaiming against the uselessness of petition, cried out, "If they will not give us what we want, shall we not take it? Are you willing to take it? Will you go and take it? If I jump down among you, will you come and take it? Will you follow me?" And as at every question the encouraging "Yes" became louder and louder, and put down the dissentient "No," he jumped from the wagon, seized a tricolored flag, and away rushed the mob to take the Tower. Two resolute men, the chief clerk of Bow Street and a Bow Street officer, had the boldness to attack this mob, and destroyed one of their banners, without any injury to themselves. The work of mischief necessarily went on. The young fanatic led his followers to the shop of Mr. Beckwith, a gunsmith on Snow Hill, and, rushing in, demanded arms. A gentleman in the shop remonstrated with him, and, without any pause, was immediately shot by him. Instantly some compunction seems to have come over this furious leader, and he offered to examine the wounded man, saying he was himself a surgeon. The assassin was secured, but the mob, who destroyed and plundered the shop, soon released him, and proceeded along Cheapside, where they fired their recently acquired arms, like children with a new plaything. They marched through the Royal Exchange, where they were met by the lord mayor, and several were secured. The city magistrates on this occasion behaved with a firmness which admirably contrasted with the pusillanimity of their predecessors in the riots of 1780. The courage of the lord mayor, Alderman Wood, and of Sir James Shaw is worthy of honorable record, and it shows not only the insignificancy of the so-called conspiracy, its want of coherence and of plan, but the real power of virtue in action to put down ordinary tumult. Sir James Shaw says, "On the 2d of December last I was at the Royal Exchange at half-past twelve; I saw the mob first in Cornhill; the lord mayor and I went in pursuit of them; they crossed the front of the Royal Exchange; we rushed through the Royal Exchange to take them in front on the other side; the lord mayor and I having received information of prior occurrences, determined on putting them down. I seized several of them, and one flag of three colors, extended on a very long pole. I did not then perceive any arms. . . . The lord mayor and I went to meet the mob with Mr. White and two constables; we got five constables in all; the whole party consisted of eight."

Such is the way in which the beginnings of seditions ought to be met. Firmness such as this would have saved Bristol in 1832. After a further plunder of gunsmiths' shops in the Minories, and the summoning of the Tower by some redoubted and unknown champion, who Bamford tells us was Preston, the insurrection fell to pieces, altogether from the want of cohesion in the materials of which it was composed. The only blood shed was that of the gentleman in Mr. Beckwith's shop, who eventually recovered. A wretched sailor was convicted of the offence of plunder at the shop on Snow Hill, and was hanged. The younger Watson escaped from his pursuers. The elder Watson was tried for high treason on the 9th of June. The trial lasted seven days. It was memorable from "the eccentric exuberance of Sir Charles Wetherell, and the luminous energy of Sergeant Copley," * who were assigned as counsel for the prisoner. The exposure of Castle, the spy, was so complete that the jury, without hesitation, returned a verdict of not guilty. Four other prisoners, who were to have been tried upon the same evidence, were at once acquitted.

On the 28th of January, 1817, the prince-regent opened the fifth session of the existing parliament. The speech from the throne contained the following passage: "In considering our internal situation you will, I doubt not, feel a just indignation at the attempts which have been made to take advantage of the distresses of the country, for the purpose of exciting a spirit of sedition and violence. I am too well convinced of the loyalty and good sense of the great body of his majesty's subjects to believe them capable of being perverted by the arts which are employed to seduce them; but I am determined to omit no precautions for preserving the public peace and for counteracting the designs of the disaffected." It would have been difficult to infer from this language that the government believed that a formidable and widely organized insurrection was threatening the country, and that the only remedy was a violation of the constitutional safeguards of the liberties of the nation. Attempts to excite a spirit of sedition among a people incapable "of being perverted by the arts employed to seduce them" were subjects for vigilance toward the few, without infringement of the rights of the

* "State Trials," vol. xxxii. p. 218, etc.
† Ibid., pp. 233, 234.

* Lord Campbell's "Chief Justices," vol. iii. p. 220.

many. The seconder of the address in the Commons asserted that the demagogues and their acts would die of themselves. The debate in the Lower House was suddenly interrupted by a message from the Lords. An outrage had been offered to the prince-regent on his return from opening the parliament. The windows of the state carriage had been broken by some missile. The two houses, after agreeing upon an address to the prince-regent on this event, adjourned. Upon the resumption of the debate the next day in the Commons, and upon its commencement in the Lords, the insult to the representative of the sovereign, which was at first asserted to be an attempt upon his life, gave a decided tone to the proceedings of both houses. In both assemblies the opposition loudly proclaimed the necessity of a rigid and unsparing economy, and the proposed amendment upon the address went directly to pledge the most severe reduction of every possible expense. The practical answer to these abortive proposals was the intimation of Lord Sidmouth, that in three days he should present a message from the prince-regent on the subject of the alleged disaffection of large bodies of the people.

On the second night of the debate on the address, Mr. Canning took a leading part in the proceedings. He had returned from the embassy to Lisbon. An office so below the proper ambition of such a man was to him a degradation. He had been excluded from power for three years. The government opened the session of 1816 in the confidence that they could do without "the greatest speaker in either house of parliament. . . . They wondered what use he could be of."* The ministerial inefficiency in that session was the cause of Canning's recall to jealous colleagues. He became president of the Board of Control. He was now put forward as the eloquent anti-reformer, to deny that the existing state of the representation was a grievance; to confound the most moderate projects of reform with the doctrines of universal suffrage and annual parliaments. It would seem that reformers of all grades had, in his mind, a family resemblance to the Spenceans. He chose to forget what had been the opinions of his great master, Pitt, maintaining that our representative system "satisfies the wants, the opinions, and the feelings of the great bulk and body of the nation." He asked the moderate reformers in that house if they hoped to guide the whirlwind which they might raise? "Are they not aware that mightier spirits are abroad, who will take that task out of their hands?" † It scarcely needed eloquence like his to call up the ghosts of the French Revolution. The day had dawned; the shadows had lost their midnight terrors.

The message of the 3d of February announced that the prince-regent had given orders that there be laid before the houses, "Papers containing information respecting certain practices, meetings, and combinations in the metropolis, and in different parts of the kingdom, evidently calculated to endanger the public tranquillity, to alienate the affections of his majesty's subjects from his majesty's person and government, and to bring into hatred and contempt the whole system of our laws and institutions." In moving the order of the day for the consideration of this message, Lord Sidmouth, in the House of Lords, affirmed that the communication was in no degree founded on or connected with the outrage upon the prince-regent on the first day of the session. The message of the prince-regent was referred to a secret committee in each house, and these committees made their reports on the 18th and 19th of the same month. The Spencean Societies, the Hampden Clubs, the Spa Fields Riot, now called conspiracy, formed the staple of these reports. The objects of the conspirators are described not only to be "the overthrow of all the political institutions of the kingdom, but also such a subversion of the rights and principles of property as must necessarily lead to general confusion, plunder, and bloodshed." Under the influence of these reports, it would have been impossible to have made such a resistance to the government as would have prevented the enactment of stringent measures, one of which was decidedly unconstitutional. Bills were brought in and passed by large majorities, to guard against and avert the dangers which had been so alarmingly proclaimed. The first of these renewed the act for the prevention and punishment of attempts to seduce soldiers and sailors from their allegiance; the second extended to the prince-regent all the safeguards against treasonable attempts which secure the actual sovereign; the third was for the prevention of seditious meetings; the last of the four gave to the executive power the fearful right of imprisonment without trial. In common parlance, the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended, under "An act to empower his majesty to secure and detain such persons as his majesty shall suspect are conspiring against his person and government." The suspension was, however, in this instance, limited to the ensuing 1st of July.

The Habeas Corpus Suspension Act was passed on the 3d of March; the bill for restraining seditious meetings did not become law till the 29th of March. Within a week after the passing of the act for imprisonment without trial, and before the magistrates had received any accession to their powers as to the dispersion of tumultuous assemblies, an occurrence took place at Manchester, which was at once evidence of the agitated condition of distressed multitudes in the manufacturing districts, and of the extreme weakness of their purpose. This was the famous march of the Blanketeers. The blanket meeting, which took place in St. Peter's Field at Manchester, was so called because many of the vast body of workmen who attended were observed to have blankets, rugs, or large coats, rolled up and tied knapsack-like on their backs. Some carried bundles under their arms, some had papers, supposed to be petitions, rolled up, and some had stout walking-sticks. The magistrates came upon the field and read the Riot Act; the meeting was dispersed by the military and constables; three hundred commenced a straggling march, followed by a body of yeomanry, and a hundred and eighty reached Macclesfield at nine o'clock at night. Some were apprehended, some lay in the fields. The next morning the numbers had almost melted away. The avowed reform leaders—delegates and Hampden Club men—were now under perpetual terror. Some wandered from their homes in dread of imprisonment; others were seized in the bosoms of their families. Public meetings were at an end. The fears and passions of large bodies of men had no safety-valve. "Open meetings thus being suspended, secret ones ensued; they were originated at Manchester, and assembled under various pretexts. . . . Their real purpose, divulged only to the initiated, was to carry into effect a night attack on Manchester, the attempt at which had before failed for want of arrangement and co-operation."* This scheme was noticed in the second report of the Lords' secret committee: "It is stated to have been proposed that Manchester should be made a Moscow, for the purpose of strengthening their cause, by throwing numbers of people out of employment." † A little while after this "Moscow" proposal a co-delegate came to Bamford, to propose the assassination of all the ministers. We know that this scheme smouldered for several years. "The fact was," says Bamford, "this unfortunate person, in the confidence of an unsuspecting mind, as I believe had, during one of his visits to London, formed a connection with Oliver, the spy; which connection, during several succeeding months, gave a new impulse to secret meetings and plots in various parts of Lancashire, Yorkshire, and Derbyshire, and ended in the tragedy of Brandreth, Ludlow, and Turner, at Derby." This tragedy is the only one of the insurrectionary movements of the manufacturing districts in 1817 that has left any traces of judicial investigation, with the exception of proceedings at York, at which all the state prisoners were discharged by the Grand Jury, or acquitted upon trial. All the persons connected with the Blanket expedition and the expected risings at Manchester were discharged before trial.

The midland counties of Nottingham, Leicester, and Derby had been in a disturbed state for several years. The habit of daring outrage was familiar to large numbers of the manufacturing population. The course of ignorant and brutal violence, known as Luddism, ha revived in redoubled fury. At the Leicester assizes, on the 1st of April, eight men were tried and convicted of the most daring outrages at Loughborough, and six of these offenders were executed on the 17th of the same month. There was not the slightest attempt at this trial to connect the crimes of these men with any political opinions. But among a population that for four years had witnessed the night attacks of armed men upon machinery, and with whom some of the leaders of such organized attacks were in habitual intercourse, it is manifest that the materials for political insurrection were abundantly accumulated. It was not the part of a wise and

* Lord Dudley's "Letters," p. 137.
† Hansard, vol. xxxv. col. 131.

* Bamford, vol. i. p. 45. † Hansard, vol. xxxvi. col. 952.

humane government to permit the feeblest spark of excitement from without to approach these inflammable materials. The secret operations of "the spy system" in the manufacturing districts were first brought to light by the sagacious energy of the late Mr. Baines of Leeds. The circumstances of this discovery are briefly told by his son, to the effect that Mr. Baines having learned that a government emissary, named Oliver, had been attempting to entrap Mr. James Willan, a printer, of Dewsbury, to attend a meeting where ten persons had been arrested, thought it his duty to investigate the facts by personal inquiry. Mr. Willan proved that Oliver, who represented himself as a delegate from the Radicals of London, had several times, for the space of two months, endeavored to seduce him into acts of violence and situations of danger, and that he had especially urged him to attend a meeting of "delegates" at Thornhill Lees on the previous Friday, at which meeting ten men were arrested by a party of military, under the command of Major-General Sir John Byng. Willan, who was a conscientious man, and a professor of the principles of the Society of Friends, indignantly repelled every invitation to violence, and refused to attend the meeting. The ten prisoners had been conveyed, with Oliver himself, to Wakefield, for examination by the magistrates; but at that town Oliver was seen at liberty and in communication with the servant of General Byng. It was further learned that Oliver had been at General Byng's house at Campsall a few days before.* Mr. Baines having published a statement of these circumstances in his paper, "The Leeds Mercury," the transaction formed the subject of a violent debate in the House of Commons on the 16th of June. In the "Life of Lord Sidmouth" this affair has been minutely gone into, for the purpose of justifying the secretary of state for the home department against the imputations which arose out of the employment of such persons as Oliver. "None of them," says the author of the life, "were employed in the first instance by Lord Sidmouth, but themselves sought him out; and if, which is not probable, they, in any instances, instigated the conspirators to crime in order to betray them, the treacherous act must have been entirely their own, as nothing would have excited more his lordship's indignation than the bare idea of so base a proceeding."† This opinion is supported by a letter of Lord Strafford (formerly Sir John Byng), written in 1846. Sir John Byng himself was perfectly incapable, as was acknowledged on all hands, of turning the spy into a tempter.

On Sunday, the 8th of June, there was a remarkable assemblage at Pentridge, a village situated some two miles from the Ambergate station on the present North Midland Railway. The village is in the hilly and thinly peopled district to the west of the River Derwent. In the neighborhood of Pentridge there are several other scattered villages—all not far removed from a direct road to Nottingham. About a mile from Pentridge, at Butterley, was a large iron foundry. Two men in the employ of the proprietors of this foundry went out into the White Horse public-house at Pentridge, on the morning of the 8th of June, and found a good many persons in the parlor there "talking about this revolution." There was one among them they called "The Captain." He had a map in his hand, and the people came in and kept asking him questions; and he said there would be no good to be done except a complete overthrow of the government. All the country was to rise, all at one time. Many talked thus. They made no secret. They spoke it openly. They did not mind who heard them. They said they had plenty of pikes, and they would go and take Nottingham wholly to themselves; and when they got to Nottingham every man would have a hundred guineas and plenty of rum, and it would be nothing but a journey of pleasure. This extraordinary assembly lasted six or seven hours. The two men from the iron-works were special constables, but they were afraid to say anything about it. Having agreed to meet on the night of the 9th, after dark, the people separated. The captain with the map in his hand was Jeremiah Brandreth, a frame-work knitter, whose family had received parochial relief. Mr. Denman (who was counsel for the prisoners), after Brandreth had been convicted, compared this man with "The Corsair" of Lord Byron. In spite of Mr. Denman's rhetorical description of the mastery of this leader over his weak followers, we must be content to believe, from the evidence of Brandreth's acts, that he was a frantic enthusiast, goaded to violence by great poverty, by imaginary oppression, and, what is more, by the grossest delusions as to his own power and the strength of his cause. We do not think that he was the less dangerous from his real character and the real circumstances around him; but we believe, as Mr. Denman came to the conclusion, that, in spite of his influence and command, "he was most clearly himself an instrument wielded by other hands." On Saturday night, the 7th of June, Oliver goes to a meeting at Nottingham, with instructions from Sir John Byng, "not to conceal anything as to the Yorkshire meeting by which these people could be deceived." On Sunday morning the Nottingham captain is heard saying, "All the country is to rise, all at one time." On Monday night he passes the door of a laboring man at South Wingfield, about three miles from Pentridge, in his way to an old barn up in the fields, and he urges the man to come with him, saying that "the countries, England, Ireland, and France, were to rise that night at ten o'clock," and that "the northern clouds, men from the north, would come down and sweep all before them." It is difficult not to regard the language of Brandreth as pure insanity, especially when we contrast it with the sober sense of some around him. "There was an old woman standing by," says the South Wingfield man, "and she tapped him on the shoulder and said, 'My lad, we have got a magistrate here;'" and the laborer himself "thought he must be drunk or mad to think of such things." But on the madman went. In the old barn at South Wingfield he assembled twenty men, who had pikes and guns, and they went forward, stopping at solitary houses, and demanding guns, and dragging unwilling men out of their beds and hiding-places, and compelling them to march with them. At the farm-house of a widow, who behaved with unflinching courage, Brandreth fired in at a window, and killed one of her servants, upon arms being refused to him. His followers said he should not have shot that poor innocent man, and he replied it was his duty to do it. Onward they marched—the volunteers and the conscripts; and the captain, when they halted at some low dwellings, and met with any one who refused to march, had his ready exhortation that "a great cloud out of the north would sweep all before them," with the more particular information that "it would not be necessary to go farther than Nottingham, for London would be taken by the time they got there." Some of the pressed men ran away in the darkness; one refused to march in rank, and upon Brandreth swearing he would shoot him in a moment, the bold fellow stepped up to him with his knife, and the captain turned off from him. During all this march the rain was incessant. By the time they reached the Butterley Iron-works their numbers amounted to about a hundred. Brandreth was boldly met by Mr. Goodwin, the manager of the works, and when he demanded men was told, "You shall not have one of them. You are too many already, unless you were going for a better purpose. Disperse! Depend upon it, the laws will be too strong for you; you are going with halters about your necks." Three men took shelter in the office of the works; one man, Isaac Ludlam, who was afterward convicted and executed, was exhorted by Mr. Goodwin not to go on; but he answered, much agitated, "I am as bad as I can be; I cannot go back." After a short pause Brandreth gave the command "March." Soon after this main body was followed by about fifty other men. On the morning of the 10th of June, Mr. Rolleston, a magistrate, went from Nottingham on the road toward Eastwood, about six miles from Nottingham, and meeting there a considerable body of men armed with pikes, he returned to Nottingham, and procured some troops from the barracks, eighteen privates, commanded by a captain and a subaltern. Upon hearing that the soldiers were coming the insurgents fled. The captain in command of the hussars deposed that the military were kept on the alert during the night. He was ordered out with a party, on the road toward Derbyshire, about six in the morning, and approached about sixty men, who fled across the fields. A man in the road tried to form them, but they paid no attention to him. A number of prisoners were taken, and about forty guns and other arms were collected together.

Thus ended "the Derbyshire insurrection." For these offences three men were executed, eleven were transported for life, four were transported for fourteen years, and five were imprisoned for various terms.

The acquittal of Watson for high treason appears to have had no

* "Life of Edward Baines," by his son, Edward Baines, pp. 92, 93.
† "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 187.

influence on the measures of government. The second suspension of the Habeas Corpus was passed by large majorities in both houses; and the prince-regent, in his speech closing this session on the 12th of July, averred that "a favorable change was happily taking place in the internal situation of the country, which was to be mainly ascribed to the salutary measures which parliament had adopted for preserving the public tranquillity." The private records of Lord Sidmouth's life show that he had no great confidence in the "favorable change." At the end of July Lord Sidmouth established his family at Malvern, intending to remain there a short time himself, "and then back," as he said, "to sedition and treason again," his under-secretary being left in charge during the interim. Before his lordship's departure, however, as he informed his brother on the 20th, he "revised all the cases of persons committed and detained under the Suspension Act; and the result, he trusted, would be the release of some upon their own recognizance, and increased indulgence to those who could not be released." *

On moving the second reading of the Habeas Corpus Suspension Bill, Lord Sidmouth made the following statement: "Some noble lords had complained that prosecutions had not been instituted against the authors, printers, or publishers of infamous libels; but it was but justice to government to state that they had not neglected their duty with regard to these publications. As soon as they reached the hands of ministers they were transmitted to the law officers of the crown, who felt that these publications were drawn up with so much dexterity—the authors had so profited by former lessons of experience—that greater difficulties to conviction presented themselves than at any former time." Within a month from this declaration Lord Sidmouth intrusted the administration of the law of libel to less scrupulous hands than the law officers of the crown. On the 27th of March the secretary of state addressed his famous circular letter to the lords-lieutenants of counties, in which, urging the importance of preventing the circulation of blasphemous and seditious pamphlets, he stated that he had obtained the opinion of the law officers that "a justice of the peace may issue a warrant to apprehend a person charged before him upon oath, with the publication of libels of the nature in question, and compel him to give bail to answer the charge." He called, therefore, upon the lords-lieutenants to communicate this opinion at the ensuing Quarter Sessions, so that all magistrates might act thereupon. Such a proceeding as this was, perhaps, the most daring invasion of public liberty that had been attempted since the time of the Stuarts. It called forth from Lord Grey, on the 12th of May, one of the most luminous speeches which that statesman ever delivered. By the libel bill of Mr. Fox, he said, it was at last established that in prosecutions for libel both the law and the fact were within the province of the jury, and to be determined by them. "But, my lords, what avails this just and beneficent statute—what security is there either for the freedom of the press or the liberty of the subject—if, while you have imposed this salutary restraint upon the judges in trials for libels, you give to them and to justices of the peace before trial a right to decide that difficult question, and to commit to prison (in many instances, perhaps, to inflict a severer punishment than the court upon conviction would adjudge) upon a charge which, after all, may turn out to have had no foundation but in the false interpretation of words perfectly innocent by the justice before whom the charge was brought? . . . If such be the power of the magistrate and if this be the law, where, I ask, are all the boasted securities of our independence and freedom?" The House of Lords was indifferent to the preservation of these boasted securities. Writing four months after this debate to the Bishop of Durham, Lord Sidmouth says, "The attempt to check the progress of treason and blasphemy, by apprising the magistrates that they had the power of apprehending and holding to bail the publishers or venders of either, was one of the charges brought against me in the course of the last session. Such a charge it shall be my constant endeavor to deserve, and I am happy in being able to assure your lordship that the activity of the itinerant dealers in these articles is materially controlled and their number greatly diminished." † We apprehend that there cannot be the slightest doubt in many minds, at the present day, that this proceeding of Lord Sidmouth was most unconstitutional, and that he speaks and writes in defence of his conduct with all the self-approval of the worst political bigot of the worst periods of tyranny.

It is difficult to imagine a more degraded and dangerous position than that in which every political writer was placed during the year 1817. In the first place, he was subject, by a secretary of state's warrant, to be imprisoned upon suspicion, under the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. Secondly, he was open to an *ex-officio* information, under which he would be compelled to find bail or be imprisoned. The power of *ex-officio* information had been extended so as to compel bail, by an act of 1808; but from 1808 to 1811, during which three years forty such informations were laid, only one person was held to bail. In 1817 numerous *ex-officio* informations were filed, and the almost invariable practice then was to hold the alleged offender to bail, or in default to commit to prison. Under this act Mr. Hone and others were committed to prison during this year. To complete a triple cord with which the ministers believed they could bind down the "man-mountain" of the press, came forth Lord Sidmouth's circular. The entire course of these proceedings was a signal failure. There was only one solitary instance of success—William Cobbett ran away. On the 28th of March he fled to America, suspending the publication of his "Register" for four months.

On the 12th of May Earl Grey mentioned in the House of Lords that a Mr. Hone was proceeded against for publishing some blasphemous parody; but he had read one of the same nature, written, printed, and published some years ago by other people, without any notice having been officially taken of it. The parody to which Earl Grey alluded and a portion of which he recited was Canning's famous parody, "Praise Lepaux;" * and he asked whether the authors, be they in the cabinet or in any other place, would also be found out and visited with the penalties of the law? This hint to the obscure publisher against whom these *ex-officio* informations had been filed for blasphemous and seditious parodies, was effectually worked out by him in the solitude of his prison, and in the poor dwelling where he had surrounded himself, as he had done from his earliest years, with a collection of odd and curious books. From these he had gathered an abundance of knowledge that was destined to perplex the technical acquirements of the attorney-general, to whom the sword and buckler of his precedents would be wholly useless, and to change the determination of the boldest judge in the land to convict at any rate into the prostration of helpless despair. Altogether the three trials of William Hone are among the most remarkable in our constitutional history. They produced more distinct effects upon the temper of the country than any public proceedings of that time. They taught the government a lesson which has never been forgotten, and to which, as much as to any other cause, we owe the prodigious improvement as to the law of libel itself, and the use of the law in our own day—an improvement which leaves what is dangerous in the press to be corrected by the remedial power of the press itself; and which, instead of lamenting over the newly-acquired ability of the masses to read seditious and irreligious works, depends upon the general diffusion of this ability as the surest corrective of the evils that are incident even to the best gift of heaven—that of knowledge.

On the morning of the 18th of December there is a considerable crowd round the avenues of Guildhall. An obscure bookseller, a man of no substance or respectability in worldly eyes, is to be tried for libel. He vends his wares in a little shop in the Old Bailey, where there are, strangely mingled, two penny political pamphlets, and old harmless folios that the poor publisher keeps for his especial reading as he sits in his dingy back parlor. The doorkeepers and officers of the court scarcely know what is going to happen; for the table within the bar has not the usual covering of crimson bags, but ever and anon a shabby boy arrives with an armful of books of all ages and sizes, and the whole table is strewed with dusty and tattered volumes that the ushers are quite sure have no law within their mouldy covers. A middle-aged man—a bland and smiling man—with a half sad half merry twinkle in his eye—a seedy man, to use an expressive word, whose black coat is wondrous brown and threadbare—takes his place at the table, and begins to turn over the books which were his heralds. Sir Samuel Shepherd, the attorney-

* Lord Sidmouth's "Life," vol. iii. p. 196.
† "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 176.

* *Ante*, vol. vii. p. 1018.

general, takes his seat, and looks compassionately, as was his nature to do, at the pale man in threadbare black. Mr. Justice Abbott arrives in due time, a special jury is sworn, the pleadings are opened, and the attorney-general states the case against William Hone for printing and publishing an impious and profane libel upon the catechism, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, thereby bringing into contempt the Christian religion. "It may be said," argued the attorney-general, "that the defendant's object was not to produce this effect. I believe that he meant it, in one sense, as a political squib; but his responsibility is not the less." As the attorney-general proceeded to read passages from the parody upon the catechism the crowd in court laughed, the bench was indignant, and the attorney-general said the laugh was the fullest proof of the baneful effect of the defendant's publication. And so the trial went on in the smoothest way, and the case for the prosecution was closed. Then the pale man in black rose, and, with a faltering voice, set forth the difficulty he had in addressing the court, and how his poverty prevented him obtaining counsel. And now he began to warm in the recital of what he thought his wrongs, his commitments, his hurried calls to plead, the expense of copies of the informations against him; and, as Mr. Justice Abbott, with perfect gentleness, but with his cold formality, interrupted him, the timid man, who all thought would have mumbled forth a hasty defence, grew bolder and bolder, and in a short time had possession of his audience as if he were "some well-graced actor," who was there to receive the tribute of popular admiration. They were not to inquire whether he were a member of the Established Church or a dissenter; it was enough that he professed himself to be a Christian; and he would be bold to say that he made that profession with a reverence for the doctrines of Christianity which could not be exceeded by any person in that court. He had his books about him, and it was from them that he must draw his defence. They had been the solace of his life. He was too much attached to his books to part with them. As to parodies, they were as old at least as the invention of printing · and he never heard of a prosecution for a parody, either religious or any other. There were two kinds of parodies: one in which a man might convey ludicrous or ridiculous ideas relative to some other subject; the other where it was meant to ridicule the thing parodied. This latter was not the case here, and therefore he had not brought religion into contempt. This was the gist of William Hone's defence. To show fully how this argument was worked—with what readiness, what coolness, what courage—would be to transcribe the trials of three days;* on the first of which the defendant spoke six hours, on the second seven hours, and on the last eight hours. It was in vain that the attorney-general urged that to bring forward any previous parody was the same thing as if a person charged with obscenity should produce obscene volumes in his defence. It was in vain that Mr. Justice Abbott repeated his wish that the defendant would not read such things. On he went, till interruption was held to be in vain. It was worse than vain, it was unjust. Truly did Hone reply to Mr. Justice Abbott, "My lord, your lordship's observation is in the very spirit of what Pope Leo the Tenth said to Martin Luther, 'For God's sake don't say a word about the indulgences and the monasteries, and I'll give you a living'—thus precluding him from mentioning the very thing in dispute. I must go on with these parodies, or I cannot go on with my defence." Undauntedly he went on, from the current literature of the time, such as grave lawyers read in their few hours of recreation, to the forgotten volumes of old theology and polemical controversy, that the said grave lawyers of modern days are accustomed to regard as useless lumber. The editor of "Blackwood's Magazine" was a parodist—he parodied a chapter of Ezekiel; Martin Luther was a parodist—he parodied the first Psalm; Bishop Latimer was a parodist, and so was Dr. Boys, Dean of Canterbury; the author of the "Rolliad" was a parodist, and so was Mr. Canning. Passage after passage did Mr. Hone read from author after auther. He thought it was pretty clear that Martin Luther did not mean to ridicule the Psalms; that Dr. Boys did not mean to ridicule the Lord's Prayer; that Mr. Canning did not mean to ridicule the Scriptures. Why, then, should it be presumed that he had such an intention? As soon as he found that his parodies had been deemed offensive, he had suppressed them, and that he had done long before his prosecution. It was in vain that the attorney-general replied that Martin Luther was a libeller and Dr. Boys was a libeller. The judge charged the jury in vain. William Hone was acquitted after a quarter of an hour's deliberation.

But Guildhall "saw another sight." With the next morning's fog the lord chief justice rose from his bed, enfeebled by illness, but undiminished in the energy of his talent. He had been deeply mortified by the acquittal of Watson for high treason. He was now resolved that the libeller should not go unpunished. "He swore," says Lord Campbell, "that at whatever cost he would preside in court next day himself, so that conviction might be certain and the insulted law might be vindicated."* With lowering brow Lord Ellenborough took his place in that judgment-seat which he deemed had been too mercifully filled on the previous day. The mild firmness of the poor publisher and his gentlemanly sense of the absence of harshness in the conduct of his first trial had won for him something like respect; and when on one occasion Mr. Justice Abbott asked him to forbear reading a particular parody, and the defendant said, "Your lordship and I understand each other, and we have gone on so good-humoredly hitherto that I will not break in upon our harmony," it became clear that the puisne judge was not the man to enforce a verdict of guilty on the second trial. Again Mr. Hone entered the court with his load of books on Friday, the 19th of December. He was this day indicted for publishing an impious and profane libel called "The Litany or General Supplication." Again the attorney-general affirmed that whatever might be the object of the defendant, the publication had the effect of scoffing at the public service of the Church. Again the defendant essayed to read from his books, which course he contended was essentially necessary for his defence. Then began a contest which is perhaps unparalleled in an English court of justice. Upon Mr. Fox's libel bill, upon *ex-officio* informations, upon his right to copies of the indictment without extravagant charges, the defendant battled his judge—imperfect in his law no doubt, but with a firmness and moderation that rode over every attempt to put him down. Parody after parody was again produced, and especially those parodies of the Litany which the cavaliers employed so frequently as vehicles of satire upon the Roundheads and Puritans. The lord chief justice at length gathered up his exhausted strength for his charge, and concluded in a strain that left but little hope for the defendant: "He would deliver the jury his solemn opinion, as he was required by act of parliament to do; and under the authority of that act, and still more in obedience to his conscience and his God, he pronounced this to be a most impious and profane libel. Believing and hoping that they, the jury, were Christians, he had not any doubt but that they would be of the same opinion." The jury in an hour and a half returned a verdict of not guilty.

It might have been expected that these prosecutions would have here ended. But the chance of a conviction from a third jury upon a third indictment was to be risked. On the 20th of December Lord Ellenborough again took his seat on the bench, and the exhausted defendant came late into court, pale and agitated. The attorney-general remarked upon his appearance and offered to postpone the proceedings. The courageous man made his election to go on. This third indictment was for publishing a parody on the creed of St. Athanasius, called "The Sinecurist's Creed." After the attorney-general had finished his address Mr. Hone asked for five minutes' delay to arrange the few thoughts he had been committing to paper. The judge refused the small concession, but said that he would postpone the proceedings to another day, if the defendant would request the court so to do. The scene which ensued was thoroughly dramatic. "No! I make no such request. My lord, I am very glad to see your lordship here to-day, because I feel I sustained an injury from your lordship yesterday—an injury which I did not expect to sustain. . . . If his lordship should think proper, on this trial to-day, to deliver his opinion, I hope that opinion will be coolly and dispassionately expressed by his lordship. . . . My lord, I think it necessary to make a stand here. I cannot say what your lordship may consider to be necessary interruption, but your lordship interrupted me a great many times yesterday, and then said you would interrupt me no more, and yet your lordship did interrupt me after-

* The three trials were printed as separate pamphlets.

* "Lives of the Chief Justices," vol. iii. p. 224.

ward ten times as much. . . . Gentlemen, it is you who are trying me to-day. His lordship is no judge of me. You are my judges, and you only are my judges. His lordship sits there to receive your verdict. . . . I will not say what his lordship did yesterday, but I trust his lordship to-day will give his opinion coolly and dispassionately, without using either expression or gesture which could be construed as conveying an entreaty to the jury to think as he did. I hope the jury will not be beseeched into a verdict of guilty." The triumph of the weak over the powerful was complete. "The frame of adamant and soul of fire," as the biographer of Lord Sidmouth terms the chief justice, quailed before the indomitable courage of a man who was roused into energies which would seem only to belong to the master-spirits that have swayed the world. Yet this was a man who, in the ordinary business of life, was incapable of enterprise and persevering exertion; who lived in the nooks and corners of his antiquarianism; who was one that even his old political opponents came to regard as a gentle and innocuous hunter after "all such reading as was never read;" who in a few years gave up his politics altogether, and, devoting himself to his old poetry and his old divinity, passed a quarter of a century after this conflict in peace with all mankind, and died the sub-editor of a religious journal. It was toward the close of this remarkable trial that the judge who came eager to condemn sued for pity to his intended victim. The defendant quoted Warburton and Tillotson as doubters of the authenticity of the Athanasian Creed. "Even his lordship's father, the Bishop of Carlisle, he believed took a similar view of the creed." And then the judge solemnly said, "Whatever that opinion was, he has gone, many years ago, where he has had to account for his belief and his opinions. . . . For common delicacy, forbear." "Oh, my lord, I shall certainly forbear." Grave and temperate was the charge to the jury this day, and in twenty minutes they returned a verdict of not guilty.

Lord Campbell has an anecdote of the chief justice, which indicates the struggle he made against any display of his deep mortification at the issue of this prosecution. "Bishop Turner, who was present at the trial, and accompanied the chief justice home in his carriage, related that all the way he laughed at the tumultuous mob who followed him, remarking 'that he was afraid of their saliva, not of their bite;' and that passing Charing Cross he pulled the check-string, and said, 'It just occurs to me that they sell the best red herrings at this shop of any in London; buy six.'"* Lord Campbell adds, "The popular opinion, however, was, that Lord Ellenborough was killed by Hone's trial, and he certainly never held up his head in public after." There is a more conclusive evidence of his feelings than popular opinion. On Sunday, the 21st of December, the day after this last trial, Lord Ellenborough wrote thus to Lord Sidmouth: "The disgraceful events which have occurred at Guildhall within the last three or four days have led me, both on account of the public and myself, to consider very seriously my own sufficiency, particularly in point of bodily health and strength, to discharge the official duties of my station in the manner in which, at the present critical moment, it is peculiarly necessary they should be discharged. . . . I wished to carry my meditated purpose of resignation into effect, as soon as the convenience of government, in regard to the due selection and appointment of my successor, may allow."†

The proceedings of the government in the libel matters of 1817 were signal failures. A few miserable hawkers were held to bail, or sent to prison under Lord Sidmouth's circular; some *ex-officio* informations were filed, with only one conviction—that of a printer in the country, who republished one of Hone's parodies, and was tried before Hone himself was tried. As to the three acquittals we have described, it is perfectly evident that three juries, consisting of respectable London merchants, would have assuredly convicted the defendant, had they not felt that the real sting of the alleged profaneness was the severity of the political satire. Although the indictment stated that these parodies were seditious as well as profane, the sedition was studiously kept in the background. Had they not been really prosecuted for their political doctrines, their unquestionable indecency and impropriety must have carried a verdict against them on the first trial. The second and third trials looked like persecution, and public opinion threw its shield over the offender. There was a feeling, moreover, that political passions were influencing the judgment-seat. The severity of the lord chief justice to the reforming member for Westminster, Lord Cochrane, was not forgotten.

When we look back upon this unhappy period, we may honestly infer that the real danger was not so much that the people should be irritated and misled by mob-leaders and unscrupulous writers, as that a general feeling should grow up in the nation that government was a power antagonistic to the governed—an oppressive and not a protective power—a power of separate interests from the interests of the people. This grew into a very widely-diffused feeling, and was found deeply rooted long after the first sufferings that attended the transition state of peace had passed away—a feeling that was far more dangerous to the national welfare than any insurrectionary outbreak of the masses of the working population. Deluded these masses unquestionably were—acted upon by demagogues—ready for riot and violence; capable of serious mischief, but incapable of resisting the law wisely administered. The eagerness of the government to suspend the constitutional protections for the liberty of the subject; to call for new enactments to repress sedition; to fetter the expression of opinion by rendering the plain-speaking of the public journals very perilous; to employ the spy-system, with the certainty that it would excite the violence which it pretended to discover—these were the causes why the government had no love from any class; very little respect; intense hate from many; slavish fear from more. A large number, indeed, of the upper and middle classes were alarmed into a prostrate adhesion to the menacing policy of the government, and were ready with "lives and fortunes" to put down the revolutionary spirit which they were assured was working under the guise of parliamentary reform. From this year we may date the retrogression of public opinion on the question of an improved representation of the people. As long as the middle classes were afraid of its agitation, and naturally associated the idea of reform with the rash movements of the operative classes—with their violent declamations and their tumultuous meetings—the differences of principle took the unhappy form of a contest between wealth and poverty, between capital and labor. The humbler classes had been taught by the demagogues that all the evils of civilization are political evils, and that democratic institutions would at once sweep away all social miseries. The upper and middle classes opposed all changes, in the belief that the preservation of existing institutions, however decayed and imperfect, was necessary for the maintenance of the security of property. There were, nevertheless, many of the wealthy and educated classes who, in 1817, thought, as Mr. Wilberforce then thought, when he wrote, "I continue friendly to the moderate, gradual, and almost insensibly operating parliamentary reform, which was last brought forward by Mr. Pitt;"* but who, nevertheless, were "adverse to the measure," on account of the character of its advocates and their followers. The reciprocal distrust of reformers and anti-reformers must have ended in a convulsion, had not alarm and violence gradually shrunk before a growing intelligence. The English mind had been trained by its historical experience to know that all the triumphs of liberty had been won quietly and legally. The time was not far distant when this forbearance would have its reward.

Amid the democratic agitations of 1817, which necessarily produced a corresponding violence in the tone of political parties, it is pleasant to turn to an "affecting, improving, and most memorable scene"† in the House of Commons, on the 3d of March. Francis Horner had closed his valuable and blameless life at Pisa on the 6th of February. Lord Morpeth, in moving a new writ for the borough of St. Mawes, in the room of Mr. Horner, delivered what Mackintosh describes as "a speech so perfect that it might have been well placed as a passage in the most elegant English writer." In the eulogies upon this statesman, so prematurely cut off from that career which opened the widest expectations of his future eminence, the leading men of all parties concurred, in a spirit which was calculated to inspire hope and confidence amid the fears and doubts of that gloomy time. "Never was so much honor paid in any age or nation

* "Lives of the Chief Justices," vol. iii. p. 225.
† "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 236.

* "Life of Wilberforce," vol. iv. p. 315.
† Sir James Mackintosh, Diary in his "Life," vol. ii. p. 339.

to intrinsic claims alone. A Howard introduced and an English House of Commons adopted the proposition of thus honoring the memory of a man of thirty-eight, the son of a shopkeeper, who never filled an office, or had the power of obliging a living creature, and whose grand title to this distinction was the belief of his virtue. How honorable to the age and to the house! A country where such sentiments prevail is not ripe for destruction." *

CHAPTER CCXIV.

Death of the Princess Charlotte—Illness of the regent—Causes of his gloom and irritation—Opening of parliament—Bill of indemnity—The petition of Ogden—Mr. Canning—Sir F. Burdett proposes a plan of parliamentary reform—Parliament dissolved—Death of Sir S. Romilly—Death of Queen Charlotte—Evacuation of France by the allied troops—Meeting of the new parliament—Duke of York the custos of the king—Act for resumption of cash payments—Sir James Mackintosh's motion on the criminal laws—Last efforts of Mr. Grattan for Catholic emancipation—Agitation for reform—The Manchester massacre, so called—The Six Acts—Death of the Duke of Kent—Death of George III.

Forty-four years ago, "without the slightest warning, without the opportunity of a moment's immediate preparation, in the midst of the deepest tranquillity, at midnight a voice was heard in the palace, not of singing men and singing women, not of revelry and mirth, but the cry, Behold, the bridegroom cometh." † The death of the presumptive heiress of the British crown, on the 6th of November, after the birth of a dead child, was the great event in the domestic history of 1817. Never was a whole nation plunged in such deep and universal grief. From the highest to the lowest, this death was felt as a calamity that demanded the intense sorrow of domestic misfortune. Around every fireside there were suppressed tears and bitter remembrances. The most solemn disclaimer was uttered, through this universal mourning, of the calumny against the people that they were desirous of a vital change in their laws and institutions. Whatever might be their complaints, they showed, on this occasion, that their attachment to a constitutional monarchy was undiminished by factious contests or real grievances, and that they looked with exulting hopes to the days when a patriot queen should diffuse the sunlight of just government through every corner of a prosperous and happy land.

The Princess Charlotte seemed born to build up for generations the succession to the British crown, by calling around her own person the warmest devotion of a zealous but a reflecting people. The nation exulted in the maturity of her person and her mind. She stood, as was hoped among her future subjects, a beautiful, an accomplished, a noble-hearted woman. She had wisely asserted her own right to choose for herself in the most important action of her life. The nation hailed and reverenced her motives. The prince of her choice brought neither extent of territory nor continental influence; but he brought an active, firm, inquiring mind, and an amiable temper. In the retirement of Claremont they lived calmly and unobtrusively, in that enviable tranquillity which is so congenial to British feeling. The public sympathy with the husband of the Princess Charlotte upon his great bereavement is well characterized by Southey in a private letter: "The manner in which I have heard Prince Leopold spoken of on the occasion impressed me a good deal. He was called 'poor *man*' and 'poor *fellow*.' His affliction has brought him down to our level, and rank was forgotten in the sympathy of humanity." ‡

Since the death of the Princess Charlotte the prince-regent had been seriously indisposed, and for a short time his life was considered in danger. He was not a hard-hearted though he was a selfish man, and the sudden calamity appears to have had a greater influence upon his health and spirits than might have been expected by those who judged that there had been no great affection between the father and daughter. In the "Autobiography of Miss Knight, Lady Companion to the Princess Charlotte," there are many curious details of unpleasant passages in the intercourse of the regent and the princess, some of which had acquired an awkward publicity at the period of their occurrence. In the unhappy position of the father and the mother of the princess there was a natural source of irritation; and the restrictions which were placed upon the intercourse of the daughter with the mother were in themselves galling to a young woman of strong affections and high spirit. In the enforcement of these restrictions the public sympathized with the two royal ladies, and manifested little respect for the support which the prince-regent received when, in 1813, he placed before the privy council all the documents relative to the inquiry into the conduct of the Princess of Wales in 1806. He then obtained an opinion, that, with reference to the welfare of the Princess Charlotte and the most important interests of the state, the intercourse between the mother and the daughter should continue to be subject to regulation and restraint. The dissension became serious upon the refusal of the Princess Charlotte to marry the Prince of Orange. The impulsiveness of the Princess Charlotte's character was manifested when, in July, 1814, she fled from Warwick House, her own residence, to the house of the Princess of Wales, in the belief that she was about to be subjected to more coercion and to a stricter surveillance than she had yet endured. Miss Knight says, "It is possible that when Princess Charlotte was a child her temper might have been violent and headstrong, and the world held that opinion when she was grown up. I never saw anything of this violence or obstinacy. Much agitation, nervous uneasiness, and sometimes nervous impatience—all this I observed, and sometimes to such a degree as to injure her health. As a proof of this, it may be remarked that she was so much afraid of her father that when she had seen him or expected him she stuttered exceedingly, which she never did at times when there was nothing particular to agitate her." * Placed under happier circumstances by her union with a man of extraordinary good sense and prudence, the nation hoped that, although one cause of previous unhappiness still existed in full force, there would be no manifestation of those dissensions which, in former days, had rendered the position of the sovereign and of the heir-apparent one of mutual misery and of public scandal.

The national expression of feeling upon the death of the Princess Charlotte was termed by Lord Dudley "exaggerated lamentation;" and he thought that it "could not but be, from its obvious purport, offensive to the other branches of the royal family." † It certainly might have been offensive to the regent; for the strong national expression of hope in a future reign presented a forcible contrast to the small measure of enthusiasm toward him who was in the actual exercise of the sovereign power. But beyond this there was a more direct cause of the prince-regent's depression of spirits—the scandals that had reached him respecting the Princess of Wales. The only remedy for his gloom and irritation "was beset with so many difficulties that his ministers shrunk from the responsibility of advising it, though he grew daily more urgent for them to attempt it at any risk." ‡ On the 1st of January the prince-regent wrote to the lord chancellor, "You cannot be surprised (much difficulty in point of delicacy being now set aside in my mind by the late melancholy event which has taken place in my family) if I turn my whole thoughts to the endeavoring to extricate myself from the cruellest as well as the most unjust predicament that ever even the lowest individual, much more a prince, ever was placed in, by unshackling myself from a woman who," etc., etc.§ Mr. Fremantle, the gossiping correspondent of the Marquess of Buckingham, assigns as a reason for the regent not opening the parliament in person, on the 27th of January, "that allusion must be made in the speech to the death of the Princess Charlotte, which he cannot bear." ‖ Lord Dudley considered that, in the speech composed for the prince-regent, he could distinguish somewhat of that feeling which "the exaggerated lamentation" for the princess was calculated to excite: "The mention of her is rather dry—sulky rather than sad."

The general tone of the royal speech was hopeful and confiding.

* Sir James Mackintosh, Diary in his "Life," vol. ii. p. 339.
† Robert Hall's Funeral Sermon.
‡ "Memoirs of Sir William Knighton," by Lady Knighton, vol. i. p. 131.

* "Autobiography of Miss Cornelia Knight," vol. ii. pp. 88, 1861.
† "Letters," p. 195.
‡ Duke of Buckingham, "Court of England during the Regency," vol. ii. p. 202.
§ "Life of Lord Eldon," vol. ii. p. 305.
‖ "Court of England during the Regency," vol. ii. p. 202.

Improvement in every branch of domestic industry and the state of public credit were proofs that the difficulties under which the country had been laboring were to be ascribed to temporary causes. So important a change could not fail to withdraw from the disaffected the principal means of fomenting a spirit of discontent. The peace and tranquillity of the country had been restored. The confidence thus expressed by the government was supported by the announcement of their intention of bringing in a bill for the immediate repeal of the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act. The chief business of the opposition was therefore to contend against the mode in which the ministers had exercised their extraordinary powers, and to argue that no necessity had ever arisen for granting those powers. The discussion on these topics was initiated in both houses by the ministers themselves. Papers relative to the recent state of the country were presented on the 2d of February. Committees were appointed to report upon them, and the reports of the Lords and Commons were presented toward the end of the month. The reports went to completely justify the necessity for extraordinary measures, and to prove the discretion and moderation of the government in the execution of the powers vested in it by the two acts of the last session. It was somewhat contrary to the general tenor of these reports, that they expressed a decided opinion that the great body of the people had remained unseduced by the designs of the disaffected, even in the most disturbed districts, and at the periods of the greatest distress. The reports produced little debate, but the discussions were repeated and vehement upon "A Bill for Indemnifying Persons who, since the 26th of January, 1817, have acted in apprehending, imprisoning, or detaining in custody, persons suspected of high treason, or treasonable practices, and in the suppression of tumultuous and unlawful assemblies." On the motion for going into committee on this bill, Mr. Canning uttered five words, which long had the effect of inducing a belief that he regarded the sufferings of the humble with cold-blooded indifference, and made a jest of their misfortunes. One of three petitioners, who complained of severities which they endured while under confinement, was described by Canning as "the revered and ruptured Ogden." In Hansard's Parliamentary Debates the words are given as "the ever to be revered and unhappy Ogden."* There appears to be little doubt that the words which his enemies ascribed to Canning were the words which he used. But in the same sentence in which he employed the unfortunate alliteration he exposed the shameful mendacity of the petition which had been got up for Ogden, which affirmed that hernia had been caused by the weight of his irons, when he had suffered from the affliction during eight years, and was cured while in confinement, having written to his relatives and friends to express the delight he felt in being made a new man again. Among the most virulent of the attacks upon Mr. Canning for his somewhat imprudent expression was an anonymous pamphlet, "which he considered as suggestive of his assassination," and of which he "was always fully persuaded that Mr. Hobhouse was the author."† A fashion, now happily past with regard to all classes, was at that time, for men filling the highest offices in the state, to settle attacks upon their personal honor by the arbitrament of a duel. To provoke a duel, Canning wrote to the anonymous author of the pamphlet, "You are a liar and a slanderer, and want courage only to be an assassin." The writer of the pamphlet acknowledged the letter, but declined to remove the mask.

The question of parliamentary reform, which had slept for ten years, as far as parliament was concerned, was revived in the House of Commons by Sir Francis Burdett. In 1809 he had proposed that every county should be divided into electoral districts, each returning one member, and that the franchise should be vested in the taxed male population. Fifteen members then supported this motion. In 1818 Sir Francis Burdett, in accordance with the views of the Hampden Club, of which he was the chairman, brought forward resolutions for universal male suffrage, equal electoral districts, vote by ballot, and annual parliaments. Sir Francis restricted his proposal to male suffrage, although many of the reform associations were composed of women as well as of men. In the session of 1818 the seconder of the resolutions, Lord Cochrane, was their only supporter on the division, in addition to the mover. The advocates of reform out of doors were damaging a cause which had once had the support of Pitt and Fox, of Grey and Erskine. Moderate men had begun to wish that the cause was in better hands than the violent advocates of the same principle that Burdett had announced. Sydney Smith, in 1819, wrote to Francis Jeffrey, "I am doubtful whether it is not *your* duty and *my* duty to become moderate reformers, to keep off worse."*

In this session messages from the regent were delivered to both houses, announcing that treaties of marriage were in negotiation between the Duke of Clarence and the Princess Adelaide Louisa Theresa Caroline Amelia of Saxe Meiningen; also between the Duke of Cambridge and the Princess Augusta Wilhelmina Louisa of Hesse; also announcing that the prince-regent had given his consent to a marriage between the Duke of Kent and her Serene Highness Mary Louisa Victoria, daughter of the Duke of Saxe Cobourg Saalfeld, widow of Enrich Charles, Prince of Leiningen, and sister of Prince Leopold. There were long debates as to the sums to be voted by parliament in consequence of these projected alliances. The marriage of the Duke of Cambridge was solemnized on the 1st of June; those of the Duke of Clarence and the Duke of Kent on the 13th of July. The daughter of the fourth son of George III., by his marriage with the sister of Prince Leopold, was born on the 24th of May, 1819. It is a remarkable example of the vanity of human fears that the people who wept, as a people without hope, for the decease of Charlotte Augusta should have realized through her premature death precisely such a female reign, of just and mild government, of domestic virtues, of generous sympathy with popular rights, of bold and liberal encouragement of sound improvement, as they had associated with her probable career—a reign more congenial to the spontaneous love of the people than they could have thought, in that season of disquiet, was a possible blessing to be reached in a few coming years.

On the 10th of June the prince-regent announced from the throne his intention forthwith to dissolve the parliament. The word prorogation was not mentioned. At the close of the royal speech the lord chancellor in formal terms notified the will and pleasure of his royal highness "that this parliament be now dissolved, and this parliament is dissolved accordingly." When the Commons returned to their house, Mr. Manners Sutton, the late speaker, offered to read the speech at the table, as is usual after a prorogation. Mr. Tierney objected to any such proceeding, as implying some approbation of this mode of dissolution, which he considered as an insult to parliament. Mr. Manners Sutton said that this was a case in which there was no precedent, there having been no such dissolution since that of the Oxford Parliament in the reign of Charles II. The motive for this extraordinary proceeding was apparently that no delay should arise in summoning a new parliament. It had been a stormy session, and it was not desirable, in the view of the ministry, that the same parliament should reassemble in consequence of the demise of the crown, which then appeared to be an event very likely speedily to happen. The proclamation for calling a new parliament was issued the same day as that on which the dissolution took place. The writs for the new parliament were made returnable on the 4th of August.

The elections were all over by the middle of July. Sydney Smith wrote to Earl Grey, "I congratulate you on the general turn of the elections, and the serious accession of strength to the Whigs." There probably never was a general election in which there was a more revolting display of the violence which too often attended protracted contests. In Westminster the government candidate, Sir Murray Maxwell, a distinguished naval officer, was nearly killed by the brutality of the mob, who were outrageous that he stood before Burdett on the poll. In this stronghold of popular opinions it was creditable to the good sense of the middle classes that Romilly was returned with Burdett, and that Hunt, who continued the contest to the end of the fifteen days allowed by law, had only eighty-four votes. Romilly's high character secured him a triumphant return at the head of the poll, though he had not spent a shilling, nor solicited a vote, nor made his appearance on the hustings. He never took that place in parliament which the reverence of his fellow-citizens had awarded him. On the 29th of October he lost his wife, to whom he was most tenderly attached. In a paroxysm of insanity he died by his own hand on the 2d of November.

* Hansard, vol. xxxvii. col. 1026.

† Stapleton, "George Canning and his Times," p. 346.

* "Memoir of Sydney Smith," vol. ii. p. 181.

On the 17th of November took place the death of Queen Charlotte, at the age of seventy-five. For fifty-seven years she had shared the political anxieties, and watched over the mental aberrations of the king, who had since 1811 ceased to be conscious of the sympathy of wife or child. Under the Regency Bill she was appointed the custos of the king's person. During the regency she had presided over the court ceremonies with the same decorum which she had always maintained, and which did something to preserve the appearance of virtue, however the reality might be sacrificed in royal retreats which her scrupulous eye might not care to explore. Richard Rush, the plenipotentiary from the United States, who was presented to her majesty, in the February preceding her decease, describes her deportment with a strong feeling of respect: "During the whole interview there was a benignity in her manner which, in union with her age and rank, was both attractive and touching." *

At the congress of the allied sovereigns and of the ministers of the several powers, at Aix-la-Chapelle, the Duke of Wellington, associated with Lord Castlereagh, represented Great Britain. The only object of the congress was to determine with regard to the continued occupation of the French territory by the troops of the allies, of which Wellington was generalissimo. On the 2d of October the evacuation was unanimously agreed upon. By the Treaty of Paris the possible occupation had been fixed at five years. The fears of the more timid of the French royalists inclined the representatives of the Continental powers, with the exception of Russia, to prolong the occupation for the whole term. Louis XVIII. and his ministry had more confidence in the security which had been established, during the three years which had sufficed to restrain any attempt to shake the government by popular violence. The Duke of Wellington was satisfied with the state of things which he had witnessed during that period. A French historian says that sufficient justice had not been done to the duke, "for the liberal and faithful manner in which he protected the interests of France throughout all the negotiations with foreign powers. . . . He was of opinion that this measure of precaution ought to cease, seeing that France had not only duly discharged her stipulated payments, but that her government appeared to present the character of order and duration." †

The members of the new parliament having assembled on the 14th of January, and Mr. Manners Sutton having been re-elected speaker, the prince-regent's speech was delivered by commission on the 21st. The most important passage in that speech was in connection with the announcement of the death of the queen: "His royal highness has commanded us to direct your attention to the consideration of such measures as this melancholy event has rendered necessary and expedient with respect to the care of his majesty's sacred person." This was the preliminary to a bill appointing the Duke of York as a successor to the queen in the office of the king's custos. In a committee on the Civil List it was proposed that the sum of 10,000*l.*, which her majesty had received on account of this office, should be continued to the Duke of York. The Windsor establishment was proposed to be reduced from 100,000*l.* to 50,000*l.* The motion of Mr. Tierney, that these charges should be defrayed out of the privy purse, was negatived by a majority of 95. The proposed allowance to the Duke of York was the subject of continued and animated debate. The repugnance to this measure was not confined to the ordinary parliamentary opposition. Lord Grenville thought that there was "something very revolting in paying a sum of 10,000*l.* per annum to superintend the condition of his father, that father being the sovereign of the country." ‡ He was apprehensive that this would be a very general feeling. Sydney Smith did not probably express himself too strongly, after the house, on the 22d of March, had divided upon the question that the clause granting 10,000*l.* a year to the Duke of York should stand as part of the Royal Household Bill, and the majority for the clause had been 59: "You see this spirited House of Commons knows how to demean itself when any solid act of baseness, such as the 10,000*l.* to the Duke of York, is in agitation." § Mr. Charles Williams Wynn, in a letter to the Marquess of Buckingham, shows that there were other reasons for this measure than the desire to put a large sum into the somewhat empty pockets of the king's son: "The Duke of York's anxious wish was to have avoided the question by declining all salary; but General Grenville says 'the regent compelled him to take it.' And one of the duke's most intimate friends, who came down to vote for him last night, told Phillimore, in confidence, that the answer to the duke's request was, 'So, sir! you want to be popular at our expense.'" *

The state of the currency and the question of the resumption of cash payments were subjects of paramount importance in the deliberations of this session. Secret committees of both houses had been appointed to inquire into the state of the Bank of England. Early in April both committees presented reports, recommending that a bill should be forthwith passed to prohibit the continuance of the payment in gold by the bank of their notes issued previous to the 1st of January, 1817, in conformity with the voluntary notice to that effect of the directors. The circulation of these notes having been unusually large, and the price of gold being about 3 per cent above that of paper, six or seven millions had been rapidly withdrawn from the bank coffers. It was stated in the reports of the committees that the measure which they recommended had for its object to facilitate the final and complete restoration of cash payments. Mr. Peel, who had been first returned to parliament in 1809, and who was now, at the age of thirty-one, member for the University of Oxford, was chosen chairman of the committee of the House of Commons on the currency question. He then filled no office under government. In the agitation of this question he first signally manifested that remarkable quality of mind which led to the most important results of his statesmanship. Early in February Mr. Wynn wrote, "Peel, who is the chairman of the bank committee, professes, I find, to have as yet formed no opinion on the subject, but to be *open to conviction*; and the same is the language of the Duke of Wellington." † On the 24th of May the ministerial resolutions were proposed to the House of Commons by Mr. Peel. The resolution which he had to submit to the house had been adopted unanimously by the committee. In consequence of the evidence before the committee, and the discussions upon it, his opinion with regard to this question had undergone a material change. "He was ready to avow, without shame or remorse, that he went into the committee with a very different opinion from that which he at present entertained; for his views of the subject were most materially different when he voted against the resolutions brought forward by Mr. Horner in 1811, as the chairman of the bullion committee. . . . He now, with very little modification, concurred in the principles laid down in the fourteen first resolutions submitted to the house by that very able and much lamented individual. He conceived them to represent the true nature and laws of our monetary system." ‡ Founded upon the resolution thus proposed, the act for the gradual resumption of cash payments, commonly known as Peel's Act, was passed on the 23d of June. By this measure the restriction upon cash payments was continued until February, 1820; and it was provided that from the 1st of February to the 1st of October the public should be entitled to demand payment of notes in gold bullion, in quantities of not less than sixty ounces, at the rate of 81*s.* per ounce; and that the same mode of payment in bullion, at a gradually reduced rate per ounce, should continue till the 1st of May, 1822, after which date current gold coin of the realm might be demanded in exchange for notes. The bank anticipated this period, resuming the payment of its notes in specie on the 1st of May, 1821.

It was in this session of parliament that Sir James Mackintosh succeeded to a great trust which devolved upon him by the death of Sir Samuel Romilly—the advocacy of amendment in the criminal laws. On the 2d of March he moved for a select committee "to consider of so much of the criminal laws as relates to capital punishment in felonies." He did not propose, he said, to form a new criminal code, nor to suggest the abolition of the punishment of death, nor to take away the right of pardon from the crown; he did not aim at realizing any universal principle. His object was to bring the letter of the law more near to its practice, under which the remission of the law formed the rule and the execution the exception. "It is one of the greatest evils which can befall a country when the criminal law and

* "Residence at the Court of London," p. 134.
† Capefigue, "Histoire de la Restauration," tome i. p. 478.
‡ "Court of England during the Regency," vol. ii. p. 316.
§ "Memoir of Sydney Smith," vol. ii. p. 177.

* "Court of England during the Regency," vol. ii. p. 321.
† Ibid., vol. ii. p. 303. ‡ Hansard, vol. xl. col. 677.

the virtuous feeling of the community are in hostility to each other. They cannot be long at variance without injury to one, perhaps to both. One of my objects is to approximate them; to make good men the anxious supporters of the criminal law, and to restore, if it has been injured, that zealous attachment to the law in general which, even in the most tempestuous times of our history, has distinguished the people of England among the nations of the world."* The proposition of Sir James Mackintosh was opposed by the government; but, upon a division, the numbers in favor of the motion were 147; against it, 128. The report of the committee recommended the repeal of many capital punishments. Six bills, embodying some of these recommendations, were introduced by Mackintosh in the session of 1820.

The determination of the lord chancellor to stand, without yielding an inch, upon the ancient ways was put to the test by a remarkable occurrence in 1818. In the court of king's bench, in the celebrated case of Ashford and Thornton, an "appeal of murder" was prosecuted, which involved such a "trial by battle" as Shakespeare has exhibited between "the armorer and his man."† Lord Campbell says, as regards the appeal of murder in 1818, 'I myself saw the appellee, on being required to plead, throw down his gauntlet on the floor, and insist on clearing his innocence by battle—as the judges held he was entitled to do." Lord Campbell adds, that it was the opinion of many great lawyers that this appeal of murder, which might be brought after an acquittal before a jury, and in which the crown had no power to pardon, was a glorious badge of the rights and privileges of Englishmen. "Yet Lord Chancellor Eldon, to the amazement of the House of Peers and of the public, moved the second reading of a bill, sent up by the Commons, to reform those practices which he described as abuses, and, notwithstanding their antiquity, attacked in the most unsparing manner."‡ The conversion of Lord Eldon to the support of any legal innovation was the more remarkable, inasmuch as he was opposed to a great popular authority, the common council of the city of London, who petitioned parliament that the people might not be deprived of their ancient and undoubted right of appeal in criminal cases.

In this session the question of parliamentary reform was again agitated by Sir Francis Burdett. He proposed that, early in the next session, the house should take into its consideration the state of the representation. The occasion was remarkable for the first declaration of the opinions of Lord John Russell, who had entered the House of Commons in 1813, at the age of twenty-one. Lord John did not agree with those who opposed all and every system of reform. He agreed in the propriety of disfranchising such boroughs as were notoriously corrupt; he would restrict the duration of parliament to three years. "He could not, however, pledge himself to support a measure that went the length of proposing an inquiry into the general state of the representation, because such an inquiry was calculated to throw a slur upon the representation of the country, and to fill the minds of the people with vague and indefinite alarms."§ At the close of the session Lord John Russell announced his intention, on the next meeting of parliament, to propose the disfranchisement of Grampound, the corruption of which borough had become notorious. He intimated that he should propose also to adopt the principle which had not yet been recognized by the house—the principle of admitting the unrepresented large towns into a share of the representation. In the session of 1820 these proposals were brought forward by him in certain resolutions, which were met in a conciliatory spirit by the government. Eventually Grampound was disfranchised in 1821, and it was agreed by the Commons that the two vacant seats should be given to the town of Leeds. The Lords, however, rejected this extension of the representation to great towns, and assigned two additional members to the county of York. The moderate reformers had become hopeful, when Lord Castlereagh gave his assent to Lord John Russell's motion in 1820. Sydney Smith writes to Earl Grey, expressing his opinion that this assent "includes everything that is important; that a disfranchised borough may be taken out of the surrounding hundred and conferred elsewhere, or, rather, that it need not necessarily be thrown into the surrounding hundred."*

On the 3d of May the fervid eloquence of Mr. Grattan was heard for the last time in the House of Commons in support of the measure nearest his heart, that of Catholic emancipation. He moved that the state of the laws by which oaths or declarations are required to be taken as qualifications for the exercise of civil functions, as far as affected his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, should be taken into consideration by a committee of the whole house. After the speech of Grattan the house was impatient to divide. The numbers were, 241 for the motion, 243 against it. In the new parliament, on the 28th of April, 1820, Sir Henry Parnell gave notice that Mr. Grattan would, on the 11th of May, submit to the house a motion for the removal of the Roman Catholic disabilities. The great Irish orator had arrived in London in a state of much debility, and his friends remonstrated that the exertion that he contemplated would be attended with serious injury to his feeble health. His answer was "I should be happy to die in the discharge of my duty." He died on the 14th of May, at the age of seventy.

On the 13th of July parliament was prorogued by the prince-regent in person. There was a passage in the royal speech calculated to renew the alarm that appears to have subsided at the beginning of the year, when the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act had been deemed no longer necessary. The prince-regent now said, "I have observed with great concern the attempts which have recently been made in some of the manufacturing districts to take advantage of circumstances of local distress, to excite a spirit of disaffection to the institutions and government of the country." There had been considerable interruption to the prosperous state of trade from February to July. The number of bankruptcies was unusually great; credit was very generally impaired; the demand for labor was of course proportionably affected, and the rate of wages was necessarily lower. At the same time the price of food had been steadily advancing. There had been meetings of the operative classes in Lancashire and at Glasgow, to consider the low rate of wages, and to appeal to public sympathy upon their distressed condition. Gradually, however, at these meetings the peaceably disposed were borne down by the turbulent, and the speeches assumed that character of political violence that justified the terms of the prince-regent's speech. Parliament, however, separated without any expectation that serious mischief was at hand. Many of the members of the cabinet were seeking a temporary repose from their official labors. The lord chancellor, perplexed by events which we shall now have to describe, writes to his brother in August, "Your exhortations to the king's servants, I doubt, can't reach many of them, for, with the exception of Liverpool, Castlereagh, Sidmouth, Wellington, Van, and myself, they are all, eight in number, in different parts of Europe."†

At a great open-air meeting at Stockport on the 28th of June, Sir Charles Wolseley, Bart., was the chairman, there commencing a career which ended in the jail, and might have ended on the scaffold. He told his audience that he was one of those who had mounted the ramparts of the Bastille at the commencement of the French Revolution, and he would never shrink from attacking the Bastilles of his own country. On the 12th of July, at a meeting held at New Hall Hill, near Birmingham, Sir Charles Wolseley was elected "legislatorial attorney and representative" for that town. The government naturally became alarmed, and caused Sir Charles Wolseley and a dissenting preacher to be indicted for seditious words spoken by them at the meeting at Stockport. Wolseley was arrested at his own house, Wolseley Park, in Staffordshire. At a great assembly in Smithfield, where Hunt presided, Harrison was arrested; and on being conveyed to Stockport, the constable who arrived there with him was attacked and shot. These events produced great alarm. Lord Sidmouth, in a private letter of the 15th of August, expressed his opinion that "the laws were not strong enough for the times, but that they must be made so." Nevertheless, he thought the plentiful season was unfavorable for sedition, and that at Manchester there was happily an increased demand for labor.‡ The attention of the home office had naturally been directed to Manchester with some anxiety,

* Hansard, vol. xxxix. col. 784.
† "Henry VI.," second part, act 2, scene 3.
‡ "Lives of the Chancellors," chap. 203.
§ Hansard, vol. xl. col. 1496.

* "Memoir," vol. ii. p. 192.
† "Life of Lord Eldon," vol. ii. p. 336.
‡ "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 249.

for a public meeting had been called by the Reformers, who had now taken the name of Radicals, for the 9th of August, to elect a "legislatorial attorney" as representative of that place. The magistrates, in consequence, issued a notice declaring such a meeting to be illegal, and requiring the people, at their peril, to abstain from attending it. The design was relinquished; and another meeting was advertised to be held in St. Peter's Field, in Manchester, for the purpose of petitioning for a reform of parliament. One great cause of alarm at the beginning of August was derived from representations made to the Lancashire magistrates, that in the neighborhoods of Bury, of Bolton, and of Rochdale there were nightly assemblies of great numbers of men, who met together for the purpose of learning and practising military training. There is no evidence that these meetings for drill had been long continued, or that there had been any attempt to conduct the drillings in secret. A very plausible reason for this practice, at this particular period, is given by one who was freely admitted to all the councils of the reformers, and as freely differed from them when they contemplated any resort to physical force. Bamford says that the reformers had been frequently taunted by the press with their ragged, dirty appearance at their assemblages, with the confusion of their proceedings, and the mob-like crowd in which their numbers were mustered. In preparation for the great meeting of the 16th of August, the committees issued injunctions for a display of cleanliness, sobriety, and order. He adds, "order in our movements was obtained by drilling," and "peace," according to a subsequent injunction of the committees, was to be secured "by a prohibition of all weapons of offence or defence, and by the strictest discipline of silence, steadiness, and obedience to the directions of the conductors." Nothing can look more harmless, and even poetical, than Bamford's description of the evening drills. They were, he says, "to our sedentary weavers and spinners, periods of healthful exercise and enjoyment; our drill-masters were generally old soldiers of the line, or of militia or local militia regiments. They put the lads through their facings in quick time, and soon learned them to march with a steadiness and a regularity which would not have disgraced a regiment on parade. When dusk came, and we could no longer see to work, we jumped from our looms, and rushed to the sweet cool air of the fields, or the waste lands, or the green lane-sides. We mustered, we fell into rank, we faced, marched, halted, faced about, countermarched, halted again, dressed, and wheeled in quick succession, and without confusion; or, in the gray of a fine Sunday morn, we would saunter through the mists, fragrant with the night odor of flowers and of new hay, and, ascending the Tandle hills, salute the broad sun as he climbed from behind the high moors of Saddleworth." * Nevertheless, although there were no armed meetings and no midnight drillings, we can understand the fears of one of the Manchester magistrates, who deposed that "when he saw the party with the blue and green banners come upon the field in beautiful order, not until then did he become alarmed."

It was announced that at the meeting of the 16th of August Mr. Hunt would take the chair. The arrival of the hero of the day, preceded by flags flying, and a band of music, was hailed by a shout from eighty thousand persons. The greater part of this vast assemblage was not composed of the operatives of Manchester. Detachments, each of several thousand persons, came from the neighboring manufacturing districts, most of these bodies arriving in that military order for which they appear to have had a considerable aptitude. Bamford was himself the conductor of the procession of his fellow-townsmen of Middleton, who marched five abreast, every hundred having a leader distinguished by a sprig of laurel in his hat, and these leaders being directed by superior officers. The Middleton band had two silk flags, on which were inscribed, "Unity and Strength, Liberty and Fraternity," "Parliaments Annual, Suffrage Universal." They also bore a crimson velvet cap of liberty. The number of the Middleton men was three thousand, and they were joined by a similar number of the Rochdale people. As they entered Manchester they found that many other parties had preceded them, including that of the Leeds and Saddleworth Union, bearing a black flag with the words in white letters of "Equal Representation or Death." It would appear that these ominous words were little in accordance with the loyal spirit of the populace, who are stated to have very generally taken off their hats when the band played "God save the King." Mr. Hunt arrives; he mounts the hustings; he has his distinguishing white hat in his hand as he bows to the people; he begins to address the assembly amid a profound silence. After a few sentences he pauses; there is a pressure from the verge of the field toward the hustings; a body of cavalry is striving to make way through the terrified multitude.

From the exaggerated contemporary accounts, it is difficult to derive a clear and connected retrospect of the causes which led to such an onslaught upon a peaceable assemblage, as would justify history in continuing to designate it by its original name, "the Manchester massacre." To obtain an impartial view of the circumstances we must refer to the statements of the Lancashire magistrates in the papers laid before parliament, to the evidence upon the trial of Hunt and his associates, and to narratives of individuals which have appeared in more recent times. Twenty-five years after these occurrences, Sir William Jolliffe supplied to the biographer of Lord Sidmouth a circumstantial narrative of the events which he had himself witnessed on the 16th of August, when acting as a lieutenant in the 15th Hussars. His regiment had been quartered in Manchester about six weeks. It was his first acquaintance, he said, with a large manufacturing population; he had "little knowledge of the condition of that population; whether or no a great degree of distress was then prevalent, or whether or no the distrust and bad feeling which appeared to exist between the employers and employed was wholly or in part caused by the agitation of political questions." * There was an ample military force of the regular army, who were stationed in Manchester; and some companies of the 88th Regiment and of the Cheshire Yeomanry had also been brought into the town. Sir William Jolliffe adds, "There was a troop of Manchester Yeomanry Cavalry, consisting of about forty members, who, from the manner in which they were made use of (to say the least), greatly aggravated the disasters of the day. Their ranks were chiefly filled by wealthy master manufacturers, and, without the knowledge which would have been possessed by a (strictly speaking) military body, they were placed, most unwisely as it appeared, under the immediate command and orders of the civil authorities." † The magistrates had been taking depositions, and deliberating upon some course of action, through the Saturday and Sunday which preceded the meeting. They had been in communication with Lord Sidmouth, who had told them "that he expected occasion to arise for their energy to display itself, and that they might feel assured of the cordial support of the government." Mr. Bond, the London police magistrate, had at this time observed to Lord Sidmouth that, "in periods of disorder and approaching insurrection, the most difficult and important point is to ascertain to what extent you shall allow the evil to proceed; for unless there is enough done to indicate great and threatening danger, the better classes will not be convinced of the necessity of interference. You can never, therefore, call the law into execution with any good effect before the mischief is in part accomplished." ‡ Upon this equivocating and most dangerous principle the Lancashire magistrates appear to have acted. They had a warrant ready for the arrest of the leaders of this meeting. They delayed its execution till Hunt and the others to be arrested were surrounded by a multitude, equal in number to one half of the entire population of Manchester and Salford at that period. This multitude was wedged together in the narrow area of St. Peter's Field, now built over, but then an unenclosed space of about three acres, approached by several principal streets. A small body of constables were stationed close to the hustings, and a continued line of the same civil force maintained a communication with the magistrates, who were assembled at a private house on the south side of the field. The distance from the hustings to this house was about three hundred yards. The Manchester Yeomanry were stationed in Mosley Street. Two squadrons of the 15th Hussars were in waiting, dismounted, in a street to the north of the field, at a distance from it of about a quarter of a mile. In this position—the reform orators ready to begin, the populace eagerly waiting, the cavalry and yeomanry at hand, the magistrates in full conclave—the warrant for the apprehension of the leaders was given to Nadin, the chief constable of Manchester, to

* "Passages in the Life of a Radical," vol. i. p. 178.

* "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 253.
† Ibid., p. 254. ‡ Ibid., p. 250.

execute. He could not carry his orders into effect, he declared, with the civil power at his command. It was immediately determined that the chief constable should have military aid. Bamford, having seen Hunt taking off his white hat and beginning to address the people, very wisely went out of the crowd to obtain some refreshments after his long march. He heard a noise and strange murmur arising, and "saw a party of cavalry in blue and white uniform come trotting, sword in hand, round the corner of a garden wall, and to the front of a row of new houses, where they reined up in a line." The men in blue and white were the yeomanry. He went back nearer the hustings to see what this movement meant. The mounted troops were received with a shout which Bamford understood as one of good will. The military shouted again, and dashed forward. There was a general cry in the quarter where he stood of "Stand fast." "The cavalry were in confusion: they evidently could not, with all the weight of man and horse, penetrate that compact mass of human beings; and their sabres were plied to hew a way through naked held-up hands and defenceless heads; and then chopped limbs and wound-gaping skulls were seen, and groans and cries were mingled with the din of that horrid confusion." * According to the narrative of Sir William Jolliffe, some one, who had been sent from the place of meeting to bring up the four troops of the 15th Hussars led the way through a number of narrow streets and by a circuitous route, to the south-west corner of St. Peter's Field. Without a halt or pause, the commands "front and forward" were given. Their line extended quite across the ground, which in all parts was so filled with people that their hats seemed to touch. The lieutenant of Hussars saw the Manchester troop of yeomanry "scattered singly or in small groups over the greater part of the field, literally hemmed up and hedged in by the mob, so that they were powerless either to make an impression or to escape." Mr. Hulton, the chairman of the magistrates, states that when the Hussars arrived, Colonel l'Estrange, their commander, asked him what he was to do? "Good God, sir," exclaimed Mr. Hulton, "do you not see how they are attacking the yeomanry? Disperse the crowd!" The panic-struck magistrate's order was obeyed. The trumpet sounded the charge. The Hussars swept the mingled mass of human beings before them. "People, yeomen, and constables, in their confused attempts to escape, ran one over the other; so that, by the time we had arrived at the end of the field, the fugitives were literally piled up to a considerable elevation above the level of the ground." † According to Sir William Jolliffe, the Hussars drove the people forward with the flats of their swords, but, as was inevitably the case in such a situation, the edge was also used. He considers that it redounds highly to the forbearance of the men that more wounds were not received, when the vast numbers are considered with whom they came into hostile collision. "In ten minutes," says Bamford, "from the commencement of the havoc the field was an open and almost deserted space. The sun looked down through a sultry and motionless air. . . . The hustings remained, with a few broken and hewed flag-staves erect, and a torn and gashed banner or two dropping; while over the whole field were strewed caps, bonnets, hats, shawls, and shoes, and other parts of male and female dress, trampled, torn, and bloody." ‡ In the evening the people assembled in great numbers at the end of Oldham Street, using menacing language. Two companies of the 88th Regiment of foot and a squadron of Hussars, being stationed there as a night picket, were assaulted with stones as the darkness came on. A magistrate having read the Riot Act, about thirty shots were fired by the 88th, wounding three or four persons. The number of those killed on this unhappy day did not exceed six, of whom one was a special constable, and another one of the Manchester Yeomanry, who was struck off his horse by a brick-bat. About seventy persons were received in the infirmary, suffering from sabre wounds, fractures, or contusions. Many more are supposed to have returned to their homes without proclaiming their injuries.

Hunt and eight or ten of his companions having been seized upon the hustings, were brought before the magistrates upon a charge of high treason. The government having abandoned that charge, they were held to bail, or detained for the want of bail, to be tried for a misdemeanor, upon the charge of having conspired to alter the law by force and threats. The lord chancellor had urged upon the cabinet that the persons arrested should be indicted for high treason. The law officers had recommended that they should be indicted for misdemeanor; and Lord Eldon asks, "Who will be bold enough to command them to institute prosecutions, such as they think they can't maintain? Without all doubt, the Manchester magistrates must be supported; but they are very generally blamed here. For my part I think if the assembly was only an unlawful assembly, that task will be difficult enough in sound reasoning. If the meeting was an overt act of treason, their justification is complete. That it was such, and that the Birmingham meeting was such, is my clear opinion." * The Manchester magistrates were "supported;" and although they were "very generally blamed here," Lord Sidmouth addressed letters to the lord-lieutenants of Lancashire and Cheshire, expressing, upon the special authority of the prince-regent, "the great satisfaction derived by his royal highness from their prompt, decisive, and efficient measures for the preservation of the public tranquillity."

However great might have been the satisfaction of the prince-regent at "the conduct of the magistrates and civil authorities of Manchester, as well as of the officers and troops, both regular and yeomanry cavalry," † there was a very widely spread feeling of indignation, both against magistrates and military, in every part of the kingdom. Strong resolutions and addresses were adopted in public meetings of boroughs, and cities, and counties, little heeding a rough reply which the prince-regent made to the address of the Common Council of the city of London at the beginning of September. In populous counties and in moderate-sized towns the excitement was equally great. Twenty thousand persons assembled at a county meeting at York, called by the high sheriff upon the requisition of many influential freeholders. Among these requisitionists was Earl Fitzwilliam, who, for this offence, was summarily dismissed from his office of lord-lieutenant of the West Riding. In the south as well as in the north the excitement was equally great. In the town-hall of Reading we ourselves heard an harangue of remarkable eloquence from a young native of that town; and when he exclaimed,

> "We must be free, or die, who speak the tongue
> That Shakespeare spake,"

a shout went up from his fellow-townsmen that he must have well remembered in the merited success of his after life. That young man was Thomas Noon Talfourd.

The government alarmists of that period were in a condition of almost helpless terror. Eldon described the people of this country as divisible into two classes—the one class insane, who manifested their insanity in perfect apathy, eating and drinking, as if there was no danger of political death, yea, even to-morrow; contrasted with the other class, in which he included the Cokes and Bedfords, who hallooed on an infuriate multitude to acts of desperation. "The country," said the chancellor, "must make new laws to meet this state of things, or we must make a shocking choice between military government and anarchy." ‡ Parliament was called together, with the very unwilling assent of Lord Liverpool, to make these new laws, which were known as the Six Acts. They were acts to prevent delay in the administration of justice in cases of misdemeanor; to prevent the training of persons in the practice of military evolutions; to authorize justices of the peace to seize and detain arms; to more effectually prevent seditious meetings and assemblies. These four had especial reference to the disturbed districts, though they applied to the whole kingdom. The two other acts were for the prevention and punishment of blasphemous and seditious libel, and to subject certain publications to the duties of stamps upon newspapers. These measures were eventually passed, although resisted at every stage. The houses adjourned on the 29th of December. Lord Campbell describes "the unconstitutional code called the Six Acts" as "the latest violation of our free constitution." The old spirit of liberty would appear to have departed from England when public meetings could not be held without the license of magistrates, when private houses might be searched for arms, and when a person convicted a second time for publishing a libel might be transported beyond the seas. And yet the measures of ministers hardly came up to the ex-

* "Passages in the Life of a Radical," p. 207.
† Sir W. Jolliffe's account. ‡ Bamford, p. 208.

* "Life of Lord Eldon," vol. ii. pp. 338, 339.
† Letter of Sir B. Bloomfield to Lord Sidmouth.
‡ "Life of Lord Eldon," vol. ii. p. 340.

pectation of the ultra-Tories of that day. The temper of some who belonged to the parliamentary majority may be estimated from the tone of two letters addressed to Lord Colchester. Mr. Banks highly approved of the measure for compelling printers to enter into recognizances, and for banishing for an indefinite term of years for a second offence for libel. "My only doubt is whether we have gone far enough in our endeavor to restrain and correct the licentiousness and abuse of the press; it is a tremendous engine in the hands of mischievous men, of which the crop never fails; and the universal rage for spreading education among the poor renders them more exposed to ill impressions, through that medium, than they were in our younger days." * Lord Redesdale is for root-and-branch work that would have been worthy of the French reign of terror: "There is a very bad spirit abroad, but I think it will be kept under. I doubt whether it would not have been fortunate for the country if half Manchester had been burned, and Glasgow had endured a little singeing. We shall again only scotch the snake, not kill it. So we did in 1794. I would have permitted the national convention at that time to have met, but the ministers did not dare to hazard the consequences. Actual rebellion is generally subdued. Smothered rebellion lurks long under the ashes." † Moderate Whigs, such as Sydney Smith, thought that with an administration determined to concede nothing, there would be a struggle which would end, not in democracy, but in despotism. "In which of these two evils it terminates is of no more consequence than from which tube of a double-barrelled pistol I meet my destruction." ‡

Parliament had adjourned to the 15th of February, 1820. An event, not unexpected at any time during the last year or two, called the houses together at an earlier period. George the Third died at Windsor Castle on the evening of the 29th of January. Six days before the death of the king, his fourth son, the Duke of Kent, expired at Weymouth. This was a sudden event. The father had for nine years been secluded from the world, a sufferer under the most fearful of human infirmities. He lived on to his eighty-second year. The son, of robust constitution, had braved, in his habit of regular exercise, the pelting rain of a wintry morning; on his return from his walk had remained in his wet boots; was attacked by feverish symptoms, and died in three days. The Duke of Kent's infant daughter was then eight months old. The Prince of Wales and the Duke of York had no child to succeed. To the Duke of Clarence had been born a daughter on the 27th of March, but the infant had died on the day of its birth. It seemed probable that Alexandrina Victoria might wear the crown; and on this probability those who knew the admirable qualities of the Duchess of Kent felt hopeful and confident that the nurture of the royal child would fit her for her high destiny.

The last night of the regency passed into the first morning of the reign of George the Fouth, as an event that would be scarcely marked as an epoch in English history. With one exception, that of the position of the queen, it would be productive of no political vicissitudes; it would excite no hopes and no fears in the public mind. After a formal meeting there would be a new parliament, and the statutes of the existing parliament would have a new title-page. Few then living would remember the very different feelings with which the transition from George the Second to George the Third was regarded. But the young as well as the old would be impressed with the fact that there had been only one king of Great Britain and Ireland during sixty years. The slightest historical knowledge would attest that these sixty years would be forever memorable as an era of vast change and tremendous struggle, in which all that constituted the greatness and glory of our country might have been overwhelmed if the nation had not been heart-whole. The old king who was gone had plunged the country into difficulty and danger by his unyielding will at one period, but he had well sustained the national spirit by the same quality of mind during another crisis of greater peril. He had passed away, and his people looked back with reverence upon his private virtues, and were willing to forget his kingly faults.

* "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. iii. p. 104.
† Ibid., p. 107.
‡ "Memoir of Sydney Smith," p. 185.

CHAPTER CCXV.

English literature in the three latter decades of the reign of George III.—The poets: Cowper—Crabbe—Burns—Darwin—Wordsworth—Southey—Coleridge—Scott—Byron—Shelley—Keats—Narrative character of poetry—Campbell—Rogers—Leigh Hunt—Moore—Crabbe's latter delineations of manners—More evangelical spirit in the body of the people—Theological literature—Writers for the stage—The novelists—Godwin—Holcroft—Dr. Moore—Burney—Scott; the Waverley Novels—The "Edinburgh Review"—The "Quarterly Review"—"Blackwood's Magazine"—Essayists—Wilson—Lamb—Hazlitt—Leigh Hunt—De Quincey—Political economists—Scientific discovery—Herschel—Davy—Dalton—Wollaston—Travellers—Two great mechanical inventions of the steamboat and the printing machine—Chronological table of British writers.

THE termination of a reign, even under the circumstances which rendered the change of sovereignty from George the Third to George the Fourth merely nominal, nevertheless offers a fit resting-place, at which we may pause in the narrative of public events, and look back upon matters which belong as essentially to the life of a people as their political condition.

The great outburst of the French Revolution has always been associated with the literature which preceded it. This literature, like that of every other period in which literature has a marked distinctive character, was the reflection of the thoughts that were seething in the minds of men. It took the form of a fanatical and intolerant irreligion. It gave expression to the belief that existing principles and forms of government were ill-adapted to promote the welfare of the governed, and that worn-out institutions must be replaced by others endowed with a new vitality. The whole spirit of political opposition excited by the corruption of the government, not being able to find a vent in public affairs, had taken refuge in literature. As irreligion in France had become a general passion, the writers, one and all, stimulated the prevailing unbelief in Christianity, under the false conviction that political society and religious society were regulated by analogous laws.* The revolutionary doctrines thus propagated by the most subtle and the most eloquent of writers very largely influenced, if they did not produce, the great convulsion upon which Europe looked with fear and wonder.

The religious liberty of Protestantism and the political liberty of representative government, however impaired and inefficient, as many held, while they permitted the extremest differences of opinion, saved England from the excesses which saw no remedy for the canker of institutions but the destruction of the institutions themselves. English literature, reflecting the general public opinion, received but a very feeble infusion of the destructive force that had rent the French people and the French Church and State asunder. Yet such an upheaving of the whole crust of society; such an armed contest as succeeded between republican license and monarchical despotism; such a war into which we were plunged, finally to become a struggle for national existence, producing a real heroic time, and stirring up depths of thought which had been stagnant during a long period of tranquillity, or of mere party agitation—these circumstances, unprecedented in their conjunction, had a manifest effect upon our literature.

> "Oh, not alone when life flows still do truth
> And power emerge." †

A new power and a wider truth were especially marked in the highest expression of ideas, that of poetry. This outpouring of verse constitutes, in itself, a literary era as remarkable as that of the age of Elizabeth. During the latter three of the six decades of the reign of George the Third there had been also a vast increase of the number of readers in our country, with a correspondent extension of periodical writing—that form of literature which is the surest indication of a larger public to be addressed. If we adequately bear in mind the expansion of thought that was coincident with the great events of this remarkable period, and trace also the rapid growth of an influential body of readers beyond the narrow circles of the learned and the fashionable, to whom nearly all writers had addressed themselves in the first three decades of this reign, we may find two links by which to connect the rapid and imperfect notices which we now propose to

* See De Tocqueville, "Society in France before the Revolution," chap. xiv.
† Browning, "Paracelsus," I.

offer, without any attempt at minute criticism, of what is generically termed the press.

About the time when Samuel Johnson died* there appeared a writer who suddenly emerged from a provincial life of sickness and seclusion, after having passed his fiftieth year, to become "the most popular poet of his generation." † William Cowper was the precursor of the poetical school that sprang up amid the excitement of the French Revolution. He had many distinctive qualities essentially different from the leaders of that school. He was unfamiliar with German modes of thought and German models of composition. With the exception of one humorous poem, his writings did not assume the narrative form, which was so marked a characteristic of the next period. His first volume, published in 1784, contained the didactic poems, which may almost be termed satires, of table talk, the progress of error, truth, expostulation, hope, charity, conversation, retirement. Cowper's poetical talents were known to his intimate friends, and he had previously published the Olney Hymns. But when Mrs. Unwin urged upon him, as an employment that might divert him from thoughts under which his mental powers too often broke down, to produce a work of magnitude, she little expected that some six thousand lines would have been written in a time scarcely exceeding three months. The peculiar character of this first volume was scarcely calculated to win for it a sudden popularity. It was not till after the publication of his second volume, in 1785, containing the "Task," that the strong sense, the high morality, the earnest piety, the love of nature, the depth of the home affections, which characterize these poems, began to be fully recognized and duly appreciated. The conventialities of most of the poets who had preceded Cowper were to be cast aside and forgotten in this manifestation of the power of earnestness and simplicitly. The popularity which, with some persons, must have been at first retarded by the strong religious feeling of these poems, was ultimately increased in what has been denominated "the great religious movement of the end of the last century."

Cowper died in 1800, but as a painter of manners he represents the fashions and classes before the French Revolution. Some of the satire belongs to no especial generation. The waste of time in cards and dice; the rank debauch, which suits Clodio's filthy taste, who can "drink five bottles, and bilk the score"—Gorgonius the glutton, "abdominous and wan"—these are general portraits. The novelists,

> "Whose corresponding misses filled the ream
> With sentimental frippery and dream,"

will possibly never be extinct. The petit maître parson in Cowper's admirable portraiture is a successor of the gross Trulliber of a former age. Fielding probably never saw the preacher who brings forth the pocket mirror in the pulpit, or with opera-glass watches the slow retiring fair. He might have seen the court chaplain

> "Frequent in park, with lady at his side."

But the churchmen generally of his time were marked by the slovenly neglect and rustic coarseness which Cowper preferred to the affectation of the clerical coxcomb of his satire. The political profligacy of those times was never more strongly painted than in the picture of the country gentleman, who, having expended his wealth in gaming or building, turns to serve his country, and receives the price of his vote from ministerial grace or private patronage. The venal senator and the remorseless highwayman each belong to those good old times:

> "Oh, innocent! compared with arts like these,
> Crape and cock'd pistol and the whistling ball
> Sent through the traveller's temples!"

In those days public corruption and private immorality filled the thinking with apprehension:

> "'Tis therefore, sober and good men are sad
> For England's glory, seeing it wax pale
> And sickly, while her champions wear their hearts
> So loose to private duty, that no brain
> Healthful and undisturb'd by factious fumes
> Can dream them trusty to the general weal."

Cowper believed that the public men of his time had grown degenerate—"the age of virtuous politics is past."

In such a brief view of literary progress as we are now attempting to give, it appears to us important to divide our subject into two periods of very moderate extent. In his great work on the literature of Europe, Mr. Hallam gives the leading writers in various periods of half a century each. Although such a division has the apparent inconvenience of making a somewhat too distinct line of separation in the works of the same author (as in the case of Shakespeare, who wrote at the end of the 16th century and the beginning of the 17th), it is far more satisfactory than the plan pursued by an eminent historian of our own time. It is somewhat embarrassing to our chronological notions when we find Rogers and Tennyson in the same chapter of poets, Sharon Turner and Macaulay of historians, and Miss Edgeworth and Thackeray, of novelists.* The convenience if not the necessity of adopting more manageable eras, and even of dividing in some cases the productions of one man into two eras, may be estimated by reference to the cases of Rogers and Crabbe. The author of the "Pleasures of Memory" published his "Ode to Superstition and other Poems" in 1786. Crabbe's early poems, "The Library," "The Village," and "The Newspaper," appeared from 1781 to 1784. The "Italy" of Rogers did not appear till 1822; Crabbe's "Tales of the Hall" appeared in 1819. In their early career Rogers and Crabbe belonged to the generation of Cowper and Burns; in their latter period they belonged to the same age as Byron and Moore.

Crabbe more than any other poet of either of the periods to which he belongs is a painter of manners. It has been observed by a critic of no common order that "with all its originality, the poetical genius of Crabbe was acted upon and changed by the growth of new tastes and a new spirit in the times through which he lived. . . . As he lived, indeed, in two eras, so he wrote in two styles." †

His early poems, which are essentially didactic, contain little of the poetical element which is to be found in the strong and impassioned narrative of his later years. "The Library" and "The Newspaper" necessarily deal with the subjects of our own present chapter.

The age of great books was gone—the age when an author wrote his one folio, bepraised by poetic friends, when the ponderous gift was accepted by princes, and when

> "Ladies read the work they could not lift."

The age of abstracts, and abridgments, and pamphlets was come—the age of "a folio *number* once a week." In "The Library" the "ancient worthies of romance" are in disgrace; the giants, the knights, and the magicians are gone. The poet accurately describes the quality of the fiction which had succeeded to the "brood of old romance." The novels of the sentimental school were in fashion, as well as the sentimental comedy. These mawkish productions were "stories of repentant rakes wooing humble nymphs;" or of "virtue going to midnight masquerade on purpose to be tried;" or the letters of the tender Delia to the sympathizing Lucinda. Crabbe's novel-reading experience is also given as a reminiscence of his later period. "Wanderings of the Heart;" "Confessions of a Nun;" "Tales of Winters, Summers, Springs, at Bath and Brighton," in which "all was love and flight to Gretna Green"—these were the staple of the circulating libraries, then recently called into existence.

"The Newspaper" describes that great province of the realms of print as it existed four or five years before the French Revolution. At the date of Crabbe's poem there were seventy-nine newspapers published in Great Britain and Ireland. Seven years before there were seventeen in London, of which seven were daily and one of once a week. The name of Sunday paper was eschewed till "Johnson's Sunday Monitor" appeared, which Crabbe not unjustly satirizes for "the moral essays on his front, and carnal business in the rear." Flourishing with morning papers and evening papers, there were papers of thrice a week and twice a week. Crabbe gives the titles of some members of the literature which he holds in contempt as "those vapid sheets"—Ledgers, Chronicles, Posts, Heralds. One paper which appeared a year after his poem, "The Daily Universal Register," is remarkable as having been printed and published by John Walter, Printing House Square. The name of that journal, in 1788, was changed to "The Times." Crabbe had no taste for newspapers. In their politics they were "fickle and false;" they were "the poi-

* See *ante*, vol. vii. chap. clxxxi.
† Southey, Life of Cowper in Collected Works, chap. i.

* So in Alison, "Europe from the Fall of Napoleon," vol. i. chap. 5
† "History of English Literature," by George L. Craik, LL.D., 1861, vol. ii. p. 485.

soned springs from learning's fountain," "blind guides," "anonymous slanderers." The newspaper editors were "mutual thieves from each brother's hoard;" "What you read in one you read through all."

"Their runners ramble day and night,
To drag each lurking deed to open light;
For daily bread the dirty trade they ply,
Coin their fresh tales, and live upon the lie."

Some of this satire was no doubt poetical exaggeration; but at that period newspapers had no high character to sustain. The government dreaded and despised them; they were in perpetual conflict with the parliament about privilege; their contributors were ill-paid; their proprietors and editors had little social respect. How great has been the change! It was during the war that newspapers, such as the "Morning Chronicle," became valuable properties. James Perry, the proprietor of that paper, was originally a reporter at a guinea a week. A payment of this amount for his weekly services was refused by one whose presumption was thus described by one of the most energetic of the newspaper producers: "We hear much of purse-proud insolence, but poets can sometimes be insolent on the conscious power of talent, as well as vulgar upstarts can be on the conscious power of purse. . . . It would surely have been a more honorable employment than that of an excise-gauger." We turn from the "base ephemera" of past journalism to Robert Burns, "the excise-gauger," the greatest name in that era of our literature that immediately preceded the French Revolution.

From the first publication in 1786 of a volume of poems, chiefly in the Scottish dialect, by Robert Burns, which was printed in the town of Kilmarnock, Scotland felt that a great spirit had arisen to shed a new lustre on the popular language and literature. The immediate and wide-spreading reputation of Burns was produced by something much higher than the wonderment that an unlettered ploughman should have been able to produce verses not only of such commanding strength, but of such unlabored refinement. The Scottish dialect, which, to a certain extent, was almost obsolete for the purposes of literature, became, in the hands of this peasant, the vehicle of thoughts and descriptions which, whether impassioned or humorous, tender or satirical, received a new charm from the simplicity of the language whose ordinary use was vulgarized by the illiterate. Burns had not the creative power of the highest order of poets; but in describing his own emotions with a warmth equal to the energy with which he plunged into his loves or friendships; in delineating with the frankest unreserve the errors from which his manly sense and his natural veneration for what is of good report could not preserve him; in painting with the most admirable truth the appearances of nature or the social characteristics which presented themselves to his observation—few poets have approached him. In his occasional impurities of thought and diction, which were the outbreak of a reckless levity, we always see a noble nature beneath the display of the wildest license. The mode in which Burns "unlocked his heart" has nothing in it of that inordinate self-love which exhibits itself in touches of glaring vanity or affected modesty, each intended to challenge admiration. In his manly pride there is no peevish misanthropy. In his violations of decorum there is no desire to make proselytes to immorality. The egotism of Burns may be compared with the egotism of the most popular English poet of the succeeding generation. In the morbid introspection and the capricious hatreds of him who "woke one morning and found himself famous," we look in vain for the innate nobleness of character of the rustic, who, having gone from his plough to become the spoiled child of Edinburgh society, fell afterward into habits of intemperance, and yet, in the grossest errors of his life, never exhibited a mean spirit. What Burns produced under all the disadvantages of imperfect education, of continuous labor, of uncongenial employment, of corrupting society, made him emphatically the national poet of Scotland in the twelve years which were allotted to his life after his first publication. It has been affirmed—and we are not disposed to question the truth of the opinion—that the influence of Burns upon the popular mind of Scotland "has been all for good, enlarging, elevating, and refining the national heart, as well as awakening it. The tendency of some things, both in the character of the people and their peculiar institutions, required such a check or counteraction as was supplied by this frank, generous, reckless poetry." *

* Craik, "English Literature," vol. ii. p. 424.

While Scotland is producing her Burns, whose inspiration was the bracing air of his own rivers and hills, and whose imagery was derived from the living or inanimate nature around him, England has her Darwin, who deemed it the office of a poet to penetrate beneath the surface of natural appearances, and to exhibit the mysteries of physiology in sonorous rhyme. The physician of Derby is almost forgotten. "The Loves of the Plants" are less popularly known than Canning's imitation, "The Loves of the Triangles." The attempt of Darwin to marry science to poetry was the mistake of a man of real talent and knowledge. The material spirit of his age pressed heavily upon him. The applications of scientific discovery to the great works of industry filled his fancy with incongruous imagery. He saw in physics a world of grandeur and beauty not yet appropriated by imagination; and he contrived that unnatural alliance of fact and fiction which, however admired in his own day, has made his analogies and similes now appear simply ludicrous. The fantastic machinery by which he attempts to connect the laws of vegetable and animal life and the operations of art with the presence of invisible beings is to make the sylphs which hovered round Pope's Belinda in their tricksy beauty very poor substitutes, in Darwin's hard unrealities, for human interests. Poetry has better materials to work upon, even in the mortal toilers by the side of the steam-engine, than the "nymphs" who "in simmering cauldrons played." Darwin is poetical when he becomes prophetic:

"Soon shall thy arm, unconquered Steam, afar
Drag the slow barge or drive the rapid car."

The prophecy is accomplished. But steam has another work to do:

"Or on wide waving wings expanded bear
The flying chariot through the fields of air."

The specific levity of air, he explains, being too great for the support of great burdens by balloons, "there seems no probable method of flying conveniently but by the powers of steam, or some other explosive material, which another half century may probably discover." The aërial journey in the steam-car is to be not only safe but joyous; there will probably be an intended emigration to the moon when

"Fair crews triumphant, leaning from above,
Shall wave their fluttering kerchiefs as they move."

A poetical revolution was at hand. A little before the beginning of the convulsions of France, and during the first year or two of the war, there was a swarm of gaudy insects fluttering in the sunshine of fashion, whose painted wings, bearing them from flower to flower, were more admired than the "ample pinion" of the true poet. This school, called Della Cruscan, originated with an English coterie at Florence. The sonnets, canzonets, elegies, epigrams, epistles of the Anna Matildas, Laura Marias, Orlandos, Cesarios, were long poured out unceasingly. William Gifford, who destroyed the tribe by his "Baviad" and his "Mæviad," says "the epidemic malady was spreading from fool to fool;" and "from one end of the kingdom to another all was nonsense and Della Crusca." Gifford not improperly lauds the work which he had done in clearing the gardens of the Hesperides from this deadly blight. "Pope and Milton resumed their superiority." He might have added that he did something to make room for another school — for Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey. In spite of the "This will never do" of the great northern critic, the Lake School, so called, which this illustrious trio founded, has survived, and will survive.

If the estimates of writers by their contemporaries are not always true, they are at least curious as illustrations of the prevailing taste.

In 1809 there appeared a satire, by an anonymous author, entitled "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers." Some of this early production of Lord Byron is personal spite and much is false criticism. In after years he suppressed the poem, having moderated his anger and matured his judgment. Yet if the poetical critic had not, to some extent, reflected the popular opinion, he would not have described "the simple Wordsworth,"

"Who, both by precept and example, shows
That prose is verse, and verse is merely prose;"

nor characterized "gentle Coleridge"

"To turgid ode and tumid stanza dear."

Southey comes off better :

> "Let Southey sing, although his teeming muse,
> Prolific every spring, be too profuse."

It may be consolatory to neglected poets to know that the two greatest of the Lake poets have won their freshest laurels from a generation that succeeded the doubters and scoffers of their early period. It was not merely the dull and the acrimonious who spoke slightingly of Wordsworth and Coleridge, even as recently as 1811. Leigh Hunt, in most cases a generous critic, in his "Feast of the Poets," makes Apollo look pleased upon "Bob Southey;" but Apollo "turned without even a look" for the "three or four others" who had entered with him :

> "For Coleridge had vexed him long since, I suppose,
> By his idling, and gabbling, and muddling in prose ;
> And as to that Wordsworth ! he'd been so benurst,
> Second childhood with him had come close on the first." *

Apollo having cried, "Laurels for four," the honored guests of the god are Campbell, Southey, Scott, and Moore. Crabbe is to be recreated "downstairs :"

> "And let him have part of what goes from the table."

Wordsworth had appeared as a writer of verse in 1793. The first volume of the "Lyrical Ballads" was published in 1798. In the second volume, published in 1800, he was associated with Coleridge. Of "Joan of Arc," the first poem which Southey gave to the world, in 1796, a portion was contributed by Coleridge. The relative value of the three friends, as poets, has been somewhat differently adjudged in the present time from the early estimate of their peculiar powers. Southey, the most voluminous, is now little read, and has certainly not produced an enduring influence upon our poetical literature. Coleridge, who, of the trio, has written the smaller amount of verse, is generally held to be the most exquisite artist, although least fitted to be popular. Wordsworth—described by Hazlitt as the most original poet living ; but one whose writings were not read by the vulgar, not understood by the learned, despised by the great, and ridiculed by the fashionable—lived to see his writings universally read by learned, great, fashionable, and even "the vulgar." His power was slowly won, but it was enduring ; for he looked beyond the classes that were once deemed to be alone sufficiently elevated for the purposes of didactic or descriptive verse. The great objection to his writings was "the wilfulness with which he persists in choosing his examples of intellectual dignity and tenderness exclusively from the lowest ranks of society." The Edinburgh reviewer wanted Mr. Wordsworth, "instead of confining himself almost entirely to the society of the dale-men, and cottagers, and little children, who form the subjects of his book, to condescend to mingle a little more with the people who were to read and judge of it." † The poet had his reward in the fact that the exceptional class of the lower ranks became his readers and admirers. He survived till the era of diffused education.

It was the complaint of the author of "English Bards" that a new reading public had arisen to buy books according to their own tastes.

> "Each country book-club bows the knee to Baal,
> And, hurling lawful genius from the throne,
> Erects a shrine and idol of its own."

It was a grievance that out of this new demand authors were to be paid at a rate far beyond that of the exclusive periods of the commerce of literature. For this was Byron indignant in his days of innocence, when he could spurn Scott as "Apollo's venal son," deeming it a sin against the dignity of verse that the booksellers had agreed to pay for "Marmion" at the rate of "half-a-crown a line." In a year or two Byron was as greedy a worshipper of "stern Mammon" as any "hireling bard." The circulating library and the book club had, to some extent, superseded the comparatively small number of private book-buyers. To this more numerous body of readers did the publishers of "The Lay of the Last Minstrel," of "Marmion," of "The Lady of the Lake," and of Scott's other romances in verse, address themselves, when they reprinted his inconveniently splendid and dear quartos in more modest and cheaper octavos. "The Lay of the Last Minstrel" was published in 1805 and "Marmion" in 1808. Byron designated these poems as "stale romance." With them commenced the new era of narrative poetry, which has almost wholly superseded the merely didactic and descriptive orders of verse, and which is not incompatible with the most refined and most subtle revelations of poetical feeling. Never was a greater mistake than the designation of Scott's narrative poems as "*stale* romance." He had the most ample knowledge of all the romances of chivalry, and especially of the legendary lore of his native land. His critical devotion to this most seductive of the pursuits of antiquarianism was exhibited in his "Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border," originally published in 1802 and 1803. The young Edinburgh advocate had previously cultivated an acquaintance with the literature of Germany, of which new well of thought and diction other poets were drinking so freely. But he saw at home a waste ground of imagination ready for his profitable culture. The quaint and sometimes tedious simplicity of the old romance was to be superseded by a rush of easy and glowing narrative which the imperfectly cultivated mind could enjoy, and of which the critical faculty could scarcely deny the charm, however it might sneer at mountain spirits and river sprites, the goblin page and the wizard's grave. There are two critical notices of Scott's poems, reprinted in juxtaposition by their accomplished author, which sufficiently indicate the triumphs which Scott had achieved in a few years. That on "The Lay of the Last Minstrel," written in 1805, concludes thus : "The locality of the subject is likely to obstruct its popularity ; and the author, by confining himself in a great measure to the description of manners and personal adventures, has forfeited the attraction which might have been derived from the delineation of rural scenery." * The critique on "The Lady of the Lake," written in 1810, opens thus : "Mr. Scott, though living in an age remarkably prolific of original poetry, has manifestly outstripped all his competitors in the race of popularity, and stands already upon a height to which no other writer has attained in the memory of any one now alive." †

The popularity of Walter Scott as a narrative poet was equalled, if not exceeded, by that of Lord Byron, when he reluctantly turned from satire and the comparatively tame Cantos I. and II. of "Childe Harold," to write verse romances, of which the scenes were oriental, and the heroes were modelled from his own likeness. Byron was almost universally held as the first of living poets. There were some, it is true, who doubted the reasonableness of the universal homage ; some who ascribed his extraordinary fame to causes of a more temporary and artificial nature than the power of his genius ; who thought that the multiplication of his own portrait was no indication of a real knowledge of the human heart ; who upheld the faith that a truly great poet could not be impressed with the grandeur and beauty of the external world without an abiding sense of the Creator's presence, nor could survey mankind in the spirit of an insane contempt of his country, and of malignant hatred of classes and individuals among whom he had lived. In the poem which, considered in a merely literary point of view, is his greatest production, "Don Juan," is the intensification of the sensual attributes of the poet's own character, dressed up with marvellous ability for no other end than to dazzle and corrupt. A higher taste and a more prevalent sense of decency has done more to consign this poem to partial neglect than Lord Eldon's refusal to give it the protection of the law of copyright. One of the most popular of our living novelists has depicted an East Indian officer, who, having returned, after long absence, to his native country, quite unfamiliar with the more recent judgments of English society on matters of literature, is scandalized at the critical opinions of his son's friends—opinions which were not of Colonel Newcome's time. What ! Lord Byron not one of the greatest poets of the world ! Sir Walter a poet of the second order ! That reverence for Mr. Wordsworth, what did it mean ? Mr. Keats, and the young Mr. Tennyson of Cambridge, the chief of modern poets ! Such were the mutations of opinion between the last years of King George III. and the first years of Queen Victoria.

While Byron was in the full blaze of his reputation, and Wordsworth was slowly establishing an enduring influence upon the popular mind, two young poets appeared, who, for a time, had to endure

* We quote from the first edition of this clever poem, published in "The Reflector."

† Jeffrey's "Essays," vol. ii. p. 508.

* Jeffrey's "Essays," vol. ii. p. 236.

† Ibid., p. 237.

as much obloquy and neglect as ordinarily falls to the lot of intrusive mediocrity. In 1812, at the age of twenty, Shelley printed his "Queen Mab." In 1821 he was drowned in the Mediterranean. In these ten years of a feverish and often unhappy existence, he produced a body of poetry "remarkable for its quantity, but much more wonderful for the quality of the greater part of it."* Few were his contemporary admirers. He was denounced and dreaded. At war with many of the institutions of society; an unbeliever in Christianity, but with a vague belief of an overruling power and of the soul's immortality; his rash opinions confirmed by something like persecution—it was reserved for another age to understand the rare qualities of his genius. Shelley has been called "the poet of poets." His highest excellences are scarcely capable of rousing enthusiasm in ordinary readers, now that he *is* read. Keats published two volumes of poems in 1817; his third volume appeared a few months before his death in 1821. The inspiration of Keats, like that of Shelley, was fitted to attract fervent votaries, but only among a comparatively small class—those "of imagination all compact." The narrative facility of Scott, the splendid declamation of Byron, were elements of popularity which were wanting in these masters of a subtler art.

The narrative character, by which a great portion of the verse of this period had established its hold upon the popular mind, was now adopted by writers whose earlier productions were more in conformity with the tastes of a generation passing away. Campbell had a wider reputation than any contemporary at the beginning of the century, created by his "Pleasures of Hope" and his noble lyrics. In 1809 he produced "Gertrude of Wyoming." Rogers appeared to revive from a sleep of twenty years, when, in 1814, he published "Jaqueline," in conjunction with the "Lara" of Byron. His "Pleasures of Memory" appeared in 1792. He returned to his characteristic style in the "Italy" of 1822. Leigh Hunt, whose juvenile poems appeared in 1802, and whose poetical faculty had been subsequently displayed in graceful verse, light or serious, in 1816 took his place among the narrative poets by his "Story of Rimini." Moore, the wittiest of satirists, the most elegant of song-writers, published "Lalla Rookh" in 1817. Crabbe—who, when he published a volume of "Poems," in 1807, was hailed "with the same sort of feeling that would be excited by tidings of an ancient friend, whom we no longer expected to see in this world"†—in that volume reprinted "The Village." His new productions, which included "The Parish Register," were principally of a narrative character. In 1810 came "The Borough," with the same marked feature of the recent poetical school; in 1812 "Tales;" and in 1819 "Tales of the Hall." It is in these novelettes in verse of Crabbe that we must look for such occasional delineations of manners as have made the prose novels of Fielding and Smollett most valuable studies of the times in which they flourished. The life of the country town and its neighborhood, half a century ago, has coarser and harder features than would now offer themselves, even in the least refined classes. The sea-going population of the "Borough" are "a bold, artful, surly, savage race"—smugglers, wreckers, bribed electors. They dwell where there are dung-heaps before every door, in the "infected row we term our street." There "riots are nightly heard." Within their hovels all is filth and indecency. Books there are none, but ballads on the wall, abusive or obscene. Aldborough was then a watering-place, and had a "season." There are few of its visitors now who would be content with

"The brick-floor'd parlor which the butcher lets."

The mayor of the borough, a prosperous fisherman, did not know in the painful accumulation of wealth that money would multiply at interest. He was not alone in his ignorance. The race of hoarders was common in every district at the beginning of the century. The neighboring squire comes once a month to the "Free and Easy Club," to be the hero of the night. The rector, doctor, and attorney meet, in pleasant conviviality, to talk over parish affairs and politics—election zeal and

"The murmuring poor who will not fast in peace."

In such meetings there was ever a dictator—a "Justice Bolt"—whose passion was that of "teaching."

"Those who instruction needed not, or sought"

—in more recent times a malady most incident to Scots. The attorney then thought that he could best thrive in encouraging litigation. The apothecary, "all pride and business, bustle and conceit," was protected in his neglect of the poor by a "drowsy bench." The parish priest, who heeded not the summons to a pauper's bed,* had not yet been roused out of his indifference by the presence near his church of "Sects in Religion." Romanists, Baptists, Swedenborgians, Universalists, Jews, were found in the country town; but most prevailing were the "Methodists, of two kinds, Calvinistic and Arminian."

"Sects in religion? Yes, of every race
We nurse some portion in our favored place;
Not one warm preacher of one growing sect
Can say our borough treats him with neglect;
Frequent as fashions, they with us appear,
And you might ask, 'how think we for the year?'"

In the "Edinburgh Review," of 1816, Jeffrey attributed the creation of an effectual demand for more profound speculation and more serious emotion than were dealt in by the writers of the former century, to the agitations of the French revolution, the impression of the new literature of Germany, and "the rise or revival of a more evangelical spirit in the body of the people."† The direct relations of this "more evangelical spirit" to our lighter literature are not very manifest; but its indirect effect may be traced in the general abandonment in prose works of fiction of the grossness which still lingered in the delineations of social life which came after those of the great humorists who were passing away when George III. ascended the throne. This may be partly attributed to the reformation of manners, which had unquestionably been produced by the same religious influences steadily working among a portion of the upper and middle classes. In 1787 Wilberforce entered in his journal a solemn record of what he deemed one of the great objects of his life: "God has set before me the reformation of my country's manners." His other great object, the abolition of the slave trade, had been accomplished, and a visible change had taken place in the general aspects of society—in all of the community except some of the very high and many of the very low—before the close of his career of practical benevolence in 1833. The "more evangelical spirit"—which many good and earnest men condemned as sectarian—had penetrated into the church. A writer who has described the various phases of this transition period of religion, with a natural affection for the somewhat exclusive society amid which he was reared, but with a generous catholicity of mind, has shown the difficulty of discriminating between the senses of two appellations, "orthodox" and "evangelical." He says, "The knot would perhaps have been best cut by defining an orthodox clergyman as one who held, in dull and barren formality, the very same doctrines which the evangelical clergyman held in cordial and prolific vitality."‡ The "prolific vitality" fortunately took the form of association. Societies were formed for grappling with open immorality, and for mitigating some of the more obvious evils of vice and ignorance. The theological literature of this awakening period presented a novel aspect. The spirit of polite unbelief, which England had imparted to France in the beginning and middle of the eighteenth century, had travelled back from France to England toward the end of that century, in the grosser forms of denunciation and ribaldry. Dignitaries of the Church applied themselves to put down "the age of reason" with gentle argument—apologetical rather than confiding. The great and fashionable, who shuddered at the notion that those beneath them should have their faith shaken and their morals corrupted by atheistical and licentious writers, did not wholly stand on the outside of the circle to whom the royal proclamation of 1787 against vice was addressed. The private offences, in the support of whose official interdiction

* Craik, "English Literature," vol. ii. p. 496.
† "Edinburgh Review," April, 1808.

* The picture of "the jovial youth" who thought his duty was comprised in his "Sunday's task" is found in Crabbe's early poem of "The Village."
† "Essays," vol. i. p. 167.
‡ Sir James Stephen, "Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography," vol. ii. p. 155.

Wilberforce founded a society, were, profanation of the Lord's Day, swearing, drunkenness. The great gave their Sunday card parties and Sunday concerts long after Hannah More published, in 1796, her "Estimate of the Religion of the Fashionable World," and Wilberforce, in 1797, his "Practical Christianity." "The Clapham Sect" strove manfully against these anomalies, amid hypocritical assent and covert ridicule. Some of this ridicule was deserved. It has been candidly acknowledged that "the spirit of coterie" was among them. They "admired in each other the reflection of their own looks, and the echo of their own voices."* It is this quality that now renders "Cœlebs in Search of a Wife"—one of the most popular books of the class of religious novels, of which this production of Hannah More was the first example—the most tedious of homilies pretending to be amusing. What has been called "the unquenchable thirst for spiritual excitement" exposed well-meaning crowds, who had a perpetual craving for the fountains of platform eloquence, to manifest a spirit of intolerance and exclusiveness which detracted largely from their honest enthusiasm for schemes of benevolence. Advertisements in magazines of sectarian doctrines, announcing the establishment of a Margate Hoy, set on foot for the accommodation of religious characters; of an eligible residence, in a neighborhood where the Gospel is preached in three places within half a mile, and of a serious man-servant wanted who can shave—such announcements as these, with which half a century has made us more familiar, were new and strange objects of ridicule in 1808.† Mackintosh, who looked with a real satisfaction at the public religious advocacy of such measures as the removal of slavery, the amendment of the criminal laws, and the general circulation of the Bible—himself a frequent speaker at anniversaries of Bible societies—was fully alive to the mistake of these pretensions to peculiar sanctity which have operated so injuriously on the true interests of religion. He thus makes a note in his diary of 1818: "They have introduced a new language, in which they never say that A. B. is good, or virtuous, or even religious, but that he is an advanced Christian."‡

The orthodox divinity of this period was distinguished for its scholarship and speculative ability rather than for the spiritual gifts claimed for another school. Of those who maintained the intellectual reputation of the English Church, Paley was the foremost. Of pulpit orators England could claim no one supreme. Chalmers, whose oratorical powers commanded the admiration of our most accomplished parliamentary speakers, was also the most admired, and deservedly so, of those who committed their eloquence to the calm judgment of the closet. His "Astronomical Discourses," published in 1816, rivalled the novels of Walter Scott in their fascinations for all readers. Scotland produced another writer of sermons, Hugh Blair, whose popularity for a while was far greater than that of any modern divine of the Church of England. Feeble and elegant, they excited no profound emotions, but were generally welcomed as agreeable reading for family Sunday evenings. Of a very different character was the preaching of Robert Hall, the Baptist minister—a man who redeemed dissent from the imputation of ignorance and vulgarity that attached to pulpits filled by uneducated men, who left their proper vocations to be gospel lights. Sound thinkers such as Robert Hall were calculated to shame the orthodox divines who, in too many instances, were opposed to the spread of education. In a sermon, preached in 1810, on "The Advantages of Knowledge to the Lower Classes," he says, "If there be any truth in the figure by which society is compared to a pyramid, it is on them its stability chiefly depends; the elaborate ornaments at top will be a wretched compensation for the want of solidity for the lower parts of the structure."

It was one of the objects of the crusade against "vice," carried on by the school of "Advanced Christians," to imitate the old Puritans in their undiscriminating hatred of the stage. This hatred was a little out of season, for comedy, happily ceasing to reflect the worst private manners, had become decorous. The goddess of dulness had driven the imps of licentiousness off the boards, although their unholy revels were encouraged in the saloons. This shamelessness was certainly enough to make good men sometimes regard the theatres as dangerous for their sons. But it was scarcely sufficient to justify that tasteless hatred of all theatrical representations which equally proscribed "Hamlet" and "Tom and Jerry," and thought that there would be contamination in beholding the sublime impersonations of Mrs. Siddons, or in listening to the majestic rhetoric of John Kemble. Their proscription of the stage was not lessened when Miss O'Neil and Edmund Kean came to maintain the succession of great tragedians. It is remarkable that, with such actors as the patent theatres possessed in the first two decades of the nineteenth century, and with all the affluence of the poetry of that era, no original tragedy was produced that could hold its place, even by the side of the still popular scenes of Rowe and Otway. The poetical tendencies of the age were not dramatic; the most popular of its poets wrote many tragedies; but "it may be doubted whether there is, in all Lord Byron's plays, a single remarkable passage which owes any portion of its interest or effect to its connection with the characters or the action."* The same may be said of the dramas of Coleridge. Scott's three attempts at poetical dialogue were utter failures. The poets who wrote plays did not conceive them in the spirit of plays to be acted. Mr. Milman's "Fazio," which was not written for the stage, was better adapted to the stage, and had a greater success than any other works of a living poet in the hands of the actors, who seized upon it before the existence of the law of dramatic copyright. In the same era, when manners were sufficiently marked to offer valuable studies of the social life of the upper classes, there was no worthy successor to Sheridan. Had there been a comic writer who could have carried forward some portion of the brilliant wit of "The School for Scandal," to have shown us the "dandies" of the regency—a race whose foppery was not less intellectual than that of the sparkling heroes of Congreve and Vanbrugh—we might have had preserved to us a picture of manners which have wholly departed in the lazy affectation of the exclusive class in more recent days. The manners which the stage presented were made up of traits of character derived from the peculiar aptitudes of the comic actors—the Irishman, the Yorkshireman, the rakish right-honorable, the sentimental tradesman—all drawn to a pattern of the most approved mode of flattering the honest, patriotic, and somewhat obtuse middle class, who were the great supporters of the theatre. John-Bullism was in the ascendent, and there was no surer way to an Englishman's heart than to stimulate his national pride, and represent his fireside as the seat of all the virtues.

If the classic comedy had passed away—if Apollo, coming to the "Feast of the Poets," mistook "Reynolds and Arnold, Dibdin and Cherry," for "the waiters"—the novel, at the beginning of the century, was beginning to assert its legitimate claims to be the reflector of manners as well as "the mender of hearts." The prose fictions of Godwin and Holcroft were written for the development of political doctrines. "Caleb Williams" is not a fiction of actual life, although a most forcible protest against some of the grosser forms of injustice and oppression which prevailed in a social state professing to be based upon the legal rights of all conditions of men. "Hugh Trevor" is a mild infusion of the principles that placed its author in a dangerous position, from which he was saved by the eloquence of Erskine. The "Zeluco" and other novels of Dr. Moore were of the same semi-didactic character. Fanny Burney was a delineator of fashionable life; but there is nothing half so real in "Evelina" and "Cecilia" and "Camilla" as her pictures of the dull court of George III. at Windsor, with the equerries standing for two hours in an outer room to hear the evening concerts. The ordinary routine of the upper slaves of royalty, described by one of the victims as "riding and walking, and standing and bowing" in dutiful attendance, and their highest accomplishments to walk out of a room backward and never to cough or sneeze—these courtly attributes are eminently suggestive of the contrast between the life in the lodge at Windsor in 1786 and the life in the pavilion at Brighton thirty years later. George III. asking wise questions of men of science that were admitted to the queen's tea-table—Dr. Herschel, Mr. Bryant, and Mr. De Luc—and the regent assuring Mr. Wilberforce that if he would come to dine with him his ears should not be offended—"I should hear nothing in his house to give me pain, that even if there

* Sir James Stephen, "Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography," vol. ii. p. 307.
† "Edinburgh Review," vol. xi. p. 351.
‡ "Life of Sir James Mackintosh," vol. ii. p. 353.

* Macaulay, "Essays," vol. i. p. 346.

should be at another time, there should not be when I was there ;" * George III. reading his dispatches before his eight o'clock chapel, tramping over his farm or following his harriers till his one o'clock dinner ; and George IV. remaining in his *robe de chambre* all the morning, either to receive his ministers or lecturing his tailor on the cut of his last new coat †—although these may be traits of individual character, they are nevertheless to be associated with marked changes in the general tone of society. The "plain living" was gone. The "high thinking" might have also been "no more," had not a change come over the manners of the great, and had not the middle classes been raised and refined by a nobler order of literature. It was in 1802 that the despairing poet complained,

"No grandeur now in nature or in book delights us."

The age of epics was past, but the charms of poetical or prose narrative were to impart higher pleasures than those of luxurious indulgence to a new race of readers. Looking back upon the real dangers, the vain fears, the party distractions, of the beginning of the century, it was a substantial blessing to the boy growing into manhood that such rich stores of pleasurable emotion were spread before him by the imaginative writers who were then developing their riches. The young student of that time might say,

"Much have I travelled in the realms of gold,"

but never with such joyous feelings as in these days of new poets and new novelists that may aspire to rank with the immortals.

It is difficult to convey to a reader of a later time an adequate notion of the interest excited by the rapid appearance of that series of novels of which "Waverley" was the first that surprised the world into a new source of delight. Scott has attributed his desire to introduce the natives of his own country to the sister kingdom as having been partly suggested by the well-merited fame of Miss Edgeworth, whose Irish pictures had made the English familiar with the character of their gay and kind-hearted neighbors. Admirable in their truth as are those novels of Miss Edgeworth, in which she delineates the virtues and the foibles of the Irish of her day ; skilful as she was in the management of some of her stories ; always using her powers in the cause of an honest patriotism, and in the exposure of social abuses—they had the attraction of faithful representations of existing manners, but wanted that charm of romantic indistinctness which belongs to novels founded upon "chronicles of eld." They have now an historical value which the contemporaries of the accomplished authoress would have scarcely acknowledged. But the author of "Waverley," who lived essentially in the past, although professing to have derived his impulse to paint the Scottish character from "the rich humor, pathetic tenderness, and admirable tact" of Miss Edgeworth, never attempted the picture of the Scot of his own day. "The ancient traditions and high spirit of a people who, living in a civilized age and country, retained so strong a tincture of manners belonging to an early period of society," were suited to a new form of romance in which the picturesque and the literal might be happily blended. How great was the ultimate success of this experiment it is needless to trace, or how Scott's original scheme expanded into tales of "fierce wars and faithful loves," common to various climes and eras of chivalry and feudalism. The success of the Waverley novels made the greater portion of the literature of the circulating library a drug in the market. The Inchbalds and Burneys and Radcliffes held their places for a little while. But the accumulations of stupidity which had incumbered the booksellers' shelves for thirty years ceased to circulate. Amid this revolution arose a female writer of real genius, Jane Austen. Her six novels will never be swept away with the rubbish of her "Minerva Press" compeers. The English life of the upper middle classes in the village and the country town—a life uncheckered by startling incident ; a simple reality which, it might be thought, every one could paint, and which would be dull and uninteresting when painted—is by this young woman delineated with a power which makes actual things more real than what is palpable to all, and by which the most familiar scenes are looked upon as if they were new. This is high art.

The rapid development in the first two decades of this century of a popular literature of a nobler order than what had preceded it is in some degree to be ascribed to the influence upon opinion of a higher school of criticism. "The Edinburgh Review," in 1802, divorced the crafts of the reviewer and the bookseller. Without wholly assenting to the dictum of Lord Cockburn, that Francis Jeffrey was "the greatest of British critics," we may well believe that no one had preceded him, and that few have come after him, who directed the judgment of his contemporaries upon current literature with such a fund of good sense, with such a quick perception of faults, with such a generous appreciation of beauties, and with such an honest impartiality—always excepting the few cases in which poets, especially, had the misfortune to deviate into fields which the critic deemed barren. The services which that review rendered to the progress of improvement, in the discussion of the great political and social questions, in which improvement at one time looked hopeless, need not here be detailed. It is sufficient for us to say that it stimulated a healthful spirit of inquiry, and altogether contributed largely to raise the standard of public intelligence. The "Quarterly Review" came in 1809 to supply what was deemed a necessary antidote to the political opinions of the "Edinburgh." Its editor, William Gifford, was far less tolerant as a critic than Jeffrey, and he had altogether more of partisanship in his estimate of literary merit. But if he was often stern and sometimes unjust to those of opposite opinions, he was not a tool in the hands of the party leaders with whom he agreed. If Brougham and Sydney Smith and Francis Horner and Mackintosh were associated with Jeffrey, Gifford could marshal Canning and Southey and Scott and Croker in the rival ranks. The partisans who wore the drab livery were not a whit less dangerous than the smarter champions of the yellow and blue. Each of the visored knights affected not to know the leaders whom they encountered in the mêlée. Jeffrey never mentioned Gifford, nor Gifford Jeffrey. The multitude shouted, and ranged themselves under the rival banners. After forty years of contest there was very little left to fight about. It is amusing to look back upon this warfare. It is consolatory to know that through the very fierceness of the battle the cause of truth and justice was advanced. It was felt that, after all, the practical ends of life are best secured by a compromise of extreme opinions. In the arbitrament of posterity upon literary merit, we come to know how powerless are the rash or prejudiced decisions of the highest courts of criticism. Keats was not "snuffed out by an article ;" Wordsworth was not doomed to oblivion by "This will never do."

Following in the wake of the great reviews there came, in due course, a higher order of magazines. "Blackwood," about the close of the regency, acquired an influence that extended far beyond Scotland. There was so much fun in its malice that its violent politics scarcely impeded its universal welcome, at least in England. There was so much of the outpouring of genius in Christopher North that few cared to inquire whether that fancy and pathos, that exquisite perception of the grand and beautiful in nature, were in unison with the narrow hatreds that belonged to an Edinburgh clique. The very excess of John Wilson's partisanship looks as if ever and anon he worked up his generous nature to uncongenial wrath, and then put on his sporting jacket and sallied forth to breathe the pure air of the moors, in a spirit of peace with all mankind. In raising the whole tone of periodical literature he gave the world a series of prose writings that fully manifested how truly he was a poet. Out of the new race of monthly miscellanies issued other prose writers who made their mark upon their own time, and will long continue to have a niche in fame's temple. Among the foremost are Charles Lamb, William Hazlitt, Leigh Hunt, Thomas de Quincey.

The least voluminous of modern essayists, Lamb, is the most original. His quaint turns of humor and pathos will command admiration when the wearisome platitudes of many a great moralist are forgotten. He looked upon society with a deep sympathy and a comprehensive charity. The man who wrote to a friend, "I often shed tears in the motley Strand, for feeling of joy at so much life," could not speak of human sorrows and infirmities with indifference. He had as acute a sense of what is hateful or ridiculous as the keenest of satirists, but he seeks not to extirpate evil by abuse, or to shame folly by sarcasm. Of a very different order of mind was Hazlitt. The quantity which he wrote sufficiently indicates the fertility of his genius, and in many of his critical essays we feel the shrewdness of

* "Life of Wilberforce," vol. iv. p. 277.
† "Raikes's Diary," vol. iii. p. 56.

his judgment and the correctness of his taste. But as he counted among his merits that of being a good hater, we must not expect to find a just and impartial estimate of contemporaneous persons or things in his political or historical writings. He has the merit of being among the first to regard Shakespeare from a higher point of view than the race of commentators, too often carping and truculent. But the Stephenses and Malones, nevertheless, kept alive a wholesome spirit of inquiry as to the real meaning of the greatest in all literature, when he uses words and phrases which appear nonsensical or obscure to the ordinary reader. Hazlitt approached Shakespeare with the same reverential spirit in which Coleridge labored with a higher faculty of philosophical criticism. Leigh Hunt, of this trio of essayists who often worked in companionship, will probably continue to have the larger number of admirers. He walked in the pleasant est places of literature. To him the great imaginative writers—especially those of Italy, and of our early school upon which Italian poetry impressed its character—offer "a perpetual feast of nectar'd sweets." In his youthful career he endured a harder fate than most of those who were opposed to the ruling powers; but he carried "the sunshine of the breast" into his prison, and the same unfailing spirits bore him through many of the disappointments of his after life. The same qualities that made the charm of his conversation pervade all his writings. The greatest of the thinkers who was cradled in the magazine literature, De Quincey, belongs more properly to the next period, although his "Opium Eater" was produced in the "London Magazine" of 1821. The "Essays" of John Foster, a Baptist minister, which first appeared in 1805, constituted one of the most treasured volumes of a period in which there were fewer books than at the present time, and when good sense, extensive knowledge, and liberal aspirations could secure a warm welcome for miscellaneous works, although not belonging to the class of light literature. These essays will not readily be neglected even in an age which seeks the excitement of less natural writing.

The school of political economists that succeeded Adam Smith—Malthus, James Mill, and Ricardo—had important influences on the political action of their time. So also had the great philosophical jurist, Jeremy Bentham. We shall have to recur to these names at another period. Of a different school was a political economist who took a broader view of the relations of capital and labor than these scientific writers, who had principally regard to the production of wealth. Dr. Thomas Chalmers, in his "Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns," advocated the belief that the wants of the poor might be provided for without the machinery of the English Poor Laws. In his own locality of Glasgow he organized a system which was successful in making private benevolence prevent the necessity of a public recognition of pauperism. He was convinced that religion presented the only cure for the evils of society. The eloquence with which he enforced this doctrine, and the sound judgment which he applies to the great questions of what is now called "social science," have had a more permanent influence than his views of the Poor Law system.

The history of the progress of scientific discovery is too large a subject, and requires too many technical details to permit a notice here beyond an enumeration of the principal discoverers. Sir William Herschel was still pursuing his observations at the age of eighty, when the first encourager of his astronomical pursuits, George III., died. He discovered the planet Uranus in 1781. It has been said of him that "no one individual ever added so much to the facts on which our knowledge of the solar system is founded." * His great telescope of forty feet focal length was completed by him at Slough, on the 28th of August, 1789, on which day he discovered with it the sixth satellite of Saturn. The principle of the reflecting telescopes of Herschel was an improvement upon those of earlier construction.

The discoveries in chemistry, and their applications to the arts, in the earlier portion of the reign of George III., were principally derived from the experiments of Black, Cavendish, and Priestley. To these philosophers at the beginning of the present century succeeded the most original of inquirers and the most popular of teachers, Sir Humphry Davy. His lectures at the Royal Institution diffused a love of science among the general community. His invention of the safety-lamp, in 1815, showed how the profoundest investigations might result in an apparently simple contrivance of the highest utility, like most of the great inventions that have changed the face of the world. Dalton in 1808 produced his atomic theory. Wollaston followed Dalton in a course of similar research, and in other walks made his experiments the bases of large additions to the industrial arts. But of all those who by science diminished the amount of domestic sorrow, and enlarged the average term of human life was the physician who for half a century had been striving in vain to make the medical world feel confidence in his discovery of vaccination. For thirty years after this antidote to the small-pox was first practised in 1800, the wholly ignorant and imperfectly educated still stood in the way of the general diffusion of this great blessing of our era. Now the law prescribes that every child born in the kingdom must be vaccinated. We look back upon the time when many who had escaped with life from the terrible disease that killed ninety-two in every thousand of the population bore into our public places the indelible marks of the scourge, and we rejoice now to behold the unscarred faces of the young as the best tribute to the memory of Edward Jenner.

With the striking exception of Mungo Park, no remarkable traveller had gone forth from England to enlarge the bounds of geographical discovery during the period of the war. Henry Martyn, Claudius Buchanan, and other zealous men were then missionaries in India, and prepared the way for the noble labors of the second Bishop of Calcutta, Reginald Heber. In 1820 the observations of Captain Parry in the polar seas led to a government expedition for exploring the Arctic Circle, in the expectation of discovering the north-west passage. These undertakings belong to a chapter which we must devote to the science of a period nearer the present time, when the vast results of the connection between philosophy and the industrial arts may be briefly traced.

It may be desirable, however, here to mention two great mechanical inventions that have had the most decided influence on the progress of society. About the first decade of the nineteenth century there was a real beginning in Great Britain of that mode of navigation which was destined to make distant countries less remote, and to change the whole system of communication in our own waters. Henry Bell had his steam passage-boat running on the Clyde in 1811. In a few years steamboats were plying on the Thames. In 1816 there were persons who had the hardihood to make a voyage in such a smoke-puffing vessel even as far as Margate. In 1818 Jeffrey thus described a steamboat on Loch Lomond, which surprised him as he was sitting with his wife in a lonely wild little bay: "It is a new experiment for the temptation of tourists. It circumnavigates the whole lake every day in about ten hours; and it was certainly very strange and striking to hear and see it hissing and roaring past the headlands of our little bay, foaming and spouting like an angry whale; but, on the whole, I think it rather vulgarizes the scene too much, and I am glad that it is found not to answer, and is to be dropped next year." * Vast as have been the results of the application of steam to navigation, we may almost venture to say that the application of steam to printing cannot be regarded as a less important instrument in the advance of civilization. The printing machine has had as great an influence upon the spread of knowledge in the nineteenth century as the invention of printing itself in the fifteenth century. The first sheet of paper printed by cylinders and by steam was the "Times" newspaper of the 28th of November, 1814. The maker of that printing machine was Mr. Koenig, a native of Saxony. Machines less cumbrous and more adapted to all the purposes of the typographical art gradually came into use. Without this invention the most popular daily paper could only produce, with the most intense exertion, five thousand copies for the demand between sunrise and sunset. Sixty thousand copies of a London morning paper can now be distributed through the country in two or three hours after the first sheet has been rolled. These astonishing changes in the powers of journalism are not more important than the effects upon all literature, in the reduction of the price of books by this invention of the printing machine and the concurrent invention of the paper machine.

* "English Cyclopædia."

* "Life of Lord Jeffrey," vol. ii. p. 181.

CHAPTER CCXVI.

State of the fine arts to the close of the regency—Architecture—Imitation of Greek models—St. Pancras Church—Wyatt and Gothic restorations—Soane—Holland—Smirke—Wilkins—Nash — Regent Street and Regent's Park—Churches—Bridges—Telford—Rennie—Sculpture—Banks—Bacon — Flaxman — Chantrey—Westmacott—The Townley, Phigaleian, and Elgin marbles—British Institution—Dulwich Gallery—Painting—West—Copley—Fuseli—Haydon—Lawrence—Wilkie—Turner—Painting in water colors—Engraving—Line engravers—Wood engraving—Bewick—Lithography.

It is the purpose of the present chapter to carry forward the survey of the state of the fine arts from 1783 to the end of the regency.

Architecture in the last years of the eighteenth century was far from being in a flourishing condition. There was much building, but there was little art. It was the epoch of the rise of that style of architecture which culminated during the regency and then collapsed: the style of imitative Greek art. Toward the end of the century was commenced a publication that should be of service in the earlier stage of our inquiry.* It formed, when completed, two costly folio volumes, was addressed to "the professor, the student, and the dilettante in this noble branch of the polite arts," and professed to give "plans and elevations of buildings, public and private, erected in Great Britain" during the past few years. Estimated simply from the examples in these volumes, the character of our architecture and the condition of architectural taste sixty years back must indeed have been at a low ebb. And evidently there was on the part of the author, himself an architect of position, the full intention to afford a favorable representation of the current architecture. He gives views and descriptions of a few public buildings, many mansions, but no churches—an omission easily explained, for no churches were erected then with any pretensions to architectural character, nor indeed till the last years of the regency. The buildings are by the leading architects of the time—by the Wyatts, Soane, Wilkins, Adams, Mylne, Holland, Nash, and others most in request with private employers as well as public bodies. In looking over the examples we see certain general characteristics, which are really the characteristics of the architecture of the period: a formal and symmetrical arrangement to which convenience is often made to give way; in the exterior design, poverty of thought and absence of imagination or invention; the general mass without grandeur or beauty; the ornamental details of the most meagre and commonplace description. But it was a time when what we should now call poverty was regarded as purity. Dallaway, an authority in those days, writing at this very time,† while speaking of the beauty of the newly erected Trinity House, complains that its "purity of style" is injured by the introduction of bas-reliefs on the façade. All the examples in the "New Vitruvius" are, or claim to be, Greek in character, except two or three which are professedly Gothic. With Chambers had ended the classical Italian style. His Somerset House had indeed not long been finished; yet not only is there no representation of it here, but in none of the buildings shown is any imitation of it traceable. Almost every building, whether public or private, has a Greek portico or pediment—usually Ionic—affixed against a wall of the baldest and most un-Grecian character, pierced with plain holes for windows.

And this sort of thing went on nearly to the end of the period under review. In the latter part of it there was indeed improvement of a certain kind. Grecian travel, or a close acquaintance with Grecian models, came to be as regular a part of every architect's course of study as a visit to Rome and the measurement of Roman remains had been a few years before. As a consequence the Grecian orders were copied with greater accuracy, and Grecian mouldings were more or less liberally introduced. But the portico continued to be the grand feature. So that the portico was an exact copy, or followed strictly the proportions of some extant example in Athens or Ionia, the body of the building was, externally at least, of comparatively little consequence. Nor was it by any means deemed essential that the portico should have any special adaptation to place or circumstance. An Ionic portico was made, during even these last and best years of Greek imitation, to grace indifferently the front of a lunatic asylum, a post-office, or a church; while the massive Doric was considered equally applicable to a theatre or a mint, a palace or a corn-market. The culminant example of this mechanical reproduction of a Greek type may be seen in the church of St. Pancras, by Euston Square, London, at once the latest, most "correct," and costliest of the semi-Greek churches. On the southern side of a temple dedicated to the Grecian nymph Pandrosus, which stood on the summit of the lofty Acropolis, and under the clear sky of Athens, was a porch the supports of which, instead of being the usual columns, were six exquisitely sculptured female figures. This porch was copied exactly—except indeed that its size was increased, and that the material of the structure was stone, and of the figures "compo," instead of the bright Penthelic marble—and placed against the side of a church in almost the lowest part of the flat and foggy New Road. And, as though to push the solecism to its limit, whereas the original stood on the south side of the temple under the full glare of a mid-day Athenian sun, while a much larger Ionic portico occupied the corresponding position on the north side, in the church the porch was reproduced in exact counterpart on both sides; the northern porch, untouched by a gleam of sunshine being that which is in full view of the entire stream of traffic, while the southern porch is comparatively hidden. It only requires to be added, to complete the æsthetic conception, that these London porches were made to serve as vestries, a chimney-pot being the crowning ornament of each, while the basements are burial-places. With such evidence of mere routine reproduction we can hardly be surprised to find, at the very close of the period, one of the most distinguished architects of the time declaring it to be "a melancholy fact that architecture has not kept pace with our other advances toward perfection—nay, that in that noble art we are at least a century behind our neighbors on the continent." * This was too strongly expressed, perhaps, but it is the fact that it was a time of cold conventionalism and unreasoning imitation. Yet, palpable as now seems the absurdity of merely copying Greek buildings or portions of buildings, without regard to purpose, place, or climate, or to the entirely different circumstances of the age and the people for which the buildings were intended, we must bear in mind that the copying from Greek temples only gave way before the copying of Italian palaces and Gothic churches. The really "melancholy fact" is that in all the forty years here passed in review, probably not a building could fairly be quoted as an example of considerate adaptation of style to purpose, or of thoughtful originality of design.

While, however, the architecture of this period claimed to be essentially Greek, one of the most conspicuous of its professors secured a large measure of his celebrity by the practice of Gothic. As we saw in a previous chapter, James Wyatt sprung into fame by the erection, in 1772, of the Pantheon. He had since been extensively employed in the erection of country mansions of the set "classic" style, and he continued to be so employed to the end of his days. But the death, in 1784, of Essex, the protégé of Horace Walpole, who had long acted almost exclusively as the architect of cathedrals, colleges, and other important Gothic buildings, left an opening which Wyatt hastened to occupy. Lee Priory, Kent (1784), his first essay in this style, was praised by Walpole. He soon found grander opportunities for displaying his capability of rivalling the mediæval designers or improving on their designs. Chief among his Gothic buildings were Fonthill, erected (1795, etc.) at an almost fabulous cost for the celebrated Beckford; the palace at Kew, of "castellated Gothic," which was left unfinished, and finally pulled down without having ever been occupied; and Ashridge, Hertfordshire, built for the Earl of Bridgewater. Regarded as imitations of the Gothic of any period, or as what is now spoken of as a development of Gothic, these buildings would appear quite puerile. They are in fact an incongruous admixture of what may, perhaps, be called Gothic forms and details, though of the latest and most meagre description, adapted to structures which neither in plan nor elevation are in any sense Gothic. But about some of them, Ashridge in particular, there is a certain grandiose picturesqueness never seen in the architect's pseudo-classic mansions. And it must be remembered, in mitigation of his Gothic

* "The New Vitruvius Britannicus," by George Richardson, Architect, 2 vols. folio, London, 1797–1808.

† "Anecdotes of the Arts in England, or Comparative Observations on Architecture," etc., 4to, 1800.

* Sir John Soane, "Civil Architecture," folio, 1829, p. 12.

heresies, that Gothic, when Wyatt began to practice it, had received no such searching investigation as that to which it has since been subjected. Not only were its principles undefined, but even its details had never been accurately represented. It was, in fact, to antiquaries as much as to architects an unknown language, and Wyatt was too busy a man to spend much time in deciphering its hieroglyphics. It is noticeable, however, as an illustration of the little genuine feeling he had for Gothic architecture, as well as of the little regard that was given to the subject generally, that at Oxford—where, if anywhere, Gothic would have seemed the appropriate style—when Wyatt was called in to construct a library for Oriel College, he, as we find it stated in an architectural work of a somewhat later time, "introduced a correct Ionic;" while for the gateway at Christchurch he introduced "a beautiful Doric," though it is considerately added, "the columns, when compared with the Greek, appear too slender." But his most indefensible Gothic misdeeds were his so-called "restorations." As the chief professor of Gothic architecture he was employed in repairing several of our noblest cathedrals, and in so doing altered or destroyed with reckless hand whatever seemed to him unnecessary or even unsymmetrical. Especially was this the case at Hereford, Litchfield, and Salisbury; at the last he altogether demolished among other things a bell tower and several chapels of exquisite beauty. Magdalen, Merton, All Souls, Balliol, and several other Oxford colleges also suffered in different degrees from his unhappy restorations. Samuel Wyatt, a brother of James, had a considerable reputation, and his works are not wholly devoid of invention. Like his brother he was largely employed in constructing private residences. His best building of a public character was Trinity House, Tower Hill, of no great architectural merit, but noteworthy as having on the front rilievi by Bacon, and in the interior one of the latest of those allegorical ceiling paintings that once furnished such profitable occupation for the pencils of Verrio and Laguerre. Sir Jeffrey Wyattville, the nephew, scholar, and faithful follower of James Wyatt, belongs only in part to this period; his great work, the alteration of Windsor Castle, was not commenced till 1824; while Sidney Sussex College was eight or ten years later. His earlier works were chiefly private residences of the ordinary Wyatt type.

Sir John Soane ought to serve as the representative of the highest order of architectural ability of this period. On the death of Taylor, in 1788, he was appointed architect to the Bank of England. On the death of Chambers (1796) he was made architect to the Woods and Forests. He was a royal academician, and professor of architecture in the Royal Academy; and he was knighted on account of his professional eminence. Soane's chief building is the Bank of England, which was greatly enlarged and entirely remodelled by him, the works extending over a period of thirty years (1788–1829). The interior, including the public rooms, has been much altered by Mr. Cockerell since Soane's time, which may be regarded as an evidence of inconvenient arrangement or of extended business; the exterior has also been altered, and improved in the alteration, by giving an increased elevation to the principal entrance-front; but the great portion of the exterior, on which Soane's reputation now mainly rests, is still nearly as he left it. At the time of its erection it was commonly regarded as a masterpiece. It is now as commonly condemned. There can be no question that it is deficient in one of the grand requisites of good architecture—propriety. The columns have nothing to support; beneath the pediments are no doorways; there are the forms of windows, but they admit no light. The whole is a mask. The parts are for ornament, not use. They may please at the first glance, but the mind refuses to dwell with a continuous pleasure on objects which suggest a use they do not supply. Else there are parts of this screen of an elegant and even picturesque appearance. Such is the well-known north-west angle, Soane's own favorite composition, with its skilfully arranged and graceful Roman-Corinthian columns. Every one feels this to have been a happy conception of the architect, and it serves excellently to conceal the oblique meeting of the walls—a defect that if left apparent would have been an almost fatal injury to a building of classical character. So again some of the inner courts are very elegant and effective. Soane had considerable ingenuity in these lesser matters. Wherever any irregularity of ground-plan existed, or any peculiarity of arrangement was required, he was usually ready with some quaint or graceful contrivance that would meet or conceal the difficulty. But a sort of scenic ingenuity is the highest merit his works possess. They have portions of much beauty, but as a whole are mean, if not insignificant. The exterior of a building of so important a character, and covering so vast a space as the Bank of England, might have been expected to form a grand and imposing mass: in reality it is little more than a long, low, unmeaning, decorated wall screen. Few of Soane's buildings remain unaltered. The front of the Treasury, Whitehall, has been entirely remodelled by Sir Charles Barry. The Courts of Law, Westminster, remain nearly untouched; but they will probably soon be swept away altogether. The Bourgeois Gallery and Mausoleum at Dulwich, and his own house in Lincoln's Inn Fields, are perhaps the chief of Soane's buildings which remain as he left them, but, like the Law Courts, they are inconvenient, cramped, and unsatisfactory.

Holland, who, as architect to the Prince of Wales, remodelled Carlton House and added the Ionic portico and screen, was one of the first to employ the true Ionic order, if he was not, as some have fancied, the first to introduce it. He enjoyed a large measure of celebrity in his day, but little is left of his more important buildings. Old Drury, opened in 1794, was destroyed by fire in 1809. Carlton House was pulled down in 1826. The Brighton Pavilion was orientalized by Nash. The East India House (designed by him in 1799, but often erroneously ascribed to Jupp, the company's surveyor) is about to be demolished. The loss of these is, however, of little consequence, except as being that of a link in the history of English architecture.

Sir Robert Smirke was the first to erect a Doric portico in the metropolis. This formed the grand entrance to Covent Garden Theatre, built by him in 1808–9. Smirke had travelled in Greece as well as Italy, and published professional comments on the edifices he examined. His Doric portico was announced as the first absolutely correct reproduction of a pure Greek order. It satisfied classical connoisseurs, and the architect at a bound became famous. He did not indeed attempt to carry "pure Greek" principles beyond the portico, but he placed on the façade statues and bas-reliefs by Flaxman, which served to indicate the purpose of the building, a purpose the building itself would scarcely have suggested. The theatre was destroyed by fire in 1856. The chief architectural feature of the long front of the Mint, erected by Smirke in 1811, is a pediment supported on Doric columns, but these rest on a rusticated basement, and there is little else in the building that is Greek either in form or spirit. Smirke erected many other public and private edifices, but his two greatest works, the Post Office and the British Museum, belong to a later period.

Another of the travelled architects of the classic Greek epoch was Wilkins, who died professor of architecture to the Royal Academy in 1839. Like Smirke, he first came into notice by his descriptions of ancient Greek remains, the result of a professional visit to Athens. His first important building of a public character was Downing College, Cambridge, commenced in 1807, which, as far as completed, proved to be beyond comparison the dullest, heaviest, and most commonplace collegiate building in the two universities. But it was called Greek, and it was considered to be classic; and when the East India Company soon after determined on erecting a college, Wilkins was appointed its architect. Haileybury College is almost a duplicate of Downing College. Wilkins also attempted Gothic. His first large building in this style, Donington Castle, Leicestershire, erected about the close of the 18th century, hardly rose in any respect above the level of Batty Langley Gothic. When called on to execute some Gothic buildings at Cambridge, the proximity of King's College Chapel gave a little more elevation to his style. But he still thought it an evidence of refinement to cover the open oak roof of a college-hall with white paint. He will probably be longest remembered by the National Gallery and University College, but these were not commenced till after the time with which we are at present concerned. The Nelson Columns, which he erected at Yarmouth and in Sackville Street, Dublin, only deserve mention as illustrations of the taste of the time and of the architect.

Nash, one of the most conspicuous of the architects of the latter portion of this period, commenced his career as a builder as well as an architect. He erected a large number of mansions in England and Ireland, the major part of them "classic" in style, with the inevitable Ionic portico; others "castellated," in which strong battlemented

keeps and machicolated towers are intermingled with large plate-glass windows and undefended doorways in a manner that would have very much surprised the fierce feudal lords, whose grim abodes these were supposed to reproduce. Nash was the favorite architect of the prince-regent; but his grand architectural effort, Buckingham Palace, was not commenced till 1825. We have here, therefore, to speak of him in connection mainly with the formation of Regent Street, which, whatever may be the character of its architecture, must be regarded as a grand improvement on previous London streets, and as having greatly stimulated improvement in our street architecture. Regent Street was begun in 1813. In laying out its course Nash aimed to produce the greatest amount of effect. He combined several houses together so as to produce the appearance of a single large building; and he varied the design of almost every block. He made the new street of greater width than any former street in the metropolis, and where it crossed the two great thoroughfares of Oxford Street and Piccadilly he formed widely sweeping circuses. At the southern end he provided a long colonnade. At the northern end, where the broad street curves sharply round, he carried forward a church entrance, crowning a circular porch-tower with a lofty spire, so as to produce a striking termination to the vista. In the same way the position of each of the churches and public buildings in the new street was laid down with a view to scenic display. But this was the object throughout. Unluckily, in his eagerness for show—stone fronts being impracticable on account of the expense—he made all the fronts of his stately "street of palaces" of plaster, and what seemed elaborate carving was mere moulded stucco. It was not left for a succeeding generation to denounce this as "sham." Wits and critics alike launched their weapons against the architect, some of them glancing off against his royal patron.* Nash about the same time laid out Regent's Park, and designed the terraces which border its pleasant glades. It was in this kind of work he was most at home. He was a poor architect, but he has given us the finest street we yet have in London, and one of the pleasantest parks. The Regent's Canal, another of Nash's projects, was carried out simultaneously with Regent's Park, to the beauty of the northern side of which he made it materially to contribute.

It has already been said that scarce any churches were erected during the period before us. There were indeed several of the "proprietary chapels," then the popular class of new churches, but they were usually plain brick buildings of the cheapest description. Toward the end of the period there came about a change. Marylebone Church, commenced in 1813 by the elder Hardwick, was a substantial and costly edifice, and is a fair specimen of the architecture of the time. A still more costly structure, St. Pancras Church, already referred to, was commenced in 1819. It was designed by the Inwoods, and is remarkable as the most elaborate attempt made in this country to apply (not to adapt) pure Greek forms to a Protestant church. Marylebone Church cost about 60,000*l.* St. Pancras very nearly 80,000*l.* It is worthy of note that in the forty years ending with 1820 scarcely a Gothic church had been erected, while during the next forty years the land was covered with them. But the movement which led to the astonishing revival of church building had already commenced. In March, 1818, parliament voted a million for the erection of new churches, and a commission was appointed to direct the expenditure of the money. The result of the labors of the commission soon became evident. The Gothic revival was some years longer in making itself felt.

It is needless to carry farther our examination of the architecture of this period; but there is one class of structures, bridges, which must be noticed, because about this time they passed definitively out of the hands of the architect into those of the civil engineer. The transfer may indeed be said to have originated with one who was a bridge-builder, if he could not be called an architect, before he became an engineer. Thomas Telford was apprenticed to "a general house-builder" of Langholm in Dumfries, and when the future designer of the Menai Bridge, and the engineer of some of the greatest works that had ever been undertaken in this country, first set up as master on his own account, he was ready to undertake any kind of masonry, from cutting letters on grave-stones to the building of country byres, Highland churches, or plain stone bridges. When he came to London he worked for a while under Chambers on Somerset House, then in course of erection. He felt no hesitation, therefore, on the score of professional disqualification, when required as county surveyor to construct a bridge of some size across the Severn at Montford. This was a stone bridge of the usual type, but in it he introduced some valuable constructive modifications. His next bridge, which crossed the Severn at Buildwas, was of iron on stone piers, and was long regarded as a model of its class. An iron bridge had been built at Coalbrookdale in 1775. Telford's iron bridge was erected in 1795–96, and was a vast improvement on its predecessor. It consisted of an unusually flat arch of 150 feet span. An iron bridge erected about the same time at Sunderland by Mr. T. Wilson consisted of a single arch of 236 feet span, and of such a height above the river as to permit the passage under it of vessels of 300 tons burden. The success of these important works insured the use of the new material. Telford was employed upon engineering works of enormous extent, in the course of which he had to erect many hundred bridges, and he employed iron or stone indifferently, according to the nature of the locality, and the greater economy or fitness of either material in each particular case. Telford's grand works, the Highland roads and bridges, the Caledonian Canal, the Ellesmere Canal, the Holyhead Road, and others of scarcely less importance belong to this period, but hardly fall within the compass of a survey of the fine arts. In the Highland improvements alone he constructed above a thousand miles of new road and twelve hundred bridges; on the line of the Ellesmere Canal he spanned the valleys of the Dee and the Chirk with aqueducts of a greater height and magnitude than had been previously ventured upon; while several of the bridges on the Holyhead Road were of importance both as engineering works and as works of art. Such especially was the grand Menai Suspension Bridge, begun in 1819, a work that has indeed been surpassed as an engineering triumph by its neighbor, the tubular bridge of Robert Stephenson, but in beauty the suspension bridge far excels its younger rival.

John Rennie, the elder, like his great compatriot, Telford, was of humble Scottish origin. His earliest occupation was that of a millwright, but his remarkably mechanical ingenuity brought him into notice, and he was, while yet a young man, employed on works requiring much constructive skill. He settled in London as an engineer about 1782. In 1799 he commenced a handsome stone bridge of five arches at Kelso, and he afterward constructed some others that were much admired. But his chief work in this line was Waterloo Bridge, which he commenced in 1811 and completed in 1817, at a cost of above a million. This is by general consent one of the noblest bridges of modern times. Indeed for simple grandeur of character, convenience of roadway, and stability of construction, it would be difficult to name its peer among bridges of any earlier period, and the only bridge of subsequent erection which has, in this country at least, equalled or surpassed it in these most important particulars is the new London Bridge, for which Rennie himself made the designs, though its erection was confided to his sons, George and John. The iron bridge which crosses the Thames at Southwark was another of Rennie's bridges. The iron bridge at Vauxhall was designed and erected by Mr. James Walker. Rennie's magnificent engineering works, the East and West India Docks, with their vast ranges of warehouses, the London Docks, the Prince's Dock, Liverpool, Plymouth Breakwater, and the improvements carried out by him in the government dockyards of Chatham, Portsmouth, Plymouth, and Pembroke, with other important works at various harbors, proofs of the amazing growth of the country in wealth and commerce, and of the great increase of engineering skill, rather than works of fine art, can only be mentioned here.

In sculpture the leading artists were Flaxman, Banks, Bacon, and Nollekens, all of whom have been spoken of in a previous chapter, and Chantrey and Westmacott, who belong more particularly to a later period. Our notice of sculpture may therefore on the present occasion be very brief. The first two of the sculptors just named produced during this period some works of great poetic power, and

* One of the best of the many witticisms circulated at the time, was an epigram in which it was proposed to visit on the prince the evil deeds of his architect:

"Augustus at Rome was for building renown'd,
For of marble he left what of brick he had found:
But is not our George, too, a very great master?
He finds London brick, and he leaves it all plaster."

the last also executed some of much beauty. But in the main sculpture dealt rather with portraits of the living and memorials of the dead than with efforts of imagination. And in monuments of a public character, especially those with which the nation honored the men who had fought her battles by land and sea, our sculptors continued to repeat with strange persistency the conventionalisms and machinery which had for ages ceased to have any intelligent meaning, or to affect either the heart or the understanding of any class of spectators. British soldiers and sailors, and even senators, philanthropists, and philosophers, were clad in the scanty folds of a "classical" drapery, in some instances almost without drapery at all, and, although the monuments were to be erected in the midst of a Christian cathedral, and in full view of a congregation engaged in Christian worship, were surrounded with heathen gods, goddesses, and attributes; or if, as was sometimes the case, the hero wore his full regulation uniform, he yet had his due attendance of undraped heathen deities. Banks was unfortunately one who yielded most unreservedly to this classic misconception. The monuments to Captains Burgess and Westcott, in St. Paul's, two of the latest of his works, are among the least defensible of their class. Happily Banks will not be judged by his public monuments. The exquisite recumbent figure of Penelope Boothby in Ashbourne Church showed with what pathos he could invest a private memorial when he trusted to the simple promptings of the feelings. His "Mourning Achilles," of which the model is in the British Gallery, no patron having had sufficient taste to commission its execution in marble, is perhaps the noblest work of the kind produced by an English sculptor; and in other works he excelled as much in grace as here in grandeur.

Bacon, who died in 1799, produced at this time little besides public monuments of level mediocrity; but these he produced with a facility and profusion that aroused the envy of his rivals and the admiration of the multitude. The best are such as those of Dr. Johnson and John Howard in St. Paul's, in which he had no occasion to go beyond simple portraiture; but even in these the attempt to attain elevation of style by arraying such men in a costume borrowed from antiquity, has nearly destroyed personal resemblance, and even mental characterization. Nollekens shared only to a small extent in these public commissions, but he was in great request for private monuments. His strength lay, however, in portraiture; and his busts and statues are now the most life-like representations left of many of the most memorable personages of his time.

Flaxman lived throughout this period, the truest and greatest sculptor England had ever produced. Sculpturesque design was as much the genuine expression of his mind as it was that of the sculptors of ancient Greece. In some of his imaginative works, as well as in several of his public monuments, his genius was fettered by the current conventionalisms; but even in works of the latter class, as the monument to Lord Mansfield, he showed of how much grandeur of moral expression sculpture was capable. His private monuments, especially some of those to females, are of the most touching tenderness and of the purest Christian sentiment. In the magnificent group at Petworth of the Archangel Michael overcoming Satan, illustrative of the famous lines in Milton, we have proof that our sculptors might find in our own poets, or in the Book which is a part of the very life of every one, subjects well fitted for sculpturesque treatment, and which, while they would require and repay the utmost exertion of mental power and technical knowledge and skill, would as much come home to the feelings and the understanding of the men and women of to-day as did the gods and heroes of the old Greek sculptors to the hearts of their contemporaries. The deities of a dead mythology never can thus come home to any modern people, unless treated as symbols of some deep or subtle truth, as they on rare occasions have been by genius of a high order. Flaxman's Psyche may perhaps take rank in this class. His pastoral Apollo is like a breath of rustic poetry. But the Venuses, Dianas, nymphs, and the like, which Flaxman's contemporaries and successors put forth in any quantity at every exhibition, will be gazed at with as little genuine sympathy on the part of the spectator as was felt in their production by the sculptor. How thoroughly Flaxman's mind was imbued with the purest Greek feeling is evinced by his illustrations to Homer, Hesiod, and Æschylus; while in nobleness of conception and beauty and delicacy of expression the illustrations to Dante are fully equal to them.

Chantrey, during the latter years of the regency, had taken his place among the foremost living portrait sculptors. The manly simplicity of his style met with early recognition, and his chisel found ample and worthy employment. A large proportion of the men most distinguished in letters, art, and public life sat to him, and in most instances he was considered to be successful in preserving the likeness as well as in maintaining a certain elevation of character. His busts are finer than his portrait-statues, and these than his imaginative works. But his statues have the great merit of first fairly grappling with the difficulties of modern costume. The happiest of the monuments in which he ventured on a poetic mode of treatment, "The Sleeping Children," in Lichfield Cathedral, belongs to the period under review, but the idea was certainly caught from Banks's monument of Penelope Boothby, and the design was made by Stothard. Westmacott's earlier poetic works include the "Psyche" and "Cupid" at Woburn; "Euphrosyne," belonging to the Duke of Newcastle, and many other very pleasing classic subjects; but among them are some of a homelier and more original character, as "The Distressed Mother," "The Homeless Wanderer," and others of a similar order. Westmacott also executed at this time several monumental statues for Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral, the well-known "Achilles," erected in Hyde Park "by the women of England," in honor of the Duke of Wellington, and numerous other commissions of a public character.

The taste in sculpture of both artists and the public was no doubt much influenced by the purchase and exhibition of three important collections of ancient marbles. The earliest purchase was in 1805, of the large collection formed by Mr. Charles Townley, of sculpture chiefly of Roman date, but the work of Greek artists, and embracing many works of exceeding loveliness and interest. This formed the nucleus of the magnificent national collection of ancient sculpture in the British Museum. The next grand addition was that of the series of reliefs which had adorned the Temple of Apollo Epicurius, near Phigaleia, and which the prince-regent bought at a cost of nearly 20,000*l.*, and presented to the nation in 1815. These rilievi, though falling short of the highest excellence of Greek art, are believed to be the work of some of the best scholars of Phidias. They are of great beauty, and of greater interest, as illustrating the history of Greek art. But the most important of the collections was that of the sculpture of the Parthenon, commonly known as the Elgin Marbles, for the purchase of which parliament voted, in 1816, the sum of 35,000*l.* These wonderful works are by far the finest extant examples of Greek sculpture when at its greatest perfection—the sculpture of the time of Pericles, executed by Phidias, or by his scholars under his immediate superintendence. For years the Earl of Elgin, who while ambassador to the Porte obtained the firman through which he was enabled to remove the sculpture from the Parthenon, was assailed with the bitterest invectives for this act of vandalism, as it was termed. But, in truth, the earl by their removal saved these marvellous works from utter destruction; he was not in time to save them from grievous mutilation. The Parthenon had been shattered in the Venetian bombardment; afterward, the eastern pediment, with its matchless statuary, was thrown down to fit the building for the service of the Greek Church; later, and up to the hour when they were rescued by Lord Elgin, the statues were used as targets by the Turkish soldiers; and finally, in the war of Greek independence (1827), the building received great additional injury during the bombardment of the city, but the best of the sculpture was then happily safe in the British Museum, preserved forever for the free study of all.

A national collection of sculpture was thus formed; but it was not till 1824 that a national gallery of painting was founded. Something had, however, been done toward clearing the way for such a consummation. In 1805 a small body of noblemen and gentlemen who felt an interest in art succeeded in establishing the British Institution, the primary object of which was declared to be "to encourage the talents of the artists of the United Kingdom;" and with this view the Shakespeare Gallery, built by Alderman Boydell, was purchased and appropriated to the exhibition and sale of the productions of British artists and the exhibition of pictures by the old masters. This last was the grand novelty in the scheme. Most of the directors and many of the subscribers were themselves the possessors of collections of paintings by the old masters, and from their galleries and the collections of other liberal amateurs has been obtained annually enough

pictures of a high class to make a most interesting and always varied exhibition. These exhibitions for the first time afforded to the general public the opportunity of seeing at their leisure paintings by the great masters; and there can be little doubt that to them is to be ascribed a large measure of the interest in art which resulted in the formation of the National Gallery. The directors at the same time sought to encourage living artists, not only by providing a gallery for the sale as well as exhibition of their works, but by offering annual premiums for pictures of a high character, and by occasionally purchasing their pictures. Among the painters to whom premiums were awarded were Hilton, Haydon, Alston, Bird, Linnell, Martin, and others whose names will be remembered, but as may be supposed more whose names are already forgotten. Up to 1820 the society had only purchased four pictures, first among which was Benjamin West's "Christ Healing the Sick," for which the directors gave the painter 3000 guineas, and which they presented to the National Gallery immediately after its formation. The interest in art no doubt also received a considerable impulse from the opening to the public in 1812 of the collection of paintings, chiefly of the Dutch and Flemish schools, bequeathed to Dulwich College by Sir Francis Bourgeois, and for the reception of which a gallery was built by Sir John Soane. The Dulwich Gallery does not rank among the great picture galleries, but it has done good service to art in this country, and not least as a precursor of the National Gallery. It is understood that the pictures now forming the Dulwich Gallery, and which were collected by Mr. Noel Desenfans, were offered to the government during the ministry of Mr. Pitt on condition that a gallery should be built for their reception. The offer was declined.

After a few years of enfeebled health, Reynolds finally laid down his pencil in 1787, and died in 1792. From this time till the year at which this chapter closes, West, as president of the Royal Academy, was nominally at the head of the British school of painting. During these years he continued to paint pictures of large dimensions, and treating of the loftiest themes in sacred and profane history. But his style underwent no change, and we have nothing to add to the summary printed in a former volume. His friendly rival was John Singleton Copley, whose manner is favorably shown in his "Death of Chatham," now a leading ornament of the British section of the National Gallery. Fuseli, too, painted, lectured, and taught; but his spasmodic compositions now scarcely excite a passing remark; and though critics termed them sublime, it may be doubted whether they ever were in any degree popular. His greatest effort was his Milton Gallery, a series of fifty paintings illustrative of the poetry of Milton. The pictures were publicly exhibited in 1799, and again in the following year, but the receipts at the doors were insufficient to defray the expenses, and the painter would have been seriously embarrassed had not private admirers come forward to purchase enough of the pictures to save him from the consequences of his temerity.

Among the younger aspirants for immortality in "high art," the unfortunate Haydon was in the latter years of the regency the most conspicuous. His "Macbeth," "Judgment of Solomon," "Christ's Entry into Jerusalem," and other gallery paintings, had aroused equal admiration and criticism, and Haydon in an evil hour was tempted to defend his own theories of art and to denounce those of his adversaries. Controversy has irresistible fascinations for some minds. Haydon was one of her victims. To his private and personal quarrels he added one with the Royal Academy. The result was what might have been predicted. He became a fluent speaker, and a piquant if not a very correct or altogether trustworthy writer. In his proper calling he made no advance. His earliest works were indeed his best. And as he found once ardent admirers grow cold, and timid friends fall away, his bitterness increased, and from this time to his unhappy death he was a disappointed man. Yet he might have been a good painter, and he was certainly a good teacher, if we may estimate a teacher's ability by the success of such pupils as Eastlake, Lance, and the Landseers. Hilton was elected an Academician in 1820, but he had as yet chiefly painted classical subjects, and had altogether failed of popular recognition. Etty had at present scarcely made his name at all known. Martin had startled the critics and fascinated the public by his "Joshua" (1814), and his still more extraordinary "Fall of Babylon" (1819). Stothard was delighting a narrow circle with his elegant but rather feeble paintings, and spending his real strength in making vignettes of almost matchless grace for engraving, at the rate of half a guinea or a guinea apiece.

In portraiture, from the early part of the nineteenth century to his death, in 1830, Lawrence was regarded as the undisputed successor to Reynolds. Northcote, Opie, Hoppner, Beechey, and Jackson, portrait painters of considerable ability and followers more or less of Reynolds, enjoyed a fair share of royal or popular patronage, but none obtained like Lawrence universal favor. Perhaps Lawrence owed somewhat of his good fortune to the very contrast afforded by his easy superficial elegance to the more sombre splendor of his predecessor. It would be foolish to compare Lawrence as a painter with Reynolds, but Lawrence was undoubtedly in his way an admirable artist. His sitters were the noblest and fairest in the land, and, while preserving the likeness, he seldom failed in the expression of manly intellect, and never in that of female beauty. His grand series of portraits of the distinguished actors in the affairs of 1814 and 1815, now in the Waterloo Gallery, Windsor Castle, could probably not have been so well painted by any contemporary artist. In a certain broad and vigorous delineation of a male head, however, Lawrence was surpassed by Raeburn, at this time the principal portrait painter in Scotland. But Raeburn was a supremely national painter. It was the hard-featured shrewd Scottish head he gloried in painting, and painted so well. The southron fared but indifferently under his vigorous pencil. Of a wholly different stamp was the elegant Harlow, who might in time perhaps have rivalled his master, Lawrence, but who died in opening manhood. His "Trial of Queen Katharine," despite its popularity, gave little promise of greatness as a painter of history; it was in fact rather a group of portraits of the Kemble family, and as such it should be estimated.

Portraiture in the hands of Lawrence assumed a new phase at this period. But a far greater change was made in the painting of scenes of domestic life by David Wilkie. Hogarth had painted both high life and low life, but it was with the pencil of a stern and relentless satirist, and in order to point a moral. Bird had still more recently depicted scenes of humble life, but with a halting and unequal touch. Wilkie was the first to paint with thorough artistic skill, and a gentle genial humor and quiet appreciation of character, the pleasant side of the every-day life of the peasant and the yeoman. His earlier pictures, "The Village Politicians," "The Blind Fiddler," "The Card Players," "The Village Festival," "The Cut Finger," "Blindman's Buff," "The Penny Wedding," and the like, were all of this homely, cheerful character. It was not till 1815 that he touched a more pathetic chord in his "Distraining for Rent." From the outset Wilkie achieved an almost unbounded popularity. His pictures told a story that all could understand; expressed a sentiment with which all could sympathize; and were in all respects painted with a truthfulness which every one could recognize. They won, therefore, the general suffrage; and at the same time their conformity, in composition, color, and other obvious technical qualities, to the principles of the Dutch masters who excelled in similar subjects, was equally efficacious with the *cognoscenti* who then gave the law in pictorial criticism. Up to the close of the period before us, Wilkie continued to paint carefully studied subjects of the healthy homely class in which he first acquired fame. Two or three years later he visited the continent, and from that time he entirely altered his manner of painting and range of subjects. But that change we need not here anticipate. At the time we now leave him he was undoubtedly the most generally popular painter in England.

Far greater and probably more permanent was the influence on English art of the genius of Turner than that of either of the painters we have yet noticed. Landscape painting toward the close of the last century was fast falling into conventionalism and inanity. The authority of the men who had just passed away and the imitation of the old masters paralyzed individual effort. Turner commenced his career by making colored drawings, in which he aimed at little more than correct topographical representation. Long after he began to paint in oil he continued to study and imitate the manner of his predecessors, Wilson, Loutherbourg, and occasionally Gainsborough, in English scenery; Vandevelde in representations of the sea; while Claude was his guide in classical compositions. But year after year he showed more and more self-reliance and originality, an ever-increasing knowledge of the capabilities of landscape art, and extended acquaintance with the phenomena of nature. The wonderful range of Turner's powers as

a landscape painter were not wholly developed in the period before us. He visited Italy for the first time in 1819, and his Italian pictures were consequently as yet unpainted. But his power as a painter of English scenery had reached its farthest extent. The "Crossing the Brook," the noblest English landscape of its kind ever painted, was exhibited in 1815. It now forms one of the choicest of the Turner treasures in the National Gallery. Its hitherto unapproached expression of space, magical aërial perspective, quiet beauty of color, and poetical feeling gave it a standing quite apart from the work of any previous painter of English scenery. Gainsborough doubtless excelled Turner in a poetic rendering of close home scenery; Wilson perhaps excelled him in a certain classical elevation of style. But neither Wilson nor Gainsborough could have painted a picture like this. Nor did Turner ever equal it. "Richmond Hill," painted in 1819, was a grievous falling off; and he never again painted English scenery on a grand scale, for of course such pictures as "Rain, Steam, and Speed" are to be classed as poetic fancies rather than English scenes.

But it was not merely as a painter of English landscape scenery that Turner was pre-eminent. In his "Shipwreck," now in the National Gallery; "A Gale at Sea," in the gallery of the Earl of Ellesmere; "The Wreck of the Minotaur," belonging to the Earl of Yarborough, and some others, he had painted a stormy sea with a force and majesty such as no previous painter had ever reached. In such works again as the "Garden of the Hesperides" (1806), "Apollo and Python" (1810, "Building of Carthage" (1815), and "Decline of Carthage" (1817), he had treated classical subjects with singular brilliancy and vigor of imagination. And not only these but a multiplicity of other pictures showed at once his wonderful versatility and poetic feeling, as well as his close observation of nature, especially of every variety of atmospheric phenomena, and his unrivalled knowledge of effect.

It is sometimes said that it was not till toward the close of his life that Turner's greatness as an artist was recognized. But this is a mistake. From almost the very outset of his artistic career his superiority was admitted both by his professional brethren and such of the public as then took an interest in art. He was elected an associate of the Royal Academy at the earliest age (24) at which, by the laws of the academy, he could be elected; and again, at the earliest legal age (27) he was elected a full member. Collectors bought his pictures at constantly increasing prices; and engravers and publishers eagerly outbid each other for his drawings, knowing well that engravings after Turner were more popular than engravings after any other landscape painter. He had, indeed, by the time at which we are arrived, become a wealthy man by the exercise of his art—which is certainly more than at that time could have been said of any other English landscape artist—and in a country like England pecuniary success is at least an evidence that a man is admired by those to whom he addresses his efforts. There were differences of opinion respecting Turner's works, as there always are differences of opinion respecting the works of a man of original genius, but his genius was not without recognition. It was not till later, when his pictures had become to the ordinary observer unintelligible eccentricities, that his popularity as a painter began to wane.

During the later years of this period there were several other admirable landscape painters: Callcott, a pleasing and graceful artist, coming sometimes close to the quieter manner of Turner, sometimes approaching the manner of the landscape painters of the Netherlands, but never very original or very vigorous; Constable, both original and vigorous—a hearty, unsophisticated delineator of homely English scenery, and especially of the scenery of the eastern counties, but a good deal of a mannerist, and somewhat confined in his range; Nasmyth, the best of the minute copyists of our woodlands and commons, ill-understood, and little appreciated in his life, and now perhaps a little overrated; Hofland, a genuine lover of quiet river scenery; and Collins, the ablest painter of his day of coast and inland scenery in combination with rustic groups.

Animal painting had in George Morland, at the early part of this period, a representative of great ability, but of coarse, intemperate habits, and the character of the man too often found expression in his pictures. He was succeeded by James Ward, only lately passed from among us at a patriarchal age, a clever painter, but superseded while still young by a yet younger rival, Landseer, and falling, perhaps as a consequence, into hopeless and most eccentric mannerism. Edwin Landseer, though yet a youth, had attained celebrity before the close of this period, but his real artistic career was hardly commenced.

The essentially English art of water-color painting dates its rise from this period. In the catalogues of the earliest exhibitions of the Royal Academy we find entries of "stained drawings." These belong to the first crude stage of the art. They were produced by the entire drawing being in the first instance made in light and shadow, with a gray or neutral tint. Over this the several local colors were passed in thin transparent washes, the ground tint softening the harshness of the superposed local colors. The sharp markings of the details were then added, usually with a reed pen. In this manner, modified by the habits of the respective artists, some very pleasing drawings were made by Paul Sandby, Hearne, and especially Cozens, a landscape draughtsman of refined feeling and considerable power. Turner and his friend and fellow-student, Thomas Girtin, for some time practised in this manner; but they were led gradually to abandon it, and adopt the method—which originated with them—of painting every object in the first instance in its proper local color, and by subsequent shades and tints, and various manipulatory processes, modifying this first painting till the whole picture is brought to the desired appearance. By this improved method water-color painting acquired an exquisite freshness and transparency quite its own, and which in the opinion of many almost atoned for the absence of the depth, force, and richness of oil. Girtin was a landscape painter of considerable ability, if not genius, and some of his water-color paintings are of exceeding beauty; but he died young, and it is mainly to Turner that the infant art owed its early culture and vigorous growth. His sketches and finished pictures in water-colors are extremely numerous and extremely fine; and in them may be traced at least the germs of almost every improvement or modification of the water-color process. Turner early turned aside to oil painting, though he continued to execute his vignettes for the engravers in water-colors; but many able artists devoted themselves wholly to the rising art, and brought it to the perfection which it ultimately reached. Among these may be mentioned Prout, unrivalled as the delineator of picturesque old houses and fragments of crumbling ruins; and David Cox, one of the boldest and at times one of the grandest painters of English hills, meadows, and sandy coasts, under the influence of storm and rain. So rapidly did the new art become popular, and so confident were its professors in their own strength and resources, that in 1805 they formed themselves into a Society of Painters in Water Colors, which has ever since continued to hold with unfailing success an annual exhibition of the works of its members.

The great extension of a taste for art was in no way more clearly shown than in the increased demand for engravings and for illustrated publications. The higher branches of engraving were, however, hardly so successfully cultivated. There was no engraver like Strange or Woollett, and the prints called for by the public were of a less elevated class of subjects. But engravers of unquestionable ability were very numerous, and an unparalleled number of excellent prints was published. Boydell's Shakespeare was issued toward the close of the century at a vast expense. To such works as this, the folio Milton, Macklin's Bible, the Poet's Gallery, and the like, succeeded a host of topographical works, editions of the poets, essayists, and novelists, with small vignettes, and handsome folios and quartos of antiquarian and architectural subjects. In the former class the drawings of Turner may be said to have formed a school of landscape engravers, neat, refined, and brilliant beyond previous example in the execution of small plates, but wanting in grandeur and vigor when grappling with plates of a large size. The architectural publications, especially those of John Britton and the elder Pugin, aided by the singular talent of the Le Keuxes in engraving mediæval buildings, did much to arouse that strong interest in Gothic architecture which has in our own day led to such remarkable results.

The demand for illustrated works had, however, an inevitable tendency to stimulate their more rapid and cheaper production. Engravers, instead of executing their plates throughout with their own hands, employed pupils and assistants on the earlier and less important parts. Further to expedite the process machines were at this time invented, the best being that of Mr. Lowry, by which the skies, plain backgrounds, and the like could be ruled in, and thus the

work of weeks be accomplished in a few hours. The tendency of this employment of mechanical appliances and of the system of journey-work was undoubtedly to interfere with the development of the highest individual excellence; but the increasing of the quantity and cheapening the cost of works only inferior to those of the first class in the higher refinements of the art, assisted largely to diffuse a knowledge and a love of art. The use of steel plates instead of copper, which carried this cheapening process so much farther, was introduced early in the century; but steel plates were not tried for fine-art purposes till about 1818, and did not fairly come into use till five or six years later.

At the head of the line engravers, at the commencement of this period, was William Sharp, who has left some good prints from the works of the old masters, but who was greatest as a portrait engraver; his print of John Hunter, after Reynolds, is of its kind a masterpiece. Other line engravers of ability, his contemporaries and successors, and, like him, engravers of subject pieces and portraits, were Fittler, Sherwin, Warren, John Landseer, the father of the painter, James and Charles Heath, Raimbach, who engraved the earlier prints after Wilkie, and John Burnet, like Raimbach, best known by his prints after Wilkie, but, like him, an excellent engraver of general subjects. The landscape engravers in line were very numerous, and the later ones especially brilliant executants. Among them were Middiman, Byrne, Cooke, John Pye, a thoroughly conscientious and able artist, the Findens, and others. In mezzotinto engraving, landscape was most successfully cultivated during this period, as portraiture had been in the preceding. Earlom, who engraved the Liber Veritatis of Claude; Lupton, who engraved many plates in the Liber Studiorum and the rivers of Turner; Charles Turner, who in his plate from Turner's shipwreck produced the noblest print of its class yet published, and S. Reynolds, were eminent in this branch of art. Aquatinta, now almost a lost art, was at this time successfully practised by F. C. Lewis, Daniell, and others. Bartolozzi at the beginning of the period was in the height of popularity for his engravings in the dotted or chalk manner, but they were really of a very meretricious character. William Blake was also an engraver in various manners, some of them peculiar to himself. But Blake is best known by his designs, full of the wildest extravagancies, yet with constantly recurring quaint, graceful, and suggestive fancies, always, however, running along the narrow line which proverbially divides genius from madness.

Wood engraving dates its revival from this period. Thomas Bewick, to whose rare application and ability this revival is almost entirely to be ascribed, began to engrave on wood while apprentice to a general engraver, and he received from the Society of Arts a prize for a wood-cut of a "huntsman and hounds" almost as soon as his apprenticeship had terminated. Bewick resided all his life at his native place, Newcastle-on-Tyne; drew most of his designs, and engraved them with a combined vigor and delicacy of line, power of expression, and felicitous characterization of surface, that came with all the freshness of novelty upon his contemporaries. Bewick published his "General History of Quadrupeds," the work by which he acquired celebrity, in 1790. It passed through several editions, and secured a ready reception for all his subsequent publications. In finish it was surpassed by later works, but only his "British Birds" (1797–1804) equalled it in design. Among single prints, the finest was his "Chillingham Bull." Bewick was always happiest in drawing and engraving objects of natural history. But his little tail-pieces, especially those illustrative of the effects of cruelty to animals, have some of them touches of a grim humor that would have done no discredit to Hogarth's pencil.

Lithography was invented by Alois Senefelder toward the end of the 18th century. It was introduced into England in 1801 by M. P. H. André, under the designation of Polyautography. André's chief publication was a series of thirty-six prints from sketches by West, Stothard, and other eminent artists; but his rude and blurred impressions were regarded as mere curiosities. In 1805 he transferred his business to a Mr. Volweiler, who was equally unsuccessful. The art seems then to have been neglected for some years, till Mr. R. Ackerman established a press, from which was issued in 1819 the illustrations to his translation of Senefelder's "Complete Course of Lithography." These prints, though much better than André's, were still very deficient in strength and clearness. It was not till the subject was taken up by Mr. Charles Hullmandel, who to the training of an artist added some chemical knowledge and great manipulative dexterity, that the capabilities of the art were fairly developed in this country. A really good lithograph can, however, hardly be said to have been produced in London as early as 1820.

Reign of George IV.

1820.—List of the King's Ministers.

Cabinet Ministers.

Earl of Harrowby	Lord President of the Council.
Lord Eldon	Lord High Chancellor.
Earl of Westmoreland	Lord Privy Seal.
Earl of Liverpool	First Lord of the Treasury.
Right Hon. Nicholas Vansittart	Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Viscount Melville	First Lord of the Admiralty.
Duke of Wellington	Master-General of the Ordnance.
Viscount Sidmouth	Secretary of State for the Home Department.
Viscount Castlereagh	Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Earl Bathurst	Secretary of State for the Department of War and the Colonies.
Right Hon. George Canning	President of the Board of Control for the Affairs of India.
Right Hon. C. B. Bathurst	Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.
Right Hon. W. W. Pole	Master of the Mint.
Right Hon. F. J. Robinson	Treasurer of the Navy, and President of the Board of Trade.
Earl of Mulgrave	Without office.

Not of the Cabinet.

Viscount Palmerston	Secretary at War.
Right Hon. Charles Long	Paymaster-General of the Forces.
Earl of Chichester, Marquess of Salisbury	Joint Postmaster-General.
Right Hon. C. Arbuthnot, S. R. Lushington, Esq.	Joint Secretaries of the Treasury.
Right Hon. Thomas Wallace	Vice-President of the Board of Trade.
Right Hon. Thomas Plumer	Master of the Rolls.
Right Hon. Sir John Leach	Vice-Chancellor.
Sir Robert Gifford	Attorney-General.
Sir John Copley	Solicitor-General.

Great Officers of State.

Marquess of Cholmondeley	Lord Steward.
Marquess of Hertford	Lord Chamberlain.
Duke of Montrose	Master of the Horse.
H. R. H. the Duke of York	Commander in-Chief.
Sir Hildebrand Oakes	Lieutenant-General of the Ordnance.
Right Hon. William Huskisson	First Commissioner of Woods and Forests and Land Revenue.

Ireland.

Earl Talbot	Lord Lieutenant.
Lord Manners	Lord High Chancellor.
Right Hon. Charles Grant	Chief Secretary.
Right Hon. Sir G. F. Hill	Vice-Treasurer.

CHAPTER CCXVII.

Meeting of parliament on the demise of George III.—Prorogation and dissolution—The Cato Street conspiracy—Debate on the subject of Queen Caroline—Differences between the king and the cabinet regarding the queen—The ministerial propositions finally agreed to—Opening of the new parliament—Preparations for the coronation—The queen expected—Her arrival—Green bag containing papers laid before parliament—Adjournment—Conferences for averting a public proceeding—Failure of the negotiation—The Bill of Pains and Penalties—Scenes in the streets—Scenes in the House of Lords—The third reading of the bill carried by a small majority—The bill finally abandoned—Joy of the country—Discussions on the subject of the queen in the next session—The coronation of the king—The queen vainly endeavors to be present—Her death and funeral.

Upon the accession of George the Fourth there were the same ministers in the cabinet as those which formed the administration of the Earl of Liverpool at the close of the war; with the exception of

Mr. Canning, who in 1816 succeeded the Earl of Buckinghamshire as president of the Board of Control.*

The statutes of William and of Anne provided that the demise of the crown should not interfere with the regular course of constitutional government. Under these statutes the parliament, although adjourned to the 15th of February, assembled on Sunday morning, the 30th of January; adjourned till the next day; and then proceeded to the swearing in of members. On the 17th of Ferbuary, the houses having again assembled, a message was delivered from the king, recommending that such measures should be adopted by the House of Commons as were necessary to provide for the exigencies of the public service, during the short period that must elapse between the termination of the present session and the opening of a new parliament, which it was his majesty's intention to call without delay. The houses sat till the 28th of February. During a few days after the death of his father, the king had been seriously ill, not without some apprehension that this would be the shortest reign in English history. When the parliament was prorogued, with a view to its immediate dissolution, the speech of the royal commissioners alluded to "the flagrant and sanguinary conspiracy which has lately been detected."

"The Cato Street Conspiracy," atrocious as were the objects which it proposed to accomplish, base and brutal as were the wretched persons engaged in it, fearful as might have been the national terror had it been successful, was certainly not calculated, as affirmed in the royal speech, "to vindicate to the whole world the justice and expediency of those measures" [the Six Acts] to which the parliament had resorted "in defence of the laws and constitution of the kingdom." The detection and prevention of what was something more formidable than "a little plot in a hay-loft,"† though not in any degree a symptom of a revolutionary spirit in the country, were certainly not advanced by the enactment of an unconstitutional code. The proceedings of a knot of sanguinary madmen had for some time been well known at the Home Office. "The principal informant was a modeller and itinerant vendor of images, named Edwards, who first opened himself at Windsor, as early as the month of November, to Sir Herbert Taylor, then occupying an important official situation in the establishment of George III."‡ Arthur Thistlewood, the leader of the gang who desired to assert their patriotism by the murder of all the king's ministers, had been a subaltern officer in the militia, and afterward in a regiment of the line. He had sojourned in France in the early stages of the French Revolution, and was among the number of those who held that violence and insurrection were the proper modes of redressing the evils of what they considered bad government. He was one of the persons engaged in the Spa Fields riot, and, in company with Dr. Watson, was tried for high treason. Upon his acquittal his rashness displayed itself in sending a challenge to Lord Sidmouth, for which folly he was convicted of a misdemeanor, and underwent a year's imprisonment. This term of confinement expired about the period of the affray at Manchester. Upon his trial he declared that his indignation at this occurrence prompted him to take his resolution of murderous vengeance: "I resolved that the lives of the instigators should be the requiem to the souls of the murdered innocents." He adds, "In this mood I met with George Edwards." He had decided that "insurrection became a public duty" before he met with George Edwards, "the contriver, the instigator, the entrapper," as he terms him.§

A noble writer, whose facts are in most cases of far higher value than his opinions, says, "The history of the Thistlewood Conspiracy, as related in the criminal annals of the period, illustrates in a remarkable manner the diseased state of political feeling then existing in England."* Lord Sidmouth has himself testified to the general healthfulness of public opinion: "Party feelings appeared to be absorbed in those of indignation, which the lower orders had also evinced very strikingly upon the occasion."† It was not in the nature of Englishmen to entertain any other feeling than indignation at the scheme of assassination which was intended to be carried into effect on the 23d of February. On Tuesday, the 22d, the Earl of Harrowby, president of the council, was riding in the park without a servant, when he was addressed by a person who said he had a letter directed to Lord Castlereagh. On the 23d Lord Harrowby was to have had a cabinet dinner at his house in Grosvenor Square, to which, as is usual, none but members of the cabinet were invited. The person who accosted Lord Harrowby met him the next morning in the ring at Hyde Park by appointment. That person was Thomas Hidon, a cow-keeper, formerly a member of a shoemakers' club, where he knew one of the conspirators, Wilson. By this man Hidon was invited to come forward and be one of a party to destroy his majesty's ministers, when they were assembled at dinner, by hand grenades thrown under the table, and by the sword if any escaped the explosion. The paper which Lord Harrowby received from Hidon was described as "a note containing the whole plot."‡ The plans of Thistlewood had been also communicated to an Irishman named Dwyer, who revealed at the Home Office what he had heard. The evidence of Hidon and Dwyer sufficiently agreed to make the cabinet take their resolution. They determined not to dine at Lord Harrowby's house, but that the preparations for dinner should go on as if no alarm had disarranged them. Mr. Birnie, the police magistrate, was to proceed to Cato Street, with a strong party of police officers, at seven o'clock, the appointed dinner hour. In Cato Street, which runs parallel with the Edgeware Road, a loft had been engaged by the parties to the plot, and during the afternoon of the 23d they had been observed conveying sacks into their place of rendezvous. A detachment of the Foot Guards had been ordered to turn out for the purpose of accompanying the police, but through some mistake the civil officers had to enter the loft to execute their warrant without the military support. As Smithers, the police officer, first confronted the twenty-four whom he found assembled, having gone up into the loft by a ladder, he was stabbed through the heart by Thistlewood, while three others of his comrades were stabbed or shot. The lights were put out, and in the confusion Thistlewood, with about fourteen, escaped. The leader, however, was arrested the next morning, the government having offered a reward of a thousand pounds for his apprehension. When the soldiers arrived they captured nine of the party, with arms and ammunition.

Thistlewood and four of his principal accomplices were tried for high treason in April. Chief Justice Abbott, in passing sentence of death upon the prisoners, expressed what was the universal public sentiment—"That Englishmen, laying aside the national character, should assemble to destroy in cold blood the lives of fifteen persons unknown to them, except from their having filled the highest offices in the state, is without example in the history of this country, and I hope will remain unparalleled for atrocity in all future times." These five were executed on the 1st of May. A motion of Alderman Wood on the day after the execution, the object of which was to blame the conduct of the government in the employment of Edwards, did not call forth the same animadversion as in the former case of Oliver at Derby. Lord Campbell says, and few will disagree with him in his opinion, "I do not think that ministers deserved any censure for the manner in which they conducted themselves in this affair."§ In such cases there is always the difficulty of interfering too soon or too late. Some members of the cabinet proposed that the dinner should take place, that guards should be stationed near Lord Harrowby's house, and that the conspirators should be arrested at the moment of their attempt. Others contended that ministers, being in possession of evidence to satisfy reasonable men, ought to stop the progress of the crime before it went on to the last step. "Lord

* The list in the opposite page of the king's ministers, of the great officers of state, of the law officers, and of the Irish administration, is of the date of June 1820.

† Sydney Smith's "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 195.

‡ "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 316. The author of the "Popular History" well recollects this man, who had a small shop in the High Street of Eton, where the most profitable exercise of his art was in the production and sale of a little model of Dr. Keate, the head master of Eton, in his cocked hat, the consumption of which image was considerable, from its rapid destruction by the junior boys as a mark to be pelted at. Sir Herbert Taylor, whose honor was unimpeachable, was utterly incapable of suggesting to the spy that he should incite these wretched men to the pursuance of their frantic designs. Yet in this as in most similar cases the functions of the tempter and the betrayer are very closely united.

§ "State Trials." See also "Annual Register," 1820, p. 946.

* Duke of Buckingham, "Court of George IV.," vol. i. p. 9.

† "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 320.

‡ "Annual Register," 1820, p. 932.

§ "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. x. p. 3.

Castlereagh was for going to the dinner in the face of it all at the hour invited, and letting each gentleman arm himself if he thought proper; while the Duke of Wellington counselled to the course that was taken." *

The Cato Street Conspiracy for a while absorbed every other topic of popular interest. If this extraordinary event had not occurred the public journals would probably have attached more importance to a short debate in the House of Commons on the subject of Queen Caroline. On the 21st of February, in a committee of supply, Mr. Hume, the member for the Montrose Burghs, who, since his return in 1818, had begun to take an active part in the discussion of financial questions, pressed to know whether any distinct provision was to be made for the queen, inasmuch as the act which granted to the Princess of Wales the sum of 35,000*l.* a year expired on the demise of his late majesty. He complained also that the queen was slighted, and asked why her name was not inserted in the Liturgy. Mr. Tierney took the same course, with an important variation: "While the noble lord (Castlereagh) called her merely that 'high personage' instead of recognizing her as the queen—while all Italy, nay, all Europe, was filled with rumors of her guilt, and of official inquiries about it—while her name was omitted in the Liturgy—while she was not acknowledged—he could not agree to vote her the means of maintaining herself, until the reasons for such extraordinary circumstances as he had recited should be satisfactorily explained." † Mr. Brougham, who was the chief legal adviser of the queen, maintained that her title did not depend upon any words in the Liturgy, or upon any act of council, or upon any expression of a minister of the crown. The provision for the maintenance of her dignity was, it appeared, to be made out of the general sum for which the minister was about to move, and that arrangement was at present to his mind quite satisfactory. He totally disregarded the rumors which were imagined to cast a cloud of suspicion upon the queen's character. Till some specific charge should be submitted to that house, his lips should be sealed upon the subject. If any charge should be preferred, he must beg it to be recollected that this illustrious personage was not remarkable for any slowness to meet accusation, nor for any difficulty to prove her innocence. He trusted no appeal upon this matter would ever be made to any turbulent passions out of doors. Lord Castlereagh rose to thank the honorable and learned gentleman for a speech which did equal honor to his head and his heart.

The perfect agreement between Mr. Brougham and Lord Castlereagh must have excited some surprise. But the queen's legal adviser was no doubt fully cognizant of an arrangement by which the cabinet had on the 21st of February tided over a difficulty which only four days before threatened their removal from office. On the 13th Lord Sidmouth had written to Earl Talbot, the lord-lieutenant of Ireland, a brief note, in which he apologizes for not having answered a letter received on the 12th. "If you knew how the day was passed you would not be surprised at the omission. The government is in a very strange and, I must acknowledge, in a precarious state." ‡ The king had for his confidential private adviser Vice-Chancellor Leach, who, in 1818, had arranged the Milan commission, for the purpose of making inquiries into those rumors of the conduct of the Princess of Wales, which appeared to have determined the king to press the conduct of some very hazardous enterprise upon his ministers. Six months before the death of George III. the cabinet had a full sense of the difficulty and danger that would arise if Caroline of Brunswick should return to England as queen-consort. But they steadily refused to meet the difficulty by acceding to the prince-regent's passionate desire for a divorce. With Mr. Brougham, as the Princess of Wales's law-adviser, they then communicated "in order to bring about some arrangement which should hold good in the event of her royal highness becoming queen." § In August "the lady in question," as Mr. Brougham terms his client, wrote to him to express her resolve to come over herself, saying she had written to Lord Liverpool to tell him so. The Princess of Wales's law adviser expresses himself with some vivacity upon the public danger and the private discomfort to himself that would result from this rash determination. "I am confident from her letter of to-day that she now intends to come, and I am still more clear that her coming would be pregnant with every sort of mischief." Mr. Stapleton, who was private secretary to Mr. Canning, gives the date of this letter, August 5th, 1819, but does not state to whom it was addressed. It is evidently addressed to some official personage, as Mr. Brougham says, "You had better communicate this. I rely on the honor of the party principally concerned to have justice done to my motives, in the event of the other setting the mob against me, which she is quite capable of doing." *

In a minute of the cabinet on the 10th of February the ministers communicated to the king their opinion, individually as well as collectively, that a proceeding for high treason against the queen was out of the question, and that a measure of divorce might seriously prejudice the interests of the king and of the monarchy. They honestly stated that any private individual, circumstanced as the king had been with respect to the princess, could not expect to obtain a divorce according to the established usage of parliament. They were of opinion, therefore, that the notoriety of what had been and still were the situation and conduct of the Princess of Wales upon the continent would induce parliament to give a ready consent to any measure which, while it afforded to the king security against the invasion of his dignity and comfort by the return of the princess to England, would be calculated, at the same time, to avoid discussions and disclosures offensive to public decency, and likely to disturb the peace of the country. They proposed, therefore, a bill to make provision for the queen by an annuity, payable only during her continued residence abroad. They thought that the king would be fully justified in withholding those distinctions which it was in the option of his majesty to confer upon her, to be named in the Liturgy, and to be crowned. They add, "The intercourse which took place with Mr. Brougham last summer affords just reason for believing that the princess would be advised to acquiesce in an arrangement founded upon these principles." On this minute Mr. Canning made a memorandum: "As a part of the whole I agree to the proposed alteration in the Liturgy. . . . I could not have agreed to the omission of her name if any *penal* process, of whatever kind, had been in contemplation." †

On the 12th of February the king replied *seriatim* to the various objections to his wishes offered by the cabinet. He altogether disapproved of the proposal of settling an annuity upon the princess, payable only during her residence abroad. On the 14th of February the cabinet restated to the king their unanimous opinion that, whatever other measure they might feel themselves justified in proposing, the originating a bill of divorce is that which they cannot recommend. On the 17th the king yielded, being "ready, for the sake of the public decorum and the public interest, to make, therefore, this great and this painful sacrifice of his personal feelings." He recited the terms of the proposed arrangement, "to avoid all future misconception;" and he added, "the king further understands that it is the intention of his servants to assert and justify the omission of the princess's name from the Liturgy."

Such was the prologue to the great "sensation" drama which was to be enacted four months afterward. All political agitation appeared to have subsided. Mr. Hunt and others concerned in the Manchester meeting were tried at York on the 16th of March and nine following days, on the charge of unlawfully assembling for the purpose of moving and inciting to contempt and hatred of the government. Henry Hunt, Joseph Johnson, John Knight, Joseph Healey, and Samuel Bamford were found guilty, and being brought up for judgment in the Court of King's Bench, were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. At the Leicester Assizes, on the 23d of March, Sir Francis Burdett was found guilty of a seditious libel. The verdict was impeached in the Court of King's Bench, and the various arguments upon the case had the effect of postponing the judgment till the beginning of 1821. The baronet was sentenced to three months' imprisonment, and to pay a fine of two thousand pounds. Amid this political quiet, now and then a flying rumor about the queen appear-

* Rush, "Residence at the Court of London," second series, vol. i. p. 289.
† Hansard, vol. xli. col. 1625.
‡ "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 310.
§ Stapleton, "George Canning and his Times," 1859, p. 265.

* Stapleton, "George Canning and his Times," 1859, p. 266.
† The minutes and the memorandum are given in Mr. Stapleton's work, pp. 266 to 274.

ed in the newspapers. In the gossip of the higher circles there was no foreboding of a coming storm. "Brougham attends frequently at the treasury upon the queen's business," writes Sydney Smith on the 15th of April. Every one was thinking of the expected coronation, in which it appears to be understood as a matter of course that the queen was not to appear. "The king sits all day long with Lady C——, sketching processions and looking at jewels; in the mean time she tells everywhere all that he tells to her."* The placidity of the royal mind appears to have been somewhat disturbed in the midst of these pleasant occupations. On the 26th of April the chancellor writes to his daughter, "Our royal master seems to have got into temper again, as far as I could judge from his conversation with me this morning. He has been pretty well disposed to part with us all, because we would not make additions to his revenue."† These minor troubles have a happy capacity for adjustment in a constitutional monarchy, when responsible ministers possess the requisite degree of firmness. The king opened the session of the new parliament in person on the 27th of April, and had a brief popularity in declaring that he left entirely at the disposal of parliament his interest in the hereditary revenues, and that so far from desiring any arrangement which might lead to the imposition of new burdens upon his people, or even diminish the amount of reduction incident to his accession, he had no wish that any addition whatever should be made to the settlement adopted by parliament in 1816.

Amid this sunshine the little cloud, no bigger than a man's hand, was seen from afar. Some members of opposition began again to call attention to the position of the queen. Mr. Tierney, in a debate on the Civil List, on the 8th of May, said that he never expected to be called upon to vote for a bill to provide for the maintenance of the royal family and household, out of which the Queen of England herself was to be excluded, after being recognized by the lord high chancellor. His allusion was to this circumstance: In the Court of Chancery, on the 11th of April, Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman had presented their appointments as attorney-general and solicitor-general to the queen, which appointments the lord chancellor immediately accepted, saying that "he would consult no views and regard no considerations in the matter except such as were purely professional." In the last days of May the preparations for the king's coronation still formed the chief topic at court. The committee for settling the forms of that ceremony had reported to the king that, as there was to be no crowning of a queen, peeresses should not be summoned to attend. His majesty had a ready answer, that as "Queen Elizabeth, though a lady, had both peers and peeresses, so he, though he was no queen, will have both ladies and gentlemen to attend him."‡ While these discussions were proceeding within the palace, the people in public places were thinking very seriously of some other possible occurrence than a coronation—so seriously that they committed their opinions to the usual issue of a bet. Some, who thought the queen would not come very speedily, paid fifty guineas to receive a guinea a day till she did come. This was the common entry in the gambler's "book" on the 29th of May, on which day Eldon wrote, "I retain my old opinion that she will not come unless she is insane." On the 1st of June the queen was at St. Omers, having rapidly travelled thither, accompanied by Alderman Wood. She had previously dispatched a courier with letters to London, demanding that a yacht should be sent to convey her to England, and that a palace should be provided for her reception. The cabinet authorized Lord Hutchinson immediately to proceed to St. Omers to make the proposal of an annuity according to the arrangement of February, but with conditions which appear to have been capable of a different construction from those which formed part of the proposition made in the "intercourse which took place with Mr. Brougham last summer." Her majesty's attorney-general accompanied Lord Hutchinson. The proposition which it appears was made then for the first time in a letter addressed by Lord Hutchinson to Mr. Brougham, and which, as her legal adviser, he read to the queen, was rejected by her under his advice.§ Her majesty, with her civic councillor, hurried off to Calais, was quickly on board a packet, landed at Dover, amid the shouts of the populace, and entering London on the evening of the 6th, surrounded by huzzaing thousands, took up her abode at the house of Alderman Wood, in South Audley Street. On that same evening a message from the king was presented to both houses, stating the arrival of the queen, and announcing that his majesty had thought it right to communicate certain papers respecting the conduct of her majesty since she left this country. On the table of each house a green bag was laid which contained the papers, sealed up.

In the House of Lords, after some discussion, it was agreed that the papers should be referred to a secret committee. In the House of Commons, previous to taking into consideration the king's message, Mr. Brougham, as her majesty's attorney-general, presented a communication from the queen, in which she stated that she had returned to England in consequence of measures pursued against her honor and her peace by agents abroad. She protested against the formation of a secret committee to examine documents privately prepared by her adversaries. She complained of the omission of her name in the Liturgy as calculated to prejudge her cause. Lord Castlereagh declared that the secret committee was only a preliminary step to ascertain whether there was any case to proceed with. Mr. Brougham strongly resisted the appointment of the committee, and commented in the most unqualified terms upon the proposition made to the queen, which was nothing more nor less than to ask her to say, "Give me fifty thousand a year, and I will plead guilty." Mr. Canning, in vindicating the conduct of the government, expressed his earnest desire that this unhappy business should be terminated without any further public proceedings. In reply to Mr. Brougham's complaint of the terms offered to the queen, he declared that they were the same terms which the queen's legal adviser had previously considered reasonable. Mr. Brougham, in reply, complained that if Mr. Canning had not considered himself bound to secrecy, he, Mr. Brougham, felt himself, in some degree, under that obligation. He pledged himself to show that there was nothing inconsistent in his taking part in the negotiation of July and in his present course. There was one circumstance in the date of the transaction referred to which constituted an essential difference between the terms then suggested and those proposed by Lord Hutchinson. "The illustrious person was not then queen, and it was a very different proposal that she should forbear to assume a title which might fall to her at some distant and contingent time, and that she should lay down what she had in course of law assumed. Widely different, too, was that proposal from the proposition of Lord Hutchinson; the one calling on the Princess of Wales not to assume a particular title, which might afterward descend to her, the other to renounce any title taken from the royal family of England."* Mr. Brougham declared, on his honor, that her majesty was not in the slightest degree implicated in the proceeding adverted to. "The right honorable gentleman might treat as he pleased the person who made those propositions, but her majesty had no more knowledge, no more influence over those propositions than the child unborn." The historical inquirer may ask, how was it that the queen had "no more knowledge than the child unborn" of those propositions? We cannot doubt that when the time for a complete revelation shall arrive, there will be a juster solution of the question than the suspicions of Mr. Canning of an absence of "plain dealing;" less tinctured, possibly, by political rivalry than his assertion that "the government was not prepared to pursue their own course by any means but those which were indicated to them; and these indications came from a quarter which wished for extremities."†

The temper of the House of Commons on Wednesday, the 7th of June, was signally manifested by its cordial assent to Mr. Wilberforce's motion, that the debate should be adjourned till the following Friday. Mr. Wilberforce says in his diary, "I endeavored to interpose a pause, during which the two parties might have an opportunity of contemplating coolly the prospect before them."‡ The proceedings of the House of Lords were also suspended. On the Friday Mr. Brougham, by command of the queen, transmitted a note to Lord Liverpool, in which her majesty said that, submitting to the

* "Memoir of Sydney Smith," vol. ii. p. 195.
† Twiss, "Life of Eldon," vol. ii. p. 362. ‡ Ibid., p. 366.
§ Hansard, vol. i. new series, col. 973.

* Hansard, vol. i. second series, col. 971.
† Stapleton, "George Canning and his Times," p. 300. Letter from Mr. Canning to Mr. Huskisson, October 2d, 1820.
‡ Life, vol. v. p. 55.

declared sense of parliament, she was willing to consider any arrangements that might be proposed consistent with her dignity and honor. Lord Liverpool, in reply, referred to a note delivered to Mr. Brougham on the 15th of April, as the proposition made on the part of the king. The queen replied that she had never seen this note. Mr. Brougham explained that her official advisers had not had an opportunity of delivering it previous to the interview with Lord Hutchinson. It was then agreed that two of the king's confidential servants should meet two persons to be named by the queen, to frame an arrangement for settling the necessary particulars of her majesty's future situation, upon the condition of her residence abroad. The Duke of Wellington and Lord Castlereagh were appointed on the part of the king, and Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman on the part of the queen. This negotiation failed through the want of concession on either side upon one point alone. The insertion of the queen's name in the Liturgy was demanded on the one side and refused on the other, although something like an equivalent was tendered by the agents of the king. Mr. Wilberforce has succinctly stated the general character of these proceedings. "The concessions made by the king's servants, as Mr. Brougham afterward declared in the House of Commons, were various and great. The name and rights of a queen were granted to her majesty without reserve, any recognition of which had formerly been carefully avoided. A royal yacht, a frigate, etc., were offered. It was agreed that her name and rank should be notified at the court either of Rome or Milan—the capitals of the countries in which she had expressed her intention to reside; and that an address should be presented to the queen no less than another to the king, to thank her majesty for having acceded to the wish of the House of Commons." * On the 19th of June this negotiation was announced to parliament as having failed. Again Mr. Wilberforce attempted to put an end to this unfortunate conflict, by moving a resolution on the 22d of June, in which, amid many qualifying phrases, the house declared its opinion that if the queen would forbear to press farther the adoption of those propositions on which any material difference yet remained, such forbearance would by no means be understood to indicate any wish to shrink from inquiry. The motion was agreed to by a very large majority. Mr. Wilberforce, as part of a deputation of members, waited the next morning upon the queen with this resolution. He and his companions were saluted by the groans of the populace. The answer of the queen rejected the proposed mediation. When this attempt failed Mr. Wilberforce was accused in the newspapers "with trifling with the House of Commons, and attempting to deceive the people." He had in his possession a triumphant answer to the charge in the positive engagement of the queen's chief law-adviser. "'She will accede to your address,' he wrote to Mr. Wilberforce (June 22d), 'I pledge myself.' His influence was overborne by a less sagacious counsellor and with 'a political forbearance which,' says the party whom it spared, 'I never knew equalled,' he suppressed this unfulfilled pledge, and bore quietly the groundless charge of an unreasonable interference." † There was now an end of all attempts at compromise. Mr. Canning, when he saw that the chances of an amicable adjustment were over, waited upon the king to express the impossibility for him to take part in any criminatory proceedings toward a person to whom he had formerly stood in confidential relations. The king, who sent his answer through Lord Liverpool, insisted that Mr. Canning should remain one of his ministers, following his own course with regard to the queen. He went abroad, to avoid taking any part in discussions of the House of Commons. That house adjourned on the 26th, that the initiatory proceedings upon the green bag might take place in the upper house. On the 4th of July the secret committee of the Lords made its report, declaring that the evidence affecting the honor of the queen was such as to require a solemn inquiry, which might be best effected in the course of a legislative proceeding. Lord Liverpool then proposed a Bill of Pains and Penalties, which had for its object "to deprive her majesty, Queen Caroline Amelia Elizabeth, of the title, prerogatives, rights, privileges, and exemptions of queen-consort of this realm, and to dissolve the marriage between his majesty and the said Caroline Amelia Elizabeth." The second reading of the bill was fixed for the 17th of August, and on that day commenced what is popularly known as the Queen's Trial.

It is scarcely necessary for us to refer to the chronicles of the time for the purpose of recalling the impressions which live in our memory of the extraordinary scenes of that summer and autumn of 1820. On the 3d of August the queen had removed from her temporary abode in London, to take up her residence at Brandenburg House, at Hammersmith. For four months from that day there never was a cessation of processions marching to Hammersmith, or of cavalcades shouting around the queen's carriage. On the day before the judicial proceedings commenced, addresses were presented to the queen by deputations from the county of Middlesex, from St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, and from the mechanics of the metropolis. These assemblages, whether led by the radical sheriff of Middlesex, in his state carriage, or by enthusiastic committeemen with white wands, gradually swelled into a multitude, of which the advanced guard were trampling down the laurels in her majesty's garden at Hammersmith before the rear-guard had passed Hyde Park Corner. Not on that 13th of November, 1642, when London poured forth its thousands while Rupert was fighting in the streets of Brentford, was there a greater earnestness than in those mechanics who marched to Hammersmith under a burning sun, and marched back again, hungry and weary, satisfied that their shouts had advanced the cause of justice for the oppressed. It is impossible not to recognize something of grandeur in such demonstrations, however capable they may be of affording matter for ridicule:

"All kinds of addresses
From Collars of SS,
To venders of cresses,
Came up like a fair;
And all through September,
October, November,
And down to December,
They hunted this Hare!" *

The weekly journal from which we quote these lines was the chief of those newspapers which "were established with the professed object of maintaining a constant war against all who espoused her majesty's cause." † There certainly never was a time in which the proper functions of the press were more degraded to the purposes of private slander. But it must be said, in fairness, that if the queen and her partisans were attacked with the coarsest reviling or the bitterest wit, the king and his supporters were no less subject to libellous attacks far exceeding the accustomed license of periodical writing. Milton has described the controversialists of London, sitting by their studious lamps, musing, searching, assenting to the force of reason and convincement. It is scarcely necessary to point the contrast furnished by the writers of 1820. The violence and ribaldry of the journals were perfectly in accord with the floods of indecency that were poured out every morning in the short-hand reports of the evidence on the trial—reports which were regularly printed by authority, circulated among the peers, and thence duly copied in the daily papers.

If the scenes that were passing in the streets were extraordinary, certainly the appearance presented by the House of Lords, on any one of the days of this trial, was no less remarkable. That house, the old Court of Requests, had been fitted up anew on the accession of George IV. The elevated arm-chair, from which former monarchs addressed the parliament, had been supplanted by a magnificent throne—a canopy of crimson velvet, supported by Corinthian columns, and surmounted by the imperial crown. For this special occasion of the queen's trial, galleries had been erected on each side of the house for the accommodation of the unusual number of peers who were expected to attend. A chair of state was placed for the queen a little beyond the bar, fronting the throne and the woolsack. The places for her counsel were immediately behind her. On the 21st of August the attorney-general was concluding his speech in support of the bill when drums and trumpets, mixed with the shouts of the people, announced the queen's arrival. She takes her seat. The interpreters being sworn, Teodora Majocchi was called in. The

* "Life of Wilberforce," vol. v. p. 56.
† Ibid., p. 65.

* From Theodore Hook's song of "Hunting the Hare," in "John Bull."
† "Lord Brougham's Speeches," Introduction to the case of Blacow.

queen turned suddenly round, uttered a loud exclamation, and rushed out of the house. This man had been one of her domestic servants. The examination of witnesses for the bill proceeded till the 6th of September. The solicitor-general summed up on the 7th, and on the 9th, upon an application from the queen's counsel, an adjournment took place till the 3d of October. The examinations and cross-examinations of the witnesses for the bill, gross and revolting as were many of the details, were signal exhibitions of legal acuteness. It was impossible to deny the right of counsel to put questions offensive to delicacy; but it was scarcely possible not to feel some indignation when a noble lord now and then asked a question which the most brazen advocate would have attempted to clothe in somewhat more decent language. The universal license of that unhallowed time seemed occasionally to make some of the highest forget their self-respect. There probably would have been more instances of unseemly interference with the ordinary course of legal inquiry, if one man had not stood in the midst of that assembly whose whole bearing was that of authority and command, whose look, denouncing "battle dangerous" if any rash offence were given, made the boldest peer prudent. The great admiral who in the Bay of Algiers was "all-fightful" complained of "the disrespect of counsel [Mr. Brougham], in fixing his eyes on him at the time that he was presuming to check him for an expression which had not been used by him, but by another noble lord." There was another of the queen's law-officers who dared even to fix his eyes upon a prince of the blood, exclaiming, "Come forth, thou slanderer." Some who heard these things might well fear that the old respect for "degree, priority, and place" was coming to an end.

On the 3d of October Mr. Brougham entered on the queen's defence. His speech on that day and the following may be cited among the greatest examples of forensic eloquence. "At half-past twelve to-day," writes Lord Dudley, "Brougham concluded a most able speech with a magnificently eloquent peroration. The display of his power and fertility of mind in this business has been amazing; and these extraordinary efforts seem to cost him nothing. He dined at Holland House yesterday, and stayed till eleven at night, talking 'de omni scibili'—French cookery, Italian poetry, and so on." * Mr. Rush, the American minister, notices, as illustrative of the English bar, and individually of Mr. Brougham, that during the adjournment of the queen's trial her attorney-general attended the assizes at Yorkshire, and engaged in a cause in behalf of a poor old woman, upon whose pig-cote a trespass had been committed, for which trespass the old woman obtained a verdict of forty shillings damages. † From the 4th to the 24th of October the examination of witnesses on behalf of the queen was continued. Mr. Denman then summed up the evidence in an address, which lasted two days. His denunciations were so unmeasured that some noble lords complained of the extraordinary license used by the queen's counsel. Mr. Rush has remarked of this time, when the most daring words were written and spoken with impunity, not only that every day produced its fiery libels against the king and his adherents, but that Mr. Denman, addressing himself to the assembled peerage of the realm, denounced in thundering tones one of the brothers of the king. Perhaps more remarkable was the boldness of the same counsel, which compared the proceedings against the queen to circumstances in the history of imperial Rome described by Tacitus—how Octavia, the wife of Nero, in consequence of an unjust aversion which existed in the mind of her husband, was dismissed, and a mistress taken in her place; how she was banished by means of a conspiracy, in which slaves were produced as evidence against her, although the greater part of her servants protested her innocence; how Nero persevered, although she was hailed as in triumph by a generous people, and how, on a second conspiracy, she was convicted, condemned, and banished to an island in the Mediterranean. Not so bold, but equally cutting, was the application by Mr. Brougham of a passage from Milton. Having asked John Allen Powell, the solicitor employed on the Milan commission, Who is your client or employer in this case? and being debarred from putting this question, the queen's attorney-general exclaimed, "Up to this moment I have never been able to trace the local habitation or the name of the unknown being who is the plaintiff in this proceeding. I know not but it may vanish into thin air. I know not under what shape it exists—

> 'If shape it might be called that shape had none,
> Distinguishable in member, joint, or limb—
> Or substance might be call'd that shadow seem'd,
> For each seem'd either—what seem'd his head
> The likeness of a kingly crown had on.'" *

It is not our intention to furnish even the very briefest abstract of the evidence that was brought forward to sustain or to rebut the charge against the queen upon which the Bill of Pains and Penalties was founded—namely, that her royal highness conducted herself toward Bartolomeo Bergami, a foreigner engaged in her service in a menial situation, both in public and private, "with indecent and offensive familiarity and freedom, and carried on with him a licentious, disgraceful, and adulterous intercourse." The impression of the character of the queen, produced upon all impartial persons by the publication of the evidence, was pretty much the same as that expressed by Sydney Smith after the proceedings had closed: "The style of manners she has adopted does not exactly tally with that of holy women in the days that are gone, but let us be charitable and hope for the best." † The evidence and the arguments of counsel having been concluded, the Peers, on the 2d of November, came to the question of the second reading of the Bill of Pains and Penalties. The question was debated for five nights, when the motion for the second reading of the bill was carried by 123 against 95. The majority was smaller than the government had expected. It was thought by many that this was "too small a majority for such a bill to be sent into such a place as the House of Commons." ‡ But the majority was still more reduced when the divorce clause came under consideration. Some peers were willing to pass the bill if this clause were removed. In the course of the proceedings Lord Harrowby had intimated that the divorce clause might be withdrawn. Mr. Canning, watching the progress of these proceedings from Paris, at the beginning of October, had written to Lord Liverpool, that though he thought the omission of the divorce clause was likely enough to facilitate the passing of the bill in the House of Lords, that omission would furnish an argument against it in the House of Commons. The bill would become "a pure penal enactment for immorality; and when, from the beginning of time, did such an enactment take place? And where, if it take place now, is this new species of legislation to end?" § The opposition saw clearly that the way to defeat the bill was to press for retaining the divorce clause; and that it should be retained was carried by a majority of 129 to 62. On the 10th of November, on the motion that the bill be read a third time, the majority was only nine—108 to 99. After the division Lord Dacre was about to present a petition from the queen, praying to be heard by counsel against the passing of the bill. Lord Liverpool rose and said that such a course would not now be necessary: "Had the third reading been carried by as considerable a number of peers as the second had been, he and his noble colleagues would have felt it their duty to persevere in the bill, and to send it down to the other branch of the legislature. In the present state of the country, however, and with the division of sentiment so nearly balanced, just evinced by their lordships, they had come to the determination not to proceed further with it. It was his intention, accordingly, to move, 'That the further consideration of the bill be adjourned to this day six months.'"

There was a general joy throughout the country at the termination of these proceedings. Those who looked carefully into the matter did not think with the excited multitude that the result was an acquittal of the queen; but all rejoiced that the time was come when

* Lord Dudley's "Letters," p. 267.

† "Residence at the Court of London," second series, vol. i. p. 339.

* The orator dovetailed with great skill inconsecutive lines of the famous passage in "Paradise Lost." The allusion might have been too strong for his audience if he had given the entire passage:

> "Or substance might be call'd that shadow seem'd,
> For each seem'd either; black it stood as night,
> Fierce as ten furies, terrible as hell,
> And shook a dreadful dart; what seem'd his head
> The likeness of a kingly crown had on."

† "Memoir," vol. ii. p. 206.

‡ "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. iii. p. 179—Letter of Mr. Bootle Wilbraham.

§ Stapleton, "George Canning and his Times," p. 298.

the heads of decent families would not be obliged to hide the newspaper from the eyes of their daughters, and when the legislature would have some better work before it than the discussion of a measure whose only fruits had been—"a government brought into contempt and detestation; a kingdom thrown into such ferment and convulsion as no other kingdom or government ever recovered from without a revolution."* There was one advantage to the government and to the country which Mr. Canning could not so well see as those who at home were watching the course of public opinion. What the ministers at the end of 1819 were dreading as symptoms of revolution were put an end to at the end of 1820 by the very "ferment and convulsion" about the queen. Mr. Wilbraham writes from Latham House to Lord Colchester, during the extremest violence of the popular feeling, "Radicalism has taken the shape of affection for the queen, and has deserted its old form; for we are all as quiet as lambs in this part of England, and you would not imagine that this could have been a disturbed country twelve months ago."†

On the 23d of November parliament was prorogued. On the 29th the queen went in procession to St. Paul's, to return thanks for her deliverance from a great peril and affliction. In the next session of parliament there were violent discussions on her majesty's affairs, particularly on her continued exclusion from the Liturgy. An annuity of fifty thousand pounds was provided for her by act of parliament. Her popularity gradually declined, and in April, 1821, it was written, "The queen is gone by as a topic of inflammation; and her taking quietly the fifty thousand pounds a year, after her protest and declaration that she would not till her right was acknowledged, was a *coup de grace* to her. It is said that an attempt is making by Lady Jersey, who patronizes her, to procure a drawing-room at Brandenburgh House, but it will undoubtedly fail. She is now hardly named in society or in the newspapers."‡ Cobbett, who had addressed the most violent letters to the queen, stimulating her to resist every attempt at compromise, says that after the abandonment of the bill, when the Whig faction flocked about her, the people, who hated this faction more than the other, troubled her with no more addresses. "The faction agitated questions about her in parliament, concerning which the people cared not a straw: what she was doing soon became as indifferent to them as what any other person of the royal family was doing. The people began again to occupy themselves with the business of obtaining a parliamentary reform; and her way of life and her final fate soon became objects of curiosity much more than of interest with the people."§

It is scarcely necessary, after the lapse of more than forty years, to enter upon any detail of the discussions upon questions connected with the queen, agitated in parliament after the great investigation was concluded—questions about which the arch-demagogue declared "the people cared not a straw." These discussions occupied many hundred columns of "Hansard's Debates" during the second session of the seventh imperial parliament. On the 11th of July, the last day of the session, and only eight days before the time appointed for the king's coronation, Mr. Hume moved that an address be presented to his majesty, praying that he would issue his proclamation for the coronation of the queen, "thereby consulting the true dignity of the crown, the tranquillity of the metropolis, and the general expectations of the people." At the moment when Mr. Hume was proposing his resolution the usher of the black rod summoned the Commons to attend in the House of Peers, where commissioners were assembled to prorogue the parliament. The motion necessarily fell to the ground. The coronation took place on the 19th of July. The queen was destined to a more bitter humiliation than any that she had previously endured. The privy council, on the 10th of July, had decided against a claim of her right to be crowned at the same time as the king. The next day she wrote to Lord Sidmouth to declare her intention to be present at the ceremony. In this injudicious and undignified determination her majesty persisted. Between six and seven o'clock in the morning she presented herself at every entrance to the abbey, and at each was denied admission. The same refusal attended her demand to enter Westminster Hall. A few of the populace huzzaed and a few hissed, but the prevailing sentiment was indifference. At the beginning of August the queen was attacked with internal inflammation, and she died on the night of the 7th. The king had sailed for Dublin on the 1st, and he received at Holyhead the intelligence of this sudden termination of a domestic trouble which had long been a source of public anxiety. Before this close of the unhappy lady's life the people had very generally begun to feel that in their compassion for the desolate and oppressed they had somewhat overstepped the safe line of a constitutional respect for the chief magistrate. There was a riot at the funeral procession of the queen's remains from Brandenburgh House. They were to be conveyed to Harwich, and there put on board a government sloop, which was to sail to Stade for the purpose of conveying them for interment at Brunswick. The mourning cavalcade was to avoid the crowded streets, but a mob had determined to force it through the city. The Life Guards having been rudely assaulted at Cumberland Gate, leading out of Hyde Park to Tyburn, a serious conflict ensued, when two of the assailants of the soldiers were shot. The procession went through the city with the lord mayor at its head. From this time there was an end of all excitement about the queen.

There was one result, however, which was of more political importance than the continued struggles of a few demagogues for notoriety. Mr. Canning, on the 12th of December, 1820, resigned his office of secretary of the Board of Control, on the ground that the discussions respecting the queen in the session of 1821 would be so intermixed with the general business that a minister could not absent himself without appearing to abandon the parliamentary duties of his station, nor could he be present taking no part in such discussions without producing embarrassment to himself and perplexity to his colleagues. The king accepted his resignation, but with a smothered displeasure at the course Mr. Canning and his immediate friends had taken. Upon the death of the queen Lord Liverpool strongly pressed the readmission of Mr. Canning to the cabinet, and the king as stoutly resisted it. His majesty was not unsupported by some of his official advisers, who disliked the presence among them of the most eloquent of the advocates of Catholic emancipation, and who, upon this and most other questions, dreaded the "flexible innovator" more than they admired "the eloquent conservative."*

CHAPTER CCXVIII.

Death of Napoleon Bonaparte — Parliamentary strictures on the measures adopted for his secure detention—Circular of the Congress at Laybach—Parliament—Irish outrages—Agricultural distress—New Corn Law—The king's visit to Scotland—Death of Lord Londonderry—His foreign administration—Mr. Canning secretary for foreign affairs—His instructions to the Duke of Wellington in his mission to Verona—French invasion of Spain—Mr. Canning's remonstrances—The Spanish American separated states—Consuls appointed—Opposition to Mr. Canning's decree to recognize their independence—Their recognition by the conclusion of commercial treaties—Circumstances which give to a neutral power the right of recognizing states which have effectually asserted their independence—Discussions with the minister of the United States of North America—Spanish aggression upon Portugal—Promptitude in sending troops for her defence—Important changes in our commercial policy—Mr. Huskisson and his defamers—The transfer of England to "the camp of progress and liberty"—The present and the past.

On the 5th of May, 1821, died Napoleon Bonaparte. Six years had passed since, in the great festival of the Champ de Mai, he had announced that the people who had called him to the throne must prepare for war. The issue to himself was his imprisonment in this lonely island of the Atlantic, long suffering under a chronic disease, and suffering more from his total want of power to endure his fate with equanimity. A hurricane swept over the island as Napoleon was dying, shaking houses to their foundation and tearing up the largest trees. We cannot avoid thinking of the similar phenomenon that attended the death of Cromwell. The faithful followers who were around his bed might have felt the sentiment if they did not know the lines of Waller:

> "We must resign! Heaven his great soul does claim
> In storms, as loud as his immortal fame:
> His dying groan, his last breath, shakes our isle,
> And trees uncut fall for his funeral pile."†

* Stapleton, "George Canning and his Times," p. 299.
† "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. iii. p. 164.
‡ Ibid., vol. iii. p. 218—Wilbraham to Lord Colchester.
§ Cobbett's "History of George IV.," § 454.

* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 23.
† "Ode on the Death of the Lord Protector."

But the last thoughts of the dying men were essentially different. To Napoleon the war of the elements seemed as if "the noise of battle hurtled in the air," and he died muttering the words, *Tête d'Armée*. Cromwell, also a great soldier, passed away with thoughts of peace in his mind, praying that God would give his people "consistency of judgment, one heart, and mutual love." The death of him who had so long filled the world with the terror of his name produced no great sensation in England or in Europe. There had been strong differences of opinion expressed in parliament as to the character of the measures which had been adopted to render his detention secure. It was urged that an unnecessary degree of restraint was imposed upon the captive, and that the governor of the island was a harsh and injudicious jailer, who performed what he thought his duty in the most vexatious spirit. The answer may be found in a parliamentary speech of Lord Bathurst: "Let them suppose that, instead of sitting to discuss whether a little more or a little less restriction should be imposed, they had thus to examine Sir Hudson Lowe at their bar: 'How and when did he escape?' 'In the early part of the evening, and from his garden.' 'Had his garden no sentinels?' 'The sentinels were removed.' 'Why were they removed?' 'General Bonaparte desired it—they were hateful to his feelings; they were then removed, and thus was he enabled to escape.'" Prudent and necessary as these restrictions might have been, querulous and insulting as Napoleon undoubtedly was in all his intercourse with the British officer who was responsible for his safe guardianship, it must still be lamented that a man was placed over our fallen enemy who, wincing under the pettiness of the captive's exaggerated complaints, appears to have forgotten how great a part he had played in the world. It is not to be supposed that Sir Hudson Lowe felt himself to be an instrument of retributive justice, or was possessed with an overwhelming feeling of the hatefulness of that selfish ambition which had desolated Europe. It was for an American statesman, who believed that the great duty of his country was to continue in "peace and fraternity with mankind," to give his testimony against the character of Napoleon as set forth by Barry O'Meara. Mr. Jefferson thought that this account placed him in a higher scale of understanding than he had allotted him. He had thought him the greatest of all military captains, but an indifferent statesman. His conversations with O'Meara proved a mind of great expansion, but the book also proved that nature had denied him the moral sense. "If he could seriously and repeatedly affirm that he had raised himself to power without ever having committed a crime, it proves that he wanted totally the sense of right and wrong. If he could consider the million of human lives which he had destroyed or caused to be destroyed; the desolations of countries by plunderings, burnings, and famine; the destitutions of lawful rulers of the world without the consent of their constituents, to place his brothers and sisters on their thrones; the cutting up of established societies of men, and jumbling them discordantly together at his caprice; the demolition of the fairest hopes of mankind for the recovery of their rights and amelioration of their condition; and all the numberless train of his other enormities—the man, I say, who could consider all these as no crimes must have been a moral monster, against whom every hand should have been lifted to slay him." *

On the death of Napoleon there was a larger question presenting itself to the minds of thoughtful men than that which arose out of the contests between the captive of St. Helena and the keeper who was set over him. The condition of the world suggested very grave doubts whether the nations had acquired any guarantees for their freedom or for their repose by the overthrow of the one great oppressor. At the exact period of Napoleon's death the sovereigns of Austria, Russia, and Prussia had assembled at Laybach, and they addressed a circular dispatch to their ministers at foreign courts, in which they proclaimed the doctrine that "useful or necessary changes in legislation and in the administration of states ought only to emanate from the free will and the intelligent and well-weighed conviction of those whom God has rendered responsible for power. Penetrated with this eternal truth, the sovereigns have not hesitated to proclaim it with frankness and vigor. They have declared that, in respecting the rights and independence of all legitimate power, they regarded as legally null, and as disavowed by the principles which constituted the public right of Europe, all pretended reform operated by revolt and open hostility." The sovereigns assembled in congress did not condescend to explain by what other modes those who contended for constitutional government against a despotic rule could establish their desire for reform. They could not proclaim their demands, however moderate or just, through the authoritative voice of a legislative assembly or the discussions of a free press. The denial of these safeguards of liberty had driven them into revolt and hostility to "legitimate power." This declaration of Laybach was not a mere threat of the mode in which these absolute sovereigns would act under any possible contingency of revolt and open hostility of peoples against rulers. The two great monarchs of Germany had denied to their own subjects the representative government which they had promised. They were now engaged, with the support of the autocrat of Russia, in putting down by military force the insurrections in Naples and Piedmont which had given these portions of Italy constitutions in which the popular voice might have expression. Spain had again obtained her Cortes, and had shaken off for a while the tyranny of Ferdinand the Seventh. The old irresponsible principles of legitimacy were to be re-established in Italy, in Spain, probably in all Europe, as in the times before that great convulsion of France, which, full of instruction, had taught no wisdom to the three monarchs who now assumed to be the armed police of the world. If Bonaparte had deposed lawful rulers without the consent of their constituents, the Holy Alliance was prepared to maintain tyrannical rulers who were hated by their subjects. If Bonaparte demolished the fairest hopes of mankind for the recovery of their rights and amelioration of their condition, the Holy Alliance had succeeded to his unrighteous office. If he had destroyed millions of lives, and had desolated countries for his ambition, the Holy Alliance was ready to perpetrate the same crimes with an equal deficiency of the moral sense, and with an odious hypocrisy which he did not care to assume. The foreign relations of England will, for a few years, be determined by the preponderance of despotic or liberal tendencies in her government. Upon a right choice of men to guide her destinies in this crisis of the world's affairs will depend her future position among the nations.

The man was not in the cabinet of 1821 who was to shape the foreign policy of England by other principles than those which many construed as subservience to the decrees of absolutism. Nor was he there when the "Gazette" of the 12th of January, 1822, announced that the Marquess of Buckingham was created a duke. This was the official notification that the Grenvilles had joined the ministry. Lord Grenville had retired from public life to spend the evening of his days in planting the pines of Australia around his wastes at Dropmore. His party was represented in the cabinet by Mr. Charles Williams Wynn, who filled the office which Mr. Canning had resigned at the end of 1820. A more important accession to the ministry was the substitution of Mr. Peel for Lord Sidmouth, as secretary of state for the home department. By the coalition with the Grenvilles there was an accession of official support to Catholic emancipation. But this was neutralized by the appointment of Mr. Peel, whose opinions on that question were deemed incapable of change. Some hope for Ireland was derived from the nomination of the Marquess Wellesley as lord lieutenant, in the place of Earl Talbot.

The session of parliament was opened by the king in person on the 5th of February. His majesty continued to receive from foreign powers the strongest assurances of their friendly disposition toward this country. In his visit to Ireland he derived the sincerest gratification from the loyalty and attachment manifested by all classes of his subjects. He believed that his presence in Ireland had been productive of very beneficial effect, although it was a matter of the deepest concern to his majesty that a spirit of outrage had led to daring and systematic violations of the law. The commerce and manufactures of the kingdom were flourishing; the agricultural interest was deeply depressed. It is scarcely necessary for us to record the wearisome debates in which the real remedies for Irish outrage and agricultural distress were kept out of view. A renewal of the Insurrection Act and a suspension of the Habeas Corpus were determined on for tranquillizing Ireland. The relief of agriculture was to be effected by a loan to parishes for the mitigation of local distress and by the repeal of the malt tax. The pressure of taxation and the change in the currency were the imputed causes of the ad-

* Tucker's "Life of Jefferson," vol. ii. pp. 500–1.

versity of the cultivators and the uncertain resources of the landowners. Some began to think that the protective laws had some effect which was not beneficial to the industry of the farmer. Lord Liverpool expressed his belief that no material or immediate relief could be effected by an alteration of the corn laws. He admitted that the existing system was a failure, inasmuch as it gave a complete monopoly to the British grower until wheat reached eighty shillings a quarter, and after that point had been attained suddenly permitted the importation of foreign corn without any restraint whatever. In 1816, 1817, and 1818 there had been three deficient harvests, and prices having risen above the rate by which the opening of the ports was decided, immense supplies of foreign corn were thrown upon the market. From 1819 to 1822 the native growers had the monopoly of the home market, and during these years the agriculturists endured the severest seasons of distress which had been experienced by that body in modern times; and the engagements which they had been induced to make, under the fallacious hopes of the corn laws of 1815, swept them from the land by thousands.* A new act was passed in 1822 to permit importation upon a high duty when wheat had reached seventy shillings a quarter, and at lower duties when it was above that price and under eighty-five shillings. This act was inoperative, as prices never reached the assigned limit. The time was far distant for going to the root of the great evil to the producers of fluctuating prices, and of the greater evil to consumers of alternations of abundance and starvation.

The great measure of Catholic relief, which was carried in the House of Commons in 1821, but was rejected by the Lords, was on the 30th of April in the present session proposed by Mr. Canning in a modified form. He introduced a bill to relieve Roman Catholic peers from the disabilities imposed upon them with regard to the right of sitting and voting in the House of Peers. The motion was carried in the House of Commons, but was rejected in the Lords. It was at this time understood that Mr. Canning was to leave the great scene of his oratorical triumphs, and to accept the post of governor-general of India. "Canning governor-general!" wrote Mr. Ward from Florence. "It is impossible to say that this is the most natural or desirable termination to the career of the most distinguished speaker in the English Parliament; but I have no doubt but that the appointment is a fortunate one for the country he is sent to govern. In his case I think I should have judged differently, and preferred the House of Commons." † To be in the House of Commons without office would have been a sore trial for the man who naturally looked forward to be the prime minister of England, when royal prejudices and party rivalries should have ceased to impede his progress. He had made up his mind that his future exertions should be devoted to India. He had been five years at the Board of Control, and he knew how much might be effected, by a wise policy of peace, to make the British rule one of justice and benevolence. His future was otherwise ordained.

On the 10th of August the king had embarked at Greenwich, for the purpose of visiting Scotland. On the 18th he landed at Leith. The reception which his Scottish subjects gave to the first sovereign of the house of Brunswick, who had come among them to banish the last lingering remembrance of the house of Stuart, was most cordial and sincere. It was said of George the Fourth, when he visited Ireland in the previous year, that "he seems to have behaved not like a sovereign coming in pomp and state to visit a part of his dominions, but like a popular candidate come down upon an electioneering trip." ‡ In Edinburgh the king, holding his levées in Holyrood House, dressed in the Highland costume, was dignified as well as gracious. At a banquet given by the lord provost he proposed the health of his host as "Sir William Anderson, baronet"—a dignity thus extemporaneously conferred—and he afterward gave as a toast, "Health to its chieftains! and God bless the land of cakes." When he quitted Scotland he left behind him a reputation which made the well-wishers of the monarchy, throughout the kingdom, regret that he generally adopted a system of seclusion which allowed few opportunities for appreciating his popular qualities. It must have required some effort on the part of the king to maintain the hilarity which he exhibited in Edinburgh. On the evening of the 15th he received, while on board the royal yacht in Leith Roads, the news that Lord Londonderry had died by his own hand. This fatal termination of a temporary insanity took place on the 12th. The king, on hearing this intelligence, immediately wrote to the lord chancellor: "On Friday was the last time I saw him: my own mind was then filled with apprehensions respecting him, and they have, alas! been but too painfully verified. My great object, my good friend, in writing to you to-night, is to tell you that I have written to Liverpool, and I do implore of you not to lend yourself to any arrangement whatever until my return to town." *

A tardy justice has in some respects been done to the memory of Lord Londonderry. A few miscreants hissed when his coffin was taken out of the hearse at the door of Westminster Abbey; Byron, in the same indecent spirit, spoke of him as "Carotid-artery cutting Castlereagh;" the calumny for a long time passed uncontradicted that he had put down the rebellion in Ireland by cruel and indiscriminate punishment; his abilities were undervalued, and his power in debate spoken of with scorn. Nevertheless, a conviction is now pretty generally felt that he had many of the qualities which constitute a statesman—courage, decision, plain sense, gentleness and suavity of manners in public as in private. It has been said, "Lord Castlereagh's foreign administration was as destitute of all merit as possible; no enlarged views guided his conduct, no liberal principles claimed his regard." † This assertion must be taken with some qualification. The American minister, who was in intercourse with him for four years, asserted that, from the end of the Revolutionary War, there was no British statesman who made more advances or did more, in fact, toward placing the relations of England and the United States upon an amicable footing. ‡ With reference to the particular period of which we have been treating, it has been said by the noble author already quoted that "on the eve of the parliament meeting (19th of January, 1821) Lord Castlereagh delivered a note to the Holy Allies, expressing in feeble and measured terms a very meagre dissent from the principles of interference." There are, no doubt, many courteous expressions in the circular of Lord Castlereagh which might warrant a belief that his dissent from the measures of the Holy Alliance was feeble—a belief entertained by some that it was even simulated. The secretary of state declares that the king has felt himself obliged to decline becoming a party to the measures proposed by the allies, either as to the establishment of certain general principles, or as to the mode of dealing, under these principles, with the existing affairs of Naples: "No government can be more prepared than the British government is to uphold the right of any state or states to interfere where their own immediate security or essential interests are seriously endangered by the internal transactions of another state. But as they regard the assumption of such right as only to be justified by the strongest necessity, and to be limited and regulated thereby, they cannot admit that this right can receive a general and indiscriminate application to all revolutionary movements without reference to their immediate bearing upon some particular state or states, or be made prospectively the basis of an alliance." No doubt the time was approaching when England must speak a plainer language to the allied sovereigns against their own interpretation of "the strongest necessity to interfere with the internal transactions of other states." Lord Londonderry was about to depart for a congress at Verona when, in an access of insanity, he thus miserably died. Whether he would have spoken the stronger language when the principle of interference was about to be extended from the affairs of Italy to the affairs of Spain may remain in doubt. Another took his place at the Foreign Office, whose language, though equally courteous, was not to be mistaken.

Mr. Canning was on his way to Liverpool for the purpose of taking leave of his constituents before he sailed for India. Every one believed that he would not now go to India. The desire of some of his former colleagues to get rid of him was very generally known; many were equally convinced that the government could not go on without him. His own mind was naturally in a position of doubt and anxiety. He writes to a friend on the 26th of August, "I have now

* See an able article on "The Wheat Trade," in "Companion to the Almanac" for 1839.

† "Lord Dudley's Letters," p. 312. ‡ Ibid., p. 296.

* Twiss's "Life of Lord Eldon," vol. ii. p. 464.

† Lord Brougham, "Statesmen of the Time of George III.," vol. ii. p. 126, 8vo. ed.

‡ Rush, Second Series, vol. ii. p. 2.

nothing to tell, and I have no pleasure in speculating on what may happen. I wish I were well on board the Jupiter." * He was kept in doubt till the 11th of September, when the Foreign Office was offered to him by Lord Liverpool. To the last day he said he hoped that the proposal made to him might be one which he could refuse—"that which has been made was the only one that I could not refuse." He would "place public duty against private liking and convenience." M. Guizot says that Lord Liverpool had endeavored in vain to induce the king to consent to the appointment of Mr. Canning. "'I will undertake it,' said the Duke of Wellington, who was accustomed to treat George IV. with a rough and unyielding respect, to which the intimidated monarch always ended by giving way. He yielded on this occasion." † Mr. Canning entered the Foreign Office with a clear view of his path of duty. After a few weeks of official experience he writes, "For fame, it is a squeezed orange; but for public good there is something to do, and I will try—but it must be cautiously—to do it. You know my politics well enough to know what I mean when I say that for *Europe* I should be desirous now and then to read *England*." ‡

The successor chosen to represent Great Britain at the congress was the Duke of Wellington. His grace set out on his mission on the 17th of September. On the 21st he wrote to Mr. Secretary Canning that he had had a long discussion with M. de Villèle on the relations of the French government with Spain. The French minister said that if the congress were to separate and come to no decision on the affairs of Spain, it was probable that France and Spain might be forced into a war, and he proposed that the allies should make a declaration of the line they would each take. The duke applied to Mr. Canning to receive his majesty's instructions in case this proposition was made at the congress. The answer of Mr. Canning was in terms that could not be misinterpreted. "If there be a determined project to interfere by force or by menace in the present struggle in Spain, so convinced are his majesty's government of the uselessness and danger of any such interference, so objectionable does it appear to them in principle, as well as utterly impracticable in execution, that when the necessity arises, or (I would rather say) when the opportunity offers, I am to instruct your grace at once frankly and peremptorily to declare that to any such interference, come what may, his majesty will not be a party." The French government had assembled an army on the frontiers of Spain, under the pretence of establishing a *cordon sanitaire* to keep out a fever that was raging at Barcelona. The real object of this army was acknowledged at the congress. It was to enable Ferdinand the Seventh to put down the constitution under which his subjects were more content to live than under his absolute rule. The declaration of the Duke of Wellington, under his instructions from the Foreign Office, prevented any open support of this project being given by the other great powers. The King of France, in opening the Chambers at the end of January, 1823, left no doubt of the intentions of the French government. Louis XVIII. announced that he had recalled his minister at Madrid, and that a hundred thousand Frenchmen, commanded by a prince of his family, were ready to march to preserve the throne of Spain to a descendant of Henry the Fourth. He declared that hostilities should cease at the moment "that Ferdinand the Seventh should be free to give his people the institutions which they could not hold except from him." § Mr. Canning wrote to our ambassador at the French court that this paragraph "is construed as implying that the free institutions of the Spanish people can only be legitimately held from the spontaneous gift of the sovereign, first restored to his absolute power, and then divesting himself of such portion of that power as he may think proper to part with. The Spanish nation could not be expected to subscribe to this principle, nor could any British statesman uphold or defend it. . . . It is indeed a principle that strikes at the root of the British constitution." ‖ The French invaded Spain. England had taken her stand upon a principle, but that attitude did not involve the necessity of going to war. Mr. Canning declared in parliament that the king's government would abide by a system of neutrality, except under certain conditions. If Portugal were to be attacked, such an assault would bring Great Britain into the field, with all her force, to support the independence of her ancient and faithful ally. Spain, though claiming her colonies as a right, had in fact lost all power over them, and the British government would not tolerate for an instant any cession which Spain might make of colonies over which she did not exercise a direct and positive influence. Mr. Canning's declaration of neutrality brought upon him the remonstrances and reproaches of a few members of the opposition. He triumphantly vindicated his conduct. The proposed censure of what some deemed the feeble tone assumed by the government terminated in an almost unanimous vote of approbation of what had been done. The opposition could not consistently maintain that the policy of Mr. Canning was in any essential point a departure from the principles that had been most eloquently asserted by Mr. Brougham at the opening of the session: "He would look forward, in order to avoid all subject of vituperation; reserving his blame for the foreigners whose tyrannical conduct obliged this nation to hate them and his co-operation for whatever faithful servant of the crown would, in the performance of his duty to the country, to freedom, and to the world, speak a language that was truly British—pursue a policy that was truly free—and look to free states as our best and most natural allies against all enemies whatsoever; quarrelling with none, whatever might be the form of their governments; keeping peace wherever we could, but not leaving ourselves unprepared for war—not afraid of the issue, but calmly resolved to brave it at all hazards; determined to maintain, amid every sacrifice, the honor and dignity of the crown, the independence of the country, the ancient law of nations, the supremacy of all separate states—all those principles which are cherished as most precious and most sacred by the whole civilized world." * At this crisis, however, the desires of the English people were probably best represented in a letter of a great humorist to the Countess Grey: "For God's sake do not drag me into another war! I am worn down and worn out with crusading and defending Europe and protecting mankind; I must think a little of myself. I am sorry for the Spaniards; I am sorry for the Greeks; I deplore the fate of the Jews; the people of the Sandwich Islands are groaning under the most detestable tyranny; Bagdad is oppressed; I do not like the present state of the Delta; Thibet is not comfortable. Am I to fight for all these people? The world is bursting with sin and sorrow. Am I to be the champion of the Decalogue, and to be eternally raising fleets and armies to make all men good and happy? We have just done saving Europe, and I am afraid the consequence will be that we shall cut each other's throats. No war, dear Lady Grey! no eloquence; but apathy, selfishness, common-sense, arithmetic! I beseech you, secure Lord Grey's sword and pistols, as the housekeeper did Don Quixote's armor. If there is another war, life will not be worth having." †

The spectacle of the South American colonies was calculated to awaken the sympathies of every English statesman of large and liberal views. But there were difficult questions involved in this struggle, which rendered it imperatively necessary for the minister directing the foreign affairs of England to proceed with the utmost caution. Mr. Canning had made, on the 30th of April, 1823, a declaration in the House of Commons which went through Europe, that whatever might grow out of a separate conflict between Spain and France, the immediate object of England was to hinder the impress of a joint character from being affixed to the war—to take care that the war should not grow out of an assumed jurisdiction of the congress. Mr. Canning's determination had the effect of preventing the great powers of the continent engaging in the attack upon the Constitutionalists of Spain. The French armies marched to Madrid, which they occupied on the 24th of May. They overran Spain, they accomplished the release of Ferdinand, who had been detained at Cadiz; the Cortes were overturned. Spain entered upon that long night of tyranny and superstition which left her among the feeblest and most degraded of nations. Such was the position of affairs at the close of 1823. At the opening of the session of parliament on the 3d of February, 1824, the royal speech alluded to the strict neutral-

* "George Canning and his Times," p. 362.
† Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 28.
‡ "George Canning and his Times," p. 264.
§ "Annuaire Historique Universel pour 1823."
‖ The papers concerning the negotiations relative to Spain are given in "Hansard," vol. viii. cols. 904–964.

* Hansard, vol. viii. col. 94, and Brougham's "Speeches," p. 299, ed. 1857.
† Sydney Smith's "Memoirs and Letters," vol. ii. pp. 235–236.

ity which the king had observed during the war in Spain. With respect to the provinces of America which had declared their separation from Spain, his conduct had been open and consistent, and his opinions frankly avowed to Spain and to other powers. "His majesty has appointed consuls to reside at the principal ports and places of those provinces, for the protection of the trade of his subjects. As to any further measures, his majesty has reserved to himself an unfettered discretion, to be exercised as the circumstances of those countries and the interests of his own people may appear to his majesty to require." On the 4th of March Mr. Canning laid upon the table of the House of Commons a memorandum of a conference between himself and the Prince de Polignac. Mr. Canning said, at this interview in October, 1823, that being convinced that the ancient system of the colonies could not be restored, the British government could not enter into any stipulations binding itself either to refuse or to delay its recognition of their independence; that the British government had no desire to precipitate that recognition so long as there was any reasonable chance of an accommodation with the mother country by which such a recognition might come first from Spain; "but that it could not wait indefinitely for that result; that it could not consent to make its recognition of the new states dependent upon that of Spain, and that it would consider any foreign interference, by force or by menace, in the dispute between Spain and the colonies, as a motive for recognizing the latter without delay." The lapse of time has shown that Mr. Canning had as great difficulty in the accomplishment of his policy in opposition to the influence exercised in the highest quarter at home, as in the hostility of those powers who had constituted themselves a union for the government of the nations. At the end of November, 1824, Lord Sidmouth withdrew from the cabinet, upon the ground of his inability to reconcile his opinions to that of so many of his colleagues, who advocated the immediate recognition by his majesty of the independence of Buenos Ayres. Mr. Charles Williams Wynn wrote to the Duke of Buckingham on the 28th of January, 1825, six days before the meeting of parliament, "There have been steps to revive the discussions of December last, proceeding wholly from *foreign* influence, which, to my mind, manifest a decided wish to break up the government." On the 27th of January the king had addressed a long letter to Lord Liverpool, for the purpose of its being laid before the cabinet. This royal manifesto is the language of one who appears, like the Seven Sleepers, to have awakened from a long slumber, and to have spoken in a tongue with which men had ceased to be familiar. "The Liberalism of late adopted by the king's government appears to the king to be a substantial part of that creed which was hailed in the House of Commons in those revolutionary days when it required all the talents and firmness of the late Mr. Pitt to put it down. . . . Can the present government suppose that the king will permit any individuals to force upon him at this time a line of policy of which he so entirely disapproves, and which is in direct opposition to those wise principles that the king's government has, for so many years, supported and uniformly acted upon?" The king then asks, Why was the Quadruple Alliance formed? and he answers, For the maintenance of the treaties of Europe, and also for the purpose of controlling the ambition and jealousies of the great allied powers themselves in relation to each other. "The Jacobins of the world, now calling themselves the Liberals, saw the peace of Europe secured by this great measure, and have therefore never ceased to vilify the principle of the Quadruple Alliance." The king desired therefore distinctly to know whether the great principles of policy established by his government in 1814, 1815, and 1818, were or were not to be abandoned. Lord Liverpool, in his answer to the king, stated that so entire an agreement subsisted between his majesty's servants as to request his permission to give their answer generally and collectively. He pointed out the divergence of opinion between his majesty and his allies as to the nature of their engagements for maintaining the peace of Europe, especially in 1815, in 1818, and in 1821: "Whatever difference or shades of difference of opinion may have hitherto existed among your majesty's servants on the subject of Spanish America, they humbly submit now to your majesty their unanimous opinion that the measures in progress respecting Spanish America are in no way inconsistent with any engagement between your majesty and your allies; that those measures are now irrevocable, and that the faith and honor of the country are pledged to all their necessary consequences." The king yielded with a tolerable grace. Disappointed as he might be at the unanimous determination of the cabinet, he saw it was impossible now to accomplish what was his real object—the dismissal of Mr. Canning. The "foreign influence" was undoubtedly what weighed upon the king. Mr. Canning, writing to our ambassador at Paris, Lord Granville, in March, after using strong terms with regard to Metternich, says, "I have evidence, which I entirely believe, of his having been, for the last twelvemonth at least, perhaps longer, at the bottom of an intrigue with the court here, of which Madame de —— was the organ, to change the politics of this government by changing me." In April he returned to the same charge against Metternich, and said that he should like him to understand that a renewal of his intrigues would lead to some such public manifestation of Mr. Canning's knowledge of what had passed as might let the House of Commons and the public into the secret. "I wonder whether he is aware that the private communication of foreign ministers with the King of England is wholly at variance with the spirit, and practice too, of the British constitution."* The recognition of the South American republics was confirmed by the declaration in the king's speech on opening the session of parliament on the 3d of February, 1825. The firm attitude of the cabinet had produced the consent of the king that the following passage should represent his opinions: "In conformity with the declarations which have been repeatedly made by his majesty, his majesty has taken measures for confirming by treaties the commercial relations already subsisting between this kingdom and those countries of America which appear to have established their separation from Spain." In the debate upon the address Mr. Canning alluded to the speech of Mr. Brougham upon the subject of South America. The honorable and learned gentlemen admitted that much had been done to which he could not object, but he suggested that things might have been better, especially as to time. "I differ from him essentially; for if I pique myself on anything in this affair it is the time. That at some time or other states which had separated themselves from the mother country should or should not be admitted to the rank of independent nations, is a proposition to which no possible dissent could be given. The whole question was one of time and mode. There were two modes: one a reckless and headlong course, by which we might have reached our object at once, but at the expense of drawing upon us consequences not lightly to be estimated; the other was more strictly guarded in point of principle, so that while we pursued our own interest we took care to give no just cause of offence to other powers." It is important to bear in mind this very clear statement of the general principle that the precise time for the recognition of states throwing off their allegiance is to be determined by circumstances of which a neutral state is the best judge. The explanation which Mr. Canning proceeded to give of the circumstances of the South American republics at the time of the recognition by Great Britain is equally important, as showing that the claim for recognition depends upon the power of the separating state to maintain and defend itself. Mr. Canning briefly and clearly explained the actual position of the three states with which the British government had to deal—namely, Buenos Ayres, Colombia,† and Mexico. "Long ago the contest between Buenos Ayres and the mother country had ceased. Buenos Ayres comprised thirteen or fourteen small and separate states, which were not till very lately collected into any federal union. Would it not have been an absurdity to have treated with a power which was incapable of answering for the conduct of the communities of which it was composed? So soon as it was known that a consolidation had taken place the treaty with Buenos Ayres was signed. As to Colombia, as late as 1822 the last of the Spanish forces were sent away from Porto Cabello, which was up till that time held for the King of Spain. It was only since that time that Colombia could have been admitted as a state of separate existence. Some time after that, however, Colombia chose to risk her whole force and a great part of her treasure in a distant war with Spain in Peru. Had that enterprise proved disastrous the expedition would have re-

* This very curious correspondence is given in chap. xxv. of Stapleton's "George Canning and his Times."

† On December 17th, 1819, in a general convention of Venezuela and Granada, the two states were united under the name of the Republic of Colombia, of which Bolivar was president. In 1832 this republic was divided into three states.

turned with the troops to re-establish the royal authority. The danger was now at end. The case of Mexico was still more striking. Not nine months ago an adventurer who had wielded the sceptre of Mexico left these shores to return thither and repossess his abdicated throne. Was that a moment at which this country ought to have interfered to decide, by recognition, the government for Mexico? The failure of the attempt of that adventurer afforded the opportunity for recognition, and the instant the failure was known the decision of the British cabinet was taken." *

During the progress of the deliberations of the British cabinet on the subject of the South American republics, Mr. Rush, the minister of the United States, was addressed by Mr. Canning with a view that the two governments should come to an understanding, and join in a concurrent declaration as to the policy to be pursued by them. Mr. Rush, in a dispatch to President Monroe, on the 23d of August, 1823, says: "The tone of earnestness in Mr. Canning's note naturally starts the inference that the British cabinet cannot be without its serious apprehensions that ambitious enterprises are meditated against the independence of the new Spanish-American states, whether by France alone or in conjunction with the continental powers I cannot now say on any authentic grounds." † It would seem that the president having made a communication of this dispatch to his celebrated predecessor, it was understood by Mr. Jefferson as a proposition by Mr. Canning that Great Britain should unite with America in an armed resistance to the possible attempt of the allied powers to intrench upon the independence of the infant republics. Mr. Jefferson considered this as the most momentous question that had been ever offered to his contemplation since that of their own independence. The venerable ex-president appears at once to have thrown aside the prejudices against Great Britain which had sometimes marked his official career. "Great Britain is the nation that can do us the most harm of any one, or all, on earth; and with her on our side we need not fear the old world. With her, then, we should most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship; and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more, side by side, in the same cause." ‡

We may here mention that during the residence of Mr. Rush at the Court of London he entered upon several most important discussions —in 1818 with Lord Londonderry, in 1824 with Mr. Canning—upon questions of former controversy, and of possible future differences that might arise between Great Britain and the United States. The most pressing question was with reference to the American claim for a boundary which would have given the United States Vancouver's Island and the Columbia River. The settlement of this question stood over, the proposal of each negotiator for a modified settlement being rejected by the other. This was the Oregon question, which was not finally settled till 1846, when, in the strong desire for peace, much more was conceded than Mr. Canning consented to admit as the right of the United States. The maritime questions upon which the two countries had gone to war in 1812, which included the relations of neutral and belligerent powers, were declined by the American plenipotentiary to be gone into without the question of impressment being considered, which matter the British plenipotentiaries refused to admit into the discussion. Mr. Rush maintained the same principles which he had maintained in 1818: "Great Britain claims the right of searching the vessels of other countries on the high seas for her seamen, and here begins the cause of complaint. For how can the claim ever be enforced consistently with what is due to other nations? Let the steps by which the enforcement proceeds be attended to. A British frigate in time of war meets an American merchant vessel at sea, boards her, and, under terror of her guns, takes out one of the crew. The boarding lieutenant asserts, and, let it be admitted, believes, the man to be a Briton. By this proceeding the rules observed in deciding upon any other fact where individual or national rights are at stake are overlooked. The lieutenant is accuser and judge. He decides upon his own view instantly. The impressed man is forced into the frigate's boat, and the case ends. There is no appeal, no trial of any kind." § Thus strongly did the minister of the United States remonstrate in 1818 against the difficulty and danger of intrusting such an authority to the discretion and humanity of an irresponsible naval officer. In 1824 Mr. Rush put the argument with equal force, that "the assumption of a right of search *for men*,* whether as a right direct or incidental, was denied by the United States to have the least sanction in public law. The bare claim was affronting to the United States in the dearest attributes of their national sovereignty." The right of search was not denied by the American plenipotentiary, but he maintained that "the doctrine of perpetual allegiance" was but as "a municipal rule, to be executed at home—not upon the high seas, and on board the vessels of a sovereign and independent state." †

In the remarkable letter of the king to his cabinet which we have just quoted, his majesty imputed to "the late policy of Great Britain" a "restless desire of self-interest." This was an allusion to the almost universal demand of the mercantile community for the establishment of commercial relations with the new states of South America by treaties of amity and commerce. In point of fact the ultimate form of recognition consisted in the negotiation and adoption of such treaties. The policy of the British government was no doubt in some degree determined by the general wish of the mercantile community, but Mr. Canning invariably put the recognition of the South American states upon higher ground: "If France occupied Spain, was it necessary, in order to avoid the consequences of that occupation, that we should blockade Cadiz? No. I looked another way; I sought materials of compensation in another hemisphere. Contemplating Spain, such as our ancestors had known her, I resolved that if France had Spain, it should not be Spain 'with the Indies.' I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old." ‡ The paramount object of separating the policy of England from any subservience to the absolutism of the continent was accomplished. It was accomplished without war. But when, a year later, the adoption by Portugal of a constitutional government was an offence to the Spanish despot, and he sent an army into Portugal to make the one rule of irresponsible power prevail throughout the Peninsula, Mr. Canning took the attitude of a great war minister, and by that attitude prevented a war. On the 11th of December, 1826, a message was presented to the House of Commons stating that his majesty had received an earnest application from the Princess Regent of Portugal, claiming, in virtue of the ancient obligations of alliance and amity subsisting between Great Britain and Portugal, his majesty's aid against a hostile aggression from Spain. On the next day, Tuesday, December 12th, Mr. Canning moved an address, in answer to the royal message, in a speech which was declared to have been "an epoch in a man's life to have heard him." In his most eloquent periods there was nothing more truly eloquent than his brief statement of the manner in which the government had received the news of the Spanish aggression. The first intimation of the event was a demand on the 3d from the Portuguese ambassador for assistance. The government desired to obtain official and precise intelligence of facts on which to found an application to parliament. "It was only on last Friday night that this precise information arrived. On Saturday his majesty's confidential servants came to a decision. On Sunday that decision received the sanction of his majesty. On Monday it was communicated to both houses of parliament; and this day, sir, at the hour in which I have the honor of addressing you, the troops are on their march for embarkation." § Mr. Canning concluded his magnificent speech with these words: "We go to plant the standard of England on the well-known heights of Lisbon. Where that standard is planted foreign dominion shall not come." The British troops were in the Tagus in less than a fortnight after these words were spoken. Not a shot was fired. The Spanish troops retired from the Portuguese frontier. The British armament returned home. It had accomplished what Mr. Canning proposed to accomplish: "Let us fly to the aid of Portugal, by whomsoever attacked, because it is our duty to do so; and let us cease our interference where that duty ends." ‖

In carrying forward this rapid view of the foreign administration of the country during the four years since the accession of Mr. Can-

* Hansard, vol. xii. col. 78.
† Rush's "Residence at the Court of London," Second Series, pp. 29–30. ‡ See Tucker's "Life of Jefferson," vol. ii. p. 515.
§ Rush's "Residence at the Court of London," First Series, pp. 200–1.

* The *italics* are used by Mr. Rush.
† Rush's "Residence at the Court of London," Second Series, p. 244.
‡ Hansard, vol. xvi. col. 397. § Ibid., col. 367.
‖ Hansard, vol. xvi. col. 369.

ning to office, we have necessarily passed over some points of political importance to which we must advert in a future chapter. But as the foreign relations of the country received a marked change during this period, an equal change was wrought upon its commercial policy during the same period—a change that may therefore properly be regarded as forming part of the same system of taking a broader and more comprehensive view of human affairs than was agreeable to those who thought that "all advances toward improvement are retrogradations toward Jacobinism."

In January, 1823, Mr. Huskisson became president of the Board of Trade. He was held to be a political adventurer, and it was not till 1825 that his great talents and vast financial and commercial knowledge gave him a seat in the cabinet. Liverpool, in 1823, had not hesitated to accept in Mr. Huskisson, as its representative, a second political adventurer. In 1816 Mr. Canning had told his constitutents that he pleaded guilty to the heavy charge that had been made against him that he was an adventurer. "A representative of the people, I am one of the people, and I present myself to those who choose me, only with the claims of character, be they what they may, unaccredited by patrician patronage." The talent and knowledge of Mr. Huskisson soon rendered him the highest official authority in his own walk, in spite of Lord Eldon's dislike of this colleague and his principles, "looking to the whole history of this gentleman."* In the session of 1823 Mr. Huskisson developed a broader system of commercial policy than any previous government had dared to propose, in opposition to the prejudices of generations—to the belief that the prosperity of the commerce and manufactures of Great Britain rested upon the exclusive employment of her own shipping, upon prohibitory duties, upon restrictive duties almost amounting to prohibition, and upon the balance of trade. Mr. Wallace and Mr. Robinson had taken some steps toward commercial freedom, but Mr. Huskisson, by rapid strides, advanced toward the completion of a healthier system than had as yet prevailed in the world. In 1823 he carried through parliament a measure known as the Reciprocity of Duties Bill, the object of which was that duties and drawbacks should be imposed and allowed on all goods equally, whether imported or exported in British or in foreign vessels, but reserving the power of continuing the existing restrictions with respect to those countries which should decline to act upon a system of reciprocity. The bill was passed on the 4th of July. On that occasion Mr. Stuart Wortley made a remark which we may now regard somewhat as a prophecy: "So many impolitic restrictions called protections being removed from the trade and shipping, it would be impossible to retain, for any considerable time, the protection given to agricultural produce."†

The measure of 1823, which struck a heavy blow at the old navigation laws, provoked little opposition compared with the clamor against the proposition of Mr. Huskisson, on the 5th of March, 1824, that the prohibitions on the importation of silk manufactures should cease on the 5th of July, 1826, that the duties on raw silk should be largely reduced, and those on thrown silk reduced one half. We all now know the value of the great argument which Mr. Huskisson employed: "The system of prohibitory duties, which has been maintained with respect to the silk trade, has had the effect—to the shame of England be it spoken—of leaving us far behind our neighbors in this branch of industry. We have witnessed that chilling and benumbing effect which is always sure to be felt when no genius is called into action, and when we are rendered indifferent to exertion by the indolent security of a prohibitory system. I have not the slightest doubt that if the same system had been continued with respect to the cotton manufacture, it would at this moment be as subordinate in amount to the woollen as it is junior in its introduction into this country."‡

It is unnecessary for us to pursue this subject beyond the point of showing the beginnings of that great system of free trade, which has raised this country to a height of prosperity which could scarcely have been contemplated by the most enthusiastic advocates of a liberal commercial policy in the time of Mr. Huskisson. In his own day he had to endure an amount of opprobrium somewhat in excess of that which usually attaches to all reformers. About six months before his measures with regard to the import of foreign silks were to come into operation, Mr. Baring, on presenting a petition from Taunton against the introduction of French silks, expressed a hope that the subject would undergo discussion at an early period, seeing that hundreds and thousands of individuals anticipated ruin and starvation from the late regulations. The discussion was brought on upon a motion for a select committee made by Mr. Ellice, the member for Coventry. In seconding the motion, Mr. John Williams declared that if the authors of this measure were prepared to make the sacrifice of the existence of half a million of persons in support of an abstract theory, the strength of their resolution would only prove the quality of their hearts. "A perfect metaphysician, as Mr. Burke had observed, exceeded the devil in point of malignity and contempt for the welfare of mankind." Mr. Huskisson most triumphantly vindicated his motives, and asserted his confidence that the power and resources of the country had been increased by those measures of commercial policy which it had fallen to his lot to submit to parliament. Mr. Canning, on this occasion, came to the defence of his friend, in affirming that the doctrine and spirit which animated those who now persecuted him was the same which had embittered the life of Turgot, and consigned Galileo to the dungeons of the Inquisition—a doctrine and a spirit which had at all times been at work to stay public advancement and to roll back the tide of civilization. Very noble and impressive was one passage of Mr. Canning's speech: "Sir, I consider it to be the duty of a British statesman, in internal as well as external affairs, to hold a middle course between extremes; avoiding alike extravagances of despotism or the licentiousness of unbridled freedom; reconciling power with liberty: not adopting hasty or ill-advised experiments, or pursuing any airy and unsubstantial theories; but not rejecting, nevertheless, the application of sound and wholesome knowledge to practical affairs, and pressing, with sobriety and caution, into the service of his country, any generous and liberal principles, whose excess, indeed, may be dangerous, but whose foundation is in truth. This, sir, in my mind, is the true conduct of a British statesman; but they who resist indiscriminately all improvement as innovation may find themselves compelled at last to submit to innovations although they are not improvements."*

A distinguished statesman and writer of France has thus described the most important effect of Mr. Canning's foreign policy: "By his speeches, by his measures, in recognizing the republics of Spanish America, and in protesting boldly, though merely by word, against the entrance of the French into Spain, he soon effected a change (sooner perhaps than he would have been inclined to do if he had not found it necessary) in the foreign policy of England, and transferred her from the camp of resistance and of European order into the camp of progress and liberty."† This was the all-sufficing benefit which Mr. Canning conferred upon his country. Once fairly severed from the principles and acts of the great continental powers, and embarked upon her own course of "progress and liberty," the ultimate hopes of sanguine politicians might still be very far from immediate realization. The great problem of the union of freedom with order might be no nearer a solution in the year 1860 than in the year 1790. The "war of opinion" might have its vicissitudes of anarchy and of despotism. It might eventually seem to have been a mere flourish of eloquence, when the great orator, with "an attitude so majestic that he seemed actually to have increased in stature," exclaimed, "I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old." The representative governments of Europe which had arisen out of the dust and ashes of Napoleon's tyranny might be again trodden down by other despots. The new republics of America might for years be torn to pieces by internal commotions, and their second condition might be even worse than their first. The proud confidence of the founder and upholder of the democratic constitution of the United States might be proved fallacious, in an exhibition of arrogance as offensive as that of absolute rulers; while his belief that men enjoying in ease and security the full fruits of their industry would follow their own reason as their guide,‡ might some day be

* Twiss, "Life of Eldon," vol. ii. p. 468.
† Hansard, vol. ix. col. 1439.
‡ "Huskisson's Speeches," vol. ii. p. 249.

* Hansard, vol. xiv. cols. 854–55.
† Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 24.
‡ See Jefferson's Letter to Judge Johnson, in his "Works;" and in Tucker's "Life," vol. ii. p. 506.

held as visionary, when the action of the supreme government should be dictated by the passions of the multitude. Yet for all this we may mistrust the partisan assuming the office of the historian, when we learn that the experience of the world since the year 1819, "which was the turning-point in our policy, both foreign and domestic," has "diffused a very general doubt among thoughtful men whether the whole representative system is not a delusion;" and are told that "the ruin of industry and the destruction of property effected in Great Britain, since the manufacturing school obtained the ascendency in parliament, much exceeds anything recorded in the history of pacific legislation." * To the restoration of a convertible paper-currency, advocated by Mr. Horner and finally carried by Peel, to the retirement of England from the Quadruple Alliance, and the recognition of South American republics accomplished by Canning; to the removal of commercial restrictions and prohibitions effected by Huskisson—to these causes the ghosts of ultra-Toryism that still walk the earth and will not be laid attribute what they deem the evils which have fallen upon their country in the peaceful revolutions of the reigns of William the Fourth and Victoria. If such were the causes of that vital change in the condition of England, which enables us with an honest exultation to contrast the present with the past, doubly blessed were the partial successes of those eminent statesmen. Some thoughtful man of their day might have anticipated the sentiment of a later poet:

> "Progress is
> The law of life—man's self is not yet man!
> Nor shall I deem his object served, his end
> Attained, his genuine strength put fairly forth,
> While only here and there a star dispels
> The darkness, here and there a towering mind
> O'erlooks its prostrate fellows." †

CHAPTER CCXIX.

Negro slavery in the West Indies—The missionary case—Opening of parliament, 1825—Public prosperity—Joint-stock companies—Mining schemes—The panic in the money market—the panic arrested—Extensive failures of commercial houses—Joint-stock banks established—State of the Catholic question—Death of the Duke of York—Illness of Lord Liverpool—Negotiations previous to the choice of a minister—Mr. Canning's administration—Violent opposition to Mr. Canning in both houses—Charge against the prime minister that he had given an unconstitutional pledge to the king on the subject of Catholic emancipation—Close of the session—Death of Mr. Canning—His last ministerial act, the conclusion of a treaty on the affairs of Greece—Principles of international law laid down by Mr. Canning—List of the cabinet of Mr. Canning—Note on the negotiations which preceded Mr. Canning's premiership.

With the object of presenting a continuous view of the foreign policy of England from the period of the accession of Mr. Canning to office in 1822, we have passed over several matters of public importance to which we must now advert.

Negro slavery in the West Indies was the subject of animated debates in the House of Commons in 1823 and in 1824. The difficult question of negro emancipation in our colonies has been happily settled by a magnificent effort on the part of the government and the people. The curse of slavery no longer exists on a single rood of the vast possessions and dependencies of the British Empire. But this result could not have been attained without the persevering efforts of the same zeal which had accomplished the abolition of the slave trade. A few of the first abolitionists still remained. Younger men had joined their ranks, with the determination to banish slavery from our own colonies, and if possible to unite all Christendom in a league against the hateful traffic, which some states still openly perpetrated and others indirectly encouraged. On the 15th of May, 1823, Mr. Thomas Fowell Buxton moved as a resolution, "That the state of slavery is repugnant to the principles of the British constitution and of the Christian religion, and that it ought to be gradually abolished throughout the British colonies with as much expedition as may be found consistent with a due regard to the well-being of the parties concerned." Mr. Canning met this resolution by proposing other resolutions, to the effect that decisive measures should be taken for ameliorating the condition of the slave population of the British Colonies; that through such measures the house looked forward to such a progressive improvement in the character of the slave population as might prepare them for a participation in civil rights and privileges. Mr. Canning's proposal was unanimously agreed to by the house. The West Indian interest at home was greatly alarmed. The resident proprietors were in a state of indignant terror when the colonial secretary issued a circular which announced the determination of the British government to interfere between the owner and his slave. This circular contained an absolute prohibition to inflict the punishment of flogging under any circumstances upon female slaves, and a strong recommendation with regard to males that the whip should no longer be carried into the field and there displayed by the driver as the emblem of his authority, or employed as the ready instrument of his displeasure.* In most of the West India Islands the circular of Lord Bathurst produced only votes of indignation in their local assemblies. In Demerara the Court of Policy passed regulations in compliance with the instructions of the circular, but the negroes entertained a belief that orders had come from England for their complete emancipation. The government of the colony had previously issued a prohibition against the negroes attending divine service, except under certain conditions, in the belief that the sectaries incited them to insubordination. On the 18th of August a rising took place among some of the slaves, who imprisoned their masters but shed no blood. On the 19th martial law was proclaimed, and under sentences of courts-martial forty-seven negroes were executed, and a great number were tortured by the most merciless flogging. The colony was subjected to martial law for five months. Under this law Mr. John Smith, a missionary of the independent persuasion, was tried upon a charge of having incited the negroes to revolt, and of having concealed their intention to rise. He was convicted and sentenced to death. The governor did not venture to execute the sentence, but left the decision to the British Cabinet, who rescinded the sentence, but decreed Mr. Smith's banishment from the colony. Mr. Brougham brought the whole case before the House of Commons on the 1st of June, 1824. The missionary, who had been cast into a loathsome dungeon, in a weak state of health, had died after some weeks of severe suffering. The feeling produced at home was that of pity for the victim, and of indignation at the injustice of the court by which he was tried. The proceedings of this general court-martial, held on the 13th of October, 1823, published by the Missionary Society, displayed "a series of errors so gross as to mock belief, and of oppressions which are unexampled in the dispensation of English justice." † Mr. Brougham, in this memorable debate, uttered a solemn warning to the slaveholders: "Yet a little delay, yet a little longer of this unbearable trifling with the commands of the parent state, and she will stretch out her arm in mercy, not in anger, to those deluded men themselves; exert at last her undeniable authority; vindicate the just right and restore the tarnished honor of the English name!" In this debate Mr. Wilberforce spoke for the last time in parliament. The speech of Sir James Mackintosh was that of a statesman whose opinions were of far more practical importance than those of the too sanguine abolitionists: "I am as adverse as any one to the sudden emancipation of slaves; much out of regard to the masters, but still more, as affecting a far larger portion of mankind, out of regard to the unhappy slaves themselves. Emancipation by violence and revolt I consider as the greatest calamity that can visit a community except perpetual slavery. . . . I acknowledge that the pacific emancipation of great multitudes thus wretchedly circumstanced is a problem so arduous as to perplex and almost silence the reason of man. Time is undoubtedly necessary."

Of the six bills for the repeal of capital punishments which Sir James Mackintosh introduced in the session of 1820,‡ three eventually became laws.§ These were the only formal results of the perseverance of the legislator upon whom the mantle of Romilly had fallen. In 1822 he obtained a pledge from the house that it would proceed to a general consideration of the

* Alison, "History of Europe from the Fall of Napoleon," vol. i. p. 54 and p. 56, 1852. † Browning.

* "Annual Register," 1823, p. 130.

† Introduction to Mr. Brougham's speech in the missionary case, in his selected speeches, vol. ii. p. 116.

‡ *Ante*, p. 1130. § 1 George IV., cap. 115, 116, 117.

criminal laws in the next session. On the 21st of May, 1823, he proposed nine resolutions, which went at once to do away with capital punishment in a number of offences to which they referred. Mr. Peel, who was now secretary of state for the home department, objected to the extent of these measures. He admitted the necessity of some amendment, and intimated his intention to propose measures which should embrace several of the improvements which Sir James Mackintosh contemplated. His son has recorded that the defeat on this occasion was a signal to Sir James for surrendering the superintendence of further reforms into the hands of one whose position as a minister gave him peculiar facilities for carrying them into effect: "He lived," says his biographer, "to see the propriety of many of these very alterations acquiesced in to an extent which he dared scarcely have imagined, and which drew from him the expression, instancing the growth of opinion on these subjects, that he could almost think that he had lived in two different countries, and conversed with people who spoke two different languages." *

When the session of parliament was opened on the 3d of January, 1825, the exultation of the royal speech upon "public prosperity" was far stronger than ministerial prudence and reserve often ventured to indulge. "There never was a period in the history of this country when all the great interests of the nation were at the same time in so thriving a condition." Alas for the instability of human affairs! In the king's speech on the 2d of February, 1826, we have this sentence: "His majesty deeply laments the injurious effects which the late pecuniary crisis must have entailed upon many branches of the commerce and manufactures of the United Kingdom." The pecuniary crisis was indeed the most unexpected, the most astounding, and the most severe in its consequences, of any derangement of commercial operations ever produced by extravagant hopes and exaggerated alarms. This pecuniary crisis universally obtained the name of "The Panic." It was described by Mr. Huskisson as "such a complete suspension of all confidence as, contradistinguished from commercial distress, rendered it impossible to procure money upon even the most unobjectionable security. . . . If the difficulties which existed in the money market had continued only eight-and-forty hours longer, he sincerely believed that the effect would have been to put a stop to all dealings between man and man except by way of barter." †

There can be no doubt whatever that at the beginning of 1825 the sanguine views of the chancellor of the exchequer, which obtained for him the name of "Prosperity Robinson," were really justified by whatever was apparent in the material condition of the country. In June of that year an article appeared in the "Quarterly Review" which went very carefully into the proofs that there had scarcely ever been a time when every branch of industry had been so generally prosperous. We are taken into the country to look upon fields better cultivated than a few years before; barns and stack-yards more fully stored; horses, cows, and sheep more abundant; implements of husbandry greatly improved: in cities, towns, and villages, more numerous and better shops, and a vast increase of goods, indicating the flourishing circumstances of the community: in manufactories similar manifestations of the increase of wealth. We are then told that if we could examine the accounts of the bankers of the metropolis, and in the small as well as large provincial towns, we should find that the balances resting with them were increased to an enormous amount. The reviewer then adds: "This indeed may be fairly inferred from the low rate of interest in the floating public securities, from the prices of the funds, from the avidity with which every project for the employment of capital is grasped at, and from the general complaint, almost the only complaint heard, that there is now no way of making interest for money." ‡ Those who in all times are ready to treat such maladies in the body politic by salutary venesection were most busy and successful at the end of 1824 and the beginning of 1825. Joint-stock companies suddenly rose up, some for provident schemes of home industry, but others holding forth the prospect of enormous wealth by working the mines of South America. "All the gambling propensities of human nature were constantly solicited into action, and crowds of individuals of every description—the credulous and the suspicious—the crafty and the bold—the raw and the experienced—the intelligent and the ignorant—princes, nobles, politicians, placemen, patriots, lawyers, physicians, divines, philosophers, poets, intermingled with women of all ranks and degrees—spinsters, wives and widows—hastened to venture some portion of their property in schemes of which scarcely anything was known except the name." *

The South American mining schemes required large remittances in money, and an equal expenditure in stores and machinery for the operations to be carried on. The new South American states asked and obtained considerable loans. Speculations in goods were carried forward to an extent and with a temporary amount of profit previously unknown. The rush of purchasers to invest in coffee, in spices, in indigo, in tallow, and in cotton, with a total ignorance of everything connected with the relation of the supply to the consumption, had for a while the effect of producing a general rise of prices. Every article which had not advanced in price was soon made the subject of an exaggerated demand. Very soon after parliament had separated, cheered by the official announcement of public prosperity, a reaction commenced. The price of every article that had been the subject of this overtrading began to fall. More precipitous was the downward tendency of the loan and share market; for no dividends came from the South American loans; no remittances in the precious metals to attest that increased productiveness of the mines which was expected to arise out of the application of British capital and machinery. The rage for speculation had so penetrated into uncommercial circles, and the sober tradesman who once used to be content with the moderate profits of his own industry had so embarked his capital in rash ventures, that, when a want of confidence began to be felt, universal distrust soon succeeded. The Bank of England, which had ten millions of bullion and coin in its coffers in April, had only one million three hundred thousand pounds in November to meet the rapid drain that was going forward. The directors of the Bank of England, in their alarm, suddenly diminished their circulation to the extent of 3,500,000*l*. In the general want of confidence, the country bankers had to endure the consequences of an almost unlimited circulation of their notes, nothing loth as they had been to assist the speculative tendencies of their customers by what seemed a method so easy to themselves. The time was at hand when every man would look suspiciously upon the dirty pieces of paper which he had held to be as good as gold; and these promises to pay would travel, first slowly and then rapidly, to the banker's counter, and many who saw these obligations return to their source would ask what they had done to provoke this run upon them. In London those large balances in the hands of the bankers which the reviewer described as "ready to embrace favorable changes in the price of any commodity, or to be placed at interest as beneficial securities presented themselves," were suddenly withdrawn to meet unforeseen losses, to satisfy unexpected demands, and, in many cases, out of a selfish mistrust of the security of those depositories which had once justly received the public confidence. Selfish and short-sighted was the panic that drove men to the banker's counter, in their ignorant belief that it was his duty to have ready in his till an amount sufficient to pay the balances of every customer. On the 5th of December the banking-house of Sir Peter Pole and Company stopped payment. On the 6th the bank of Williams and Company followed. The author of this history cannot easily forget the scene which he witnessed on the morning of the 7th of December. On the night of the 6th two personal friends, partners in a country bank, who had their accounts with Williams and Company, arrived at his house in town to consult with him on the best course to be pursued in this hour of danger. It was agreed that one of the partners should immediately return home and countermand an order that had been given for the closing of the bank on the following morning. The other partner, who was a member of parliament, was to set out with the present writer to seek the assistance of friendly capitalists before the general world was astir. In the chambers in the Albany of one of the members of a city bank they found the firm assembled, deliberating by lamp-light, as many others were deliberating, while the watchman still cried the morning hour. The request for aid was made, and was as promptly answered: "We shall stop ourselves at

* "Life of Mackintosh," vol. ii. p. 391.
† "Huskisson's Speeches," vol. ii. p. 445.
‡ Vol. xxxii. p. 189.

* "Annual Register," 1824, p. 3.

nine o'clock." The two friends proceeded to Lombard Street and its neighborhood as the morning dawned. Long before the time of opening, the doors of the banking houses were surrounded by eager crowds, each struggling to be foremost, as at the entrance of a theatre. Many such doors were opened, and after the first rush some began to be ashamed of their suspicious impatience. Heads of firms stood quietly beside their clerks, sometimes smiling, with an unmistakable meaning, upon those who showed how easily are "benefits forgot;" some pointed to their title-deeds and other securities, as ready for any sacrifice to preserve their commercial honor. Before the close of the year seventy-three banks had failed, of which seven were metropolitan. The country bank in which we felt an interest was saved by the more sensible of the townsmen coming promptly forward to declare their opinion of its solvency and their resolution not to press in the hour of difficulty. This was a very general course throughout the country.

During the three weeks of alarm and misery which preceded the Christmas of 1825, the cabinet was daily deliberating upon measures to be pursued to stop the disorder and to mitigate its consequences. The bank directors came forward to lend money upon any description of property, and relaxed all their accustomed regulations for the discount of bills. The amount of mercantile bills under discount had been four millions on the 3d of November; it had increased to fifteen millions on the 29th of December. Sovereigns were coined at the mint at the unprecedented speed of 150,000 daily. At the Bank of England notes were printed with equal promptitude; for with the sanction of the cabinet it was determined that one and two pound notes which the Bank of England had called in should again be issued for temporary purposes. Still these two supplies of an unexceptionable currency could not be produced fast enough to fill up the vacuum occasioned by the almost total withdrawal of country bank-paper. An accidental circumstance solved the difficulty. A box containing about seven hundred thousand pounds of one-pound notes, which had been put aside unused, was accidentally discovered at the bank. Mr. Harman, one of the directors, stated it as his opinion that the timely issue of these notes "worked wonders—it saved the credit of the country." *

The credit of the country was saved; in other words the excessive demand for gold did not involve the danger at one time apprehended —a suspension of cash payments. The credit of the country was saved; but the destruction of private credit, the consequent ruin of many commercial firms, and the terrible struggle of others to keep their position, were wide-spread consequences of the panic of 1825. It was not till toward the end of January, 1826, that important mercantile failures began to create alarm. These failures continued to a vast extent throughout the whole year. The total number of bankruptcies in 1825 was a little above eleven hundred; in 1826 the number was nearly two thousand six hundred. The destruction of capital and credit paralyzed all the exertions of industry, and produced excessive distress among the manufacturing population. Diminished employment and lower wages, added to the loss which many who lived by their daily labor had sustained in the failure of country banks, rendered the year 1826 a very unhappy one to all those, whether wealthy or poor, whose means of support were connected with the industry of the country. Many indeed had to pay the penalty of their indulgence in wild speculation, and others had to suffer a severe retribution for their abuse of the facilities for raising money upon bills, which had gone on till the sudden crash came, and borrowers and lenders were involved in equal difficulty. One well-known example is an illustration of the dangers that always beset men of sanguine hopes, who regard their facility of creating wealth in the future as a power already realized, so as to warrant the large outlay which belongs to accumulated capital. On the 18th of December, 1825, there is this entry in the diary of Sir Walter Scott: "Rich and poor four or five times; once on the verge of ruin, yet opened a new source of wealth almost overflowing. Now to be broken in my pitch of pride, and nearly winged (unless good news should come), because London chooses to be in an uproar, and in the tumult of bulls and bears a poor inoffensive lion like myself is pushed to the wall. But what is to be the end of it? God knows; and so ends the catechism." The lion would not have been pushed to the wall in the tumult of bulls and bears in London if, in building, and planting, and furnishing, and exercising hospitality upon the most sumptuous scale, he had not only anticipated the resources of his own genius, but had incurred debts on his private account, and as a partner in a printing establishment, to the extent of nearly a hundred and fifty thousand pounds. The printing and publishing houses with which Scott was connected necessarily failed, and he failed with them. Then began the heroic period of his life, in which his great intellect received the noblest stimulus—that of a desire by his own unaided exertions to discharge the obligations which he had incurred by his former disregard of prudence and moderation. Many a man who had been bowed down by the storm might have felt the same aspiration again to stand erect, but few could have accomplished it so thoroughly as the great author, who never lost heart or hope, and in the darkest hour said, "If God grant me life and strength for a few years longer, I have no doubt that I shall redeem it all."

When the session of parliament was opened on the 2d of February, 1826, it was truly said in the royal speech that some of the causes of the evil which had occurred were beyond the reach of direct parliamentary interposition, nor could security against the recurrence of them be found unless in the experience of the sufferings which they had occasioned. But to a certain portion of the evil correctives at least, if not effectual remedies might be applied. It was desirable to place on a more firm foundation the currency and circulating credit of the country. Lord Liverpool then stated the measures which government intended to submit for the consideration of parliament. One of those measures was a regulation by which one and two pound bank-notes should be gradually withdrawn from circulation, and a metallic currency substituted for them. The other measure had reference to the exclusive privileges of the Bank of England under their charter which would not expire till 1833. Lord Liverpool said, "If the bank could be induced to give up so much of their exclusive privilege as related to country banks, and if they would accompany that surrender with a measure which would be desirable for their own sakes, namely, the establishment in some parts of the country of branches of their own institution, the effect on the general circulation of the country would, he thought, be most beneficial." The privilege of the Bank of England had prevented the establishment of any banking concern with a greater number of partners than six. Lord Liverpool said he was old enough to remember the time when there was scarcely such an institution as a country bank, except in great commercial towns, and when the transactions of the country were carried on in Bank of England notes and money obtained from London. There had been a great change. Any small tradesman, a cheesemonger, a butcher, or a shoemaker might open a country bank. The exclusive privilege of the Bank of England did not touch them. But an association of persons with fortune sufficient to carry on a banking concern with security was not permitted to do so.* The panic of 1825 produced the great measure of 1826, sanctioning the establishment of joint-stock banks; under which enactment a banking firm might include any number of partners except within sixty-five miles of London. This year was also the date of the establishment of branch banks of the Bank of England. Scotland was exempted from the prohibition of the small note currency. It is worthy of note, that during the panic not a single Scotch bank failed.

The difficulties of capitalists in the manufacturing districts produced, as their inevitable consequence, distress among the workers. In those days riot was too commonly the concomitant of distress. The popular excitement took the usual course of the days of popular ignorance—the destruction of machinery. At various places in Lancashire, from the 23d to the 30th of April, one thousand power-looms were destroyed, with the old accompaniments of reading the Riot Act and calling out the military. At Trowbridge the populace, who found potatoes dearer in their market than on the previous week, believing themselves injured by the monopolists of vegetables, attacked all the standings of the market gardeners and country butchers, so effectually doing their work that they scared away for some time all those who kept down the prices of the town dealers by competition. There were riotous proceedings and destruction of property in most places where the operatives were suffering distress.

* Porter's "Progress of the Nation."

* "Hansard," vol. xiv. col. 19.

Lamentable as such outrages must be in their effects upon the sufferers themselves, they sometimes speak with a stronger voice than the sober arguments of those who would mitigate the suffering by inquiries into its remediable causes. While the noble and the rich of Lanarkshire, in a public meeting, resolved that the distress of the working people of Glasgow was to be attributed to machinery, they and most other landed proprietors strenuously resisted any approach to a relaxation of the corn laws. The price of wheat had fallen in March below the price of January, chiefly in consequence of a belief that the government intended to release bonded wheat at a low duty. The ministers declared they had no such intention, and the average price again rose to that of the beginning of the year. The complaints and violence of the manufacturing districts alarmed the government, and at the beginning of May the release of the corn in bond was proposed and carried, with a discretionary power to admit foreign grain to the extent of five hundred thousand quarters, in the event of the next harvest proving unfavorable. These concessions were not obtained without great difficulty—without a protest on the part of the ministers that they had not and could not have any connection whatever with any measure affecting the existing system of the corn laws. "If," said Lord Eldon, "the measure pledged that house, or any man in that house, to any alteration unfavorable to the corn laws, he would be the last man to stand up as its advocate." *

At the close of the session on the 31st of May the royal intention was announced "to dissolve without delay the present parliament." It was the seventh session of that parliament. The dissolution at this early season had no reference to the state of political parties, but simply had regard to the convenience of the time for a general election. The leading question upon which men's minds would be most stirred throughout the kingdom, and especially in Ireland, would be that of Catholic emancipation. The cabinet remained in the position as to this question which it occupied in 1812, when Lord Castlereagh became one of its members. Catholic emancipation was what is called "an open question," upon the principle described by Mr. Canning—"the principle of treating it as a question out of the ordinary course of ministerial business; as one to be argued upon its own merits, such as they might appear to each individual member of the administration." † Lord Liverpool, as the head of the government, was opposed to the Catholic claims, but his opposition was qualified by the moderation of his character, and no one doubted his sincerity. Lord Eldon again and again avowed his "firm and determined purpose to support to the last our establishment in Church and State." ‡ When Mr. Canning became secretary of foreign affairs, he was unpopular with the anti-Catholic party in general, and obnoxious to the lord chancellor in particular. § Lord Eldon was, however, consoled by the decided views of Mr. Peel on this subject, whose influence with the anti-Catholic party was materially strengthened by his position as representative of the University of Oxford. Mr. Peel, although then of comparative unimportance as a political leader, was in 1818 preferred by the university as a representative of its orthodoxy, while Mr. Canning was rejected. Upon the great "open question" the party of Mr. Canning in the cabinet obtained in 1825 a majority in the House of Commons upon a bill for the repeal of disabilities, the enactment of a state provision for the Roman Catholic clergy, and the raising of the qualification of the Irish franchise from forty shillings to ten pounds. The bill passed the Commons by a majority of twenty-seven. It was rejected by the Lords by a majority of forty-eight. On the 25th of April the Duke of York, on presenting a petition from the dean and canons of Windsor, made a speech which produced an enormous sensation throughout the country, and especially from his concluding words: "My own opinions, my lords, are well known. They have been carefully formed. I cannot change them. I shall continue to act conformably to them, to whatever obloquy I may be exposed, in whatever circumstances and in whatever situation I may be placed. So help me God!" The Relief Bill had been read a second time in the House of Commons four days before this memorable declaration by the prince of the blood next the throne—the heir presumptive; but it had no doubt a great influence in producing the large majority in the House of Lords against the bill. Lord Eldon writes: "If the Duke of York's speech was imprudent, it has, nevertheless, on account of its firmness and boldness, placed him on the pinnacle of popularity." * The duke became the Protestant hero; his speech was printed in letters of gold, and zealous Protestants interpreted the words "in whatever circumstances I may be placed" as an assurance that whatever might be the dangers of the country, whatever might by the risk of a rebellion in Ireland, probably of a disruption of the union, the Duke of York, if he came to the throne, would interpret the coronation oath as his father had interpreted it. The duke, by the frankness of his character, his attention to the interests of the army, and his popular demeanor, had many friends and admirers, who nevertheless privately thought, as the lord chancellor privately wrote: "It is to be regretted that in his highly important and lofty situation he spends so many days with blacklegs and so many nights at cards." † In the session of 1826 the question of Catholic emancipation was not agitated in parliament.

On the 1st of January, 1827, the death of the Duke of York was momentarily expected. The duke died on the 5th. The lord chancellor mourned deeply over the loss of the prince, chiefly because he had great influence with the king, and in correspondence with his majesty upon political questions, and in his recommendation of proper persons to be continued or appointed ministers, was much governed in his judgment by what had been, and what he thought would be, the conduct of each person as to the Catholic claims. This was the one test of fitness for office with the Duke of York and with the lord chancellor, who thus recorded their mutual opinions. ‡ Mr. Canning was especially hateful to them at the time of the duke's illness, when the chancellor "saw a great deal of his royal highness." The foreign secretary's memorable speech of the previous 1st of December, on the subject of the aggression of Spain upon Portugal, "was regarded by the Tories as amounting to a demonstration in favor of liberalism." §

The funeral of the Duke of York took place at Windsor on the night of the 20th of January. Nothing in that ceremony was more remarkable than the mismanagement by which the cabinet ministers were marshalled by the heralds in the nave of St. George's Chapel two hours before the arrival of the funeral procession. The night was bitterly cold. As we ourselves looked down from the organ loft upon the greatest in the land, thus doomed to stand upon the unmatted pavement, shivering and shifting their uneasy positions, we observed the oldest man of the cabinet taking very wise precautions for his personal comfort and safety. One who was by the side of Mr. Canning attributes to his kindness of heart a suggestion to the chancellor that he should lay down his cocked hat and stand upon it. ‖ The chancellor's health was preserved by this precaution. The funeral of the duke proved fatal to Mr. Canning. He caught a cold there which resulted in an illness from which he never really recovered. ¶

The removal from the active concerns of life of a public man more immediately important to the nation very soon followed the death of the Duke of York. On the 16th of February Lord Liverpool moved an address to the king, expressive of the concurrence of the Peers in a message recommending a provision for the Duke and Duchess of Clarence. The next morning the servant of the prime minister, going into his sitting-room after breakfast, found him senseless on the floor in a fit of apoplexy. On the 18th Lord Eldon thus expressed his opinion as to the results of this event: "His life is very uncertain, and it is quite certain that as an official man he is no more. Heaven knows who will succeed him." **

The hopeless illness of Lord Liverpool must have been a heavy blow to Mr. Canning, whatever prospect might have opened to him of taking that post in the state which might be called his by inheritance. The fatal stroke of apoplexy broke up a friendship of forty years between the two statesmen. Immediately after the funeral of the Duke of York they were together at Bath, telling stories of their early years, and amusing each other with recounting all sorts of fun

* "Hansard," vol. xv. col. 1375.
† Ibid., vol. xii. col. 491.
‡ Twiss, "Life of Lord Eldon," vol. ii. p. 538.
§ Ibid., p. 466.

* Twiss, "Life of Lord Eldon," vol. ii. p. 547.
† Ibid., vol. ii. p. 547. ‡ Ibid., p. 581. § Ibid., p. 578.
‖ Stapleton, "George Canning and his Times," p. 578.
¶ Ibid. ** Twiss, vol. ii. p. 583.

and adventures.* They were college friends at Christ Church. They entered the House of Commons together in 1792. They differed, as leading members of the same cabinet, only upon one point of policy—that of Catholic emancipation. The moderation of Lord Liverpool prevented that difference operating in the slightest degree against the cordial support of his friend's liberal foreign policy, and that support of the prime minister carried the foreign secretary through the opposition which otherwise might have overwhelmed him. This prop was gone, and he must now trust to his own resources to contend with or to propitiate jealous colleagues, or retire at once from the position which he had won by his administrative talents and his unrivalled eloquence. The Catholic question was the chief barrier which opposed his natural claim to be the head of a ministry such as existed under Lord Liverpool. It was a time when the advocates and the opposers of relief to the Catholics would be pitted against each other, and no possible doubt could be entertained of the consistency with which the leaders of each party would maintain their opinions. On the 5th of March Sir Francis Burdett had proposed a resolution, "That this house is deeply impressed with the expediency of taking into consideration the laws imposing civil disabilities on his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, with a view to their relief." In the adjourned debate on the 6th Mr. Secretary Peel and Mr. Secretary Canning were distinctly marshalled against each other; and each, without any direct personal allusions, sufficiently expressed his own views for the guidance of his followers. Mr. Peel, alluding to the death of the Duke of York and the incapacity of Lord Liverpool, declared that he had now an opportunity of showing his adherence to those tenets which he had formerly espoused—of showing that he stood by his opinions when the influence and authority which might have given them currency was gone, "and when it was impossible, he believed, that in the mind of any human being he could stand suspected of pursuing his principles with any view to favor or personal aggrandizement." † The biographer of Sir Robert Peel, his diplomatic friend and ardent admirer, says that this language did not meet with entire credence, it being a prevalent opinion that as Mr. Canning was growing daily in influence with the Liberal party, Mr. Peel was anxious on his side to secure to himself the firm support of the Tories, "in order to raise himself eventually to the head of the government." ‡ Mr. Canning, in his reply, glanced with a very intelligible meaning at the consequences that would result from throwing away any chance of improving the condition of Ireland, if a ministry wholly anti-Catholic should carry into effect the doctrine of Mr. Peel, that the troubles and difficulties of that country should be met by firmness and decision: "Firmness and decision, sir, are admirable qualities; but they are virtues or vices according as they are used. I will not take them in the unfavorable sense in which they have been taken generally, by the ears which have heard them this night; for if I did I should not envy the hand on which would devolve the task of carrying such a system into effect." § The king had quickly to determine upon his choice, not of either of the principles avowed by these two parliamentary leaders, but of the possibility of reconciling those differences of opinion under a premiership which might allow the continuance of that system of compromise which made the Catholic question an open one for the cabinet. The king consulted the Duke of Wellington, Mr. Peel, and Mr. Canning. These ministers had repeated conferences with each other, but no solution of the difficulty could be arrived at. There was no one to be found, either pro-Catholic or anti-Catholic, who could be placed at the head of the government with the same power and influence as Lord Liverpool had exercised for continuing the system of compromise. Mr. Canning saw the difficulty, and offered to retire if the king could form an administration wholly composed of persons thinking as the king himself thought. His majesty did not see the possibility of maintaining such a ministry; and finally, on the 10th of April, gave his commands to Mr. Canning to prepare, with as little delay as possible, a plan for the reconstruction of the administration. ‖

On the 12th of April a new writ for the borough of Newport was moved in the House of Commons, in consequence of the acceptance by Mr. Canning of the office of first lord of the treasury. At the same time it was agreed that the house should adjourn till the 1st of May. During this interval the greatest excitement prevailed, not only among political partisans, but in every circle in which the characters and opinions of public men formed subjects of discussion. The commanding talents and the liberal policy of Mr. Canning produced a very extended hope that he would be able to maintain his great position against the attacks of his numerous enemies. At this time Lord Eldon wrote, "The whole conversation in this town is made up of abusive, bitterly abusive, talk of people about each other—all fire and flame; I have known nothing like it." * It was pretty generally known that the offers of Mr. Canning to six of his late colleagues in the cabinet had been either contemptuously or civilly rejected. Those of his colleagues who resigned their offices before or on the 12th were, the lord chancellor, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Westmoreland, Lord Bathurst, Lord Bexley, and Mr. Peel. Mr. Canning went into the king's closet and said, presenting these letters of resignation to the king, "Here, sire, is that which disables me from executing the orders I have received from you respecting the formation of a new administration. It is now open to your majesty to adopt a new course." The king gave Mr. Canning his hand to kiss, and the minister had to look around for new supporters. Lord Bexley afterward withdrew his resignation. Lord Melville retired from the office of first lord of the admiralty, and the Duke of Clarence was appointed lord high-admiral. The Duke of Wellington, contrary to the desire of the king and his minister, subsequently resigned, in addition to his seat in the cabinet, his office of commander-in-chief. When the houses met, after the Easter recess, on the 1st of May, Mr. Canning had completed the formation of his ministry.† On that day all the avenues to the House of Commons were crowded by persons anxious to catch a glimpse of the minister so beloved and trusted, so feared and hated. He walked up the old staircase which led to the lobby with a firm and agile step, and one of the crowd, at least, who looked upon his radiant face thought of Burke's famous description of Conway, "hope elevated and joy brightened his crest." ‡ The House of Commons on that night presented an unusual spectacle. Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Tierney sat immediately behind the minister. Mr. Brougham took his seat on the ministerial side, with other members who three weeks previously had sat on the benches of opposition. In the House of Peers Lord Lyndhurst was on the woolsack. Three new peers took the oaths, Viscount Goderich (late Mr. Robinson), Lord Plunkett, and Lord Tenterden. Mr. Peel on that night made a most elaborate exposition of the causes which had led to the resignation of himself and other members of the late government. There was no acrimony in his studied oration. Mr. Canning had the gratifying assurance from Mr. Brougham, who in the eminent position which he had won had the right to speak the sentiments of a large and powerful body, that the new government should have his support, without the possibility of his taking office himself. Mr. Canning made his explanation calmly as befitted his great place. He could scarcely then have been prepared for the fury of the tempest with which he was soon to be assailed. In the House of Commons he, with his friend Huskisson by his side, was well able to hold his ground against any assailant. Mr. Peel did not offer any opposition to the minister which could imply a difference of opinion amounting to personal hostility. A few of the immediate friends of Mr. Peel were not so guarded in joining what has been termed "a teasing opposition." Some "of that species of orators called the yelpers," of whom Canning was the terror—for his "lash would have penetrated the hide of a rhinoceros" §—were perpetually pestering the minister "to give some explanation of the circumstances which led to the dissolution of the late and the formation of the present administration." Canning was contented to say, "I will not answer a single question relative to the late transactions, unless it be brought forward as a motion." Mr. Brougham steadily supported Mr. Canning in this determination, declaring that such questions were really suggested for the sake o

* Stapleton, p. 580. † "Hansard," vol. xvi. col. 980.
‡ Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 28.
§ "Hansard," vol. xvi. col. 1007.
‖ See note at the end of this chapter.

* Twiss, vol. ii. p. 588.
† We give, at the end of this chapter, a list of the administration as it stood on the 1st of May, and as it was modified before the close of the session. ‡ See *ante*, vol. vi. p. 853.
§ Scott, Diary in Lockhart's "Life," vol. vii.

exciting unfair and irregular discussions. Alluding to the same tactics that had been practised in another place, he could only express his unfeigned regret that a prayer that he had heard on the previous Sunday had not hitherto been fulfilled—that it had not yet pleased Divine Providence "to endure all the nobility with grace, wisdom, and understanding." Such an enlightenment might have saved a great statesman from what appeared to many as a blot upon his otherwise high-minded career. One of the most judicious politicians of another country has spared us the pain of expressing our own opinions upon the conduct of the most distinguished among the Whigs: "Attacked in the House of Peers by Lord Grey with *haughty and contemptuous violence*, Mr. Canning had been but feebly defended by his unskilful and intimidated friends in that house; and he was so much wounded at this that for a moment, it is said, he entertained the idea of resigning his seat in the House of Commons and obtaining a peerage, that he might have an opportunity of vindicating his policy and honor in the House of Lords."* He might have calmly said, with Lear, "The little dogs and all, see, they bark at me;" but "tooth that poisons if it bite" would leave a rankling wound. The Duke of Newcastle might call upon every friend of his country to aid in dispossessing "one who was the most profligate minister who had ever been placed in power." Such impotent rage carried its own antidote. But Lord Grey was of another order of minds. Lord Holland stood up boldly to defend himself and his friends from the charge of having given an unworthy support to the minister thus assailed by the strong and the impotent. He showed, as Mr. Brougham had shown, how the liberal opinions of Mr. Canning claimed support from those who professed similar principles.

The attack by Lord Grey upon Mr. Canning's foreign policy was not difficult of refutation. But there was one point of material importance upon which Lord Grey must have known that he could not receive an answer when he said, "I ask of the noble lords opposite, or of any one of them, to answer me, aye or no, has or has not an engagement been entered into not to bring forward the Catholic question as a measure of government?" He added, "If such an engagement have been made, that at once settles my mind, because it is a principle which I have always opposed. It is nothing less than that which in 1807 I rejected, and to which nothing shall ever induce me to agree."† It is possible that the somewhat loose manner in which George IV. was accustomed to talk of state affairs to his familiar friends, and which thus became the tattle of the court circle, might have warranted Lord Grey in more than insinuating against the conduct of the prime minister that he had given an unconstitutional pledge such as had been refused by the ministry of which Lord Grey himself formed a part in 1807.‡ But the confidences of his majesty extended beyond those among whom he passed a life of gentle dalliance and practical jokes at the lodge in Windsor Great Park. The Duke of Buckingham, whom he had raised to the loftiest eminence of the peerage, relates, in the "Private Diary" which the lapse of thirty-five years has brought to light, that the king unbosomed himself to him in the most unreserved manner as to the recent changes of administration. The duke was very wroth with Mr. Canning, who had not propitiated him by the offer of some great office, although the Grenvilles were represented in the cabinet; and he was himself friendly to Catholic emancipation. The conversation turned upon this absorbing question: "Canning," said the king, "has pledged himself never to press me upon that subject, and never to be a member of the cabinet that does." His majesty added, with an oath, that the moment his minister "changed his line he goes."§ We can understand how the king's uncontradicted talk might have provoked the indignation of Lord Grey against one whom he deemed ready to sacrifice honor for power. Two years afterward his majesty repeated the same narrative of what passed in the closet when there was no witness present. On the 28th of March, 1829, when Lord Eldon was using his influence over his sovereign to prevent the Catholic Relief Bill proposed by the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel becoming law, the ex-chancellor makes this entry in his diary: "His majesty employed a very considerable portion of time in stating all that he represented to have passed when Mr. Canning was made minister, and expressly stated that Mr. C. would never, and that he had engaged that he would never, allow him to be troubled about the Roman Catholic question."* In the "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel"—those most interesting revelations published by the trustees of his papers—this passage from the diary of Lord Eldon is quoted by him for the purpose of appending to it a vindication of the character of the man of whom Mr. Peel said, in the great debate on the Catholic Relief Bill in 1829—wishing that Mr. Canning were alive to reap the harvest which he sowed, and to enjoy the triumph which he gained—"I was on terms of the most friendly intimacy with my right honorable friend, down even to the day of his death." The testimony to the political integrity of Mr. Canning upon the question of Catholic emancipation in 1827 is as follows: "There must, no doubt, have been some misapprehension on the king's mind as to the engagement or intentions of Mr. Canning with regard to the Catholic question. I feel very confident that Mr. Canning would not have accepted office having entered into any engagement, or given any assurances, which would have the effect of placing his government and himself in that relation to George the Fourth, with respect to the Catholic question, in which preceding ministers had stood to George the Third."† What Sir Robert Peel concluded to have been "a misapprehension on the king's mind" has been designated by a coarser term in the "Private Diary" of the Duke of Buckingham, which contains these entries: July 17th—received a letter from George [Lord Nugent]—"He treats the pledge of Canning not to press the Catholic question as a lie of the king's." . . . July 19th, "I had a long letter from George, strongly urgent against the line which I have adopted, and declaring the king to tell falsehoods, and to intend to deceive."‡

During the two months in which the session was continued after the reassembling of parliament on the 1st of May, the irregular discussions in both houses left but little opportunty for real progress in the nation's business. The personal hostility to Mr. Canning, which the Duke of Wellington almost acknowledged, was something strange in parliamentary tactics, and some attributed it to the traditional jealousy of the aristocracy, whether Whig or Tory, that a plebeian—an adventurer—should presume to take the helm of the state instead of one of their "order." Others ascribed the personal attacks of many peers and commoners to that hatred of genius too often entertained by mediocrity of understanding. The incessant exhibition of this spirit rendered it impossible for the minister either to make a triumphant display of his oratorical power or to carry through any measure of great public importance. He spoke for the last time on the 18th of June, on the subject of the corn trade. The session was closed on the 2d of July.

When men were speculating in February on the probable successor of Lord Liverpool, Lord Eldon wrote, "I should suppose Canning's health would not let him undertake the labor of the situation; but ambition will attempt anything."§ The prorogation of parliament did not produce the usual effect of comparative relaxation upon the toil-worn minister. Four years previous Mr. Canning, Mr. Huskisson, and Mr. Robinson were described after a prorogation as "boys let loose from school." The American minister who was thus astonished at the deportment of grave statesmen was more astonished when the secretary for foreign affairs, after dinner, proposed that the company should play at the game of "Twenty Questions." Complete relaxation, however impaired may be the health of a prime minister, is one of the few things which he is utterly powerless to command. Mr. Canning had an interview with the king on the 30th of July, when his majesty was so struck by the looks of the premier, to whom he had given a cordial support, that he sent his own physician to attend him. The next day Mr. Canning had to work in Downing Street. The Duke of Devonshire had lent him his villa at Chiswick, in the belief that change of air would restore him. He occupied the bedroom in which Fox had died. On the 31st a few friends had dined with him; but he retired early. The suffering from internal inflammation which he felt on that last night of July terminated in

* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 31.
† "Hansard," vol. xvii. col. 724. ‡ *Ante*, vol. vii. p. 1066.
§ "Private Diary of Richard Duke of Buckingham," 1862, vol. i. pp. 13 and 14.

* Twiss, "Life of Lord Eldon," vol. iii. p. 82.
† "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. i. p. 275.
‡ "Private Diary," vol. i. p. 21. See note at end of this chapter.
§ Twiss, vol. ii. p. 583.

his death on the 8th of August. He was buried in Westminster Abbey on the 16th, in the most private manner. But the universal display of sorrow told more than any funereal pomp that a great man had departed.

The settlement of a treaty between Great Britain, France, and Russia, on the subject of the affairs of Greece, was the latest as it was among the most important of the official acts of Mr. Canning. That treaty was signed on the 7th of July, 1827. Forty years had elapsed since, a schoolboy at Eton, he had written a very eloquent poem on "The Slavery of Greece." He painted the ancient glories of her arms and her arts; he evoked the great names of her philosophers and her poets, to point the contrast of her glories fading into shame—servitude binding in its galling chain those who had stood up against Asia's millions—cities mouldering—the fallen column on the dusty ground—worst of all, the sons of the freedom-breathing land sighing in abject bondage, groaning at the labors of the oar or of the mine, trembling before

"The glitt'ring tyranny of Othman's sons." *

The position of Greece since 1821 was such as to arouse the deepest sympathies of every Englishman who knew anything of her ancient story. The Greeks in that year, seizing the opportunity of a war between the sultan and Ali Pasha, rose in revolt. A proclamation issued by the archbishop of Patras produced a general insurrection. For six years a cruel and devastating war had gone on, in which the Greeks, at first successful, had more and more quailed before the greater force which the Porte was able at last to bring against them, by employing the disciplined troops of the Pasha of Egypt. The story of this war has a peculiar interest to us in connection with the individual efforts of Englishmen to promote this struggle for freedom; of Byron, who died at Missolonghi with "Greece" on his lips; of Cochrane, whose hopes of rousing the Greek leaders to decisive and unanimous action came to an end when all was lost at the great battle before Athens. In September, 1826, the Divan having obstinately refused to enter into negotiations with those over whom they considered themselves the absolute masters, those "who form part of the nations inhabiting the countries conquered ages ago by the Ottoman arms" †—the British government proposed to Russia that the Porte should be apprised that the result of this obstinacy would be the recognition of the independence of Greece. What, according to international laws, should be the basis of this recognition was clearly laid down by Mr. Canning. The Turks were to be told that Great Britain and Russia "would look to Greece with an eye of favor, and with a disposition to seize the first occasion of recognizing, as an independent state, such portion of her territory as should have freed itself from Turkish dominion; provided that such state should have shown itself substantially capable of maintaining an independent existence, of carrying on a government of its own, of controlling its own military and naval forces, and of being responsible to other nations for the observance of international laws and the discharge of international duties." Such was the exposition which the British government then adopted, in the affairs of Greece, of the principles which should determine the recognition of the independence of a revolting or separating state. The principle of what should constitute a belligerent was laid down with equal clearness by Mr. Canning at an earlier stage of this conflict: "The character of belligerency is not so much a principle as a fact. A certain degree of force and consistency acquired by any mass of population engaged in war entitles that population to be treated as a belligerent, and even if their title were questionable renders it the interest, well understood, of all civilized nations so to treat them. For what is the alternative? A power or community (whichever it may be called) which is at war with another, and which covers the sea with its cruisers, must either be acknowledged as a belligerent or treated as a pirate."

Upon the conclusion of the treaty of July, 1827, it was agreed that instructions should be sent to the representatives at Constantinople of the three contracting powers that they should present a joint declaration to the Divan, stating that as the war of extermination had been prolonged for six years, producing results shocking to humanity, and inflicting intolerable injury on the commerce of all nations, it was no longer possible to admit that the fate of Greece concerned exclusively the Ottoman Porte. They were to offer their mediation between the Sublime Porte and the Greeks to put an end to the war, to settle by amicable negotiation the relations which ought for the future to exist between them, and to propose that all acts of hostility should be suspended by an armistice. A similar proposition should be made to the Greeks. A month was to be given to the Ottoman Porte to make known its determination. If no answer were returned, or an evasive answer were given, the Divan was to be informed that the three powers would themselves interfere to establish an armistce. Although the admirals of the allied squadrons of the three powers were to be instructed to take coercive measures to enforce an armistice, they were to be warned against any hostile step which would be contrary to the pacific character which the three powers were desirous to impart to their interference.

Such were the views of a statesman who, ardently desiring the preservation of peace, would not hesitate to enforce the true principles of international law that should govern the recognition of a belligerent power and of a state claiming to be independent. These were principles which would remain for our guidance in all future questions involving a similar exercise of discretion and forbearance, but calling for resolute action when it might become necessary to assert the right of civilized communities to decide upon such questions without reference to the passions and prejudices of the contending parties. Mr. Canning was most anxious, in the terrible conflict between Turks and Greeks, to avoid any course of action which would lead to direct hostilities, and especially to avert the possible danger of a policy of absolute neutrality on the part of Great Britain which might have placed the Turkish Empire at the feet of Russia. By completing the treaty with Russia and France, he secured that co-operation which would prevent that separate action of Russia which would have necessarily resulted in her own aggrandizement. All the complicated previous negotiations for the pacification of Greece had reference to this difficulty.

THE CABINET OF MR. CANNING.

Earl of Harrowby	President of the Council; succeeded by the Duke of Portland.
Lord Lyndhurst	Lord Chancellor.
Duke of Portland	Lord Privy Seal; succeeded by the Earl of Carlisle.
Right Hon. George Canning	First Lord of the Treasury, and Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Right Hon. W. S. Bourne	Secretary of State for the Home Department; succeeded by the Marquess of Lansdowne.
Viscount Dudley and Ward	Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Viscount Goderich	Secretary of State for the Department of War and Colonies.
Right Hon. C. W. W. Wynn	President of the Board of Control.
Lord Bexley	Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.
Right Hon. William Huskisson	Treasurer of the Navy, and President of Board of Trade.
Viscount Palmerston	Secretary at War.
Right Hon. George Tierney	Master of the Mint.
Earl of Carlisle	First Commissioner of Woods and and Forests; succeeded by the Right Hon. W. S. Bourne.

NOTE ON THE NEGOTIATIONS WHICH PRECEDED MR. CANNING'S PREMIERSHIP.

The editor of the "Private Diary" of the Duke of Buckingham announces that portion which relates to an audience of George IV. as of singular interest: "such an exposition of ministerial intrigue does not exist in any published work." We are constrained to believe that the whole of the exposition, whether relating to the Duke of Wellington, Mr. Peel, or Mr. Canning, is, for the most part, a figment of the king's. We have noticed in the text what his majesty said as to a pledge given by Mr Canning We have a few words to write upon what the Duke of Buckingham accepted as a story clearly made out "against Peel and the Duke of Wellington, the truth of which I cannot doubt." Twice, said the king, he saw the Duke of Wellington, and twice the duke said that "he could not be his minister"—"the duke persevered in excluding himself." The king went on to say that "at last Peel, who had kept a very high and mighty bearing," agreed to meet Canning, and after this meeting wrote to him to say that one had been suggested as premier whose name he did not like to put in writing; that delays intervened, and that at last "Peel came to the king and thun-

* "Microcosm," 1787, No. 5.
† Manifesto of the Ottoman Porte, 1827.

dered out the Duke of Wellington's name," upon which his majesty said that "having been refused twice by the duke himself," he would not, "in the eleventh hour, have a man crammed down his throat." Peel then refused to act with Canning; the king refused to accept Wellington; named Canning as his minister; and then the resignations took place.

The circumstances thus recorded and credited are totally at variance with the statements and documents published by Mr. Stapleton in 1859. Mr. Canning had a long audience of the king on the 27th of March, the particulars of which are minutely detailed in a paper dictated by him to his secretary. Between the 31st of March and the 6th of April he had no communication with the king on the subject of the cabinet arrangements; but he had frequent conferences with the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel. On the 9th of April Mr. Canning, *by the king's command*, saw Mr. Peel, "who came for the purpose of stating the name of an individual whose appointment as premier Mr. Peel conceived likely to solve all difficulties." That individual was the Duke of Wellington. Under him Mr. Canning declined to serve, as the duke "for years had been combating in the cabinet Mr. Canning's system of foreign policy." On the next day the king gave his commands to Mr. Canning to prepare a plan for the reconstruction of the administration. The "story clearly made out against Mr. Peel and the Duke of Wellington," like many other stories, is destroyed by a little cross-examination. So far from the king refusing the Duke of Wellington, he sent Mr. Peel to Mr. Canning to endeavor to induce him to accept the duke as the anti-Catholic head of the ministry.

CHAPTER CCXX.

India—Retrospect from 1807 to 1826—Lord Minto governor-general—Mutiny of officers at Madras—Trade of India thrown open—Government of the Marquess of Hastings—War with Nepaul—War with the Pindarees—The war terminated, and the Mahratta confederacy broken up—Conquest of Ceylon—Singapore—Malacca—Lord Amherst governor-general—War with the Birman empire—Campaign of Sir Archibald Campbell—Peace with the Birmese—Bombardment and capture of Bhurtpore—Regulation of the press in India—The case of Mr. Buckingham—Material progress of British India.

At the opening of the session of parliament at the end of 1826 the houses were informed of the termination of war in the Birmese territories, and of the conclusion of a peace highly honorable to the British arms and to the councils of the British government in India. From 1824 there had been war with the Birman empire, Lord Amherst being governor-general. From 1813 to 1822, during the government of the Marquess of Hastings, there had been war with the Nepaulese and war with the Pindarees, the latter war involving changes in the relations of the British power with native princes, which eventually led to their complete submission. From 1807 to 1812 there had been war with the Rajah of Travancore; there had been mutinies in the native army; and, by a series of hostile operations, the British had become the sole European power in India. Lord Minto was governor-general during this first period, succeeding Lord Cornwallis after the very brief term of his government.* We propose to take a brief survey of the events of this period of twenty years, during which time there had been important changes in the relations of the state to the East India Company, and a general impatience among the commercial community at the continuance of their monopoly, and at the somewhat arbitrary regulations by which it was deemed necessary to uphold their exclusive privileges. But there had never been a year in which the British empire in India was not extending and consolidating, and the same courage, fortitude, and perseverance evinced in military enterprises which first laid the foundations of that empire, and would still have to sustain it through years of danger and difficulty. Nor let us forget that, during these twenty years in which the native powers adverse to our rule and influence were either crushed or propitiated, some efforts were made to accomplish a more complete subjection of the native populations by a civil rule of justice and beneficence, by repressing, as far as was safe, the barbarous rites of their idolatries and superstitions, and by winning them over to some possible recognition of Christian principles by encouraging rather than repressing efforts for their conversion, and by the establishment of an Anglican Church, whose first bishops were tolerant as well as zealous, active in well-doing, of high talent, and of blameless life.

* *Ante*, vol. vii. p. 1055.

At the beginning of 1807 India was at peace. On the death of the Marquess Cornwallis the powers of the governor-general were temporarily exercised by Sir George Barlow, who was subsequently intrusted with the full authority of his post by the court of directors. The Grenville administration had just come into office, and they wished to bestow the appointment upon one of their own supporters, and especially upon some nobleman. The harmony that had hitherto subsisted between the two independent bodies in whom was vested the government of India was now interrupted. The ministry who had at first consented to the continuance in office of Sir George Barlow recalled him, by an exercise of the royal prerogative, in direct opposition to the board of directors. The debates in parliament on this subject were continued and violent. The conflict was finally settled by the appointment of Lord Minto. The tranquillity of his government was after a while seriously disturbed by an outbreak against the power of the company at Travancore. There was war against the rajah of this state, which originated in a dispute between his dewan, or chief minister, and the British Resident. His troops were beaten in the field during 1808, and the lines of Travancore being stormed at the beginning of 1809, and other forts captured, relations of amity between the company and the rajah were restored. A more serious danger arose out of a circumstance which appears now among the almost incredible things of the past. The officers of the Madras army, who had long been stirred up to discontent, had mutinied, and Lord Minto, in August, 1809, sailed for Madras to quell this extraordinary insubordination of British officers. There were various and contradictory regulations existing in the several presidencies. There were inequalities in the rate of allowances. At Madras, what the council termed "a very dangerous spirit of cabal" had been pointed out as early as March, 1807, by the council to the Court of Directors. There was there an officer high in command, Lieutenant-Colonel St. Leger, who was described in the dispatch of the council as "the champion of the rights of the company's army." Colonel St. Leger, as well as other officers, was suspended by an order of the 1st of May, and then open mutiny burst out at Hyderabad, Masulipatam, Seringapatam, and other places. On one occasion only was blood shed in this extraordinary revolt. Many of these officers were very young men, who were incited to acts of insubordination by the example of their seniors. Brave as were the British officers in the field, their exclusiveness and assumption of superiority were offensive to civilians and dangerous in their intercourse with the natives. These misguided men gradually returned to habits of obedience. In September Lord Minto published an amnesty, with the exception of eighteen officers, nearly all of whom chose to resign rather than to abide the judgment of a court-martial. It now became the wish of all to obliterate the painful remembrance of the past. During this alarming period, in which the mutiny of the officers might have led to the entire disorganization of the sepoy army, the king's troops manifested the most entire obedience to the orders of the governor-general. Lord Wellington, engrossing as was his duty in Spain in December, 1809, wrote from Badajoz to Colonel Malcolm, to express how much he felt on what had passed in the Madras establishment: "I scarcely recognize in those transactions the men for whom I entertained so much respect and had so much regard a few years back." Those transactions, he said, were "consequences of the first error—that is, of persons in authority making partisans of those placed under them, instead of making all obey the constituted authorities of the state."*

During the administration of Lord Minto a number of successful operations were undertaken in the Eastern Archipelago, which, in 1810, gave us possession of Amboyna and the Banda isles, of the island of Bourbon, and of the Mauritius. The most important of these conquests was the rich island of Java, which, after a severe battle with the Dutch troops near the capital, capitulated in 1810. Sir Stamford Raffles, who was appointed lieutenant-governor of Java, described it as "the other India." It passed out of our hands at the peace—a circumstance attributed by many to the complete ignorance of the British government of the great value of this possession. The policy of the Court of Directors was to maintain peace as long as possible upon the continent of India, and thus the depredations of the Pindarees and the Nepaulese were not met by the governor-general

* "Dispatches," vol. v. p. 330.

with any vigorous measures of repression. He demanded redress of the Rajah of Nepaul for the outrages of his people, but he did not make any more effectual demonstration to compel a less injurious conduct. His diplomacy had for its main object to prevent the establishment of the French in the peninsula. He concluded treaties with the Ameers of Scinde, and with the King of Caubul, of which the terms of friendship were that they should restrain the French from settling in their territories. With Persia, where France was endeavoring to establish her influence, a treaty was concluded, binding the sovereign to resist the passage of any European force through his country toward India.

The usual term of a governor-general's residence being completed, Lord Minto resigned in 1813, and proceeded to England. He came at a time when a material alteration was at hand in the position of the East India Company. By the statute of Queen Anne, and by successive acts of parliament, the company had the exclusive privilege, as regarded English subjects, of trading to all places east of the Cape of Good Hope, as far as the Straits of Magalhaens. In March, 1813, the House of Commons resolved itself into a committee to consider the affairs of the East India Company. The government proposed that the charter of the company should be renewed for twenty years, during which term they should retain the exclusive trade to China, but that the trade to India should be thrown open on certain conditions. The government also proposed to appoint a bishop for India and three archdeacons. The committee examined various witnesses. The first witness was Warren Hastings, then eighty years of age. He expressed his decided opinion that the settlement of Europeans would be fraught with danger to the peace of the country and the security of the company, and that the trade between India and England, as then regulated, was far more beneficial than if perfectly free. On the subject of the propagation of Christianity in India and the proposed episcopal establishment, his evidence is described as having evinced "a most philosophic indifference." * The debates in both houses on the resolutions occupied four months of the session. A bill was finally passed by which the trade to India was thrown open as proposed, the territorial and commercial branches of the company's affairs were separated, and the king was empowered to create a bishop of India and three archdeacons, to be paid by the company.

Lord Minto was succeeded as governor-general by the Earl of Moira, afterward Marquess of Hastings, who took possession of the government on the 4th of October, 1813. During 1814 and 1815 there was war between the British and the Nepaulese. This is sometimes called the Gorkha war, from that portion of Nepaul which surrounded Gorkha, the capital, and which was originally subject to the separate rule of one of the princes of the Nepaul dynasty. The Gorkhas, at the period of the government of the Marquess of Hastings, were subjecting all the smaller states to their dominion, and were able to maintain an army of twelve thousand disciplined men, who were clothed and accoutred like the British sepoys. As they advanced toward the British possessions on the northern frontier, they manifested a desire to try their strength against the company's troops, and exhibited their ill-will in 1814 by attacking two police-stations in the districts of Goruckpoor and Sarun, and by massacring all the troops in the garrisons there. The first operations of the British troops were unsuccessful; but in 1815 Sir David Ochterlony was enabled to dislodge the Gorkhas from their hill-forts, and to compel their commander, Ammer Singh, to capitulate. A treaty of peace was concluded at the end of 1815, but its ratification by the rajah being withheld, a large British army advanced to Khatmandu, the present capital of Nepaul. The treaty was ratified and the war concluded at the beginning of 1816. Some portions of territory were ceded to the company; but for the most part the chiefs who had been expelled by the conquering Gorkhas were restored to their ancient possessions.

The province of Malwa was the chief seat of a body of freebooters, the Pindarees, who carried on a war of devastation with peaceful neighbors, and were more formidable from their want of that political organization which constitutes a state. They lived in separate societies of one or two hundred, governed each by its chief, but they were always ready to combine under one supreme chief for the purposes of their marauding expeditions. In 1814 fifteen thousand horsemen were assembled on the north bank of the Nerbudda, under a leader named Cheetoo. In October, 1815, they seized the opportunity of our troops being engaged in the Nepaulese war to cross the Nerbudda, and having plundered and devastated a territory of our ally, the Nizam of the Deccan, recrossed the Nerbudda to prepare for another raid with a greater force. Between the 5th of February and the 17th of May, 1816, they had again collected an immense booty, with which they retired, not only having devastated the lands of our allies, but within the company's frontiers having plundered more than three hundred villages, and put to death or tortured more than four thousand individuals. These fierce and successful attacks of the Pindarees were not solely instigated by their own desire for the rich booty of peaceful provinces. They would scarcely have ventured to defy the British power had they not been secretly supported by a confederacy of Mahratta potentates. The governor-general had obtained certain information that the Peishwa, the Rajah of Nagpore, Scindia, Holkar the younger, and Ameer Khan, were preparing in concert with the Pindarees to invade the company's territories while our troops were engaged in the Nepaulese war. The governor-general, at the conclusion of the peace with Nepaul, applied to the authorities at home for permission to carry on the war with the Pindarees upon a great scale. Till this permission should arrive he had only to keep the Bengal army in advanced cantonments. When his warrant for extended operations did arrive, the Marquess of Hastings was ready with an army in each of the three presidencies to take the field against the Pindarees, and against all their open or secret supporters. The immensity of his preparations, says a French writer, was determined by the importance of his designs. "The governor-general took the resolution to complete the plan conceived long before and pursued without relaxation by his predecessors—the absolute conquest of the Peninsula." * Whether or no such a design, which was regarded at home as a dream of ambition, had urged the Marquess of Hastings to undertake a war of enormous magnitude, it is quite certain that the issue of that war was another most decided advance in the assertion of our supremacy, which manifestly tended to "the absolute conquest of the Peninsula."

At the end of September, 1817, orders were issued for a simultaneous movement of the army of Bengal under the command of the governor-general, of the army of the Deccan, under the command of Sir Thomas Hislop, and of various corps from different stations, each marching to points from which the Pindarees could be surrounded, and at the same time their Mahratta and other supporters prevented from uniting their forces. It is not within our limits to attempt any detail of this very complicated warfare. The war with the Pindarees was terminated in the spring of 1818, with the entire destruction or dispersion of these terrible marauders. The best historian of the events which led to this most desirable result is Sir John Malcolm, who was himself one of the most active and sagacious of the British commanders. Their complete extinction has been graphically described by him: "Within five years after their name had spread terror and dismay over all India there remained not a spot that a Pindaree could call his home. They had been hunted like wild beasts, numbers had been killed, all ruined, those who espoused their cause had fallen. Early in the contest they were shunned like a contagion—the timid villagers whom they had so recently oppressed were among the foremost to attack them." †

On the 5th of November the governor-general had extorted by the presence of his powerful army a treaty with Scindia, in which that Mahratta chief engaged to aid in the destruction of the Pindarees. That army was at this moment attacked by an enemy far more dangerous than any which it would be likely to encounter in the field. It was encamped in low ground, on the banks of a tributary of the Jumna. The Indian cholera morbus, which had broken out at Jessore, had ascended the valley of the Ganges, and reaching the camp of the main British army destroyed in little more than a week one tenth of the number there crowded together. The camp was broken up, and the army marched on in the hope of reaching some spot where the disease would be less fatal. It was the end of November before the remnant of this fine army having reached Erech, on the

* Thornton, "British Empire in India," vol. iv. p. 228.

* "Annuaire Historique," 1818, p. 357.

† Sir John Malcolm, "Memoir of Central India."

Bettwa River, the pestilence seemed to have exhaust its force. During its rage the Marquess of Hastings fully expected to be a victim; for his personal attendants were dropping all around him. Bury me in my tent, he said, lest the enemy should hear of my death, and attack my disheartened troops. Scindia had seized the opportunity, not to render aid against the Pindarees, but to invite them to come into his territory. The cholera passed away, and the governor-general hurried back to his former position to cut off the possible junction between the marauding bands and Scindia's troops. In the remaining months of 1817 and the beginning of 1818 the Mahratta confederacy was utterly broken up by the successes of the British. The Rajah of Nagpore, after a battle of eighteen hours, was defeated, and his town of Nagpore taken on the 26th of November. Holkar was beaten on the 21st of December at the battle of Meehudpoor, and peace was concluded with him on the 6th of January. The Peishwa of the Mahrattas surrendered to the English in the following June, agreeing to abdicate his throne, and become a pensioner of the East India Company.

During the period of the administration of the Marquess of Hastings Ceylon was entirely subjected to the British dominion. The Dutch had been in possession of the maritime provinces of this island from the beginning of the seventeenth century, while the interior, known as the kingdom of Kandy, was governed by native princes, with whom the Dutch were continually at war. In 1796 these maritime provinces were wrested from the Dutch by a British armament, and our establishments there were rendered more secure by the acquiescence of the King of Kandy in this occupation of the coast districts. The British administration of Ceylon was not connected with that of the East India Company; it was a distinct possession of the crown, having been formally ceded by the Treaty of Amiens. In 1815 the King of Kandy had rendered himself so obnoxious to his subjects by a series of atrocities—such as causing a mother to pound her children to death in a mortar—that his deposition took place, and the British were invited by Kandian chiefs to take possession of his dominions. The conquest of the island was thus effected, and the natives had begun to taste the value of a just and merciful rule, when, in 1817, a rebellion broke out in the eastern provinces, and was with difficulty suppressed after a costly and sanguinary warfare of two years' duration. From 1819 to 1848 complete tranquillity prevailed in that island, and its material and moral condition were greatly advanced under intelligent and zealous governors. At Singapore, in 1819, Sir Thomas Raffles established a factory on the south shore of the island, and in 1824 a cession in full sovereignty of this and the neighboring islands was obtained by purchase from a person who claimed to be King of Jahore, and was afterward raised to that throne. Malacca was ceded to the British in 1824 by treaty with the government of the Netherlands.

Had Mr. Canning become governor-general of India when his appointment as successor of the Marquess of Hastings was resolved upon, it may be doubted whether he could have carried through the policy which, as president of the Board of Control, he avowed in parliament in 1819, upon the vote of thanks to the Marquess of Hastings and the army in India: "Anxious as I am for the prosperity and grandeur of our Indian empire, I confess I look at its indefinite extension with awe. I earnestly wish that it may be possible for us to remain stationary where we are, and that what still exists of substantive and independent power in India may stand untouched and unimpaired. But this consummation, however much it may be desired, depends not on ourselves alone. Aggression must be repelled, and perfidy must be visited with its just reward. And while I join with the thinking part of the country in deprecating advance, who shall say that there is safety for such a power as ours in retrogradation?" * Of the prudence and wisdom of the theory of policy thus set forth, the nation at large, the East India Company, the great Indian administrators, never appeared to entertain the slightest doubt. But, practically, it was invariably found that without advance there would be retrogradation. It was in vain that those who led the British armies in India must have felt what Mr. Canning expressed—with how much jealousy the house and the country are in the habit of appreciating the triumphs of our arms in India; how our military operations, however successful, have always been considered as questionable in point of justice. * Lord Amherst, who in March, 1823, embarked for India as governor-general, had to pass through this almost inevitable process of entering upon a war of conquest with the most sincere desire to remain at peace. Within six or seven months after his arrival in India he had to write to a friend at home: "I have to tell you that I most unexpectedly find myself engaged in war with the King of Ava." † This was the war with the Birman empire, which involved us in hostilities from March, 1824, to February, 1826. Before the middle of the eighteenth century the name of Birman signified a great warlike race that had founded various kingdoms, among which were Siam, Pegu, Ava, and Aracan. The kingdoms of Ava and of Pegu were in a continued state of warfare, in which the Peguers were ultimately victorious. Ava had been conquered by them, when, in 1753, a man of humble origin but of great ability, who has been called "the Napoleon of the Hindo-Chinese peninsula," ‡ raised a small force, which, constantly increasing, expelled the conquerors and placed Alompra on the Birman throne. It has been remarked as equally curious and instructive that "the last restoration of the Birman Empire and the foundation of ours in India were exactly contemporaneous. Clive and Alompra made their conquests at the same moment." § For nearly seventy years the British from the Ganges and the Birmese from the Irawaddi pushed their conquests, whether by arms or negotiation, till they met. Their inevitable rivalry soon led to hostilities. The Birmese had gradually subjugated the independent states which formerly existed between their frontiers and those of the company. Lord Amherst, in the letter we have already quoted, describes how they seized an island on which we had established a small military post, and when the governor-general mildly complained to the King of Ava of this outrage, attributing it to the mistake of the local authorities, a force came down from Ava, "threatening to invade our territory from one end of the frontier to the other, and to reannex the province of Bengal to the dominions of its rightful owner, the Lord of the White Elephant."

At the beginning of April the Bengal army embarked for Rangoon, the chief seaport of the Birman dominions, situated at the embouchure of the Irawaddi—according to Lord Amherst "the Liverpool and Portsmouth of Ava." This important place was taken possession of almost without striking a blow; but the hope of the governor-general that from thence he should be able to dictate the terms of a moderate and therefore lasting peace was not very quickly realized. The British had to deal with the most warlike of their neighbors. The King of Ava called his people to arms. During the rainy season they had abundant time for preparation; and Sir Archibald Campbell, who occupied Rangoon, felt the immediate necessity of fortifying it against the probable attack of a bold and persevering enemy. An enormous pagoda, more than three hundred feet high, became a citadel, garrisoned by a battalion of European troops, and the smaller Bhuddist temples assumed the character of fortresses. During June and July the Birmese made repeated attacks upon the British positions, but were as constantly repelled. On the night of the 30th of August, when the astrologers had decided that an attack upon this sacred place would free the country from the impious strangers, a body of troops called Invulnerables advanced to the northern gateway. A terrible cannonade was opened upon these dense masses, and they fled at once to the neighboring jungle.

The Birmese were more successful in their offensive operations in Bengal. Under the command of an officer called Maha Bandoola, the Aracan army advanced to Ramoo, and completely routed a detachment of native infantry. The alarm was so great in Calcutta that the native merchants were with difficulty persuaded to remain with their families, and the peasants almost universally fled from their villages. The Birmese, however, did not advance. The British had taken some important places of the Birman territory, and Maha Bandoola was recalled by the Lord of the White Elephant for the defence of his golden empire. In December Maha Bandoola brought sixty thousand fighting men to make one overwhelming attack upon Rangoon. For seven days there was severe fighting. The Birmese troops were repeatedly driven from their stockades, and at last, when they advanced on the 7th of December for a grand attack on the

* "Hansard," vol. xxxix. col. 882.

* Hansard, vol. xxxix. col. 866.
† "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. iii. p. 316.
‡ "Annuaire Historique," 1824, p. 537.
§ "Edinburgh Review," vol. xlvii. p. 183.

great pagoda, they were driven back into their intrenchments, and after severe fighting were chased into the jungle.

In February, 1825, Sir Archibald Campbell began to move up the Irawaddi into the interior of the Birman Empire. As part of his force advanced to attack the formidable works of Donoopew, they were repulsed, and the retreat was so precipitate that the wounded men were not carried off. The barbarity in warfare of the Birmese was notorious. These unfortunate men were all crucified, and their bodies sent floating down the river upon rafts. On the 25th of March Sir Archibald Campbell undertook the siege of Donoopew. For a week there had been an incessant fire from our mortars and rockets, and the breaching batteries were about to be opened when two Lascars, who had been taken prisoners, came to the camp, and said that the chiefs and all the Birmese army had fled, for that Maha Bandoola had been killed the day before by one of our shells. By the possession of Donoopew the navigation of the Irawaddi became wholly under our command. The army continued to advance, and Prome was occupied at the end of April. The rainy monsoon now set in, and there was a suspension of operations. In the middle of November and beginning of December there were two great battles, in the latter of which the Birmese were thoroughly discomfited. Overtures of peace were now made, but their object was only to gain time. At the beginning of 1826 there was severe fighting as the British advanced toward Ava. Repeated defeats and the approach of a conquering army compelled the king really to sue for peace when the British had reached Yandaboo, only forty-five miles from the capital. He had previously refused to ratify preliminaries which had been concluded on the 3d of January, in announcing which event to her friends at home Lady Amherst described herself "in the highest state of exultation and joy."* The vigorous operations of Sir Archibald Campbell, who had defeated a large army styled "The Retrievers of the King's Glory," had finally compelled the Treaty of Yandaboo, which was signed on the 24th of February. By this treaty the King of Ava agreed to renounce all claims upon the principality of Assam and its dependencies, to cede in perpetuity the conquered provinces of Aracan, of Yeh, of Tavoy, of Mergui, and of Tenasserim, and to pay the sum of one crore of rupees toward the expenses of the war. He further agreed that accredited British ministers should be allowed to reside at Ava, that an accredited Birmese minister should reside at Calcutta, and that free trade to British subjects should be allowed in the Birmese dominions.

The fierce conflict of two years on the banks of the Irawaddi presented a memorable example of that courage and endurance which eventually overcomes dangers and difficulties apparently insuperable. It has been truly said by an officer engaged in this war, "Perhaps there are few instances on record in the history of any nation of a mere handful of men, with constitutions broken down by many months of previous disease and privation, forcing their way in the face of such difficulties, and through a wilderness hitherto untrodden by Europeans, to the distance of five hundred miles from the spot where they originally disembarked, and ultimately dictating a peace within three days' march of the enemy's capital."† During these land operations, with all this bravery and fortitude of the little army, it would have been impossible to succeed without the active co-operation of a flotilla on the rivers. The naval assistance thus rendered is memorable for "the employment of a power then for the first time introduced into war—steam. The steam-vessel had been very useful, not merely in carrying on communications with dispatch, but in overcoming formidable resistance."‡

During the last year of the Birmese war the East India Company became engaged in a new conflict, for the purpose of protecting a native prince, with whom we were in alliance, against an usurper. The Rajah of Bhurtpore, before his death at the beginning of 1825, had declared his son to be his successor, and had included him in the treaty of alliance with the company. The nephew of the deceased prince raised a revolt against this succession. Many of the native princes looked on anxiously to see if the British, with the Birmese war on their hands, would put forth any strength to maintain one of their devoted adherents. In the streets of Delhi the populace had shouted, "The rule of the company is at an end." The prince who had been expelled had been assured by Sir David Ochterlony that he should be supported. Lord Amherst was at first for non-interference. He knew that Bhurtpore had been deemed impregnable; and he might fear that, now occupied with an enormous force by the usurping rajah, the same ill-fortune might befall an attack upon the place as had befallen Lord Lake in 1805, when he was beaten from the city by the Jauts, who had ever since regarded themselves as invincible. The commander-in-chief in India, Lord Combermere, in his peninsular experience as Sir Stapleton Cotton, had seen what war was in its most difficult operations, and he could not despair of taking an Indian fortress when he recollected the terrible sieges of Ciudad Rodrigo and Badajoz. He had just come to India to succeed Sir Edward Paget in the chief command. The Duke of Wellington described his old companion-in-arms as having lost no time in joining the army on his arrival in India, and as having travelled upward of a thousand miles in ten days, in order that he might begin the operations at a proper season. "He had commenced those operations," says the duke, "carried them on with that vigor and activity which insured their success, and had closed them by a military feat which had never been surpassed by any army upon any occasion."* Lord Combermere, upon his arrival before Bhurtpore, addressed a letter to the usurper, requesting him to send out the women and children, who should have safe-conduct. This humane request was not acceded to. On the 23d of November the bombardment commenced. On the morning of the 18th of January the assault began at the signal given by the explosion of a mine, which utterly destroyed the whole of the salient angle of the fortress. Our troops rushed in at the breaches. In two hours the whole rampart, though obstinately defended, was in our possession, and early in the afternoon the citadel surrendered. The formidable works of Bhurtpore were afterward destroyed, the rightful prince was reinstated, and the people returned to their allegiance. The rapid and decided success of Lord Combermere dissipated the fears which Bishop Heber had expressed to his friends at home at the beginning of the siege. He thought that should Lord Combermere fail, "all Northern and Western India, every man who owns a sword and can buy or steal a horse, will be up against us, less from disliking us than in the hope of booty."

Before concluding this notice of the affairs of India during the administration of three governors-general, we must advert to a matter of important controversy—the regulation of the press in India. The first newspaper published under the rule of the company was one established at Calcutta in 1781. Other newspapers were set up during the next twenty years. In 1799, under the administration of the Marquess Wellesley, regulations were issued for the newspaper press, the most important of which was that no paper should be published until it had been previously inspected by the secretary to the government, or by a person duly authorized by him. The penalty for contravening these regulations was immediate embarkation for Europe. Mr. James Mill, in his "History of British India," describes the Indian press as a great nuisance, in its indecorous attacks upon private life and its ignorant censures of public measures, to control which Lord Wellesley's regulations were framed. In 1818 the Marquess of Hastings promulgated new regulations, which did not attempt to establish a censorship, but prohibited animadversions on proceedings in England connected with the government of India, discussions on the political transactions of local administration, private scandal, and disquisitions having a tendency to create alarm among the natives as to the probability of any interference with their religious opinions or ceremonies. In 1816 Mr. James Silk Buckingham, who had obtained a license to reside in Calcutta, purchased the copyright of two of the newspapers published there, and amalgamated them under the title of "The Calcutta Journal." Although the Marquess of Hastings had abolished the censorship previous to publication, he had established a tribunal whose business it was to watch the statements and opinions of the Indian newspaper press, and to give to their conductors that sort of warning with which we are familiar enough in the control of the press in a neighboring country. In India a neglect of such warnings would be followed by the

* Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. iii. p. 430.

† Lieut.-Col. Alexander M. Tulloch, quoted in MacFarlane's "Our Indian Empire," vol. ii. p. 325.

‡ Mr. Wynn, in debate on Vote of Thanks to the Army, "Hansard," vol. xvii. col. 668.

* "Hansard," vol. xvii. col. 771.

deportation of the offending proprietor, if not by a total suppression of the journal in which he had embarked his property. Mr. Buckingham, according to a statement of Dr. Phillimore in the House of Commons, received three such warnings previous to the Marquess of Hastings resigning his administration, one of which, in 1822, was called for by his offence in traducing the government of India respecting the kingdom of Oude.* Mr. Adam, during the interval in which he administered the government previous to the arrival of Lord Amherst, took a very summary mode to put an end to the freedom of Mr. Buckingham's strictures upon Indian affairs, and especially of a freedom most obnoxious to the authorities—the disposal of their patronage. The appointment by Mr. Adam of a Scotch clergyman, the head of the Presbyterian establishment in India, to the lucrative agency through which the government was supplied with stationery, called forth the animadversions of "The Calcutta Journal." Mr. Adam immediately annulled Mr. Buckingham's license to remain in India, adding the threat that if he were found in the country after two months he should be sent to England as a prisoner. Mr. Buckingham transferred his paper to a British-born subject of the name of Arnot. At the period of Lord Amherst's arrival, by a series of arbitrary proceedings the deportation of Mr. Arnot was effected, "The Calcutta Journal" suppressed, and its circulation merged in a Calcutta newspaper over which the government had efficient control by its appointment of an editor. Mr. Buckingham—who long made England resound with the story of his wrongs, and who was in some degree recompensed by a large public subscription—appealed to the privy council against the regulations of the Bengal government on the subject of the press. The East India Company contended before the privy council, as Dr. Phillimore contended in his place in parliament in 1826: "When the house considered the vast importance of our possessions in India, and the delicate tie by which they were held—that a handful of Europeans exercised supreme sway over many millions of the native people, and that our empire was maintained by opinion alone—they must see that if the same freedom of discussion were allowed to prevail in that country as we enjoyed in this, and if individuals were permitted to traduce the government through the means of the press, it would be impossible to retain the power which this country held in India." † Nevertheless Lord Amherst adopted a different policy with regard to the press, which was undoubtedly the most prudent, as it was the most dignified. He had made one mistake on this subject upon his first arrival in India, seduced, it is alleged, by evil counsels. "Ever after, while his lordship was present in Calcutta to protect it, the press enjoyed a freedom unknown to it for forty-four years, and experience showed, as it had done before, that that freedom was as safe as it was beneficial." ‡ Mr. Elphinstone, in a conversation with Bishop Heber, while maintaining the inconvenience and even danger of unrestricted political discussion, "acknowledged that the dangers ascribed to a free press in India had been exaggerated."

In the history of British India up to this period we find very few traces of any effort on the part of the government to call forth the material resources of the Peninsula; to supply by new appliances of modern science the decay of the ancient works by which lands were irrigated and famine prevented; to bring distant places into correspondence by roads and improved navigation. The all-absorbing business of conquest prevented any marked attention to the improvement of the native cultivation of the soil, or of the communications by which produce could be conveyed from the producer to the consumer. The company was indeed very solicitous about the growth of opium, its great source of revenue, but it did little for the cultivation of cotton, the British demand for which would have formed a sufficient excitement to its growth and preparation for market by improved processes. Some efforts in this direction were, however, made by the East India Company. As early as 1788 they distributed among the natives seeds from different cotton-growing countries. In 1813 they brought an American to teach the people how to cultivate the cotton-plant, and they imported American gins for cleaning the wool. Small progress was made in carrying forward such improvements. The cultivation of cotton, of the sugar-cane, of the hemp-plant, and of the cereals, would be always restricted to the local demand as long as roads and water communications were neglected by the authorities which governed the country. Lord William Bentinck succeeded Lord Amherst as governor-general, and until his administration the roads of the country consisted of little more than native wheel-tracks. "Above Allahabad, and in various other parts, so recently as the year 1830, a regiment proceeding in course of relief from one station to another had to be preceded by a native guide."

* "Hansard," vol. xv. col. 1013. † Ibid., col. 1013.
‡ "Edinburgh Review," vol. xlvii. p. 182.

CHAPTER CCXXI.

Administration of Lord Goderich—Turkey and Greece—The battle of Navarino—Resignation of Lord Goderich—Administration of the Duke of Wellington—Parliament—The schoolmaster abroad—Progress of education—Mr. Brougham's speech on law reform—The new metropolitan police—Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts—Mr. Huskisson's retirement from the ministry—Ireland—Election for Clare of Mr. O'Connell—Ministerial views on Catholic emancipation—Opening of parliament—Emancipation referred to in the king's speech—The Catholic Relief Bill moved by the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel—Continued and violent debates—The Catholic Relief Bill passed—Mr. O'Connell's second return for Clare—Meeting of parliament—Motions for reform—Illness and death of George the Fourth.

The death of Mr. Canning placed Lord Goderich at the head of the government. The composition of the cabinet was slightly altered. Mr. Huskisson became colonial secretary, Mr. Herries chancellor of the exchequer. The government was generally considered to be weak, and not calculated for a long endurance. Its greatest accession of strength seemed to be in the acceptance of the office of commander-in-chief by the Duke of Wellington. Lord Eldon, in serious apprehension that this appointment committed the duke to the support of the administration, wrote to him a letter which called forth this explanation: "If, on the one hand, the administration have no claim upon my services out of my profession, I, on the other hand, can be of no counsel or party against them." † The cabinet of Lord Goderich had not a long existence. It lasted scarcely five months, and it fell through the petty jealousies of some of its members, which gave the finishing blow to the tottering fabric.

On the 10th of November it was known in London that dispatches had been received at the admiralty announcing a great naval battle in the Bay of Navarino. If the popular belief in omens of national success or disaster had not nearly passed away, the public might have looked with trembling anxiety to these dispatches, in the dread that the battle would prove a defeat. For at the lord mayor's banquet on the 9th of November a great device of illuminated lamps representing an anchor suddenly fell down upon the dignitaries below, slightly wounding the Duke of Clarence and the lord mayor, scattering unwelcome oil over the dresses of the ladies who graced the civic feast, and altogether marring the usual flow of hollow compliment which is so coarsely proffered and so greedily accepted on these occasions. The gazette soon proclaimed that the Turkish fleet had been nearly annihilated, that the flags of England, France, and Russia floated supreme on the shores of the Morea. Nevertheless politicians shook their heads at what they considered an aggression which might lead to an interminable war—an aggression which ultra-Toryism regarded as particularly objectionable, inasmuch as it crippled the means of a despotic power effectually to crush its rebellious subjects. The Sublime Porte had well learned the lessons taught by the congresses of Troppau and Laybach when it proclaimed, in its manifesto of the previous June, that "Almighty wisdom, in dividing the universe into different countries, has assigned to each a sovereign into whose hands the reins of absolute authority over the nation subject to his dominion are placed."

When the demand under the Treaty of London, which was made by England, France, and Russia, for an immediate armistice, as a preliminary and an indispensable condition to the opening of any negotiation, was announced by the ambassadors of these powers at Constantinople, the divan declined to recognize any interference with its conduct toward its rebellious subjects. The Greeks readily ac-

* "Companion to the Almanac, 1857."
† Twiss, "Life of Eldon," vol. iii. p. 13.

pted the armistice proposed by the treaty. Ibrahim Pasha had ne from Alexandria with the Egyptian fleet during the period of e discussions at Constantinople. The allied fleets were lying off avarino, their admirals being without authority to prevent the action of the Egyptian fleet with the Turkish, already moored in at harbor. The Egyptian commander was informed by Sir Edward drington that he might return, if he chose, with a safe-conduct to exandria, but that if he entered the harbor he would not be ffered to come out. Ibrahim Pasha made his choice to join the rkish fleet. On the 25th of September a conference took place be- een the admirals and Ibrahim Pasha, at which the Egyptian prince tered into a verbal agreement for a suspension of hostilities during enty days. The English and French commanders, relying upon is agreement, sailed to Zante to obtain fresh provisions. Ibrahim sha then came out of the harbor, with the object of carrying his arfare to some other point in the Morea. Sir Edward Codrington ct him near Patras with a small force, and compelled him to re- rn. After that, says the protocol of the three admirals, "the oops of the pasha have not ceased carrying on a species of warfare ore destructive and exterminating than before, putting women and ildren to the sword, burning their habitations, and tearing up trees y the roots, in order to complete the devastation of the country." he dispatch of Sir Edward Codrington, dated from H.M.S. Asia, in e port of Navarino, narrates the subsequent decisive event. The ount de Hayden, Rear-Admiral of Russia, and the French rear-ad- iral, the Chevalier de Rigny, having agreed with him to enter the ort in order to induce Ibrahim Pasha to discontinue his brutal war f extermination, took up their anchorage about two o'clock on the fternoon of the 20th of October. The Turkish ships were moored n the form of a crescent. The combined fleet was formed in the rder of sailing in two columns, the British and French forming the reather or starboard line, and the Russian the lee line. The Asia ed in, followed by the Genoa and Albion, and anchored close along- ide a ship-of-the-line bearing the flag of the Capitana Bey. The sta- ions of the French and Russian squadrons were marked out by the English admiral, who was the chief in command. "I gave orders," ays Sir Edward, "that no gun should be fired unless guns were ired by the Turks, and those orders were strictly observed." The hree British ships passed the batteries, and moored without any act f hostility on the part of the Turks, although they were evidently repared for a general action. At the entrance of the harbor were ix Turkish fire-vessels, which a portion of the English squadron were appointed to watch. On the Dartmouth sending a boat toward ne of these vessels, her crew was fired upon by musketry. The fire was returned from the Dartmouth and La Syrène, which bore the lag of Admiral de Rigny. An Egyptian ship then fired a cannon- hot at the French admiral's vessel, which was immediately returned; 'and thus," says Sir Edward Codrington, "very shortly afterward he battle became general." After describing, with the usual indis- inctness, the movements of various ships, he comes to the catastro- phe. "This bloody and destructive battle was continued with un- abated fury for four hours, and the scene of wreck and devastation which presented itself at its termination was such as has been seldom before witnessed." Of the Egyptian and Turkish fleets, which numbered about a hundred and twenty men-of-war and transports, one half were sunk, burned, or driven on shore. The allied admirals published a notice after the battle, that as they did not enter Navarino with a hostile intention, but only to renew propositions to the commanders of the Turkish fleet, they would forbear from destroying what ships of the Ottoman navy might still remain, "now that so signal a vengeance has been taken for the first cannon-shot which has been ventured to be fired on the allied flags." They threatened that if there were any new act of hostility they would immediately destroy the remaining vessels and the forts of Navarino. The dispatch of Sir Edward announcing the victory contains a frank admission that he was not insensible to other feelings than those of professional obedience to his instructions: "When I found that the boasted Ottoman word of honor was made a sacrifice to wanton, savage devastation, and that a base advantage was taken of our reliance upon Ibrahim's good faith, I own I felt a desire to punish the offenders. But it was my duty to refrain, and refrain I did; and I can assure his royal highness [the Duke of Clarence] that I would still have avoided this disastrous extremity if other means had been open to me."

The differences upon financial measures between Mr. Herries, the chancellor of the exchequer, and Mr. Huskisson, secretary of state for the colonies, could not be reconciled by Lord Goderich, and he therefore tendered his resignation to the king on the 9th of January, 1828. His majesty immediately sent to Lord Lyndhurst to desire that he and the Duke of Wellington should come to Windsor. The king told the duke that he wished him to form a government of which he should be the head. "He said that he thought the government must be composed of persons of both opinions with respect to the Roman Catholic question, that he approved of all his late and former servants, and that he had no objection to anybody excepting to Lord Grey." * It was understood that Lord Lyndhurst was to continue in office. The Duke of Wellington immediately applied to Mr. Peel, who, returning to his post of secretary of state for the home department, saw the impossibility of reuniting in this administration those who had formed the cabinet of Lord Liverpool. He desired to strengthen the government of the Duke of Wellington by the introduction of some of the more important of Mr. Canning's friends into the cabinet, and to fill some of the lesser offices. The Earl of Dudley, Mr. Huskisson, Lord Palmerston, and Mr. Charles Grant became members of the new administration. Mr. William Lamb, afterward Lord Melbourne, was appointed chief secretary for Ireland. The ultra-Tories were greatly indignant at these arrangements. They groaned and reviled as if the world was unchanged. The Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel had disappointed the country by making a mixed government; Mr. Huskisson was odious to the agricultural and shipping interests; the whole cabinet was composed of a majority of favorers of the Roman Catholic claims; above all, Lord Eldon was omitted.† The ex-chancellor considered himself very ill-used, and publicly said, "I don't know why I am not a minister." Mr. Peel, in his private correspondence of this date, shows how clearly he saw that the nation could no longer be governed upon the old exclusive principles. He was fast sliding into that liberality which was incomprehensible to those who had looked upon his previous career. He writes, on the 18th of January, "I came not for the dissatisfaction of ultra-Tories; this country ought not and cannot be governed upon any other principles than those of firmness, no doubt, but of firmness combined with moderation." A fortnight afterward he asks, in writing to the same correspondent, What would have been the inevitable fate of a government composed of himself and of some ultra-Tories whom he names, who would indeed be supported by very warm friends, but those very warm friends country gentlemen and fox-hunters, who would attend one night in parliament, but who would quickly weary of sitting up till one, two, or three o'clock in the morning, fighting questions of detail? The greater difficulty was expressed in the fact that the country could no longer be governed by "country gentlemen and fox hunters." ‡

On the 29th of January parliament was opened by commission. The most important part of the royal speech was that which, after reciting the progress of events in the East, and referring to the treaty with France and Russia, says, "With a view to carry into effect the object of the treaty, a collision, wholly unexpected by his majesty, took place in the port of Navarino between the fleets of the contracting powers and that of the Ottoman Porte. Notwithstanding the valor displayed by the combined fleet, his majesty deeply laments that this conflict should have occurred with the naval force of an ancient ally; but he still entertains a confident hope that this untoward event will not be followed by further hostilities, and will not impede that amicable adjustment of the existing differences between the Porte and the Greeks to which it is so manifestly their common interest to accede." The expression "untoward event" produced angry remonstrances from many quarters—from the Whigs, from some of Lord Goderich's ministry, from the friends of Sir Edward Codrington. But all united in declaring that no blame was attached to that gallant officer. The Duke of Wellington, in a few straightforward words, defended the expression. The treaty of July was not intended to lead to hostilities. The former government thought the object of the treaty would be effected without hostilities. "Therefore, I say, that when unfortunately the operations under the treaty did lead to hostilities, it was an untoward circumstance."

* "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," part i. p. 12; Letter of the Duke.
† "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. iii. p. 534.
‡ "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," pp. 16, 17.

In the debate upon the address in the House of Commons, Mr. Brougham raised very strong objections to the appointment of the Duke of Wellington as the head of the government. Though he professed to entertain the highest opinion of the noble duke's military genius, he evidently undervalued his administrative talents. He thought a great soldier's experience was no fit preparation for civil duties. Mr. Brougham had not then the advantage of knowing, through the publication of the duke's "Dispatches," how equal he was to the highest statesmanship, with probably the one exception of undervaluing the strength of popular opinion. Mr. Brougham in 1828 thought it unconstitutional that almost the whole patronage of the state should be placed in the hands of a military premier. With his unfailing power of sarcasm, he considered that there was no validity in the objection that the duke was incapable of speaking in public as a first minister ought to speak, because he had heard last year the duke declare in another place that he was unfit for the situation of first minister, "and he really thought he had never heard a better speech in the whole course of his life." Mr. Brougham wound up his objections to the appointment of the Duke of Wellington by a passage of splendid declamation, whose concluding words, especially, were echoed through the country with extraordinary fervor—with an enthusiasm which speedily carried forward the small beginnings of a great change to very decided results which would more than ever make the action of the government in a great degree dependent upon the opinion of the people. When he had called the appointment of the Duke of Wellington to the head of the government unconstitutional, let it not be supposed, he said, that he was inclined to exaggerate. "He was perfectly satisfied that there would be no unconstitutional attack on the liberties of the people. These were not the times for such an attempt. There had been periods when the country heard with dismay that the soldier was abroad. That was not the case now. Let the soldier be ever so much abroad, in the present age he could do nothing. There was another person abroad—a less important person—in the eyes of some an insignificant person—whose labors had tended to produce this state of things—the schoolmaster was abroad." *

It was no idle boast of the orator that education was in various ways raising the moral and intellectual character of the community. There had been a real beginning of this great work. Yet it was only a beginning. To imagine, however, that England had been wholly destitute of the means of education, while the schoolmaster was doing his work efficiently in Scotland, is to a certain extent a mistake. When the endowed grammar-schools were founded, it never entered into the minds of their benefactors that all the people—or, in the language of those ages, that all the poor—should be instructed. A few who were unable to pay for their education were to be selected, and these were to receive forever an education of the highest order. These schools were the natural successors of the schools and chantries of the unreformed Church. This was the only system of education in England almost up to the time of the revolution. The commercial classes had then grown into wealth and importance, and they began to think that schools in which nothing was taught but Latin and Greek were not altogether fitted for those destined to a life of traffic. At the beginning of the eighteenth century there were endowments and subscriptions in most towns, not for new grammar-schools but for new free-schools. During the progress of education in recent years it has been common to speak with contempt of these schools, and of the instruction afforded in them. With a comparatively small population, these free-schools, we venture to think in opposition to modern authorities, were admirable beginnings of the education of the poorer classes. While the grammar-schools were making divines and lawyers and physicians out of the sons of the professional classes and the wealthier tradesmen, the free-schools were making clever handicraftsmen and thriving burgesses out of the sons of the mechanics and the laborers; and many a man who had been a charity-boy in his native town, when he had risen to competence pointed with an honest pride to the institution which had made him what he was, and drew his purse-strings to perpetuate for others the benefits which he had himself enjoyed. The reports of the commissioners for inquiry into charities presented in 1842, showed that the annual income of the grammar-schools (some, however, being exempted from the inquiry) was 152,047*l.*, and the income of the free-schools 141,385*l.* There was also an income amounting to 19,112*l.* belonging to charities for general educational purposes. This income was a small educational foundation for the whole population in England and Wales at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The first attempt to place the instruction of the poor upon a broader basis was by the establishment of Sunday schools in 1783. Mr. Malthus (in 1803) described these institutions as very few, some objectionable, and all imperfect. But the parliamentary returns of 1818 exhibit 5100 Sunday-schools, attended by 452,000 children. In 1833 the number of Sunday-school scholars exceeded a million and a half. In 1818 the returns, under a circular letter addressed to the ministers of the respective parishes, showed that there were about 15,000 unendowed day-schools, containing about 500,000 scholars. Of these 336,000 were in the ordinary schools—the private day-schools, such as have always existed among us for the education of the middle and poorer classes. There were only then, when the systems of Bell and Lancaster had been in operation about twelve years, 175,000 scholars, receiving instruction partly or wholly gratuitous through the operation of private benevolence. Four years after Mr. Brougham had declared that the schoolmaster was abroad, the government returns showed that both the paying and the non-paying scholars in the unendowed day-schools were more than doubled.

Moving onward in other roads than that of school education, the schoolmaster was abroad. "The Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge" originated with Mr. Brougham in 1826. It had long been felt that books of sound information were, through their dearness, inaccessible to the bulk of the people. Constable, in 1825, was "meditating nothing less than a total revolution in the art and traffic of bookselling." He would issue "a three-shilling or half-crown volume every month, which must and shall sell, not by thousands or tens of thousands, but by hundreds of thousands—ay, by millions." * The sanguine bookseller published his "Miscellany," which led the way in the combination of superior literature with comparative cheapness; but its sale was numbered by hundreds rather than by millions. In 1827 "The Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge" commenced the publication of their sixpenny treatises—valuable manuals, but still far from supplying what the hard-worked classes wanted in the union of goodness and cheapness. Nevertheless the modern epoch of cheap literature was commencing. "The London Mechanics' Institution" was inaugurated in 1823 by Dr. Birkbeck, and gradually similar institutions were founded in populous towns of England and Scotland. In 1828 "The London University" was opened, the building having been in progress and the organization nearly completed in 1826 and 1827. To Mr. Brougham belongs the honor of being among the most zealous for the formation of this institution for the higher branches of education independent of religious opinions. The opposite plan of "King's College" was developed at a public meeting in 1828. Unquestionably at this period "the schoolmaster was abroad." In setting forth upon his mission he had to climb the steepest hill, like the prince of the Arabian story, surrounded by a chorus of hisses and execrations. But he went steadily on his way, stopping his ears to these sounds of impotent fury, and the prize which he won was the power of accomplishing all needful reforms by moral force, so that those who once feared and despised the people should never more be ready to proclaim that "the soldier was abroad."

On the ninth day after the meeting of parliament Mr. Brougham took that position, which he ever afterward maintained, of being the most indefatigable and persevering of law reformers. The reformation of the criminal law was no longer opposed, except by a few, whose opinions had very speedily come to be considered as worthless as they were obsolete. A commission had been appointed to inquire into abuses in courts of equity. The course of improvement which was open to Mr. Brougham was to promote an inquiry "into the defects occasioned by time and otherwise in the laws of this realm of England, as administered in the courts of common law." Mr. Brougham introduced his motion in a speech of nearly six hours. It has been said of this speech, "its huge length and unwieldy dimensions compelled attention." † These are not the qualities which usually

* Hansard, vol. xviii. col. 58.

* Lockhart's "Life of Scott," vol. vi. p. 31.

† Roebuck's "History of the Whig Ministry," vol. i. p. 50.

compel attention in the House of Commons. During that extraordinary exhibition of the rare ability to mass an infinity of details so as to make each contribute something to the general effect, the attention of the house was uninterruptedly sustained. The first listeners were among the last. While the orator exhibited no signs of physical exhaustion, scarcely one of his audience seemed to feel a sense of weariness.* The peroration of this great effort of memory and judgment was the only portion that could be properly deemed rhetorical: "It was the boast of Augustus—it formed part of the glare in which the perfidies of his earlier years were lost—that he found Rome of brick, and left it of marble—a praise not unworthy of a great prince, and to which the present reign also has its claims. But how much nobler will be the sovereign's boast, when he shall have it to say that he found law dear, and left it cheap; found it a sealed book, left it a living letter; found it the patrimony of the rich, left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression, left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence!" On the adjourned debate of the 29th of February, upon Mr. Brougham's proposition for a commission, the government, through the law officers and the home secretary, expressed its intention so far to concur in the motion as to consent that separate commissions should issue—one for inquiry into the progress of suits at common law, the other into the state of the laws affecting real property. Mr. Brougham concurring in this alteration, the two commissions were forthwith appointed.

The House of Commons was now fairly engaged in the work of improvement. On the motion of Mr. Peel a select committee was appointed to inquire into the public income and expenditure; to consider measures for an effectual control on all charges connected with this receipt and expenditure, and also for reducing the expenditure without detriment to the public service. No one can trace the course of our parliamentary history after the close of the war without feeling how much of the tardy recognition by the government of principles of financial economy was due to the unwearied exertions of Mr. Hume. His views, however they might at times be impracticable, produced as a whole the inevitable triumph of all zealous and continuous labor. Mr. Secretary Peel early in the session proposed another measure which, he said, might at first sight appear limited in its application and local in its objects, but which was connected with considerations of the highest importance to the well-being of the country. He proposed that a committee should be appointed to inquire into the state of the police of the metropolis. In the next session of parliament Mr. Peel carried his great plan for abolishing the local establishments of nightly watch and police, for forming the Metropolitan Police District, and for appointing a sufficient number of able men, under the direction of the secretary of state, to be the police force for the whole of this district. For several years a prodigious clamor was raised against this force, not only by thieves and street-walkers, but by respectable upholders of the ancient watch, and by zealous friends of the nation's freedom, who dreamed that the new police would have the certain effect of depriving us of our immemorial liberties. The new police was to be "the most dangerous and effective engine of despotism." Sensible men were satisfied to believe that Mr. Peel's innovation would have no other effect upon our liberties than that of depriving us "of the liberty we have hitherto enjoyed of being robbed and knocked on the head at discretion of their honors the thieves." †

A great parliamentary struggle was at hand in 1828, which was the prelude to a still more important conflict in 1829. This was Lord John Russell's motion, on the 26th of February, for a committee of the whole house to consider of so much of the acts of the 13 and 25 of Charles II. as requires persons, before admission into any office in corporations, or having accepted any office, civil or military, or any place of trust under the crown, to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the practice of the Church of England. The motion was opposed by Mr. Huskisson, Lord Palmerston, and Mr. Peel. It was opposed, says Sir Robert Peel in his "Memoirs," "with all the influence and authority of the government recently appointed." Nevertheless, on a division on the motion of Lord John Russell, it was carried by a majority of forty-four, there being two hundred and thirty-seven in favor of the motion and one hundred and ninety-three against it. Sir Robert Peel says, in his "Memoirs," that the administration considered that they should not be justified in abandoning the service of the crown in consequence of this defeat, and, further, that it would have been very unwise hastily to commit the House of Lords to a conflict with the House of Commons on a question of this nature. Mr. Peel eventually proposed a measure of compromise—that a declaration should be substituted in place of the sacramental test. The bill as amended passed the House of Commons, and met with very little effectual opposition in the House of Lords, the two archbishops and three bishops speaking in its favor. Sir Robert Peel says that the conciliatory adjustment of the question was what he earnestly desired; that had any other course been taken by the government the final result of parliamentary discussion would probably have been the same—namely, the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts; and that it may fairly be questioned whether the repeal would have taken place under circumstances more favorable to the true interests of the Church, or more conducive to the maintenance of harmony and good-will among the professors of different religious creeds. It was in vain that Lord Eldon described the bill to be "as bad, as mischievous, and as revolutionary as the most captious dissenter could wish it to be." He nevertheless prophesied truly when he said, "Sooner or later, perhaps in this very year, almost certainly in the next, the concessions to the dissenters must be followed by the like concessions to the Roman Catholics." * Mr. Huskisson opposed the repeal of the Corporation and Test Act upon the same principle which had determined Mr. Canning's opposition. "I am convinced," said Mr. Huskisson, "that the present measure, so far from being a step in favor of the Catholic claims, would, if successful, be the means of arraying an additional power against them." However eager for the application of religious toleration to themselves, the greater number of English dissenters were ready to make common cause with the Brunswick clubs, who, without the slightest reference to political dangers, clung to the extremest assertion of Protestant supremacy.

The support which Mr. Huskisson's opinions derived from his position as a minister of the crown very soon came to an end. He entered the cabinet as a suspected man who was desirous of carrying forward his policy upon the questions of corn laws and commercial restrictions much faster than the head of the government and the majority in parliament deemed prudent and profitable. There were two cases of borough corruption before the House of Commons, those of Penryn and East Retford, which imperatively called for disfranchisement. On the discussions with regard to these disfranchisements it had been proposed that the seats of these offending boroughs should be transferred to Manchester and Birmingham. The ministry opposed the proposition for giving both seats to these great communities. The bill for disfranchising Penryn and giving its seats to Manchester was expected to be thrown out by the Lords. The seats for one borough only would have to be transferred. Mr. Huskisson, in one of these debates, had declared that if there were only one case before the house he would have no hesitation in transferring the franchise to Birmingham. On the 19th of May Mr. Calvert moved that the franchise of East Retford should be extended to the neighboring hundred. Mr. Huskisson in vain desired the postponement of the question; but when his vote was claimed for Birmingham, upon the ground of consistency, he yielded, and voted with the minority against the government. He went home, he says, observing the intelligible looks of some, and hearing the audible whispers of others, and, perhaps magnifying the impression which his vote might make, wrote, before he went to rest, a letter to the Duke of Wellington, offering him the opportunity of placing the office of colonial secretary in other hands, "as the only means in my power of preventing the injury to the king's service which may ensue from the appearance of disunion in his majesty's councils." The duke immediately took the letter to the king, regarding it as an absolute resignation. The letter was marked "private and confidential." Friends of Mr. Huskisson went to the duke, contending that Mr. Huskisson's letter did not convey a formal resignation; that it was a

‡ We speak from personal observation, having sat under the gallery with the object of preparing the speech for publication in a more enlarged shape than the reports of the daily papers.

† Fonblanque, "England under Seven Administrations," vol. i. p. 266.

* Twiss, vol. iii. p. 38.

mistake; "It is no mistake," said the inflexible premier, and the words passed into a common form of speech. Those of Mr. Canning's ministry who had joined the government of the Duke of Wellington felt that this stern and resolute attitude was intended to get rid of them altogether. Lord Dudley, Mr. Grant, Lord Palmerston, and Mr. Lamb resigned their offices. Sir George Murray succeeded Mr. Huskisson as secretary of war and the colonies; Sir Henry Hardinge became secretary of war in the place of Lord Palmerston; the Earl of Aberdeen secretary of state for foreign affairs in the place of Earl Dudley; and Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald president of the board of trade in the place of Mr. Charles Grant. Other changes in civil and diplomatic appointments were the necessary consequence of this rupture.

The able French minister, who had ample experience of party conflicts during the term of representative government in his own country, at once assumes that the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel, in eagerly seizing the opportunity of removing the four Canningites from the cabinet, and of supplying their places with Tories, "thus manifested their anxious desire to rally all Protestants beneath the same standard, and to restore unity of principles and purpose in the government." * A little more than a week before the discussion on the disfranchisement of East Retford, Sir Francis Burdett had obtained for the first time in the parliament of 1826 a majority of the House of Commons in favor of the Roman Catholic claims. The resolution was affirmed by a majority of 272 to 266. Sir Robert Peel says, in his "Memoirs," that he should have declined to remain minister for the home department and to lead the House of Commons, being in a minority on the most important and domestic questions. The Duke of Wellington's government was in danger from the retirement of Mr. Huskisson and his friends, and Mr. Peel therefore remained to give his support to a cabinet which now appeared to be wholly constructed upon the principle of hostility to the Catholic claims. The resolution for considering the Catholic claims which had been carried in the House of Commons was debated in the House of Lords on the 9th and 10th of June. The majority against the motion which had passed in the House of Commons was forty-four. But there were admissions in the course of the debate which were as important as a majority in favor of the resolution. The lord chancellor and the Duke of Wellington had admitted that the Catholic question was a great difficulty, out of which they at present saw no outlet. "This statement," said the Marquis of Lansdowne, "having been made by two noblemen so high in the confidence of the sovereign, it almost necessarily follows that it is accompanied with their intention of looking at this difficulty with a view to its final arrangement." †

The appointment of Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald to a ministerial office caused a vacancy in the representation of the county of Clare. The contest for this seat produced events in Ireland "of deep importance, especially in their relation to the Catholic question." ‡ Mr. Fitzgerald was a person of great influence in the county of Clare. He had conciliated the Roman Catholics by a constant advocacy in parliament for the removal of their disabilities. Certainly no Protestant could have had a fairer chance of support, not only from the landlords but from their tenantry. Yet the whole power of the Catholic Association was called forth to prevent his return, and to secure the election of Mr. O'Connell, who, by his faith, was disqualified from sitting in parliament. During the short administration of Mr. Canning the association, founded in 1823, had voluntarily dissolved itself, having confidence that the minister would bring forward some effectual measure of relief. The accession to power of the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel, and the subsequent changes in the cabinet which had disturbed the balance of opinions on the greatest question of domestic policy, revived the association with new strength, which was calculated to produce the most serious alarm. Lord Anglesey, the lord-lieutenant, had gone to Ireland with the decided opinion that concessions to the Catholics should be refused. What he saw there in the summer of 1828 produced in his mind a conviction of the positive danger of persevering in the old system of policy. Mr. O'Connell, whose power as a demagogue was probably never exceeded by any Irishman or Englishman—gifted with a popular oratory which completely won the hearts of a fervid peasantry — professing the utmost deference to the Catholic priesthood, which he swayed as much by his devotion as a son of the Church as by his prompt and versatile ability—wanting perhaps "very determined courage," * but with every other quality for the leader of a rebellion—Mr. O'Connell stirred up his countrymen to a madness of which the Clare election was the type. The Catholics had a common grievance and a common sympathy, which, since the union, had been a constant source of irritation and of occasional alarm. But a real sense of the imminent danger of refusing concession had never been produced, until the proof was supplied by the Clare election that local and personal attachments were weakened, that the friendly relations of men in different classes were loosened, and that a power had arisen "to unite the scattered elements of society into a homogeneous and disciplined mass, yielding willing obedience to the assumed authority of superior intelligence, hostile to the law and to the government which administered it." † At the period of the Clare election the lord-lieutenant wrote to the home secretary that he was quite certain that the agitators could lead on the people to rebellion at a moment's notice, but that the hope of tranquillity, present and future, rested upon the belief of O'Connell and his friends that they could carry their cause by agitation and intimidation, without coming to blows. Lord Anglesey believed their success to be inevitable. "There may be rebellion; you may put to death thousands; you may suppress it; but it will only be to put off the day of compromise, and in the mean time the country is still more impoverished, and the minds of the people are, if possible, still more alienated." ‡ On the 5th of July Mr. O'Connell was elected for Clare. A petition against his return was presented to the House of Commons, but nothing was done, for the session was nearly at an end. The great agitator did not attempt to take his seat during the three weeks which elapsed between his return and the prorogation of parliament. He had six months before him for continued agitation. The session closed on the 28th of July, without a word in the king's speech regarding Ireland.

The Duke of Wellington, in the course of a debate in May, 1829, said, "It is now well known that during the whole of the last autumn and summer I had those measures in contemplation which have been since brought into effect. It is also well known that my principal object, and that to which all my efforts were directed, was to prevail upon the person in these kingdoms the most interested of all others, from his situation, in the settlement of the Catholic question, to give his consent to its being brought forward." § In the autumn and summer of 1828 the duke had not only a difficulty with the king, but with the one of most importance among his colleagues. At the beginning of August the premier and the lord chancellor had been in communication with the king. Mr. Peel was invited to participate in the proposed arrangement. He gave his deliberate opinion by letter to the Duke of Wellington, that there was upon the whole less of evil in making a decided effort to settle the Catholic question than in leaving it, as it had been left, an open question. Mr. Peel, however, proposed to retire from the government, although he was willing to support it, but unwilling to undertake the management of this business in the House of Commons. Twenty years after he says that this letter was written with a clear foresight of the penalties to which the course he resolved to take would expose him—"the rage of party, the alienation of private friends, the interruption of family affections." He would not condescend to notice other penalties, such as the loss of office and of royal favor, "if they were not the heaviest in the estimation of vulgar and low-minded men, incapable of appreciating higher motives of public conduct." ‖

The efforts of the Duke of Wellington to obtain the sanction of the king, that the whole subject of Ireland, including the Catholic question, should be taken into consideration by his confidential servants, were not successful during the remaining months of 1828. In his interviews with the duke his majesty manifested much uneasiness and irritation. Lord Eldon represents that the king told him, at an in-

* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 37.
† Hansard, vol. xix. col. 1292.
‡ "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. i. p. 105.

* "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. i. p. 147 (Lord Anglesey's expression). † Ibid., p. 116. ‡ Ibid., p. 147.
§ Hansard, vol. xxi. col. 1023.
‖ "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. i. p. 188.

terview on the 28th of March, 1829, that his ministers had threatened to resign if the measures were not proceeded in, and that he had said to them, "Go on," when an interview which had lasted several hours had brought him into such a state that he hardly knew what he was about.* Mr. Peel, very early in the course of these discussions, had expressed his opinion that whenever it was once determined that an attempt should be made by the government to settle the Catholic question, the settlement should be, if possible, a complete one. Partial concessions would be of no use. † On the 12th of January, 1829, the six ministers who had voted uniformly against the Catholic claims had each a separate interview with his majesty, when he intimated his consent that the whole question of Ireland should be considered without his being pledged by such consent to adopt the views of his confidential servants, however unanimous they might be. On the 17th the Duke of Wellington wrote to Mr. Peel that he did not see the slightest chance, in consequence of what had passed in interviews with the king, and with certain of the bishops, of getting rid of these difficulties, if Mr. Peel should not continue in office. Mr. Peel yielded to this earnest solicitation. When the draft of the speech from the throne was submitted to the king, he gave a reluctant assent to the passage which implied an intention on the part of the government to make a decisive effort to adjust the Catholic question. The parliament was opened by commission on the 5th of February. The day before the meeting of parliament Mr. Peel addressed a letter to the vice-chancellor of Oxford, expressing his intention to vacate his seat for that university.

In the speech from the throne the existence of an association in Ireland dangerous to the public peace, and inconsistent with the spirit of the constitution, was pointed out, to ask for such powers as may enable his majesty to maintain his just authority. "His majesty recommends that, when this essential object shall have been accomplished, you should take into your deliberate consideration the whole condition of Ireland, and that you should review the laws which impose civil disabilities on his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. You will consider whether the removal of those disabilities can be effected consistently with the full and permanent security of our establishments in Church and State, with the maintenance of the reformed religion established by law, and of the rights and privileges of the bishops of the clergy of this realm, and of the churches committed to their charge." In the House of Peers the Duke of Wellington announced that the measure which it was the intention of the government to propose for the adoption of parliament, would extend to the removal generally of all civil disabilities under which the Roman Catholics labored, with exceptions solely resting on special grounds. In the House of Commons Mr. Peel made a similar announcement. The great contest in parliament was not to come on till Mr. Peel should be in his place to take his proper share in the discussions. He was persuaded to allow his name to be put in nomination for re-election at Oxford. His friends did not sufficiently estimate the power of a party cry. Sir Robert Inglis, his opponent, was finally returned by a majority of one hundred and forty-six votes. Lord Colchester records the termination of the election, adding, "Cheers for Lord Eldon in convocation, hisses for the king, hisses and groans for Peel." Nevertheless the value of these hisses and groans may be tested from the fact that Mr. Peel polled twice as many first-class men as Sir Robert Inglis, and the "No Popery" and "Church in Danger" cries were not universally successful, for he had three hundred and thirty-three clergymen among his supporters. Mr. Peel took his seat for Westbury on the 3d of March. The bill for suppressing the Catholic Association had passed during the secretary's absence from parliament. In that interval several thousand petitions were presented to parliament—the greater part against the proposed measures of concession. Lord Eldon was the most indefatigable in the enforcement of the prayer of these very exclusive productions, which echoed his own assertion on the first night of the session, that if a Roman Catholic were ever admitted to form part of the legislature, or to hold any of the great offices of state, from that moment the sun of Great Britain was set forever. In the House of Commons Mr. Peel gave notice, on the 3d of March, that on the 5th he would call attention to that part of the speech from the throne which referred to the civil disabilities of the Roman Catholics. On the evening of the 3d the king commanded the Duke of Wellington, Lord Lyndhurst, and Mr. Peel to attend him at Windsor on the following day. The audience lasted five hours. The king most tenaciously insisted that no alteration should be made of the ancient oath of supremacy. The ministers as firmly maintained that without this alteration the measure of relief would be unavailing. They left the royal closet in the assured belief that their official functions were at an end. "At the close of the interview the king took leave of us with great composure and great kindness, gave to each of us a salute on each cheek, and accepted our resignation of office, frequently expressing his sincere regret at the necessity which compelled us to retire from his service." * Before the king went to rest a great and sudden change had come over him. He wrote to the Duke of Wellington to acquaint him that he anticipated so much difficulty in the attempt to form another administration that he could not dispense with the services of those whose resignations he had accepted, and that they were at liberty to proceed with the measures of which notice had been given in parliament. †

On the 5th of March, from ten o'clock in the morning, all the avenues of the House of Commons were crowded by persons who hoped to gain admission to the gallery. The doors were not opened till six o'clock; for, according to a notice previously given, the house was called over. To put an end to all possible cavil on the part of the king, Mr. Peel had suggested to the Duke of Wellington that a distinct authority should be given to them to say to parliament that the measures in contemplation were proposed with the entire sanction of his majesty. That authority having been received during the night, Mr. Peel commenced his speech in these words: "I rise as a minister of the king, and sustained by the just authority which belongs to that character, to vindicate the advice given to his majesty by an united cabinet." With regard to himself, he had for years attempted to maintain the exclusion of Roman Catholics from parliament and the high offices of state. He did not think it was an unnatural or unreasonable struggle. He resigned it, in consequence of the conviction that it could no longer be advantageously maintained. As Mr. Peel proceeded to explain the proposed measure, in a speech of four hours, the cheers of the house were occasionally heard in Westminster Hall. The bill would admit a Roman Catholic to parliament upon taking an oath, in place of the old oath of supremacy, that he would support the existing institutions of the state, and not injure those of the Church. It would admit a Roman Catholic to all the greatest offices of government, with the exception of regent, lord chancellor of England, and lord chancellor and viceroy of Ireland. All corporate offices and municipal privileges, all that pertained to the administration of justice, would be open to Roman Catholics. From all offices connected with the Church, with its universities and schools, and from church patronage, they would be necessarily excluded. Commands in the army and navy had been open to them before this measure. Connected with the Bill of Relief there were securities and restrictions proposed; and by a separate bill the qualification for the freeholder's electoral franchise in Ireland was increased from forty shillings to ten pounds. It is unnecessary to trace the course of the debates in either house during the conflict, which lasted to the 10th of April, when the Relief Bill was read a third time in the House of Lords by a majority of a hundred and four. It had been passed in the House of Commons, on the 30th of March, by a majority of a hundred and seventy-eight. Amid the passionate invectives, the taunts and sneers, of the opposers of the measure, there was one sentence in the speech of a great man who relied upon no oratorical power for enforcing conviction, which made more impression upon the mind and heart of the nation than the highest displays of argument or declamation. Thus spoke the Duke of Wellington, on moving the second reading of the bill on the 4th of April: "My lords, I am one of those who have probably passed a longer period of my life engaged in war than most men, and principally, I may say, in civil war; and I must say this—that if I could avoid, by any sacrifice whatever, even one month of civil war in the country to which I am attached, I would sacrifice my life in order to do it. I say that there is nothing which destroys property and prosperity and

* Twiss, vol. iii. p. 83.
† "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. i. p. 189.

* "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. i. p. 347.
† Ibid., p. 349.

demoralizes character to the degree that civil war does; by it the hand of man is raised against his neighbor, against his brother, and against his father; the servant betrays his master, and the whole scene ends in confusion and devastation. Yet, my lords, this is the resource to which we must have looked—these are the means to which we must have applied, in order to have put an end to this state of things, if we had not made the option of bringing forward the measures, for which I hold myself responsible." * The great captain was assailed as virulently as Mr. Peel was assailed, by the most furious of those who assumed to be the only true supporters of Church and State. The Earl of Winchelsea published a letter in which he insinuated that the duke had supported the establishment of King's College, that he "might the more effectually, under the cloak of some outward show of zeal for the Protestant religion, carry on his insidious designs for the infringement of our liberties, and the introduction of popery into every department of the state." The duke demanded that the letter should be withdrawn; the earl refused to do so. On the 21st of March the two peers had a hostile meeting in Battersea Fields. The Duke of Wellington fired without effect; the Earl of Winchelsea discharged his pistol in the air, and then tendered a written apology. In a letter to the Duke of Buckingham, a month after this transaction, the Duke of Wellington thus defended a conduct which he admitted must have "shocked many good men:" "The truth is that the duel with Lord Winchelsea was as much part of the Roman Catholic question, and it was as necessary to undertake it, and carry it out to the extremity to which I did carry it, as it was to do everything else which I did do to attain the object which I had in view. I was living here in an atmosphere of calumny. I could do nothing that was not misrepresented as having some bad purpose in view." When Lord Winchelsea published his letter the duke determined to act upon it. "The atmosphere of calumny in which I had been some time living cleared away. The system of calumny was discontinued." † Mr. Peel had to endure calumnies even more galling than those which the Duke of Wellington decided to resist by the course which a brave soldier, jealous upon the point of honor, was then almost compelled to take in deference to the false opinions of society. Twenty years after this great political struggle Sir Robert Peel wrote the following solemn appeal to protect his memory: "I can with truth affirm, as I do solemnly affirm in the presence of Almighty God, 'to whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid,' that in advising and promoting the measures of 1829 I was swayed by no fear except the fear of public calamity, and that I acted throughout on a deep conviction that those measures were not only conducive to the general welfare, but that they had become imperatively necessary in order to avert from interests which had a special claim upon my support—the interests of the Church and of institutions connected with the Church—an imminent and increasing danger." ‡

The Catholic Relief Bill received the royal assent on the 13th of April. Lord Eldon at two previous audiences of George IV. had urged him to refuse the royal assent. The king, who was a great actor, not only in the power of mimicry which he possessed, but in exhibiting a well-feigned passion, deceived his ex-chancellor into the belief that his old master would peril everything, even his throne, by this obsolete exercise of the royal prerogative. Dangerous, almost infatuated, as was this advice of Lord Eldon, we cannot doubt his sincerity, we cannot believe that any corrupt motive, or even any personal ambition, prompted his interference to avert what he believed would be a great political evil. He distrusted the Roman Catholics, not from a blind adherence to a worn-out bigotry, but from a reliance upon that unstatesmanlike caution which could not look beyond a dark present into a brighter future. Happily he had to deal with a sovereign of different character than he who compelled Pitt—in the fear that he might drive the king into insanity—to lay aside the implied pledges of the union, and thus to make the legislature equivocate for thirty years with the just expectations of disappointed millions. A few childish lamentations, and there would be an end of the opposition of George the Fourth to the resolve of his ministry. He would go to Hanover—he would return no more to England—let them get a Catholic king in Clarence—were his ejaculations at the interview of the 9th of April. On the 14th Lord Eldon wrote to his daughter: "The fatal bill received the royal assent yesterday afternoon. After all I had heard in my visits not a day's delay." *

About a month after the passing of the bill Mr. O'Connell was introduced to the House of Commons for the purpose of taking his seat for Clare. A petition against his return had been referred to a committee, who declared that he was duly returned. Mr. O'Connell had been elected before the passing of the new act, and the clerk of the house accordingly tendered to him the oath of supremacy which was required to be taken under the old law. This oath Mr. O'Connell refused to take, claiming to take the oath set forth in the Relief Act. He was the next day heard at the bar. His courtesy, his moderation, his legal knowledge, surprised the house, and called forth the approving voices of the great law-officers who had opposed his claim at once to take his seat. Upon a division a new writ was ordered for Clare. A large subscription was entered into for securing Mr. O'Connell's second return, which took place on the 30th of July. His violence at that election was a painful and disgusting contrast to his assumed gentleness at the bar of the House of Commons. His unmeasured words almost induced a general apprehension that the great measure of Catholic emancipation had been too readily yielded to that sense of an overwhelming necessity which had converted opposing statesmen into its responsible promoters. There was a higher principle than the expediency which changed the policy of Mr. Peel—a principle thus proclaimed out of the walls of parliament, to assert the Christian obligation of passing this law: "It is the direct duty of every Englishman to support the claims of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, even at the hazard of injuring the Protestant establishment; because those claims cannot be rejected without great injustice; and it is a want of faith in God and an unholy zeal to think that he can be served by injustice, or to guard against contingent evil by committing certain sin." † This was a great truth, maintained in words not to be forgotten, by a bold thinker who did not fear evil tongues—one whose tolerant zeal for the Church establishment, which he ardently desired to uphold, could not shut his eyes to the exclusive pretensions of those who would have built its security upon a rotten foundation. It was a truth whose constant recognition would support every conscientious statesman through the perils with which Ireland would yet be surrounded; would neutralize the interested agitation for the repeal of the union which the chief agitator would for years carry forward to the verge of rebellion; would produce the general conviction that the "great injustice" being effectually removed, a fair field would be left for the removal or amelioration of social evils; would convert even the terrible calamity of a famine into a final blessing; would "assert eternal providence" in manifesting that a righteous act would at last have its reward, in rendering the once wronged Ireland no more a terror to England, but the sharer of her liberty and her prosperity—a true sister, no longer to be alienated by just complaints, much less by demagogic violence and priestly stratagem.

The parliament was prorogued on the 24th of June. The landowners when they returned to their country mansions did not find happy faces amid either tenants or laborers. The summer and autumn were wet and cold; the harvest was protracted; the crops were ill got in, and were hurried to market. They were found to be of inferior quality, and prices suffered temporarily a great depression. Then came the severest winter since 1813-14. Parliament met on the 4th of February, 1830. The king's speech lamented that, notwithstanding the indication of active commerce afforded by increased exports, distress should prevail among the agricultural and manufacturing classes. One effectual mode of mitigating the pressure upon industrial capital was announced in the intention to propose a considerable reduction in the amount of public expenditure. The promise was realized. The chancellor of the exchequer proposed, on the 15th of March, the total remission of the excise duties on beer, cider, and leather. Increased duties on spirits were to supply a portion of the deficiency. The propositions of the government were finally agreed to. Motions for reform of parliament were brought forward, with the usual fate of every previous attempt to

* Hansard, vol. xxi. col. 45.
† Duke of Buckingham, "Court of George IV.," vol. ii. p. 397.
‡ "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. i. p. 365.

* Twiss, vol. iii. p. 87.
† Dr. Arnold, "Christian Duty of considering the Roman Catholic Claims." "Miscellaneous Works," p. 6.

carry a sweeping or a partial measure. Again was it resolved that the seat which was vacant through the corruption of East Retford should not be transferred to Birmingham. Mr. O'Connell proposed to bring in a bill to establish universal suffrage, triennial parliaments, and vote by ballot. Lord John Russell had a counter-proposition for additional representatives for populous counties and large unrepresented towns. The solution of this difficult problem seemed as far off as ever. It was helped forward by the imprudent conduct of a great peer, who openly proclaimed what too many of the aristocracy felt in their hearts. A petition was presented to the House of Commons complaining of the interference of the Duke of Newcastle in the elections for the borough of Newark, and praying that his power of ejecting tenants from the property which he held as lessee of crown lands should be prevented in future by the non-renewal of his lease. The government declared that it was not their intention to renew this lease: it was unnecessary, therefore, to grant a committee to inquire into this matter. The debate, however, disclosed a correspondence which roused a feeling of indignation throughout the land. A public meeting had been held at Newark to condemn the proceedings of the nobleman who appeared to have held in small respect the well-known resolution of the House of Commons that it is a violation of the privileges of parliament for peers of the realm to interfere in elections. The Duke of Newcastle was invited to attend that meeting. He declined to attend, and asked the bold question, "May I not do what I will with mine own?" It was the argument of Shylock when he demanded the pound of flesh, "'Tis mine, and I will have it." These words went forth to teach Englishmen that property had its duties as well as its rights, preparing the way for that quickly-coming change when the democratic element would assert its claim to be more respected—when the franchise would cease to be considered as a chattel which the great could call their own. One measure of great importance was proposed this session by Mr. Brougham, as a specific measure connected with his extensive views of law reform which he had developed in 1828. On the 29th of April, 1830, he moved for leave to bring in a bill to establish local jurisdiction in certain districts in England. He showed that to recover small sums in the superior courts was a process involving delay and expense which prevented a creditor obtaining the satisfaction of his just demands. It was his hope that he might be eventually able to establish the system of local jurisdiction, from which he expected benefits unspeakably valuable to the country. That hope was long deferred. The county courts, which were founded upon the recommendation of the common law commissioners, arising out of Mr. Brougham's views in 1830, and upon their further enforcement when he became lord chancellor, were not established till Queen Victoria had been eight years upon the throne.

On the 24th of May a message was sent to both houses of parliament by the king, announcing his illness and stating the inconvenience of signing public instruments with his own hand. A bill was introduced for the appointment of commissioners to affix the king's sign-manual by a stamp, in the king's presence, and by his immediate order given by word of mouth. The bill received the royal assent on the 29th of May. On the 26th of June, at three o'clock in the morning, King George the Fourth expired at Windsor Castle. It is difficult to look back upon the career of this prince, whose sovereignty, either as regent or king, formed one of the most important eras in the annals of our country, without feeling how much his life had been one of great opportunities wasted and of natural powers perverted; how the circumstances by which he had been surrounded from his youth were almost wholly injurious to his character and his happiness. The present generation—in some degree by the force of contrast—have come to look very severely upon the faults of this erring brother. They were painfully visited upon him by the absence of all domestic happiness, by the feeling that he was not beloved or respected by the people he was appointed to rule over. The Duke of Wellington has given a character of the monarch who held in dread the great captain's strong sense and inflexible resolution: "He was indeed," said the duke, "the most extraordinary compound of talent, wit, buffoonery, obstinacy, and good feeling—in short, a medley of the most opposite qualities, with a great preponderance of good—that I ever saw in any character in my life." *

* Raikes's "Diary," vol. i. p. 92.

CHAPTER CCXXII.

Oath of allegiance taken by peers and commoners—Business of parliament commenced—Unmeasured language in the House of Commons—Motion for a regency in the event of the king's demise—France—Retrospect of government in reign of Charles X.—Prince Polignac appointed president of the council—Sudden prorogation of the chambers—Algiers—The royal ordinances promulgated—The three days of July—Duke of Orleans lieutenant-general of the kingdom—Abdication of Charles X.—Duke of Orleans king—Recognition by England of the new government of France—Revolution of Belgium—The opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway—Early opposition to the railway system—The locomotive engine—George Stephenson—His son Robert—Anticipations of the triumphs of railways—Death of Mr. Huskisson—Opening of parliament—Declaration of the Duke of Wellington—The king's visit to the city postponed—Defeat of ministers on the Civil List—They resign—Mr. Brougham's parliamentary position—Administration of Earl Grey completed—List of the ministry.

On Friday, the 25th of June, both houses of parliament had adjourned to the following Monday. The death of George the Fourth having taken place at three o'clock on the morning of the 26th, summonses were issued for the immediate attendance of the peers for the purpose of taking the oath of allegiance to King William the Fourth, as administered by the lord chancellor. According to ancient practice the oath to the Commons was to be administered by the lord steward. At an early hour, therefore, many members of the lower house attended in the Long Gallery for the purpose of taking this oath. The lord steward, the Marquess of Conyngham, did not arrive till late. When the house did meet, Mr. Brougham made an indignant protest against the treatment which the Commons of England had experienced; for many members had that morning, like himself, been kept for hours dancing attendance in the Long Gallery, and waiting the pleasure of the lord steward. On the following Monday Mr. Brougham explained that he should not have indulged in the remarks which he had made on the Saturday had he been aware that the lord steward, being also governor of Windsor Castle, could not leave till he had handed over the body of the king to the lord chamberlain. The incident is scarcely worth notice, except as affording a very early indication of the policy of Mr. Brougham, "that he at least had no intention of any longer forming a portion of what was termed his majesty's opposition, but that he was about to resume in earnest the character of an opponent." * The voice of public scandal, whose echo never died away, asserted that the Marquess of Conyngham and his family had very important private interests to take care of at Windsor Castle, in the few hours that elapsed between the death of the king and their departure from the palace of which they had long been inmates.

On the 29th of June the business of parliament commenced. A message from the king recommended "such temporary provision as may be requisite for the public service in the interval that may elapse between the close of the present session and the meeting of a new parliament." During the remaining three weeks of the session there was much sharp discussion in both houses. On the 30th of June, in the House of Lords, Earl Grey, upon the question of an address to his majesty, moved an amendment to adjourn, in order to give time for the consideration of the Civil List, and the expediency of providing a regency. The original motion was carried by a large majority. In the House of Commons Lord Althorp moved a similar amendment, which was also lost. On that night, after the proposed amendment had been negatived, a new debate arose upon the question being put on the original address. Several years had passed since the House of Commons had heard such unmeasured language as now proceeded from the orator who was the real leader of the opposition. It is difficult to understand how this fierceness should have been provoked by any act or manifest temper of the government—by anything beyond the popular suspicion that the Duke of Wellington was an enemy to the liberties of his country. A threat was supposed to have been held out in the other house by the duke which Mr. Brougham thus interpreted for him: "If you leave government in the minority, I will resign, and where then will you get a field-marshal to superintend your finances and your law courts?" Mr. Brougham then warned the government that in the event of a new

* Roebuck, "History of the Whig Ministry," vol. i. p. 251.

election they might look back even to the parliament with some of the pleasures of memory. Their case might be the same as that of Prince Polignac, who must needs send the representatives of France to their constituents, and in choosing a new assembly that great nation was up, not in arms, but in the panoply of reason. "We can perceive, sir, in this country as in that, that the day of force is over, and that the minister who hopes to rule by an appeal to royal favor or military power may be overwhelmed, though I in nowise accuse him of such an attempt. Him I accuse not. It is you I accuse—his flatterers—his mean, fawning parasites." Sir Robert Peel rose: "I ask the hon. and learned gentleman, as I am one of those on this side of the house to which he is referring, whether he means to accuse me of such conduct? . . . I ask him whether he presumes—whether he presumes to call me the mean and fawning parasite of any body?" The historian of the Whig ministry says, "Checked thus suddenly in mid career, Mr. Brougham seemed at once to perceive that the phrase he had used and the charge he had brought were not to be justified." He disclaimed every intention of applying the words to Sir Robert Peel himself. Sir Robert Peel required something more. Mr. Brougham had "no right to accuse men as honest, upright, and independent as himself of being parasites. He would make the apology and retractation for the hon. and learned gentleman"—that "these words were uttered in the warmth of debate, and without reference to any individual application." * Mr. Brougham at once adopted the apology thus prescribed to him.

On the 6th of July Mr. R. Grant moved an address to his majesty, touching the expediency of making provision against the dangers to which the country might be exposed by a demise of the crown. The motion was rejected by a majority of a hundred and fifty-four. It was on this occasion that Mr. Macaulay, who had very recently been returned to parliament for the borough of Calne, first exhibited his power of discussing a constitutional question upon broader principles than those of the mere debater. The solicitor-general had talked about the delicacy due to the new monarch; that in previous cases of interference there had been a suspension of the executive functions. "I should wish," said Mr. Macaulay, "to ask the honorable and learned gentleman what he conceives to be the end and object of parliament? The history of our hereditary form of government does not present us with any certain security for the wisdom or virtue of the chief magistrate. The destinies of the community may be intrusted to the feeble hands of infancy; and this and other consequences have afforded ample themes to the satirist and the declaimer. Look at this moment at the enormous weight and extent of power confided to the hereditary monarch, whether an infant or an adult. . . . Yet this enormous empire, with all its complicated interests, may be placed under the control of a thoughtless boy or girl. For a child, unable to walk or to express the simplest wish in its mother tongue, the claims of veteran generals and of accomplished statesmen are passed by. Senates pay it homage, and by the years of its rule laws are numbered and public acts are dated. To many this system may appear, if not absurd, unreasonable; and what is the answer? Why in this enlightened age do we resist, and would oppose, even with our lives, any change of that system? What is the advantage that counterbalances its numerous and admitted evils? It may be designated in one word—certainty. . . . Under an hereditary government the royal authority passes without interval from one royal depository to another, and none can dispute in whom the right to the supreme magistracy resides. If this certainty be of more value than wisdom, virtues, or public services—if it be paramount to every other consideration, then, I ask, what becomes of all the arguments of the honorable and learned member? He tells us to pause in the appointment of a regency, and to choose well rather than to choose soon; but if we follow his advice we forego the only advantage of our hereditary form of government—its certainty." † A satisfactory measure by which this desirable certainty was attained, the personage in whom the nation could place the utmost confidence being nominated sole regent, was passed in the new parliament. The Duchess of Kent was appointed to this high office, in the event of the Princess Victoria becoming queen before she had attained the age of eighteen.

The king, on the 23d of July, prorogued parliament in person. The royal speech contained these flattering words: "It is with the utmost satisfaction that I find myself enabled to congratulate you upon the general tranquillity of Europe." On the 24th parliament was dissolved by proclamation.

It has been observed by M. Guizot that the ties, apparent or concealed, that exist between France and England, have never been broken even by their rivalries. "Whether they know or are ignorant of it, whether they acknowledge or deny the fact, they cannot avoid being powerfully acted upon by each other." * Never was this truth more strikingly exemplified than in the effect produced upon English opinion with regard to our domestic politics, by that French revolution of 1830 which, bursting forth within forty-eight hours of the dissolution of our own parliament, had a most decided influence upon the elections that took place during the month of August, and thus produced a change of administration which immediately led to our own peaceful revolution—the reform of parliament. To comprehend in some degree the causes of the great event which hurled the elder branch of the Bourbons from that throne upon which they appeared to be firmly seated after the battle of Waterloo, we must advert very briefly to the course of the government of France after the death of Louis XVIII., on the 16th of September, 1824.

On the 15th of August, a month only before the decease of Louis, the censorship of journals was re-established by a royal ordinance. The state of the king's health appeared to the minister, M. de Villèle, to require that the government should have in its hands this power of controlling the press. The good sense of Louis XVIII., and his desire to govern as far as possible in an enlightened and liberal spirit, preserved France during his reign from any popular convulsion. Under the charter the struggles of parties were of a constitutional character. There were great orators in the Chamber of Deputies who were opposed to the government; there were bitter satirists in prose and verse, such as Courier and Beranger, who attacked the ultra-royalist party and the priestly party with unsparing ridicule—nevertheless the nation had not arrived at the belief that another vital change in its institutions was necessary, and was content to confide in the power of the charter gradually to repair its own deficiencies. Charles X. came to the throne. The French saw the change with something like dread, for he was considered the representative of ultra-royalist opinions. He at once manifested a solicitude that the people should accept him as a constitutional king. His first act was to abolish the censorship of the journals. He said to the peers and deputies that his great desire was to consolidate the charter for the happiness of his people. He promised to each religious body protection for its worship. The ceremony of consecrating the king at Rheims was little in accordance with the spirit of the age, or the general character of the French. The people laughed and sneered when the "Moniteur" said: "There is no doubt that the holy oil which will flow on the forehead of Charles X. in the solemnity of his consecration, is the same as that which, since the time of Clovis, has consecrated the French kings." Napoleon putting the crown upon his own head was a fitter type of popular sovereignty in France than Charles X. anointed in seven parts of his body by the Archbishop of Rheims. Nevertheless the king had solemnly promised to maintain the charter, and the obsolete pageantries of his coronation were not imputed to him as a fault. The people had soon to learn how little dependence could be placed upon the professions, and even upon the liberal actions, of their new king. "Without false calculation or premeditated deceit, Charles X. wavered from contradiction to contradiction, from inconsistency to inconsistency, until the day when, given up to his own will and belief, he committed the error which cost him his throne." † He was at heart "a true emigrant and a submissive bigot." In 1826 a shrewd Englishman, writing from Paris, saw clearly how the bigotry would terminate: "The French government are behaving very foolishly, flinging themselves into the arms of the Jesuits; making processions through the streets of twelve hundred priests, with the king and royal family at their head; disgusting the people, and laying the foundation of another revolution, which seems to me (if this man lives) to be inevitable." ‡

M. de Villèle's career, as the chief minister of Louis XVIII. and

* Hansard, vol. xxv. col. 326. † Ibid., vol. xxv. col. 1029.

* Guizot, "Memoirs to illustrate the History of My Time," vol. i. p. 306. † Guizot., vol. i. p. 266.
‡ "Letters of Sydney Smith," vol. ii. p. 261.

Charles X., had been of a longer duration than might have been expected from the discordant elements by which he was surrounded. For six years he had been the presiding spirit of the government. When he entered upon power he said, "I am born for the end of revolutions." This belief had little of the spirit of prophecy, however the prudence and sagacity of this minister might have retarded that isolation of the ruler from the ruled which is the beginning of new revolutions. The elections of 1827 were unfavorable to the government; and the minister, not having the cordial support of the whole royalist party, was compelled to retire from office. The dauphiness said to the king, "In abandoning M. de Villèle, you have descended the first step of your throne." M. de Martignac became the head of the cabinet which replaced that of M. de Villèle. His tendencies were liberal and constitutional; his talents had not their proper influence either with the king or the chambers. He did what was in his power to prevent the measures of repression which one party desired, and to carry forward those measures of conciliation which he thought would retard a rupture between the throne and the nation. Lafayette characterized the policy of Martignac in a very significant sentence: "Three steps forward and two backward, we have the net product of one little step." To move forward at all, and not to have the power of carrying the chambers in a retrogressive policy, was held at the Tuileries to be the fault of this minister. In August, 1829, a royal ordinance appeared changing the whole of the ministry, and finally appointing Prince Jules de Polignac president of the council. The prince had been ambassador in England; and many of the French, and not a few of the English, chose to believe that he had been appointed to his post through the influence of the Duke of Wellington, and that his subsequent measures were taken in concert with our cabinet. Sir Robert Peel, on the 2d of November, 1830, emphatically denied that the government of this country, directly or indirectly, had interfered in this appointment.* In the choice of Polignac as his prime minister, "Charles X.," says M. Guizot, "had hoisted upon the Tuileries the flag of the counter-revolution." On the 2d of March, 1830, the chambers were opened. There was a half menace in the royal speech, which appeared to presage some exercise of arbitrary power. "If criminal manœuvres were to place obstacles in the way of my government, which I neither can nor wish to foresee, I should find the power of surmounting them in a resolution to maintain the public peace, in the just confidence of the French people, and in the devotion which they have always demonstrated for their king." The address of the chamber of deputies, which was carried by a majority of 221 to 181, affirmed that it was their duty to declare to the king that the charter supposed, in order to its working, a concurrence between the mind of the sovereign and the interests of his people; that it was their painful duty to declare that such concurrence existed no longer, as the administration ordered all its acts upon the supposition of the disaffection of the people. The next day the chambers were prorogued till the 1st of September. On the 16th of May they were dissolved. New elections were ordered for June and July, and the parliament so elected was to meet on the 3d of August. Most men saw clearly that a great struggle was at hand. The Duke of Orleans, on the 31st of May, gave a fête in honor of his brother-in-law, the King of Naples, at the Palais Royal, at which Charles X. and the royal family were present. M. de Salvandy said to the Duke of Orleans, "This is truly a Neapolitan festival; we are dancing on a volcano." The duke agreed with him, adding that he would not have to reproach himself with making no effort to open the eyes of the king. "What am I to do? Nothing is listened to. Heaven only knows where they will be in six months. But I well know where I shall be. Under any circumstances my family and I remain in this palace." †

On the 12th of July, during the progress of the French elections, the news arrived of the capture of Algiers. For two or three years the French government had been carrying on a small war against that barbarian power. But the ministry of Polignac resolved to strike a great blow for the establishment of a colonial dominion, and for the revival of that passion for military glory which had so often bestowed popularity upon the rulers of France, in their neglect of the national industry and their indifference to the growth of the people's liberties. A formidable expedition sailed from Toulon on the 25th of May, of which the three hundred and fifty ships carried forty thousand troops. Before the elections began the landing of this expedition was announced. Before they were concluded Algiers had been surrendered and the Dey had been dethroned. But this triumph produced not the slightest effect upon the elections. In some respects it made the electors more determined that a military glory should not encourage the tendencies to absolutism at home. M. Guizot, upon hearing the news of the capture of Algiers, wrote, "I hope this success will not stimulate power to the last madness." The elections being completed, it was ascertained beyond a doubt that a very large majority of the Chamber of Deputies would be opposed to the administration of the Prince de Polignac. Charles X. at this juncture was meditating some desperate act which would restore what he believed to be his legitimate rights. "The charter contained, for a prudent and patient monarch, certain means of exercising the royal authority and of securing the crown. But Charles X. had lost confidence in France and in the charter." * The historian of his own time relates that the Russian ambassador, Count Pozzo di Borgo, a few days before the government was committed to its fatal determination, had an audience with the king, in which his majesty's conversation led the shrewd diplomatist to have little doubt as to the measures in preparation. He had found the king studying the fourteenth article of the charter, "seeking with honest inquietude the interpretation he wanted to find there; in such cases we always discover what we are in search of." † The fourteenth article of the French constitution says that the king is supreme head of the state. How Charles X. interpreted this is disclosed in that Revolution of July for which it is affirmed France had no desire. "The spirit of legality and sound political reason had made remarkable progress. Even during the ferment of the elections, public feeling loudly repudiated all idea of a new revolution." ‡

On the 21st of July a report, signed by the Prince de Polignac, was presented to the king in council, in which it was represented that signs of disorganization and symptoms of anarchy presented themselves in every part of the kingdom; that the periodical press was the chief instrument of disorder and sedition. It had endeavored to eradicate every germ of religious sentiment from the heart of the people; worst of all, it had dared to criticise the causes, the means, the preparations, and the chances of success of that expedition whose glory had cast such a pure and durable brilliancy over the crown of France. The laws were insufficient to restrain the license of the press; it was time, it was more than time, to stop its ravages. The report then set forth that the ordinary conditions of representative government did not then exist in France; that a turbulent democracy had disposed of a majority of the elections through the means of the journals and by affiliated societies. The fourteenth article of the charter was then appealed to as giving to the king a sufficient power, not indeed for the change of institutions, but for their consolidation and immutability. No government on earth could stand if it had not the power of providing for its own security, which is pre-existent to laws, because it is in the nature of things. The moment was come to have recourse to measures which were in the spirit of the charter, but which are beyond the limits of legal order, the resources of which have been exhausted in vain. Such was the tenor of the document which an infatuated ministry presented to an infatuated king, as a justification of the decrees which they proposed for the overthrow of the constitution.

The three ordinances by which the liberty of the periodical press was suspended, the Chamber of Deputies was dissolved, and the number of deputies was lessened and their term of office regulated, were kept profoundly secret till nearly midnight of the 25th of July. No communication whatever was made to the heads of the police, nor to the commanders of the forces, that any unusual amount of vigilance or energy might be required in the possible event of a popular movement. The ministers had not the least idea that any effect would be produced by their acts beyond the suspension of obnoxious journals and the re-election of a Chamber of Deputies under conditions more favorable to the government. At eleven o'clock on the evening of Sunday, the 25th of July, copies of the memorial of the ministers to the king, and of the three ordinances which had been signed in coun-

* Hansard, Third Series, vol. i. p. 90.
† Guizot, vol. ii. p. 12.

* Guizot, vol. i. p. 357. † Ibid., p. 358. ‡ Ibid., p. 355.

cil on that day, were sent to the responsible editor of the "Moniteur," to be published in his paper of the following morning.

On Monday morning, the 26th of July, while the population of Paris were quietly proceeding to their various duties or pleasures, Paris was shaken to its centre as by a political earthquake. Before the doors of the Bourse were opened the holders of stock were crowding thither to sell. More important than the operations of commerce were the proceedings of the journalists. The proprietors and editors of the chief opposition papers took a wise and prudent course in the first instance. They consulted the most eminent lawyers, who gave their opinion that the ordinances were illegal and ought not to be submitted to. One of the judges of the Tribunal of First Instance authorized the "Journal of Commerce" to continue its publication provisionally, because the ordinances had not been promulgated in legal forms. Forty-four conductors of newspapers assembled at the office of the "National," signed a protest in which they declared their intention to resist the ordinances as regarded their own interests, and invited the deputies to meet on the 3d of August, as if no decree had gone forth for new elections. The government, said this protest, has this day lost that character of legality which commands obedience; we resist it as far as we are concerned; it remains for France to judge how far it should carry its own resistance. On that Monday there was no appearance of popular insurrection. There was occasionally a cry in the streets of "Long live the Charter! Down with the Ministers!"

The next day a more ominous cry went forth: "Up with Liberty! Down with the Bourbons!" The provisions of the decrees respecting the press were to be carried through by naked force. Four of the most popular journals had been printed without the license which was required by the ordinance. Sentinels were placed around the offices to prevent their sale; but copies of the journals which not only contained the ordinances but the protest of the journalists were thrown out of the windows, and were quickly circulated throughout Paris. The old scenes of the revolution of 1789 were rapidly developed. In the Palais Royal and other public places men mounted upon chairs read the ordinances and the bitter comments upon them to assembled crowds. The steps taken by the police to prevent the farther issue of these papers were calculated to stimulate the excitement of the people into absolute fury. The doors of the offices where they were printed were broken open, and the presses rendered unserviceable. The printers thrown out of their employ joined the crowds in the streets; and they are not a class to be injured without lifting up their voices against the wrong. In the course of that Tuesday the resistance to the acts of the government began to be transferred to men who might have been able to guide its course more safely than the declamation of the journalists or the passions of the populace. The deputies were beginning to arrive in Paris. M. Guizot describes how, on reaching the city on the morning of the 27th, he found a note from M. Casimir Périer, inviting him to a meeting of some of their colleagues. "A few hours before," he says, "and within a short distance of Paris, the decrees were unknown to me; and, by the side of legal opposition, I saw on my arrival revolutionary and unchained insurrection."* He went to the meeting at the house of M. Casimir Pêrier, and was selected, in conjunction with MM. Villemain and Dupin, to draw up in the name of the deputies present a protest against the decrees. This protest was adopted on the 28th. It was signed by sixty-three deputies. Its tone was moderate, and did not close the door against conciliation. It left to the king and his advisers a *locus penitentiæ*.

The solution of the great question was very soon to be taken out of the hands of deputies who entertained a diversity of opinion; some wishing to carry resistance to the utmost limit of legal order and not beyond, some desiring a change of dynasty, and a few sighing for a republic. The people in the streets were not distracted by contending opinions; they were not inclined to look forward to "the fashion of uncertain evils." They saw that the government had forfeited its claim to their obedience, and they little cared what form of government might succeed to the one that had betrayed its trust. There were ten thousand soldiers in Paris under the command of Marmont. The immediate business which presented itself to the minds of the people was to fight if necessary. Guizot relates that, while he and a few other deputies were consulting, on the evening of the 28th of July, in a drawing-room of the ground-floor of a private residence, whose windows were open, a crowd of laboring people, youths, children, and combatants of every kind, filled the court-yard, and, addressing the deputies, said they were ready to defend them if soldiers and police, as was stated, were coming to arrest them. At the same time they demanded an instant adhesion to their revolutionary proceedings. M. Guizot says that the revolutionists at any price, the dreamers of an imaginary future, had rapidly thrown themselves into the movement, and became hourly more influential and exacting. "Some firm, well-regulated minds ventured to resist and show themselves resolved not to become revolutionists even while promoting a revolution." This was a subtle distinction, which certainly did not enter into the views of the great body of the bourgeoisie, who entered almost with one accord into the contest with unconstitutional power, although they had everything to lose by the spread of anarchy. The manufacturers had closed their workshops, and sent their men into the streets to contend for their common liberties. The members of the national guard, which had been disbanded in 1827, had again put on their uniforms and taken their arms, which the greater part of them had retained. The crowd which on the evening of the 28th surrounded the drawing-room with open windows had been fighting themselves throughout the day, or knew that there had been fighting in almost every quarter of Paris. From daybreak multitudes had begun to assemble, armed with sticks and pikes, old guns and sabres. They unpaved the streets; they threw up barricades of timber and of carts filled with the paving-stones; they seized the Hôtel de Ville; they hoisted the tricolored flag on its roof and on the towers of Nôtre Dame. The bells of the Municipal Palace and of the Metropolitan Church again called the citizens to arms as in the days of the first revolution. Terror was in every family now as then; but there were no frightful excesses, no sanguinary scenes of popular vengeance, to make even the name of liberty hateful. The people stood prepared for the struggle with the regular troops that was coming upon them; for Paris, on that morning of the 28th, had been declared by the government to be in a state of siege. Marmont had not begun to act after receiving the ordinance, which thus declared that the military power was the sole arbiter, before the insurgents were in possession of the chief part of the capital. He finally formed his troops in four columns, which were directed upon different points. It was not long before the sanguinary conflict began. It would be beyond the object of this history, even if it were in the power of the writer, to furnish a clear detail in a small compass of the struggles of this memorable day. Those who witnessed some of the many occurrences which were proceeding simultaneously in distant parts of Paris felt this difficulty in the subsequent discharge of their official duty. "The events," said M. Martignac, in the defence of Polignac, "so press upon, jostle, and confound each other, that the imagination can scarcely follow them or the understanding range them in order." The first serious fighting appears to have taken place in the narrow street of St. Antoine, which was closed by barricades. From the houses approaching this street, paving-stones, broken bottles, and even articles of furniture, were showered upon the heads of the unfortunate soldiery. The column which was ordered to force this street returned to the Tuileries, where Marmont had his headquarters. Another column had to sustain an obstinate fight about the Hôtel de Ville. The general who commanded the troops obtained possession of the place, but he was compelled to confine his resistance to the populace to defensive operations. Another column lost many men at the Marché des Innocens. The fourth column sustained less loss. Night came on. The firing was still continued; the tocsin was rung from every church; the lamps were extinguished in the streets. Neither mail nor diligence left Paris. The communication with the provinces by telegraph was cut off. During the afternoon five deputies, headed by M. Lafitte, had waited upon Marshal Marmont at the Tuileries to ask for a suspension of hostilities, that in the interval they might send a deputation to the king. The marshal said he could only dispatch a messenger to the king to inform him of the proceedings of the assembled deputies and of the state of affairs in Paris. His aide-de-camp received at St. Cloud a verbal answer directing Marmont to hold out, to collect his forces, and to act in masses. In conformity with these orders, the column which had held the Hôtel de Ville returned at midnight

* Guizot, "My own Times," vol. ii. p. 3.

to the Tuileries, having left in the streets several hundred men killed or wounded. The king, in his suburban palace, had no conception of the magnitude of the danger, but was passing his evening at cards, while the court routine went forward as if the distant boom of the cannon was a sound which should inspire no fear and awaken little sympathy.

On the 28th the working classes had almost exclusively borne the brunt of the battle. On the morning of the 29th hostilities had again commenced by seven o'clock. National guards, young students, and even deputies, were now at the barricades. The stately Faubourg St. Germain was now as ready for battle as the dingy Faubourg St. Antoine. The posts of the Luxembourg were disarmed. At a very early hour several royalists of high rank went to the Tuileries and had an interview with Marmont and Polignac. They urged the minister to recall the ordinances. He was calm and polite, but would promise nothing. He would consult his colleagues. They then suggested to Marmont that he should arrest the ministers. He seemed somewhat inclined to take their advice, when Peyronnet, one of the most obnoxious of the cabinet, came in, and exclaimed, "What! are you not gone yet?" They had stated their intention to go to St. Cloud. They set out, but Polignac got there before them. According to M. Guizot, the Duke de Mortêmart, Messrs. De Sémonville, D'Argout, De Vitrolles, and De Sussy were "the enlightened royalists who attempted to give legal satisfaction to the country, and to bring about an arrangement between the inert royalty at St. Cloud and the boiling revolution at Paris. But when they demanded an audience of the king they were met by the unseasonable hour, by etiquette, the countersign, and repose." From Charles X., whose inconsistency in this trying hour of his destiny was as remarkable as in all his previous actions, they at last extorted a promise for the dismissal of the Polignac ministry, the appointment of the Duke de Mortêmart as president of the council, and for other appointments which would be a guarantee for constitutional government. Still the king lingered and delayed the proper signatures till late in the day to the necessary ordinances. The Duke de Mortêmart, who set out on his return to Paris without a proper passport, met with a succession of interruptions from the royal guards. He had equal difficulty with the people in passing the barricades. The battle was raging all around Marmont at the Tuileries. The detachment at the Palais Bourbon was attacked, and the commander retired with his troops into the garden, and promised to be neutral. The Louvre was surrounded by masses of the populace, of whom a great number fell by the fire of the Swiss from the windows. At the Place Vendôme two regiments of the line were stationed, and a remnant of the gendarmerie. They were surrounded by the people, who, manifesting no inclination to regard the soldiers as enemies, the whole body of the troops, with their officers, went over to the side of the insurgents. On a second attack the Swiss were driven from the Louvre. The defection of the army, which was beginning to spread, proclaimed to Marmont that it was impossible to continue this contest. The insurrection had become a revolution. He hastily quitted the Tuileries with his troops to repair to St. Cloud. The populace as quickly broke into the palace. The tricolor was hoisted on the staff where the white flag of the Bourbons had floated for fifteen years. The deputies who had met in the morning had determined to establish a provisional government. Lafayette, who had received from them the command of the forces in Paris, had, in the uniform of a national guard, gone to take possession of the Hôtel de Ville. Upon the news of the defection of the two regiments, and the capture of the Louvre and the Tuileries, a municipal commission that had been formed by ballot, with authority to take all measures that the public safety might require, installed themselves at the Hôtel de Ville, surrounded by dead bodies heaped up on the place. In a few hours the national guard was organized; the administration of finance was provided for; the post-office was again set in action; the mails and the diligences left Paris bearing the tricolor flag. Three of the royalists who had been at St. Cloud arrived at ten o'clock at night with the ordinances already mentioned, and with a further ordinance, repealing those of the 25th of July, and appointing the Chamber of Deputies to meet on the 3d of August. The three royalists from St. Cloud came to negotiate for the preservation of the crown to Charles X. They were interrupted by cries of "It is too late!" The sovereignty of France had vanished from the grasp of the elder branch of the Bourbons.

On the 30th of July the deputies who had held their previous meetings at private houses met more formally in the hall of the Chamber of Deputies, inviting their absent colleagues to join them there. They came to a resolution of soliciting the Duke of Orleans, who was at his country-seat at Neuilly, to repair to the capital to assume the functions of lieutenant-general of the kingdom. Forty deputies signed this resolution. Three only declined being parties to it, considering this as a decisive step toward a change of dynasty.* On the 31st the deputies so assembled published a proclamation which thus commenced: "France is free! Absolute power elevated its standard; the heroic population of Paris has beaten it down. Paris, under attack, has made the sacred cause triumph by arms which had succeeded already through the constitutional elections." The proclamation then announced that the deputies, in anticipation of the regular concurrence of the chambers, had invited a true Frenchman, one who had never fought but for France—the Duke of Orleans—to exercise the functions of lieutenant-general of the kingdom. "We shall secure to ourselves by law all the guarantees we require to render liberty strong and permanent." On the 1st of August the Duke of Orleans was at the Palais Royal, had accepted the office, and proceeded on horseback to the Hôtel de Ville, as a mark of courtesy to the national guard and to their commander, Lafayette. M. Guizot relates that the deputies accompanied the duke on foot across the barricades. Women and children surrounded them, dancing and singing the "Marseillaise." Cries and questions of every kind burst incessantly from the crowd. Who was that gentleman on horseback? Was he a prince? A hope was expressed that he was not a Bourbon. "I was much more deeply impressed," says Guizot, "by our situation in the midst of that crowd and their attitude than even by the scene which followed a few moments after at the Hôtel de Ville. What future perils already reveal themselves for that new-born monarchy!" Lafayette, surrounded by his staff, advanced to the steps to meet the duke, who cordially embraced him. In the great hall the proclamation of the deputies was read, and received with cheers. The lieutenant-general of the kingdom advanced to the window, holding Lafayette by the hand and waving the tricolor flag. He then appointed provisional ministers, of whom Mr. Guizot was minister of the interior. Meanwhile it was known at St. Cloud that the king's authority was at an end. The crowd of courtiers quickly dropped off from him. In his restlessness he went to Trianon and then to Rambouillet. He was still surrounded by a large body of soldiery. On the 2d of August he addressed a letter to the Duke of Orleans, inclosing a formal act of abdication in favor of his grandson, the Duke of Bordeaux. Remaining at Rambouillet with numerous soldiers around him, the provisional government began to be uneasy as to the possibility of another conflict. Three commissioners were sent to confer with Charles and to urge him to depart. Their recommendations were backed by the presence of six thousand of the national guard, who marched to Rambouillet, accompanied by vast numbers of Parisians on foot and in vehicles of every description. The king consented to leave, and to proceed to Cherbourg, escorted by the Garde-du-Corps. Throughout his journey the unfortunate king and his family received no indignities from the people, but they saw on every steeple the tricolored flag, and the tricolored cockade in many a hat. They embarked for England on the 16th, and were carried to the coast of Devonshire, the king having decided that England should be his place of refuge. For a short time he resided at Lulworth Castle. He subsequently occupied Holyrood House. Some ultra-Liberals in Edinburgh having shown an inclination to treat the fallen monarch with disrespect upon his arrival, Sir Walter Scott published a manly and touching appeal to the more honorable feelings of his fellow-citizens. "If there can be any who retain angry or invidious recollections of late events in France, they ought to remark that the ex-monarch has, by his abdication, renounced the conflict into which, perhaps, he was engaged by bad advisers; that he can no longer be the object of resentment to the brave, but remains to all the most striking emblem of the mutability of human affairs which our mutable times have afforded." †

On the 3d of August the Duke of Orleans opened the legislative session in the Chamber of Deputies. In that chamber, during the next

* Guizot, vol. ii. p. 9.
† Lockhart's "Life of Scott," vol. vii. p. 226.

four days there was a partial opposition from the adherents of the fallen dynasty against the manifest tendency to a solution of the difficult question of a future government by the appointment of the Duke of Orleans as king. The charter of Louis XVIII. received some alterations, and then it was declared, by a large majority, that, subject to the acceptance of the modified charter, the universal and urgent interests of the French nation called to the throne the Duke of Orleans. On the 9th of August the Duke of Orleans, in the Chamber of Deputies, declared his acceptance of the crown, with the title King of the French, and took this oath: "In the presence of God, I swear to observe faithfully the constitutional charter, with the modifications expressed in the declaration; to govern only by the laws and according to the laws; to cause good and true justice to be rendered to each according to his right; and to act in all things only with a view to the interest, the happiness, and the glory of the French people."

"While two American packets, escorted by two French men-of-war, rapidly conveyed the old king and his family from France, all France hastened to Paris."* An English historian may add that no inconsiderable portion of the population of this kingdom were, as he himself witnessed, looking with intense interest upon the localities of the great events of the three days. Some were fraternizing with national guards in the *cafés;* others were mingling in a crowd of all nations at the evening *réceptions* of General Lafayette; a privileged few were banqueting at some shady *guinguette* with a great company of French, English, Belgian, and Polish liberals, whose fervid eloquence seemed the prelude to a very unsettled future of European society. There was, however, so much to admire in the conduct of the French people, that although the traces of carnage were everywhere around—although men of education joined their voices in the common cry of "death to the ministers," as an atonement for the blood of the slain whose graves were daily strewn with *immortelles*—the old idea of revolution had lost something of its terrors. There had been more bold speaking at our elections for the new parliament than was considered in some quarters safe or decorous. Yet the sympathy of the British population with the Revolution of France was not to be mistaken for an approbation of levelling and destructive doctrines, such as had led astray many enthusiasts among us in 1789. It was "a contrast to the first revolution;" it "vindicated the cause of knowledge and liberty, showing how humanizing to all classes of society are the spread of thought and information, and improved political institutions."† The sympathy was too manifest to be set at naught by the government of this country, even if it had been as much disposed to uphold "a royal rebellion against society," as it was the fashion unjustly to ascribe to the great warrior who was the head of the cabinet. He, it has been stated, was for a short time perplexed and undecided. "When nothing was known beyond the ordinances of July, some one asked the Duke of Wellington, 'What are we to think of this?' 'It is a new dynasty,' answered the duke. 'And what course shall you take?' inquired his friend. 'First, a long silence, and then we will concert with our allies what we shall say.'"‡ A wiser and nobler policy than "a long silence" and "concert with our allies" was speedily adopted. When the new parliament was opened on the 2d of November, "the ready manner in which ministers recognized the new government of France" was cordially approved by Earl Grey.

The Revolution of France necessarily produced a great effect upon the popular feeling throughout Europe, and especially in the Kingdom of the Netherlands. Since the settlement of Europe, in 1815, when the Congress of Vienna decided that Belgium and Liège, together with the Seven United Provinces, should be formed into one kingdom, there had been constant dissensions between the Belgian and Dutch subjects of William Frederick I. The union with Holland had imparted an extraordinary impulse to the commerce and manufactures of Belgium, but this material prosperity could not blend the two peoples into one nation. The differences of religion and of language, and the inequality upon several financial matters of the northern and southern kingdoms, kept up the acrimony which was exhibited, not only in the public journals, but in the debates of the States-General. In April, 1830, Messrs. Potter, Tielmans, Bartells, and others, were tried at Brussels on a charge of conspiracy against the government of the Netherlands. The three named were found guilty, and sentenced to be banished. Potter was in Paris during the revolution of July, the events of which period were not calculated to moderate his revolutionary zeal. He was an active agent in promoting the rising of the populace in Brussels on the 25th of August. In a second insurrection, of September, the Dutch troops were compelled to retreat before the armed insurgents. The contest went on in various sanguinary conflicts, until the five great powers imposed a cessation of arms on both nations and recognized the independence of Belgium by a protocol of the 4th of November.

The autumn of 1830 witnessed in England the most remarkable contrast between the triumphs of intellect and the disgraces of ignorance. On the 15th of September the first railway for the conveyance of passengers was opened, the carriages being drawn by a locomotive engine, at the speed of a racehorse. Immediately after the harvest the southern agricultural counties were given over to more havoc and alarm than had ever attended the operations of the frame-breaking General Ludd. There was a war of the laborer against the farmer, in the shape of incendiary fires of barns and corn-stacks, and the destruction of threshing-machines and other implements of industry beyond the commonest tool. Before we proceed to trace the course of the universal political excitement of the next two years, let us rapidly view the rise of the new power of communication which was destined to produce results beyond all possible conception in the progress of civilized communities. The simultaneous manifestation of the belief of large bodies of laborers, that their condition would be bettered by driving back society to the commonest inventive arts of savage tribes, and to the barbaric ignorance which, in destroying capital, would make all poorer, may be more fitly treated of in a subsequent view of the condition of the laborers in husbandry, when incendiary fires and the destruction of machinery were traced to causes of no temporary nature.

On the 2d of March, 1825, there was a debate in the House of Commons on the motion for the second reading of the bill for the Liverpool and Manchester Railway. The subscribers to this undertaking were the bankers, merchants, traders, and manufacturers of Liverpool and Manchester. They had not engaged in this project with a view to individual profit as shareholders, for it had been agreed that no person should hold more than ten shares, and they would be satisfied if they received ten per cent, or even five per cent, upon their investment. Their great object was the increase of commerce. It was alleged that no such encouragement was necessary; for there were two or three canals, which were sufficient for every purpose of commerce in the districts through which the railway was to pass. The answer was, that under the existing system cotton had been detained at Liverpool for a fortnight, while the manufacturers of Manchester were obliged to suspend their labors, and goods manufactured at Manchester could not be transmitted to Liverpool in time for shipment, on account of the tardy canal conveyance. Then came the rejoinder. The experiment of conveying goods on a railway had been tried, and had completely failed. The best locomotive engine that could be found had been selected; and the average rate on a plane surface was not three miles and three quarters per hour, which was slower than canal conveyance.* Before a committee upon the bill, Telford and others expressed an opinion that with the improvement of the locomotive the speed upon a railway might be fifteen miles, and even twenty miles an hour. These opinions were called "the gross exaggerations of the powers of the locomotive steam-engine;" and it was contended that even if such a speed could be attained, the dangers of bursting boilers and broken wheels would be so great that we should as soon expect that "people would suffer themselves to be fired off upon one of Congreve's ricochet rockets as trust themselves to the mercy of such a machine going at such a rate." In the same article from which we quote the general question of railways is thus summarily disposed of: "As to those persons who speculate on making railways general throughout the kingdom, and superseding all the canals, all the wagons, mail and stage-coaches, post-chaises, and, in short, every other mode of conveyance by land and

* Guizot, vol. ii. p. 36.
† Dr. Arnold, August, 1830. "Life," vol. I. p. 264.
‡ Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir R. Peel," p. 46.

* Hansard, 2d series, vol. xii. cols. 845 to 854.

by water, we deem them and their visionary schemes unworthy of notice." *

The bill for the Liverpool and Manchester Railway passed, in spite of the most strenuous opposition from canal companies, and from proprietors of land through or near which the line was intended to run. For four years the works went on. Difficulties were overcome which then appeared insuperable, but which would be deemed trifles in the great engineering operations of a later period of railway speculation. Nevertheless, satisfactory as was this progress, no one believed that a passenger traffic would arise that would dispense in any considerable degree with mails and stage coaches. Railways were not a new invention, nor were locomotive engines. Tramroads were used in collieries; and the construction of a steam-engine that would move forward with a weight behind it had been attempted by various projectors. But the tramways were laid on yielding beds and out of level, and the engines would either not go at all or very soon come to a stand. The alliance of the railway and the locomotive was still far distant. In 1813 there was a superintendent engineer of a colliery at Killingworth, who had gradually risen from the humble position of an engine-fireman to be worthy of an employ which placed him above the condition of a laborer. This self-taught man was George Stephenson. His mind was ever active. He had constructed an incline and an apparatus by which wagons descending from the coal-pit to the loading-place were made to draw up the empty wagons. At the time when Davy had invented his safety-lamp, Stephenson had constructed a similar lamp, without any knowledge of the contemporary invention, and this lamp is still in use in the pit at Killingworth. In 1814 he had constructed a locomotive engine for the colliery in which he was engaged. It was a success, drawing eight loaded wagons along the tramway at the rate of four miles an hour. He then declared that there was no limit to the speed of such an engine, if the works could be made to stand it. During the next ten years his skill and perseverance raised him into employment as the engineer of railways connected with colliery properties. A more important undertaking was the construction of the Stockton and Darlington Railway, on which an engine was employed which drew a load of ninety tons at the rate of eight miles an hour. In 1824 he surveyed the line for the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, and superintended that work till the line was opened in 1830. Great were the objections of engineers to locomotives being employed on this line; but with the true confidence of genius, George Stephenson persevered in working out, with the aid of his son Robert, the plans of an engine which would produce results undreamed of by the most sanguine believers in the wonders to be effected by the appliances of science to the industrial arts. He persuaded the directors of the railway to offer a prize for the best locomotive. The Rocket engine constructed by him won the prize. The old modes of transit were from the hour of that experiment changed throughout the whole civilized would. Burke has described in glowing imagery the beneficent angel of a noble house unfolding to Lord Bathurst, in the reign of Anne, the commercial grandeur of his country; but pointing to America, a little speck, a seminal principle, then scarcely visible in the national interests, which, seventy years afterward, should give to England a commerce equal to the whole of that which the young man saw at the beginning of the century. We may imagine the angel of the humble house of Stephenson showing to the father and the son, intensely meditating over their models and their plans, what would be the effect of their projects upon themselves and upon the world. To the father he might have said, You shall not only construct mighty works yourself, but be the precursor of a great race of engineers who will cover England, Scotland, and Ireland with a web of railways, bringing districts once inaccessible to commercial interchange into easy communication, equalizing prices throughout the land, cutting tunnels through the adamantine rock, carrying bridges over great rivers. You were the first that should realize the dream of the poet's "Car of Miracle,"

"Steady and swift the self-moved chariot went." †

Before ye both shall "taste of death"—the one in the fulness of years, the other too soon called away from his appointed task—the whistle of the locomotive shall have been heard upon the continent of Europe, from the Garonne to the Danube. France, Belgium, Germany, Spain, Italy, shall have welcomed the sound; Russia shall not have forbidden its approach. It shall have penetrated the densest forests of North America; its jubilant voice shall tell that a railway has connected the coasts of the Atlantic and the Pacific. Wherever England has colonized there shall have come this sound, the herald of the never-resting spread of her arts, her laws, and her language. To the son the angel might have foretold—it shall be yours to connect Birmingham with London, as your father connected Liverpool with Manchester; you shall carry the ponderous train over the broad Tyne at Newcastle, and, more daring, over the Menai Strait, by a tubular bridge that shall be a wonder of the world; you shall complete the railway communication between West Canada and the United States without interruption by the waters of the St. Lawrence; you shall unite Alexandria with Cairo, to perfect the overland route to India, by works as grand and far more useful than the Pyramids, and "forty centuries shall look down upon you," the true conqueror.* The aggregate results in their own country that followed that auspicious and yet so melancholy opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway might have been shown to them in a vision too vast to be comprehended by us, except by the aid of common computation. Four hundred millions sterling expended upon ten thousand five hundred miles of railway; the receipts of these lines in one year, that of 1860, nearly twenty-eight millions; the passengers in that year one hundred and sixty-three millions, exclusive of periodical ticket-holders; in that year the merchandise carried, nearly thirty million tons; the coal and other minerals above fifty million tons; the live stock, consisting of cattle, sheep, and pigs, about thirteen millions.† Extend the view beyond our own land, and even figures convey an inadequate idea of the effect produced upon civilization by the untutored genius of the engine-fireman of Killingworth, and the more cultivated mind of his equally illustrious son.

Glimpses of the coming era of railways might have filled the mind of the great economist who led the advancing steps of commercial freedom, and who, of all statesmen, was best fitted to deal with the difficulties that would surround the rush of speculation to this novel species of enterprise. At the public meeting of the 18th of June, 1824, for erecting a monument to James Watt, Mr. Huskisson said that the man to whose memory they owed a tribute of national gratitude had, by his discovery, "subdued and regulated the most terrific power in the universe—that power which, by the joint operation of pressure and heat, probably produces those tremendous convulsions of the earth which in a moment subvert whole cities, and almost change the face of the inhabited globe. This apparently ungovernable power Mr. Watt reduced to a state of such perfect organization and discipline—if I may use the expression—that it may now be safely manœuvred and brought into irresistible action—irresistible, but still regulated, measured, and ascertained—or lulled into the most complete and secure repose, at the will of man, and under the guidance of his feeble hand. Thus one man directs it into the bowels of the earth, to tear asunder its very elements, and bring to light its hidden treasures; another places it upon the surface of the waters, to control the winds of heaven, to stem the tides, to check the currents, and defy the waves of the ocean; a third, perhaps, and a fourth, are destined to apply this mighty power to other purposes, still unthought of and unsuspected, but leading to consequences possibly not less important than those which it has already produced." ‡ The "other purposes still unthought of and unsuspected" might be dimly contemplated in the triumphs of the locomotive engine.

Mr. Huskisson had been returned as the representative of Liverpool to the new parliament. Being in ill-health he was unable to appear on the hustings when his constituents re-elected him; but he was sufficiently recovered to attend the intended magnificent ceremonial of opening the railway. On the morning of the 15th of September he took his seat in the first of the eight carriages that were to proceed to Manchester. At the other end of that carriage was the

* "Quarterly Review," vol. xxxi. p. 361.
† Southey, "Curse of Kehama," xxiii.

* *Ante*, vol. vii. p. 1020.
† For details of these results in England, Scotland, and Ireland, see "Companion to the Almanac," for 1862.
‡ "Huskisson's Speeches," vol. iii. p. 672.

Duke of Wellington. There were eight locomotive engines with their attached carriages forming this procession. On quitting the tunnel at Liverpool the Northumbrian engine, which drew the three carriages containing the directors and their most distinguished visitors, took the south line of the railway, the seven other engines with their carriages proceeding along the north line. The speed of the Northumbrian was accelerated or retarded, as the visitors might desire, to look at particular portions of the works. At Parkside there was a stoppage. Many of the gentlemen in the Northumbrian carriages got out. Mr. Huskisson was induced by a friend to go forward to speak to the Duke of Wellington, from whom he had been estranged by his vote on the transfer of the seat of East Retford. As Mr. Huskisson approached the duke, held out his hand. It was a moment of agitation for the sensitive commoner. Suddenly a cry was heard: "Get in—get in." The Rocket was coming. There was a space of four feet between the two lines, and only eighteen inches between the carriages, as they overhung the lines. Many ran round to the end of the stationary carriage. Mr. Huskisson lost his presence of mind, fell upon the north rail as he attempted to escape, and his right leg being crushed by the Rocket, he felt at once that the injury was fatal. He was carried to the vicarage of Eccles. The surgeons, who were quickly in attendance, declared that he would sink under amputation. From the moment he was struck he received the solace of the presence of his wife. He died that night after nine hours of agony, and was buried in the cemetery at Liverpool, followed to the grave by thousands of his sorrowing constituents.

The formal commencement of the first session of the Ninth Parliament of the United Kingdom had taken place on the 26th of October, the members of the two houses had taken the customary oaths, Mr. Manners Sutton had been re-elected speaker of the Commons, when, on the 2d of November, King William the Fourth opened the parliament in person. Never had public expectation been so roused to discuss the probable tone of the king's speech; never was one of the great parties more exultant or the other more indignant—not so much at that portion of the speech which had reference to the revolutions of France and the Netherlands, or the outrages of the southern counties, or the efforts to produce a clamor in Ireland for a repeal of the union, but at the concluding paragraph, in which it was indirectly but unmistakably intimated that a reform in parliament, for whose necessity public opinion had been so loudly expressed in the recent elections, would have no sanction from the government. The obscurity of the oracle was soon dissipated by the interpretation of the chief priest. In the House of Lords, when Earl Grey had said that the only mode to avert from this country the dangers which were apprehended from the political convulsions of Europe was to secure the affections of the people, to redress their grievances, "and, my lords, I will pronounce the word, by reform in parliament," the Duke of Wellington thus replied: "He was fully convinced that the country possessed at the present moment a legislature which answered all the good purposes of legislation, and this to a greater degree than any legislature ever had answered in any country whatever. He would go farther, and say that the legislature and the system of representation possessed the full and entire confidence of the country. . . . He was not prepared to bring forward any measure of the description alluded to by the noble lord. He was not only not prepared to bring forward any measure of this nature, but he would at once declare that, as far as he was concerned, as long as he held any station in the government of the country, he should always feel it his duty to resist such measures when proposed by others." * In the House of Commons not a moment was lost by the real leader of the house—whose importance as a leader of the people had been unequivocally pronounced by his election as one of the representatives of Yorkshire—in declaring his determination to bring the great question of reform to an immediate practical issue. The Commons have a constitutional right to do whatever business they please before the king's speech is taken into consideration. On the motion that the usual sessional orders be agreed to, Mr. Brougham said "he could not allow the opportunity which that question presented to pass over without giving notice of his intention on that day fortnight to bring the great question of a reform of the Commons' House of Parliament fully under consideration. His object was not revolution but restoration." On that day fortnight the government of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel was at an end. "Never," says Sydney Smith, "was any administration so completely and so suddenly destroyed; and, I believe, entirely by the duke's declaration, made, I suspect, in perfect ignorance of the state of public feeling and opinion." * During that fortnight men's minds in the metropolis and throughout the country were in a most unusual and, in some respects, alarming state of ferment. In parliament it was sufficiently evident, not only from the altered character of the lower house in the distribution of seats, but from the unmeasured language against ministers of some of their former supporters in both houses, that upon the first important question the government would be in a minority. Sir Robert Peel is reported to have said, immediately after his retirement from office, "We have alienated the Tories without conciliating the Whigs."

It is usual some time after the commencement of a new reign that the sovereign should go in state to the city and dine in Guildhall. The king had promised to dine with the lord mayor on Tuesday, the 9th of November. The lord mayor elect, Mr. John Key, on the previous Saturday wrote to the Duke of Wellington that while the feelings of all the respectable citizens were decidedly loyal, and they were desirous to testify their loyalty on the approaching occasion, he had learned that there were some desperate characters who would take the opportunity of making an attack on his grace's person on his approach to the hall. He therefore suggested the propriety of the duke coming strongly and sufficiently guarded. The king was advised upon this warning to decline fulfilling the promise which he had made to the lord mayor. On the 8th of November Lord Althorp asked Sir Robert Peel for an explanation "of one of the most extraordinary and alarming events that he had ever known in the course of his public experience. . . . It was not in London alone that the most serious effects would result from this affair. The alarm throughout the kingdom would be excessive." Sir Robert Peel explained that it was not fitting that the Duke of Wellington, after all the services he had rendered to his country, should be seen going to Guildhall with a large military guard. In the course of the Saturday and Sunday the most industrious attempts had been made to inflame the public mind against the new police. On the night of the 2d, after the king had been to parliament, there had been sixty-six cases of assault committed on the police constables. He sincerely believed that if his majesty had not been advised to forego the satisfaction of visiting the city of London, there would have been such a disturbance of the public peace as would have rendered it necessary to resort to military authority for its preservation. The explanation seemed in some degree satisfactory to the house, but it was contended by many of the journals that the too ready credence of the government to Alderman Key's alarm was to disseminate alarm throughout the country. It was more rationally contended in parliament that the unpopularity of the Duke of Wellington, produced chiefly by his declaration against reform, ought not to have cast a doubt upon the universal popularity of the king. Sir William Knighton records that the Duke of Wellington told him that he advised the king and queen not to go, because the probability was that bloodshed would have happened in their presence. "'In regard to myself,' he said, 'I have no desire to be massacred, which would have happened. I would have gone if the law had been equal to protect me; but that was not the case. Fifty dragoons on horseback would have done it; but that was a military force. If firing had begun, who could tell where it was to end? I know what street-firing is; one guilty person would fall and ten innocent be destroyed. Would this have been wise or humane, for a little bravado, or that the country might not be alarmed for a day or two? It is all over now, and in another week or two will be forgotten.'" †

For another week the business of parliament went on with tolerable smoothness. On the 15th of November, on the order of the day for the house to go into a committee upon the civil list, Sir Henry Parnell moved, as an amendment, that a select committee be appointed to examine the accounts presented to the house by order of his majesty connected with the civil list, and to report thereon. The

* Hansard, 3d series, vol. i. col. 52.

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 313.
† "Memoirs of Sir William Knighton," vol. ii. p. 182.

debate was very short, being principally confined to the mover of the amendment and to the chancellor of the exchequer, Mr. Goulburn, who met the motion of Sir Henry Parnell by a decided negative. The division was very quickly taken, showing, in a house of four hundred and thirty-seven members, the ministers to be in a minority of twenty nine. The next day Lord Sidmouth thus expressed himself in a private letter: "Last night's division was a surprise to the ministers and their opponents. The general expectation appears to be that the duke will resign to-day. In that case the regrets of the good and the fears of the wise will be almost universal." * Lord Sidmouth appears to have had a confused recollection of Johnson's line,

"Fears of the brave and follies of the wise."

There were fears and there were follies, which drove the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel from power. Sir Robert Peel is reported to have said immediately after his retiring from office, "The downfall of the cabinet was inevitable. The duke, by his declaration against all reform, hastened the catastrophe. The head of the government ought never to allow his secrets to be discovered." † The follies of the wise were associated with the fears of the brave. "I was defeated," the duke subsequently said, "on the civil list. . . . . I admit I resigned next morning because I did not wish to expose his majesty and the country to the consequences that might result from the government going out on the success of the question of parliamentary reform." Sir Robert Peel corroborated this: "Though we retired on the civil-list question, yet it is impossible to deny that the anticipation of the probable manifestation of opinion on the question of reform in this house entered into the consideration of the government."

The resignations of the ministers were formally announced in both houses on the 16th of November, it having been previously known that Earl Grey had been sent for by the king. On that evening Lord Althorp said he hoped that, as there was no longer any administration in existence, Mr. Brougham would not submit to the house that evening a question of so much importance as that of which he had given notice. Mr. Brougham said, if the motion were put off it would be contrary to his opinion and to his wishes, but that if he gave up his opinion he would do so in deference to the wishes of the house. "And further, as no change that may take place in the administration can by any possibility affect me, I beg it to be understood that, in putting off the motion, I will put it off until the 25th of this month, and no longer. I will then, and at no more distant period, bring forward the question of parliamentary reform, whatever may be the condition of circumstances, and whosoever may be his majesty's ministers." ‡ On the 22d of November the commoner who had so decidedly proclaimed his isolation from the expectant ministry—further declaring on the 17th, "I have nothing to do with them except in the respect I bear them"—took his seat as chancellor in the House of Lords. The patent by which he was created a peer was not then in the hands of the clerk of parliament. As Mr. Brougham he could be speaker of the House of Lords, but he had only power to put the question. The negotiations which had been carried on for Mr. Brougham's acceptance of a minor office than that of lord chancellor are for the most part matter of conjecture, with the exception of the fact that he refused the office of attorney-general. We personally know, as we knew thirty years ago, that Mr. Brougham's reluctance to leave the House of Commons was almost insuperable; that the high dignity of lord chancellor was not the object of his ambition; that there was no coquetting on his part, having the great seal in prospect, when he made in the House of Commons the declarations that we have recited. Lord Althorp himself said—and it is now, through the lapse of time, no violation of confidence to repeat his words—"I almost forced the great seal upon Mr. Brougham. I told him that if he did not consent to join the administration the possibility of forming a government of his political friends would be broken up. Slowly, most unwillingly, was his consent wrung from him. 'What,' he said, 'leave the House of Commons? If I yield, do not be surprised if my repentance should urge me to some rash act of which you may too soon hear.'"

* "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 428.
† Guizot, "Memoirs of Peel," p. 51.
‡ Hansard, Third Series, vol. i. col. 563.

The administration of Earl Grey had been readily completed, when the difficulty about Mr. Brougham had been surmounted. On the 22d of November the principal members of the government kissed hands on their appointments; and on that evening Earl Grey, in the House of Lords, made his statement, as prime minister, of the principles which would determine the conduct of his government. Moderate reform; economy and retrenchment; repression of outrage and relief of distress; the preservation of peace with foreign powers—these were the principles which he and his friends would uphold, and for the maintenance of which they threw themselves upon the confidence and support of their sovereign, of their lordships, and of the country. In the course of a fortnight all the minor offices were filled up, and were printed in the Gazette. The two houses continued to sit for a month after the accession of the Whigs to power; but, in consequence of the necessity for re-election of various members of the lower house, the proceedings were of little permanent interest. On the 23d of December Earl Grey and the chancellor of the exchequer moved the adjournment of the houses to the 3d of February.

MINISTRY, DECEMBER, 1830.

Cabinet.

Marquess of Lansdowne	Lord President of the Council.
Lord Brougham and Vaux	Lord High Chancellor.
Lord Durham	Lord Privy Seal.
Earl Grey	First Lord of the Treasury.
Viscount Althorp	Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Sir James Graham, Bart	First Lord of the Admiralty.
Viscount Melbourne	Secretary of State for the Home Department.
Viscount Palmerston	Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Viscount Goderich	Secretary of State for the Colonies.
Right Hon. Charles Grant	President of the Board of Control.
Lord Holland	Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.
Lord Auckland	President of the Board of Trade and Master of the Mint.

Not of the Cabinet.

Right Hon. C. W. W. Wynn	Secretary at War.
Sir James Kempt	Master-General of the Ordnance.
Lord John Russell	Paymaster-General of the Forces.
Right Hon. G. A. Ellis	First Commissioner of Land Revenue.
Duke of Richmond, K.G.	Postmaster-General.
Right Hon. Robert Grant	Judge Advocate-General.
Lord Nugent, Robert Vernon Smith, Esq., Francis T. Baring, Esq., Hon. G. Ponsonby	Lords of the Treasury.
Right Hon. E. Ellice, Right Hon. Spring Rice	Joint Secretaries of the Treasury.
Right Hon. Poulett Thomson	Vice-President of the Board of Trade and Treasurer of the Navy.
Sir Thomas Denman	Attorney-General.
Sir William Horne	Solicitor-General.

Great Officers of State.

Marquess Wellesley	Lord Steward.
Duke of Devonshire	Lord Chamberlain.
Earl of Albemarle	Master of the Horse.
Marquess of Winchester	Groom of the Stole.

Ireland.

Marquess of Anglesey	Lord Lieutenant.
Lord Plunkett	Lord High Chancellor.
Hon. E. G. S. Stanley	Chief Secretary.

Scotland.

Francis Jeffrey, Esq.	Lord Advocate.
Henry Cockburn, Esq.	Solicitor-General.

CHAPTER CCXXIII.

Reassembling of parliament—Reform Bill prepared by the cabinet—Lord John Russell introduces the Reform Bill—Wonder and alarm at its contemplated provisions—Fears of the aristocracy—The debates on the first reading—The debates on the second reading—Defeat of the ministry in committee—Lord Grey and Lord Brougham urge the king to dissolve—The dissolution and general election—The Reform Bill carried—The bill in committee—It is passed—The bill in the House of Lords—The bill rejected upon the second reading—Resolutions of the House of Commons—Parliament prorogued.

WHEN the legislature reassembled on the 3d of February numerous petitions were presented to the House of Commons praying for

reform of parliament. Lord Althorp then informed the house that on Tuesday the 1st of March the government would be prepared to submit their plan for the improvement of the representative system, and that the task of explaining the nature and extent of the reform which they contemplated would be confided to Lord John Russell. He was best entitled to propose a full and efficient improvement of the representation who had so often failed in his most zealous attempts to procure a partial one. In the House of Lords Earl Grey stated that a measure of reform which would be effective, without exceeding the bounds of a just and well-advised moderation, had received the unanimous consent of the whole government, and would at as early a period as possible be submitted to the other house of parliament. It is now known that a committee of four members of the government, two of whom were of the cabinet, had been selected by Lord Grey to consider the manifold details connected with so large a change, and to prepare a bill. That committee consisted of Lord Durham, Sir James Graham, Lord John Russell, and Viscount Duncannon. The assertion of a son of Earl Grey that his father "laid down the principles on which the measure was to be founded, the details of which were to be worked out by other members of the government," is no doubt substantially correct.* The measure prepared by the committee, which was finally adopted by the cabinet, was submitted to the king on the 30th of January. The time had gone by, as far as regarded England, when, on that day which was then called the anniversary of a martyrdom, according to Voltaire every king in Europe rises from his bed with a crick in his neck. William IV. is represented to have been anxious to postpone the proposal of the measure to parliament. Lord Grey would have had little difficulty in convincing him that the crown was most safe when the three branches of the constitution were working in harmony with the just desires of the people.

In the interval between the announcement of the 3d of February and the bringing forward the Reform Bill the chancellor of the exchequer had introduced his budget, of which some portions were carried and others abandoned. The duties on newspapers and advertisements were to be reduced; those on coals, on candles, and on printed cottons were to be abolished. The propositions to reduce the duty on glass and the duty on tobacco were withdrawn; for some of the taxes offered as substitutes had been strenuously opposed. The Whig ministry had not learned to know the ministerial safety of firmness. It was to be the privilege of the financial minister of fourteen years later to produce improvements in our architectural taste and in our domestic comforts, which few could have anticipated, by relieving the manufacturers of glass altogether from the payment of duty and from the interference of the officers of revenue with their processes. In that same interval Lord Brougham had also introduced a bill for establishing a new court in bankruptcy, which was read a first time.

During the month of February the scope of the Reform Bill had been kept profoundly secret. A few persons were in the confidence of the government whose judgment and experience were valuable in the arrangement of its details. But when on the 1st of March the speaker came down to prayers, and not only found the house remarkably full, but every empty seat bearing a label of the name of its proposed occupant, not a dozen of that crowd had the slightest conception of the nature of that measure which they might be called upon to support or to oppose. The speech with which Lord John Russell introduced the proposition of the government was lucid, slightly argumentative, entirely free from rhetorical ornament. The proposed reform was far too great to require more than the simplest and most intelligible statement. It was intelligible enough to produce both wonder and ridicule. It was proposed to a House of Commons of which one hundred and sixty-eight members for England were returned by boroughs. They could scarcely imagine that the whole system of nomination should come to an end. Sixty boroughs were proposed to be wholly disfranchised, as having each less than two thousand inhabitants; forty-seven boroughs, having less than four thousand inhabitants each, were to return one member instead of two; and a single borough which had formerly returned four members was to be reduced to half its number of representatives. It was not proposed wholly to fill up the seats thus to be disposed of, but to reduce the number of members of the House of Commons. The existing number of six hundred and fifty-eight was to be curtailed to five hundred and ninety-six. Seven unrepresented large towns were to have the right of returning two members each; twenty smaller towns unrepresented were to return one member each. London was to be divided into four districts, each having two members. Fifty-four members were to be added to the county representation. These and other details of the measure were subsequently altered. Instead of the old rights of election in boroughs, a household franchise of 10*l.* was substituted. Corporations were deprived of the exclusive privileges which some possessed of returning members. The duration of elections was to be remedied by a previous registration. When Lord John Russell proceeded to read the names of the boroughs to be disfranchised wholly or in part, then indeed was the excitement of the house at an unprecedented height. For once in the grave records of parliamentary debate we find a morsel of description upon which the imagination may raise up a picture of a most extraordinary scene. "The noble lord accordingly read the following list, in the course of which he was frequently interrupted by shouts of laughter, cries of 'Hear, Hear,' from members for these boroughs, and by various interlocutions across the table."* For many members it was indeed a personal question of the last importance. Statesmen, too, who looked beyond individual interests were aghast at a proposal so sweeping, so revolutionary, as they were warranted in believing. It was left to opposition members somewhat below the highest mark to reply that night to Lord John Russell. Sir Robert Peel sat rigid as a statue, his face working with internal emotion, his brow furrowed as by the wrinkles of age. Around him were many of his supporters, bursting again and again into uncontrollable laughter at what appeared to them the prelude to a certain and speedy downfall of the ministry. There were fashionable parties that night where the hosts and the guests sat late in anxious expectation of intelligence from the house. At one of these was the Duke of Wellington. As news of the ministerial proposition was read or told there was a burst of merriment in the company. "It is no joke," said the duke; "you will find it no laughing matter." All London knew the next day what the ministerial project meant. Lord Eldon wrote, in his first moments of surprise, "There is no describing the amazement this plan of reform has occasioned."†

Sir Robert Inglis, the member for the University of Oxford, was the first to reply to the arguments of Lord John Russell. His speech was an able one, anticipating most of the arguments which were employed for the seven wearisome nights of debate on the introduction of the bill, and making a free use of that great weapon of alarm which had been so successfully employed by his party, from the time when Pitt abandoned his position as a reformer in the general terror at the first outbreak of the French revolution. The lapse of forty years had furnished a new argument to prove the danger of any accession to the strength of the democratic principle. Sir Robert Inglis maintained the impossibility of the co-existence of a monarchy with a free press and a purely popular representation. "Sir, I am fully persuaded that a representative system so exclusively popular as that which the noble lord wishes to introduce has never yet been found in juxtaposition with a free press on the one hand and with a monarchy on the other."‡ The destruction of the monarchy was to involve the simultaneous destruction of the House of Peers. On the very day, said Sir Robert Inglis, when the House of Commons of 1648 murdered their king they voted the Lords to be useless and dangerous. The abolition of the House of Lords was the most stirring and practical of the prophecies of the alarmists. "Whatever," added Sir Robert Inglis, "the intentions of the framers or of the supporters of this measure may be, I am quite sure that, if carried, it will sweep clean the House of Peers in ten years." In or out of parliament the cry was that the destruction of the aristocracy by the passing of the democratic Reform Bill was inevitable.

The word aristocracy was used both by the enemies and friends of reform, with a very loose signification. By some it was intended exclusively to mean the nobility; to others it more properly signified the governing body of the great and wealthy families, and not a

* "Life and Opinions of Charles Earl Grey," by Lieut.-General Hon. C. Grey, 1861.

* Hansard, vol. ii. col. 1077.
† Twiss, vol. iii. p. 120.
‡ Hansard, vol. ii. col. 1122.

particular class whose rank was hereditary. It is recorded that during one of the debates on the Reform Bill Lord Sidmouth said to Lord Grey, "I hope God will forgive you on account of this bill; I don't think I can;" to which Lord Grey replied, "Mark my words: within two years you will find that we shall have become unpopular, for having brought forward the most aristocratic measure that ever was proposed in parliament." * We have understood that Lord Althorp expressed pretty much the same opinion. Neither of the two ministers could have meant to say that the Reform Bill would especially increase the power and influence of the peers. Lord Eldon must also have used "aristocracy" in the extended sense of a governing body not wholly composed of a privileged order, when he said at a Pitt dinner in May, "The aristocracy once destroyed, the best supporters of the lower classes would be swept away. In using the term lower classes he meant nothing offensive. How could he do so? He himself had been one of the lower classes." † To see nothing in the social condition of our country but a governing body of great families and the "lower classes," was one of the defects of the able lawyer's mental vision. He boasted, and not improperly so, that, like himself, "the humblest in the realm might, by a life of industry, propriety, and good moral and religious conduct, rise to eminence." But the father of Lord Eldon and of Lord Stowell would have been indignant enough could he have foreseen that his distinguished son would have ranked him as one of "the lower classes;" the father being, according to the description of his other remarkable son, "a considerable merchant, who, by a successful application of his industry to various branches of commerce, raised a competent fortune." ‡ The ex-chancellor, when he thus talked about "the lower classes," looked at them with the prejudices of caste which, singular enough, were most cherished by the new nobility. That system had not only been modified but almost destroyed a century before John Scott sat in the House of Peers. "The nobility and the middle classes in England followed the same business, embraced the same professions, and, what is far more significant, intermarried with each other." § There was another mode of amalgamation in England between the highest and the humblest, which was more rare and yet not less instructive. In the lapse of time some of the lower classes—some even of the lowliest—could, by right of blood, have stood upon the same level as the proudest peer of the realm, who in common with them could trace his lineage to one of the three great fountains of honor, Edward III., Edward I., or Henry III. The Marquess of Chandos, who was one of the most conspicuous of the noble opponents of the Reform Bill, was christened Richard Plantagenet, by reason of his descent from Elizabeth of York. There were others of his time not so highly placed, but perhaps more happily, who could carry up their lineage even higher than himself. In 1845 John Penny, apprentice to Mr. Watson, saddler, of Windmill Street, the only surviving son of Stephen James Penny, late sexton of St. George's, Hanover Square, could claim undoubted descent from Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, fifth son of King Edward the Third. At the same period George Wilmot, keeping the turnpike gate at Cooper's Bank, near Dudley, who is shown to have descended from Edmund of Woodstock, Earl of Kent, sixth son of King Edward the First, was taking toll "almost under the very walls of those feudal towers that gave the name to the barony of which he is a co-heir." ‖ The aristocracy and the lower classes were not wholly separated by an exclusive right of quartering coat-armor. The author of "Royal Descents" thinks that the princely blood of Plantagenet might be found to flow through veins even more humble than some of those which he has recorded. He adds, "This is as it should be. There is no prescriptive right of interminable gentility, any more than of great talents or personal attractions." The intermarriages that prevented the aristocracy becoming a caste in England, and the constant elevation of what Lord Eldon denominated "the lower classes" to form part of the governing body, rendered it quite certain that the revolution, as it was called—the reform measure of 1831—would resolve itself into something very different from the government of a democracy, and that no fears were more idle than those which proclaimed that the degradation of rank and the destruction of property were close at hand.

The second night of the debate was memorable for the speeches of Mr. Macaulay and Mr. Stanley, of which Sir James Mackintosh said, they were "two of the finest speeches ever spoken in parliament." M. Guizot, having affirmed that "the loftiest minds, the most eloquent orators of England, called for reform with earnest conviction, and seemed to regard it as even more indispensable than irresistible," * then quotes, though imperfectly, the peroration of Macaulay's speech: "Turn where we may, within, around, the voice of great events is proclaiming to us, Reform, that you may preserve. Now, therefore, while everything at home and abroad forebodes ruin to those who persist in a hopeless struggle against the spirit of the age, now, while the crash of the proudest throne of the continent is still resounding in our ears, now, while the roof of a British palace affords an ignominious shelter to the exiled heir of forty kings, now, while we see on every side ancient institutions subverted and great societies dissolved, now, while the heart of England is still sound, now, while old feelings and old associations retain a power and a charm which may too soon pass away, now, in this your accepted time, now, in this your day of salvation, take counsel, not of prejudice, not of party spirit, not of the ignominious pride of a fatal consistency, but of history, of reason, of the ages which are past, of the signs of this most portentous time. Pronounce in a manner worthy of the expectation with which this great debate has been anticipated, and of the long remembrance which it will leave behind. Renew the youth of the state. Save property, divided against itself. Save the multitude, endangered by its own ungovernable passions. Save the aristocracy, endangered by its own unpopular power. Save the greatest, and fairest, and most highly civilized community that ever existed, from calamities which may in a few days sweep away all the rich heritage of so many ages of wisdom and glory." † The comment of M. Guizot upon this burst of eloquence is: "These sombre prognostics, this powerful language, carried some disturbance into the soul of Peel."

The third night of the debate presented unusual interest in the antagonism of Lord Palmerston and Sir Robert Peel. The minister who had quitted office when the friends of Mr. Canning appeared to be insulted in the ejection of Mr. Huskisson from the cabinet, now stood forward as the advocate of a measure of reform compared with which the case of East Retford was but a drop in the ocean. Lord Palmerston ventured to assert that if Mr. Canning "had lived to mark the signs of the present times, and to bring his great and comprehensive intellect to an examination of the difficulties to be overcome, he would have been as ardent a supporter of the measure now proposed by the government as any of the friends he saw around him." ‡ Sir Robert Peel, in his reply, exclaimed, would to God that Mr. Canning were here, "to confound the sophistry and fallacies of reformers, and to win back the people by the charms of truth and eloquence to a right appreciation of the form of government under which they live." Sir Robert Peel concluded his speech by a solemn admonition to the ministers: "It was the duty of the government to calm, not to stimulate, the fever of popular excitement. They have adopted a different course—they have sent through the land the firebrand of agitation, and no one can now recall it." § The debate on Lord John Russell's motion for leave to bring in the bill was closed on the seventh night without a division; and when the speaker had decided that the ayes had it, the cheers from the ministerial benches were enthusiastic. The bill was read a first time on the 14th of March.

On the 21st of March Lord John Russell moved the order of the day for the second reading of the Reform Bill. Sir Richard Vivian moved, as an amendment, that the bill be read a second time that day six months. The second reading was carried by a majority of one only in a house of six hundred and eight; "probably the greatest number which up to that time had ever been assembled at a di-

* "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 439, note.
† Twiss, vol. iii. p. 127. ‡ Twiss, vol. i. p. 23.
§ De Tocqueville, "France before the Revolution," book ii. chap. ix.
‖ We derive these particulars from the curious and interesting volume of the late Mr. C. E. Long, entitled "Royal Descents: a Genealogical List of the several persons entitled to Quarter the Arms of the Royal Houses of England," 1845.

* "Memoirs of Peel," p. 56.
† "Speeches of T. B. Macaulay, corrected by himself," p. 18.
‡ Hansard, vol. ii. col. 1323. § Ibid., col. 1334 and 1356.

vision." * In ordinary times this bare majority would have compelled the retirement of a ministry from office. They had now the support of the great body of the people, and they must fight the battle till the proper time should arrive for an appeal to the constituencies that had returned the unreformed parliament. On the 18th of April the house went into committee on the order of the day, to consider the provisions of the bill for the amendment of the representation. General Gascoigne, following Lord John Russell, moved, "that it is the opinion of this house that the total number of knights, citizens, and burgesses, returned to parliament for that part of the United Kingdom called England and Wales, ought not to be diminished." The debate was adjourned to the 19th. At a late hour the house divided: for General Gascoigne's amendment, 299; against it, 291. The ministry were beaten by a majority of eight. A man of the rarest genius, though not a striking parliamentary orator, Francis Jeffrey, has left an exquisite picture of an out-door scene on this memorable daybreak: "It was a beautiful, rosy, dead calm morning, when we broke up a little before five to-day; and I took three pensive turns along the solitude of Westminster Bridge; admiring the sharp clearness of St. Paul's, and all the city spires soaring up in a cloudless sky, the orange red light that was beginning to play on the trees of the abbey and the old windows of the speaker's house, and the flat, green mist of the river floating upon a few lazy hulks on the tide and moving low under the arches. It was a curious contrast with the long previous imprisonment in the stifling, roaring house, amid dying candles and every sort of exhalation." †

On the 21st of April, in the House of Peers, Lord Wharncliffe gave notice that he should the next day move that an address be presented to his majesty praying that he would be graciously pleased not to exercise his undoubted prerogative of dissolving parliament. On the same evening, in the House of Commons, ministers were again defeated by a majority of twenty-two on a question of adjournment. Mr. May states that this vote could not bear the construction which Lord Brougham affirmed on the following day, that it amounted to "stopping the supplies." The question before the house was a question concerning the Liverpool election. "Late down in the list of orders for the day a report from the committee of supply was to be received, which dropped by reason of the adjournment." ‡

On the morning of Friday, the 22d, the prime minister and the lord chancellor were with the king. They had come either to lay the resignations of the ministry at his majesty's feet or to request him to dissolve the parliament. The popular story of the time was that the king was reluctant to dissolve until the notice given by Lord Wharncliffe was felt by him to be an interference with his prerogative; that then he was impatient to go at once to parliament, and said if the royal carriages were not ready send for a hackney coach. Mr. Roebuck has given a most interesting relation of "the whole scene of this interview of the king and his ministers, as related by those who could alone describe it." § The chancellor was requested to manage the king on the occasion. His majesty was startled at their proposition of a dissolution—how could he, after such a fashion, repay the kindness of parliament in granting him a most liberal civil list, and giving to the queen a splendid annuity in case she survived him. Nevertheless the chancellor said that the further existence of the present House of Commons was incompatible with the peace and safety of the kingdom. Lord Grey stated that without a dissolution they could not continue to conduct the affairs of the country. But nothing is arranged, said the king, the great officers of state are not summoned—the crown and the robes are not prepared—the Guards, the troops, have had no orders, and cannot be ready in time. The "daring chancellor," as Mr. Roebuck terms him, replied deferentially that the officers of state had been prepared to be summoned, and that the crown and robes would be ready. The difficulty about the troops was not so easily answered. The orders for the attendance of the troops upon such occasions always emanate from the sovereign. "Pardon me, sir," said the chancellor, "I have given orders, and the troops are ready." The king then burst out, "You, my lord chancellor, ought to know that such an act is treason, high treason, my lord." The chancellor humbly acknowledged that he did know it, and that nothing but his own solemn belief that the safety of the state depended upon that day's proceedings could have emboldened him to venture upon so improper a proceeding. The king cooled down; the speech to be read by his majesty was in the chancellor's pocket; and the ministers were dismissed with something like a menace and a joke upon the audacity of their proceedings. The Lords had begun to assemble at two o'clock. At twenty minutes before three the lord chancellor took his seat, and almost immediately withdrew from the house, Lord Shaftesbury being called to the chair. Lord Wharncliffe rose to make his motion. At the moment of completing the reading of his resolution, the lord chancellor entered the house, and immediately addressing it, said with great emphasis, "I never yet heard that the crown ought not to dissolve parliament whenever it thought fit, particularly at a moment when the House of Commons had thought fit to take the extreme and unprecedented step of stopping the supplies." * There was great confusion, with cries of "The king, the king." Lord Londonderry rose in fury, and exclaimed, "I protest, my lords, I will not submit to—" The chancellor, hearing the king approaching, clutched up the seals and rushed again out of the house. There was again terrible confusion. The Earl of Shaftesbury resumed the chair, and the Earl of Mansfield proceeded to deliver a general harangue against the Reform Bill. The lord chancellor had met the king while the noise of the house was distinctly audible. "What's that?" said his majesty. "Only, may it please you, sir, the House of Lords amusing themselves while awaiting your majesty's coming." The king entered the house, cut short Lord Mansfield's oration, and after the Speaker of the House of Commons and about a hundred members had attended at the bar, commenced his speech with these very decisive words: "My Lords and Gentlemen, I have come to meet you for the purpose of proroguing this parliament, with a view to its immediate dissolution." The House of Commons, before the usher of the black rod had tapped at the door, had been a scene of turbulence and confusion—even outrivalling that of the Lords—which the speaker had vainly endeavored to repress. Lord Campbell, at that time member for Stafford, says, "Never shall I forget the scene then exhibited in the House of Commons, which might convey an adequate idea of the tumultuary dissolutions in the times of the Stuarts. The most exciting moment of my public life was when we cheered the guns which announced his majesty's approach." † Had those guns been heard a day later the probability is that both houses would have resolved upon an address to the king against dissolution, and the royal prerogative would not have been exercised at all, or exercised under circumstances of great difficulty and danger.

On the dissolution of parliament there was an illumination in London, sanctioned by the lord mayor, which was attended with more mischief from the turbulence of a mob—who broke the windows of the Duke of Wellington and other anti-reformers—than productive of any real advantage to the popular cause. After the Edinburgh election the lord provost was rudely assaulted, and was with difficulty rescued by the soldiery. These things were disclaimed by reformers as being the acts of blackguards; but it must be acknowledged that there was a very slight approach to justice in the charge that Sir Robert Peel had made against the government, that they had, "like the giant enemy of the Philistines, lighted three hundred brands and scattered through the country discord and dismay." ‡ The zeal of their supporters, we fear, was not everywhere satisfied with the formation of political unions; but that they read without much dissatisfaction the newspaper reports of smashed glass, and rude assaults during the elections in towns where the magistrates were supine and the police feeble. Such proceedings seriously damaged the just cause of peaceable reform. The cry that went through the country of "the bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the bill," delighted the government, for it set aside all minor differences of opinion among reformers, and materially influenced the elections by the application of this simple test to a candidate—would he support the bill? But the mob-violence became to them a source of anxiety and alarm, producing distrust and desertion among the ranks of reformers. "For God's

* May, "Constitutional History," vol. i. p. 352.
† Cockburn, "Life of Lord Jeffrey," p. 317.
‡ "Constitutional History," vol. i. p. 352.
§ "History of the Whig Ministry," vol. ii. p. 148.

* Hansard, vol. iii. col. 1807.
† "Lives of the Chancellors," chap. ccx., note.
‡ Hansard, vol. ii. col. 1356.

sake keep the people quiet in Scotland," wrote the lord advocate a few months later; "nothing in the world would do such fatal mischief as riot and violence." *

The appeal to the people was signally triumphant. Parliament opened on the 14th of June, when Mr. Manners Sutton was chosen speaker for the sixth time. The king went in state to the House of Lords on the 21st of June, and in his speech recommended the important question of reform in the representation to the earliest and most attentive consideration of parliament. On the 24th Lord John Russell again brought in the Reform Bill, with a few alterations. The measure thus proposed was confined to England. There was to be a separate bill for Scotland, which was brought in by the lord advocate on the 1st of July; and a separate bill for Ireland, which was brought in by Mr. Stanley on the 30th of June. The discussion upon the English Bill was to take place on the second reading, which was moved by Lord John Russell on the 4th of July. There were three nights of debate. Mr. Macaulay's speech on the second night was described by Lord Jeffrey as putting him "clearly at the head of the great speakers, if not the debaters, of the house." One passage of that speech may be now read with especial interest. "Your great objection to this bill is that it will not be final. I ask you whether you think that any reform bill which you can frame will be final? For my part, I do believe that the settlement proposed by his majesty's ministers will be final, in the only sense in which a wise man ever uses that word. I believe that it will last during that time for which alone we ought at present to think of legislating. Another generation may find in the new representative system defects such as we find in the old representative system. Civilization will proceed. Wealth will increase. Industry and trade will find out new seats. The same causes which have turned so many villages into great towns, which have turned so many thousands of square miles of fir and heath into cornfields and orchards, will continue to operate. . . . For our children we do not pretend to legislate. All that we can do for them is to leave to them a memorable example of the manner in which great reforms ought to be made." † On the third night of debate the house divided: for the second reading, 367; against it, 231. On the 12th of July the house went into committee. It was not till the 6th of September that the bill came out of this harassing stage of its progress, being the thirty-ninth sitting of the committee. Night after night there were debates upon every clause of disfranchisement and every clause of enfranchisement. The leader of this mode of opposition was Mr. John Wilson Croker, whose power of mastering the most obscure details, whether in politics or literature, was perhaps unrivalled, and, we fear we must add, whose application of his minute researches was not always quite honest. His mind was formed by nature and habit for controversy. His acuteness and his energy were supported by his determined will, and his passionate resolve to look only at one side of the shield. He was a master of sarcasm, which, however, was not unaccompanied by a kindly spirit. Guizot, with a just discrimination between the value of set speeches and real business, assigns to this "man of vigorous, clear, precise, and practical mind," ‡ the real leadership in the opposition to the Reform Bill in the House of Commons. The minister who was always ready to repel his attacks was one of very different character. Lord Althorp subdued his adversaries, and was a buckler to his supporters, by his singleness of purpose. Never was any one more truly described than the chancellor of the exchequer was by Jeffrey: "There is something to me quite delightful in his calm, clumsy, courageous, immutable probity and well-meaning, and it seems to have a charm for everybody." § Mr. Croker was to the last a most unyielding advocate of principles which had ceased to have any consistent application. When the Reform Bill passed he believed, with men of more timidity and less intellectual grasp, that the time was not far distant when all that England prized would perish under a reformed parliament. In September, 1832, it was written of Mr. Croker by one of his own party that "no words can describe his desponding, hopeless view of all public matters; national ruin and bankruptcy with him are inevitable." § In 1836 his friends observed that he absolutely seemed to rejoice at any partial fulfilment of his prophecies. "Fitzgerald once said to Lord Wellesley at the castle, 'I have had a very melancholy letter from C—— this morning.' 'Aye!' said Lord Wellesley, 'written, I suppose, in a strain of the most sanguine despondency.'" * It is satisfactory to contrast the opinions of the Duke of Wellington after the passing of the Reform Bill, as reported by the same authority: "He said, we have seen great changes; we can only hope for the best; we cannot foresee what will happen; but few people will be sanguine enough to imagine that we shall ever again be as prosperous as we have been. His language breathed no bitterness, neither sunk into despondency." †

Before the Reform Bill came out of committee an important alteration was carried by the Marquess of Chandos, that tenants-at-will paying fifty pounds per annum for their holdings should have a vote for the county. This proposal, which involved other amendments of a similar tendency, was carried by a majority of eighty-four. It was contended that this clause, instead of making the farmers more independent, as was alleged, would make a tenant wholly dependent upon the will of his landlord in the exercise of his franchise. Undoubtedly, before the repeal of the corn-laws, which, in freeing the farmers from the shackles of protection, gave scope for the exercise of their skill and capital, the tenant-at-will was more subservient to the commands of the owner of the soil. It may, however, be doubted now, when the interests of landlord and tenant have become more identified, because the social relations of each are better understood, whether it would be possible, as apprehended by Lord Milton, that "a knot of persons, of great landed possessions, would combine for the purpose of securing the representation, and by the power which the adoption of these proposed amendments would give them would fix the whole representation in the hands of an oligarchy." ‡ Freed from the committee, having been read a third time, after a division in a house whose diminished numbers showed how wearisome were the protracted discussions, the Reform Bill passed the House of Commons on the 21st of September, the numbers being three hundred and forty-five for the measure and two hundred and thirty-six against it.

On the 22d of September the House of Lords presented an unusual attendance of peers. Peeresses were accommodated at the bar, and the space allotted to strangers was thronged to an overflow. The lord chancellor takes his seat at the woolsack. The deputy-usher of the black rod announces "a message from the Commons;" the doors are thrown open, and Lord Althorp and Lord John Russell, bearing the Reform Bill in their hands, appear at the head of a hundred members of the lower house. Lord John Russell, in delivering the bill to the lord chancellor, who had come to the bar, says with a firm and audible voice, "My Lords, the House of Commons have passed an act to amend the representation of England and Wales, to which they desire your lordships' concurrence." § The words, usually of mere form and ceremony, by which a message of the Commons is communicated to the Lords, were spoken by the lord chancellor with unusual solemnity of tone and manner amid breathless silence. ‖ The bill was then read a first time, and was ordered to be read a second time on Monday, the 3d of October.

During the five nights of debate in this memorable week, the House of Lords stood before the nation presenting examples of the highest eloquence that ever characterized a great deliberative assembly. Whatever adverse sentiments the reports of these debates might excite, they could not fail to impress the thinking part of the nation with the conviction that the House of Lords fitly represented the most powerful nobility in Europe, not only because it was the most wealthy and the best educated of any aristocratic assembly; not only that it was surrounded with grand historical associations; but that, however it might be opposed for a time to the prevailing popular opinion, it was in many essentials so intimately allied with the body of the people that they could never be in a long-continued state of isolation or antagonism. This debate was opened by Earl Grey. There was a calmness and solemnity in his words and manner which well befitted the statesman who now, in his sixty-eighth year, stood prominently forward as the advocate of a measure which he had pro-

* "Life of Jeffrey," p. 324.
† "Speeches of T. B. Macaulay, corrected by himself," p. 32.
‡ "Memoirs of Peel," p. 56.
§ "Cockburn, "Life of Jeffrey," p. 322.
‖ Raikes's "Diary," vol. i. p. 87.

* Raikes's "Diary," vol. iii. p. 43.
† Ibid., vol. i. p. 68.
‡ Hansard, vol. vi. col. 274.
§ This scene forms the subject of a historical painting.
‖ Hansard, vol. vii. col. 480.

posed in the House of Commons forty years before ; and, more than advocate, as the responsible author of a Reform Bill of far greater scope and of more practical importance than any plan which he had supported during his long parliamentary career. But it was not enough, he said, for a public man, pretending to the character of a statesman, to show that what he has to propose is in conformity with opinions long established in his mind ; he is bound to feel the conviction that in proposing a measure affecting the mighty interests of the state, the course he takes is called for by justice and necessity. He has further to prove that he has not brought right opinions into notice rashly, precipitately, or at a dangerous season. Having explained the general character of the proposed bill, he thus vindicated its extent and comprehensiveness.* "I felt that the most prudent and the safest measure of reform would be a bold one, because, when I looked at the condition of the country—when I considered how just the claims of the people were—and when, above all, I reflected upon the absolute necessity of satisfying the respectable and reasonable part of the community, in order that thereby the government and legislature might be furnished with a ground on which a firm and safe stand might be made in defence of the principles of the constitution, if ever they should be really assailed—from all these considerations, I say, I was satisfied that nothing but a bold and decisive measure would give such general satisfaction and content as would set the question at rest."† Earl Grey was followed by Lord Wharncliffe, who moved an amendment to the effect that the bill be rejected altogether.

On the second night of debate the Duke of Wellington spoke at much greater length than he usually spake. He maintained that this country having enjoyed a larger share of happiness, comfort, and prosperity than were ever enjoyed by any nation, could any man believe that these advantages would remain if such a democratic assembly as that proposed should once be established in England? "A democracy has never been established in any part of the world that it has not immediately declared war against property, against the payment of the public debt, and against all the principles of conservation which are secured by, and are in fact the principal objects of, the British constitution as it now exists." The Duke of Wellington's speech gave a very significant anticipation of the rejection of the bill by the Lords, and of the probability that, the government being defeated, there would be another ministry who would propose a reform that might not be dreaded as "a bold and decisive measure." "I recommend to you to keep yourselves free to adopt any measure upon this subject which should secure to this country the blessings of a government."‡ The duke, after the passing of the bill, always asked, How is the king's government to be carried on? The long-continued Tory belief was that Lord Grey's vital change—"that sweeping bill which prevented him, and will prevent any other government from ruling the country again" §—would render any government impossible but that which was dictated by the will of a turbulent democracy. The great soldier's notion of "ruling," which was the one idea of his party, was something different from that which we entertain at this day, when the best rule which England has ever lived under is the most in harmony with the sober desires of the great middle class, and most careful of the rights and liberties of the universal people.

Lord Dudley, upon the third night of debate, delivered an elegant and classical speech opposing the bill, which Lord Brougham subsequently characterized as "an exercise or essay of the highest merit, on change, on democracies, on republicanism—an essay or exercitation on some other thesis, but not on this bill."‖ One part of the speech of Lord Dudley was, however, anything but irrelevant to the measure before the house. In a very few words it comprehended volumes of declamation that had been already spoken, of the well working of nomination boroughs and of all the other anomalies of the representative system. "It was only by the abuses of the constitution, as they were called, that the due balance was maintained, and the evils which would arise from the superiority of the popular branch of the legislature prevented, or at least mitigated. It was only because the crown and the House of Lords had an influence in that of the Commons, which was wholly unacknowledged by the theory of the constitution, that the constitution had been maintained."* The fourth night of the debate was chiefly occupied by the able speeches of Lord Carnarvon and Lord Plunkett.

On the fifth and last night the speech of Lord Eldon was affecting, from his allusions to his great age, and to his early education upon cheap terms in the corporation school of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. He appeared to think that the school would be destroyed by lessening the influence of the corporation and that of freemen of the borough ; and that thus a hope which he had cherished would not be realized. "I had hoped that when my ashes were laid in the grave, where they probably soon will be, that I might have given some memorandum that boys there, situated as I was, might rise to be chancellors of England." On that night the great lawyers had almost exclusive possession of the house—two ex-chancellors and he who now sat on the woolsack. Lord Brougham rose to speak before his friend and rival, Lord Lyndhurst. To attempt a selection of passages from this speech—from what Lord Lyndhurst described as "a splendid declamation, which had never been surpassed on any occasion even by the noble and learned lord himself"—would be to carry us beyond our proper limits. One passage, however, in the peroration may be fitly given : "Hear the parable of the Sibyl, for it conveys a wise and wholesome moral. She now appears at your gate, and offers you mildly the volumes—the precious volumes of wisdom and peace. The price she asks is reasonable : to restore the franchise, which, without any bargain, you ought voluntarily to give : you refuse her terms—her moderate terms—she darkens the porch no longer. But soon—for you cannot do without her wares—you call her back ; again she comes, but with diminished treasures ; the leaves of the book are in part torn away by lawless hands, in part defaced with characters of blood. But the prophetic maid has risen in her demands—it is parliament by the year—it is vote by the ballot—it is suffrage by the million! From this you turn away indignant, and for the second time she departs. Beware of her third coming, for the treasure you must have ; and what price she may next demand, who shall tell? It may even be the mace which rests upon that woolsack. What may follow your course of obstinacy, if persisted in, I cannot take upon me to predict, nor do I wish to conjecture. But this I know full well, that, as sure as man is mortal and to err is human, justice deferred enhances the price at which you must purchase safety and peace—nor can you expect to gather in another crop than they did who went before you, if you persevere in their utterly abominable husbandry, of sowing injustice and reaping rebellion."† Lord Lyndhurst followed. The debate was concluded by a reply of Earl Grey to the principal arguments against the bill which had been adduced during those five nights. He was exhausted, as were nearly all his listeners, but his intellectual vigor was never more signally manifested. Of the sincerity of his concluding words not even the bitterest of his political adversaries could doubt : "I have lived a long life of exclusion from office ; I had no official habits ; I possessed not the advantages which those official habits confer. I am fond of retirement and domestic life, and I lived happy and content in the bosom of my family ; I was surrounded by those to whom I am attached by the warmest ties of affection. What, then, but a sense of duty could have induced me to plunge into all the difficulties, not unforeseen, of my present situation? What else, in my declining age,

> 'What else could tempt me on those stormy seas,
> Bankrupt of life, yet prodigal of ease?'"‡

Between six and seven o'clock on the morning of Saturday the 8th of October, the House of Lords divided upon the second reading of the Reform Bill :

Non-contents, present 150, proxies 49.....	199
Contents, present 128, proxies 30.....	158
Majority against the Bill.....	41

Lord Eldon rejoices, in a letter of the next day, that the mob would

* Hansard, vol. vii. col. 935.
† Ibid., col. 1342.
‡ Ibid., col. 1205.
§ Raikes's "Diary," vol. iii. p. 7.
‖ Speech on Reform, October 7.

* Hansard, vol. vii. col. 1342.
† "Brougham's Speeches," vol. ii. p. 384.
‡ Hansard, vol. viii. col. 338.

not stay for the close of the debate.* Their patience during a cold and drizzling night of waiting in Palace Yard had been worn out; and when the peers came forth there were none to salute them with cheers or hisses. The rolling of the carriages alone was heard, as reformers or conservatives, in the broad daylight, went to their homes as quietly as if a whole nation had not been anxiously awaking that morning to know how the great work was so far concluded.

The rejection of the Reform Bill by the House of Lords was not unforeseen. The disproportion of the two parties in that house was perfectly well known. During the reigns of George III. and George IV. the creation of peers had been almost exclusively confined to the Tory party; the bishops had, with very few exceptions, been selected with no forgetfulness of their political opinions. To remedy, in some degree, this disproportion, sixteen new peers had been created before the second reading of the bill. Lord Grey, in moving that reading, had addressed to the bishops a very significant warning "to put their house in order." Many of the peers had refrained from voting; but on the 7th of October the bishops were on their bench in strong numbers; and, of thirteen present, twelve voted against the bill, nine others sending their proxies for the same object of defeating the measure which had so triumphantly passed the House of Commons. The great contest was yet, however, to be fought out in another campaign. The Lords had gone from the house on the Saturday morning, after such a night of excitement and fatigue as few had before encountered. On the following Monday Lord Ebrington, member for Devonshire, moved in the House of Commons a resolution to the effect that the house, lamenting the present fate of the bill for amending the representation, feels itself called upon to reassert its firm adherence to the principle and leading provisions of that great measure, and to express its unabated confidence in the integrity, perseverance, and ability of those ministers who, in introducing and conducting it, had so well consulted the best interests of the country. The resolution was carried by 329 votes to 198. The public enthusiasm gave a hearty assent to the principle urged on that occasion by Mr. Macaulay, when he asked, "Ought we to abandon the bill merely because the Lords have rejected it? We ought to respect the lawful privileges of their house, but we ought also to assert our own." Riot and outrage at Derby, and at Nottingham the burning of the castle by a frantic mob clouded for a time the hope which all honest reformers entertained that reason and justice should alone prevail. The saddest, however, could relish the wit which, however pungent, was like oil upon the waves. "Mrs. Partington" became famous throughout the land: "As for the possibility of the House of Lords preventing ere long a reform of parliament, I hold it to be the most absurd notion that ever entered into human imagination. I do not mean to be disrespectful, but the attempt of the Lords to stop the progress of reform reminds me very forcibly of the great storm of Sidmouth, and of the conduct of the excellent Mrs. Partington on that occasion. In the winter of 1824 there set in a great flood upon that town—the tide rose to an incredible height—the waves rushed in upon the houses, and everything was threatened with destruction. In the midst of this sublime and terrible storm Dame Partington, who lived upon the beach, was seen at the door of her house with mop and pattens, trundling her mop, squeezing out the sea-water, and vigorously pushing away the Atlantic Ocean. The Atlantic was roused. Mrs. Partington's spirit was up; but I need not tell you that the contest was unequal. The Atlantic Ocean beat Mrs. Partington. She was excellent at a slop or a puddle, but she should not have meddled with a tempest. Gentlemen, be at your ease—be quiet and steady. You will beat Mrs. Partington."†

The ministry stood firm, although they were taunted with their continuance in power after they had found themselves opposed by such a majority in the House of Lords as no minister had ever encountered a second time. There was no wavering in the king. He went to the House of Peers on the 20th of October; and having given the royal assent to Lord Brougham's Bankruptcy Court Bill, among other bills, he prorogued the parliament, stating that its attention must necessarily be called upon at the opening of the ensuing session to the important question of a constitutional reform in the Commons House of Parliament.

* "Life," vol. i. p. 329.
† Sydney Smith, "Speech at Taunton," Oct. 12, 1831.

CHAPTER CCXXIV.

Intense excitement during the prorogation—Dangers from popular ignorance—Incendiary fires and machine-breaking—The Derby, Nottingham, and Bristol riots—Destruction of property at Bristol—The cholera approaching—Cowardly alarmists—Central Board of Health formed—Parliament—New Reform Bill passed by the Commons—The bill in the Lords read a second time—Political unions—The Lords' committee, and the majority against ministers—The king refuses to create peers—The ministry resign—The Duke of Wellington attempts to form a government—The negotiations fail—The reform ministry returns to power—The king's consent to a creation of peers given, but not exercised—Final passing of the Reform Bill.

It is impossible to look back at the interval between the prorogation of parliament on the 20th of October, 1831, and the conclusion of the labors of the last unreformed parliament on the 16th of August, 1832, without a sense of relief in feeling that the country had passed without permanent damage through a crisis of unexampled danger, aggravated by a special visitation of Providence which many persons regarded as a judgment. The times were truly alarming. Nevertheless, during the great political conflict of seven months, during the terrific outbreak of a knot of miscreants at Bristol, the occasional violence of the mob in London, the partial outrages of the peasantry of the southern counties, the terrors of a new and frightful disease for which no medical authority could prescribe a satisfactory treatment and which no public regulation could arrest—the political excitement was so great and universal that, like combatants on a field of battle, the energy of the hour was sufficient to repress, whether among reformers or anti-reformers, any sentiment of fear that would have amounted to a panic. The nation, whether ranged on one side or the other, had never been so much in earnest since the days of the Long Parliament. It is true that the popular cause could number its supporters by thousands, while those on the other side might be counted by hundreds. But the leaders of the hundreds believed that they had everything to lose, and they not only fought with desperation themselves, but were cheered on by a most zealous following, who sincerely dreaded that the end of all government and the destruction of all property were close at hand. There were everywhere wrong-headed men in popular assemblies ranting about the unequal distribution of wealth; pretended teachers of political economy proclaiming the tyranny of capital, and showing how easily a change might be made by which the laborers, without any intervention, might till the fields and work the looms. Some more modestly proposed that at the death of any member of the community his widow and children should have no exclusive claim, and that all his property should be divided among every member of society of adult age. The absurdities that hung around every scheme for the "division of property" neutralized their possible effect upon the great body of mechanics, who were not without some means of instruction that had been placed within their reach. There was another class more open to dangerous advice, and more incapable of weighing the probable consequences of lawless acts.

The laborers in husbandry had been often told that they had a claim upon a much higher rate of allowance from the poor's-rates, while at this very time the enormous pressure of those rates was driving the land even of whole parishes out of cultivation. The laborers believed, as they had been long encouraged by magistrates to believe, that the parish was bound to find work and pay wherever there was no profitable work to be done. The "Organisation du Travail" of the French political philosophers in 1848 was not an original invention. In England we had not the national workship, but we had the parish gravel-pit. The gravel-pit lowered the wages of all agricultural labor by confounding the distinctions between industry and idleness, between strength and weakness, between dexterity and clumsiness. All the moral qualifications that made one laborer more valuable than another were utterly broken down. And so when the weekly pittance for unprofitable labor was doled out by the overseer of the poor—when the farmer equalized the rate of wages by reducing his ploughman and carter almost to the level of the gravel-diggers, and sent their wives to the overseers to make up by allowance the just payment of which they were defrauded—the peasantry took to burning ricks and breaking machines. The machine-breaking was intelligible. Machines were held to be substi-

tutes for manual labor, and thus to diminish profitable employment. But the rick-burning: How could arson be a relief for hunger? The destruction of food raised the price of food. The excessive ignorance of the peasantry, the hateful isolation of their class from their employers, the neglect of the rich, made them apt listeners to the devilish promptings of some village Cade in the beer-shop. They had undoubted grievances; and we can scarcely wonder that paupers and poachers became rick-burners and machine-breakers, in the belief that those above them in rank were in a conspiracy to oppress them. The southern laborers knew nothing of the Reform Bill, and cared nothing. They thought only of the misery and neglect of their own unhappy lot. "Swing" was at work months before Lord Grey came into power—"Swing" was their one reform leader. They took their own course of proclaiming their wretchedness and their ignorance, to the terror and shame of those who had kept them ignorant, and passed them by in the haughty indifference which regarded a peasant and a slave as something near akin—"slaves in ignorance, without having them chained and watched to prevent them hurting us." * The jail and the gallows seemed the only remedies when property became unsafe—

> "The blind mole casts
> Copp'd hills toward heaven, to tell the earth is throng'd
> By man's oppression, and the poor worm doth die for 't." †

In the same state of ignorance, especially of political ignorance, as the southern peasantry, but not with equal provocation for their outrages, were the dregs of the people who broke open the city jail at Derby, and set the prisoners at liberty, and those who burned down Nottingham Castle. More entirely distinct, even than the agricultural laborers, from those who cherished any over-zealous aspirations for an amended representation of the people, were those who formed the mass of rioters at Bristol. There an insignificant mob of the merest outcasts of a seaport long remarkable for a filthy, ignorant, and drunken horde of laborers of the lowest class—many of the so-called workers habitual thieves—held during a Saturday afternoon, and the whole of Sunday till daybreak on Monday, the lives and property of the inhabitants of one of the great cities of the empire at the mercy of their reckless brutality.

Sir Charles Wetherell had been among the most determined opponents of the Reform Bill during its passage through the House of Commons. He was Recorder of Bristol, and being a man of as much eccentricity as talent he disregarded the warnings which were given him, that it might be more prudent to open the city sessions on the 29th of October without any public entry. Recorders nowadays go more modestly about their business; but Sir Charles Wetherell determined to have a procession. A large number of influential inhabitants, whether as political supporters or to maintain the dignity of his judicial function, formed a great cavalcade around the sheriff's carriage in which the recorder was to enter the city. He reached the Guildhall amid the hisses of the populace, but with no injury from the few stones that were thrown at his carriage. There was some confusion in the hall during the opening of the commission; but the preliminary business having been gone through and the court adjourned till Monday morning, the recorder retired, the people giving three cheers for the king. Sir Charles Wetherell took up his residence at the Mansion-house. This during the whole of the afternoon was surrounded by a mob, upon which constables occasionally rushed to seize some prominent offender, boy or man, who manifested his spirit by hurling some missile at an irritated guardian of the peace. The evening came on; the mob of blackguards became more daring; colliers came in from the neighboring pits to join the fun, and the Mansion-house was attacked in a far more formidable manner than at the earlier hour in the afternoon; for the greater number of constables had left the rioters to their diversion, and had quietly gone away to seek refreshment. In the darkness of that autumnal night the windows of the chief magistrate's residence were shattered, the doors were forced, and preparations were made to set the Mansion-house on fire. Sir Charles Wetherell during the tumult effected his retreat. The troops arrived and arrested the conflagration. The soldiers were cheered as they trotted their horses backward and forward; the commander of the district, Colonel Brereton, exhorted the mob to peace, but he did not effectually clear the streets. The ragged populace were triumphant for that Saturday. On the Sunday morning the consequences of a too humane lenity were signally exhibited. The troops had remained in the streets all night. On the Sunday morning, all being quiet, they retired to their quarters. The churches and chapels were filled as usual, without any apprehension of danger. A crowd was again collected before the Mansion-house. They burst into the hall, and, reaching the upper rooms, threw the furniture into the street. They penetrated to the wine-cellars, and, carrying off the corporation stores of the choicest port, were soon lying upon pavements dead with drunkenness. The troops again came out, and the tumult, which might have been quelled without bloodshed if the respectable inhabitants had been sworn in on the Saturday as special constables, which they entreated to be, now became a wide-wasting career of rapine and destruction. There was a little firing of the 14th Light Dragoons upon the mob, who assaulted them with brick-bats. Still there was a belief that the worst had passed. The soldiers were then for the most part withdrawn from the city. The subsequent proceedings of the mob sufficiently indicated the class of persons of which it was composed. They beat in the doors of the Bridewell with sledge-hammers, set free the prisoners, and fired the building. Another party conducted the same operations with equal success at the New Borough Jail. A third manifested their zeal for liberty by releasing all confined in the Gloucester County Jail. There were to be no more prisons in Bristol. From these three places of confinement the flames were rising at one and the same time. Fire now became the great manifestation of the savagery which some dreaded, or pretended to dread, as the natural result of the reform agitation. The Mansion-house was set on fire. The demoniacs ran from room to room, kindling the flames, and when the roof fell in the progress of the conflagration had been so rapid that many were cut off from a retreat. The Bishop's Palace was reduced to ashes. The Custom-house followed. This building was near the Mansion-house in Queen's Square. Prisons and stately buildings were not the sole objects of this most causeless outbreak. There was no rallying-cry in the streets, such as that of "No Popery" in 1780, and of "Church and King" in 1791. No voice was heard to exclaim, "The bill." It was all mad fury without any possible object except plunder and the indulgence of the grossest sensuality. At three o'clock in the morning there were forty-two dwelling-houses and warehouses burning. Two sides of Queen's Square, with the exception of two houses, were destroyed. The flames were lighting the ruffians who paraded as rebels and, knocking at the doors of ale-houses and liquor-shops, were demanding "drink or blood." Their intoxication quelled the outrages even more effectually than the soldiery, who were now brought back into the city, and hesitated not to fire and charge, as they might have done far more advantageously had force been employed at the commencement of the outbreak. The outrages were at an end; not through this final act of tardy vigor by direction of the magistracy, but through the exhaustion of the handful of blackguards when the daylight showed the extent of the ruin which they had perpetrated. It was a lamentable circumstance, though one not without its lesson, that Colonel Brereton, having been brought to trial at a court-martial for neglect of duty, shot himself on the fourth day of the inquiry. The law avenged itself in January on the rioters. Bristol had for many a year to levy a rate of 10,000*l.* for compensation to the losers of property.

The author of the "Popular History" ventures to obtrude some words which he wrote at this fearful season—not as containing any very striking reasoning or exhortation, but as expressing his own feelings in common with those of the eminent men with whom he was then associated in the diffusion of knowledge: "In moments such as these, when we hear of a few hundreds of abandoned miscreants—not workingmen in any sense of the title, but thieves and outcasts—not knowing the first interests of workingmen, because wanton destroyers of the capital by which labor must be supported—when we hear of a small band of these most ignorant of mankind, in this enlightened country, in this intellectual age, holding the lives and possessions of a community of eighty thousand people,* even

* Dr. Arnold, "Life," vol. i. p. 282.
† "Pericles," act i. scene i.

* The population of Bristol in 1831, as shown by the population returns published in 1832, was above 100,000.

for a single hour at the mercy of their lawless passions, we could almost be tempted to think that real freedom should never be the birthright of such spurners of the laws of God and man. Cast your eyes for a moment upon such scenes of frantic riot, of desperate outrage, of grovelling drunkenness in the lowest stage of brutal abandonment; think of the terror of the peaceful inhabitants of such a place in those hours of midnight plunder and Sabbath riots; and picture to yourselves the wives and children of those once happy families clinging to their husbands and their parents to shield them from the destruction that was let loose in such unnatural and hideous shapes. When you have pondered upon these things, look round for the remedy. It is the diffusion of sound knowledge which leads to the cultivation of genuine religion. Unless you, each in your own circle, put down that ignorant spirit that would make this temple of our once industrious and peaceful island 'a den of thieves,' our liberties are at an end, because our security is at an end. There can be no liberty without security. Unless you each in your own circle endeavor to instruct the less informed in the knowledge of their rights in connection with their duties, we shall all go backward in freedom and therefore in national prosperity." *

While Bristol was burning the cholera had come to England. At the beginning of November cases which had terminated fatally were reported from Sunderland. A true Christian—one whose honor it was to lead the way in the establishment of a better system than prevailed in great public schools—a liberal thinker who regarded "the Ministerial Reform Bill as a safe and necessary measure"—is described as filled with the most anxious fears toward the end of 1831. Dr. Arnold was accustomed to preach a practical sermon to his school on Sundays. His biographer says, "There are those among his pupils who can never forget the moment when, on that dark November afternoon, after the simple preface, stating in what sense worldly thoughts were or were not to be brought into that place, he at once began with that solemnity which marked his voice and manner when speaking of what deeply moved him: 'I need not tell you that this is a marked time—a time such as neither we nor our fathers for many generations before us have experienced; and to those who know what the past has been it is no doubt awful to think of the change which we are now about to encounter.' But in him the sight of evil and the endeavor to remove it were hardly ever disjoined; and while everything which he felt partook of the despondency with which that sermon opens, everything which he did partakes of that cheerful activity with which the same sermon closes in urging the example of the apostle's 'wise and manly conduct amid the dangers of storm and shipwreck.'" † Very different from a counsellor of "wise and manly conduct" was a writer in a periodical work of the highest authority, published in November, 1831. To produce a terror among the community for a political object has been considered the especial function of a corrupt minister. To exaggerate real causes of alarm, in the endeavor to terrify the heads of families into a retreat from the political battle-field, was now the object of a factious journalist. He asked, What has been done to meet this fatal contagion? Anticipating the sudden paralyzation of commerce through every limb of our body politic—with prodigious masses of artisans sunk at once into the depths of pauperism—he asks whether the ministers have considered the necessity of guarding against the rapacity of monopolists as respects food and fuel; whether they had begun to think of public stores of bread? Have they considered what ought to be done for the supply of our markets, the regulations as to travellers, inns, and public conveyances of all kinds? "Have they even dreamed of the enormous burden of care that may within a week devolve upon them as a cabinet?" Unquestionably the ministers had not so dreamed. They knew perfectly well, as the author of this article most probably knew, that any interference with the laws of demand and supply would render a temporary disturbance of the ordinary intercourse between man and man, between town and country, ten thousand times more dangerous. The advice to private persons is as remarkable for the most extravagant selfishness as the advice to the government is conspicuous for ignorance of the commonest laws of political economy. Such families as mean to quit the town in which they reside ought to hold themselves prepared for immediate flight; the civil power should be prepared to take charge of the houses and property left behind; the opulent must expect to pay dearly for such protection, "but they have a right to expect it." When the desire to quit the town becomes general, the more that go the better; but none must go unless they have the means of conveyance. There should be lazarettoes out of town to which families might, if they pleased, remove; care being taken that families of the same class be placed together. Encampments might be allowed under proper regulations. All these recommendations are for the runaways. Those who have the courage to remain in great cities, such as London, are not to be less scrupulous in manifesting the same selfish cowardice. To the utmost practicable extent disfurnish the house. Get rid of all superfluous domestics, and take care that it shall be impossible for those that are retained to communicate with any one out of doors. All letters and supplies of food must be received from the police messengers. They must be drawn up to a window of the first floor by means of a rope having a yard of chain and an iron pail attached to it. Mixed up with some semi-medical precautions, the article sets forth how in some cities this pest destroys here a sixth, there a fourth, and in a third town a half of the population. The plague of Marseilles, the plague of Messina, are examples of false confidence. To excite fear is a true mode of being safe. At Messina, where no precaution was adopted, "all at once the pest was found raging, and the populace rose in the frenzy of wrath and despair, and glutted themselves with murder." * Marseilles was named without a word of "Marseilles' good bishop." There were many in England, lay and clerical, who remembered noble examples, in their own country, of the duty of the rich to the poor in such a season of calamity, and they followed them in the spirit of Christian brotherhood. Perhaps the cholera awakened some of this feeling, which had been too long slumbering.

The ministers were solemnly warned by this writer of the responsibility they incurred if they neglected those preparations which they alone could make. "The more rigorous the laws, and the more strictly they are enforced, the more certainly will the government be pronounced a merciful one." The government did not neglect preparations and did not shrink from wise precautions; but these were of a very different character than such as would have plunged the whole country into a confusion far more dreadful than any visitation of the most pestilent disease. A central board of health was formed, which, in a circular letter dated from the council office, recommended, as to precautionary measures, that every large community should be divided into sections to form distinct boards of health, each to consist, if possible, of a resident clergyman, of a number of substantial householders, and of one medical man at least. Such boards were to appoint inspectors, each of whom was daily to visit a hundred houses, and upon their reports to endeavor to remedy such deficiencies as might be found to exist in the primary elements of public health—namely, food, clothing, bedding, ventilation, space, cleanliness, habits of temperance, prevention of panic. With regard to intercourse with suspected or infected persons or places, they strongly deprecated all measures of coercion for avoiding communication, which measures, when tried upon the continent, had invariably been found productive of evil. Temporary cholera hospitals, detached, insulated, and thoroughly exposed to free and open air, were recommended to be established. Fortunately the good sense of the English people prevented a natural and wholesome alarm being degraded into a panic. Religious trust and active benevolence were much better supports than the practical atheism which would have turned domestic servants out of doors, and have fled from the duties of social life to seek some imaginary hiding-place where the destroyer could not come. On the 6th of November the people knelt in their churches to utter a form of prayer, whose words would not be forgotten in their private orisons: "Lord! have pity on thy people, both here and abroad; withdraw thy heavy hand from those who are suffering under thy judgments, and turn away from us that grievous calamity, against which our only security is in thy compassion." The visitation of this calamity, although very fatal in some districts, was by no means extensive, compared with the aggregate number of the population. It had died out after the ensuing sum-

* "The Rights of Industry: addressed to the Workingmen of the United Kingdom. By the author of 'The Results of Machinery.'" 1831.

† "Life of Dr. Arnold," vol. i. p. 272.

* "Quarterly Review," No. xci., November, 1831, article viii.

mer. There had not been during its continuance any markéd interruption in the ordinary intercourse of life, and in the communications between place and place. The cholera left a real blessing behind it. The care of the public health from that time became a duty which no ministry could neglect, and which, after many experiments in the organization of a fit machinery, placed us in a condition not only to mitigate the effects of any pest in recurring years, but to elevate the whole body of the people in habits of cleanliness and comfort, and to prolong the duration of life in village and in city, in the pleasant fields and in the close factories.

In the midst of the cholera visitation, parliament assembled on the 6th of December. In the king's speech, first of all was recommended a careful consideration of the measures to be proposed for the reform of parliament; a speedy and satisfactory settlement of the question becoming daily of more pressing importance to the security of the state and to the contentment and welfare of his majesty's people. On the 12th of December Lord John Russell introduced the new bill for parliamentary reform. It was in many respects really a new measure. The results of the census of April had been obtained. The census of 1821 had been found a fallacious guide as to what boroughs ought or ought not to be disfranchised. Taking the census of 1831 as the basis of the population test, the boundaries of towns, which had been carefully surveyed, were included in the boroughs of which they had previously formed no part. A mixed test of the importance of boroughs was to be determined by the number of persons, the number of houses, and the amount of assessed taxes paid. The disfranchised boroughs were still to be fifty-six, though the list of those to be placed in what was called Schedule A was materially varied from that formerly proposed. Schedule B, of boroughs to return only one member, was now reduced from forty-one to thirty, while others which had formerly been in this schedule were to be taken out, and to return two members. These variations from the former scheme were rendered necessary chiefly by the determination of the government not to diminish the number of the House of Commons, continuing the number as it then stood of six hundred and fifty-eight. Some of the most ardent reformers thought that the bill was impaired by these alterations. Sir Robert Peel taunted the ministers with having adopted amendments offered from his side of the house, but nevertheless expressed his determination of giving to the principle of this bill a steady and firm opposition. On the second reading in the House of Commons there was a debate of two nights, terminating on the morning of Sunday, the 18th, when the ministerial majority was a hundred and sixty-two. Parliament was now adjourned to the 17th of January.

To follow the progress of the Reform Bill through the House of Commons during the next two months would be impossible for us to attempt, even if the details of the conflict—in which the cleverness, pertinacity, and unfairness of the opposition were strikingly in contrast with the good-humored steadiness of Lord Althorp and the impassibility of Lord John Russell—were less wearisome than they now would be when the interest of such a session of skirmishes is wholly lost in the result of the great battle. The Scotch and Irish bills were brought in on the 19th of January. On the 20th the house went into committee on the English bill, which committee was not ended till the 10th of March, the report being considered on the 14th. On the 19th the third reading of the bill was moved. There was again a final debate, in which the combatants on each side were marshalled in as great numbers as on any previous occasion. In a house of five hundred and ninety-four members the bill was passed by a majority of a hundred and sixteen.

On Monday, the 26th of March, the Reform Bill was carried up to the House of Lords, and was read the first time on that day. There was a general opinion that the bill would not pass unscathed through the upper house without a large creation of peers. On the 7th of January Sydney Smith wrote to the Countess Grey, that everybody expected a creation as a matter of course. "I am for forty, to make things safe in committee."* It was impossible that Lord Grey should not have felt the most extreme reluctance to resort to so bold and hazardous a measure. Somewhat later Sydney Smith wrote, "If you wish to be happy three months hence, create peers. If you wish to avoid an old age of sorrow and reproach, create peers." Upon this letter of Sydney Smith, which was addressed to Lady Grey, the following note is written by herself: "Many of Lord Grey's friends, as represented by Mr. S. Smith, concurred in the opinions expressed in this letter, and the whole of the liberal press, the 'Times' in particular, urged the necessity of creating peers, with alarming violence, and did not scruple to assert that even the life of an old and timid man should be sacrificed for the good of the country! And had the bill been again thrown out, there is every probability that Lord Grey would have run considerable risk. Fully aware of this fact, it was therefore an act of no inconsiderable courage to resist the entreaties of his friends and the opinion of the public; but the event justified the wisdom of his decision."* The "alarming violence" of the liberal press at this subsequent period was only the reflection of the more alarming violence which then prevailed throughout the country. In the concluding portion of his speech on moving the second reading, Lord Grey said, "My lords, I admit that we have of late heard none of that outcry on the part of the people which first marked the progress of this bill. In its place a fearful silence at present prevails—a silence which may, perhaps, lead some persons foolishly to imagine that the people are no longer looking at this question with the same feelings of interest. But I caution your lordships to beware how you form that opinion."† The previous strong manifestation of popular opinion; the formation of political unions throughout the country; the open talk of making force prevail if reason could not prevail, had produced some alarm in the court. Communications, it is affirmed, had passed between the king's private secretary and Lord Wharncliffe, in which the royal wish had been expressed that the opposition to the bill in the House of Lords should be less decided. Lord Grey was aware of some partial change of opinion. He said on this first debate on the second reading, "I must confess that I look with something like hope to that which appears to be a sort of approach to a favorable decision on the part of this house." Lord Wharncliffe and Lord Harrowby had announced to him that they intended to vote for the second reading, but with a full intention of striking from the bill those parts which they deemed the most obnoxious.‡ The debate was carried on for four nights, Lord Ellenborough having moved as an amendment that the bill be read that day six months. At seven o'clock in the morning of the 14th of April the bill was read a second time by a majority of nine—a hundred and eighty-four contents; a hundred and seventy-five non-contents. There were votes for the bill from some who had been absent from the division in 1831; some who had voted against it now abstained from voting; seventeen who had voted against the previous bill now voted for this bill. Jeffrey, who was present through the debate, described it as not very brilliant, but in its latter stage excessively interesting. Lyndhurst's, he said, was by far the cleverest and most dangerous speech against the government; Lord Grey's reply, considering his age and the time, really astonishing—he having spoken near an hour and a half after five o'clock, from the kindling dawn into full sunlight. Of the aspect of the house through that night the lord-advocate has left a striking picture.§ The benches of the peers very full; their demeanor, on the whole, still and solemn; nearly three hundred members of the Commons clustered in the space around the throne, or standing in a row of three deep below the bar; the candles renewed before the blue beams of the day came across their red light, and blazing on after the sun came in at the high windows, producing a strange effect on the red draperies and dusky tapestries on the walls.

Parliament was adjourned for the Easter recess till the 7th of May. Although there might be some rejoicing at the majority for the second reading of the bill, the popular conviction was, that it was not safe from mutilations which would have materially changed its character. For three weeks there was incessant agitation, far more formidable than riot and window-breaking. Petitions from almost every populous place exhorted "King William, the father of his country," not to hesitate if a necessity should arise for creating peers. The petition from Birmingham to the Lords implored them to pass the Reform Bill into a law unimpaired in any of its great parts and

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 334.

* "Life and Opinions of Charles, Earl Grey, by his son, the Hon. C. Grey," p. 16.

† Hansard, vol. xii. col. 25.

‡ Roebuck's "Whig Ministry," vol. ii. p. 261.

§ Cockburn, "Life of Lord Jeffrey," vol. i. p. 330.

provisions. On the day appointed for the parliament to meet, the political unions of Warwick, Worcester, and Stafford were assembled in Birmingham, at New Hall Hill. It was considered to be the largest meeting ever held in Great Britain. There was a solemnity in the enthusiasm of this vast body of people which may awake the memory of the fervid zeal of the old Puritans. One of the speakers, Mr. Salt, called upon the vast multitude to repeat, with head uncovered, and in the face of Heaven, the words which he should repeat; and every man bared his head and slowly uttered, word by word, this comprehensive resolve: "With unbroken faith through every peril and privation we here devote ourselves and our children to our country's cause." On that afternoon the House of Lords went into committee on the Reform Bill. The first great principle of the measure was the disfranchising of the boroughs. Lord Lyndhurst moved that the first and second clauses of the bill be postponed. These were the disfranchising clauses; and the motion was carried against ministers by a majority of thirty-five. Lord Grey, on that Monday night, moved that the chairman of the committee should report progress, and ask leave to sit again on Thursday. His motion was carried. That interval of two days preceded a week of intense excitement, such as the country had not witnessed in any previous stages of this contest—such as had certainly not occurred in the memory of man—perhaps had not occurred since the revolution of 1688.

On the morning of the 8th of May the cabinet, not without some apprehensions of the ultimate consequences of such a proceeding, resolved upon asking the king to give his sanction to a large creation of peers. Lord Brougham has recorded his doubts, as to this step in the following words: "I had a strong feeling of the necessity of the case, in the very peculiar circumstances we were placed in; but such was my deep sense of the dreadful consequences of the act that I much questioned whether I should not have preferred running the risk of confusion that attended the loss of the bill, as it then stood, rather than expose the constitution to so imminent a hazard of subversion." * The king without any hesitation refused his assent to the proposition. "His majesty's resolution had already been shaken by the threatening aspect of affairs, and by the apprehensions of his family and court, and he not unnaturally shrank from so startling an exercise of his prerogative." † The resignation of the ministers was at once tendered to the sovereign, and the next day was formally accepted by letter. The details of this audience have not yet escaped into the materials for history which are found in private memoirs. Let us stray a moment from the dull highway of politics into the pleasanter by-path of a private interview between Lord Althorp and the Lord Advocate of Scotland. "I went," writes Jeffrey on the 9th, "to Althorp at ten o'clock, and had a characteristic scene with that most honest, frank, true, and stout-hearted of all God's creatures. He had not come downstairs, and I was led up to his dressing-room, where I found him sitting on a stool, in a dark duffle dressing-gown, with his arms (very rough and hairy) bare above the elbows, and his beard half shaved, and half staring through the lather, with a desperate razor in one hand and a great soap-brush in the other. He gave me the loose finger of the brush hand, and, with the usual twinkle of his bright eye and radiant smile, he said, 'You need not be anxious about your Scotch bill for to-night, for I have the pleasure to tell you we are no longer his majesty's ministers.'" Lord Althorp's parting exhortation to the lord advocate was, "Do what you can to keep peace, and with your last official breath exhort and conjure lovers of liberty to be lovers of order and tolerance." On the evening of the 9th Lord Grey announced to the Lords and Lord Althorp to the Commons the resignation of ministers. On the 10th Lord Ebrington moved that the house should address the king, expressing their deep regret at the change which had taken place in the councils of his majesty, and to implore him "to call to his councils such persons only as will carry into effect, unimpaired in all its essential provisions, that bill for reforming the representation of the people which has recently passed this house." The motion was carried by a majority of eighty—ayes, 288; noes, 208.

For one week the nation was left to its conjectures, to its fears, to its anger, at the position of the government. The functions, indeed, of a government were suspended. The Whig cabinet had gone out without leaving one holder of a subordinate office who would consent to join the government which the Duke of Wellington had received authority from his sovereign to form. But though the nation was in suspense, that week was not a time of inactivity. In every populous place there were public meetings; and there was scarcely a town or city where resolutions were not entered into that petitions should be presented to the House of Commons praying that no supplies should be granted till the bill was passed unimpaired. Mr. John Wood—whose political character was distinguished through many years of public service for his temperate support of liberal principles—on presenting a petition from Manchester, signed in the space of three hours by twenty-five thousand persons, stated that the whole of the North of England; as a deputation which brought the petition informed him, was in a state of indignation which it was impossible to describe. It was his firm conviction that if a borough-mongering faction should prevail, the people would themselves take the most effectual mode of stopping the supplies, by telling the tax-gatherer to call again when the Reform Bill was passed. The danger seemed coming on which Mr. Macaulay had dreaded when the first Reform Bill was rejected by the House of Lords: "I do not predict, I do not expect, open armed insurrection. What I apprehend is this—that the people may engage in a silent but extensive and persevering war against the law. I fear that we may before long see the tribunals defied, the tax-gatherer resisted, public credit shaken, property insecure, the whole frame of society hastening to dissolution." * All these possible consequences presented a greater danger than the threats of some political unions, that they would march to London and bivouac in the squares; more fearful than the protestations of the Birmingham Union, that two hundred thousand men should go forth from their shops and forges to encamp on Hampstead Heath, and there become the arbiters of the nation's destiny. Much of this was wild talk, and equally wild were the speculations that the Duke of Wellington had resolved to put an end to such popular demonstrations by the power of the sword. A debate ensued upon the presentation of the Manchester petition, in which violent expressions were employed, touching "a fighting duke and a military government"—of a people not to be diverted from their purpose by "swords and bayonets." It was stated that the Duke of Wellington had stood pledged since the 9th to quiet the country in ten days. The Scots Greys, quartered at Birmingham, had been employed on the Sunday in grinding their swords, as was afterward told the world in the autobiography of a trooper who held some strong political opinions in common with other members of his corps, and was punished, as many averred with some appearance of truth, for the too free expression of those opinions.† The Duke of Wellington had other business in hand far more pressing, and with far more promise of success, than an attempt to govern England by the sword. He set out with confidence upon a royal commission to endeavor to give the necessary cohesion to the variously shaped atoms whose parliamentary union had thrown out the Reform Bill. Out of the conglomeration of these a road was to be formed over which the state carriage might travel in safety—not a macadamized road, but one constructed of round and square, smooth and rough materials, thrown together in a heap, to become serviceable when the people had sustained many accidents with fortitude, had ceased to be impatient of unavoidable obstruction, and were reconciled to what they deemed tyrannous. Of the failure of this plan the Duke of Wellington gave a narrative to the House of Lords on the 17th of May. His majesty, when he was left entirely alone by his ministers, had sent for Lord Lyndhurst, "to inquire if, in his opinion, there were any means, and, if so, what means of forming a government for his majesty, on the principle of carrying an extensive reform in the representation of the people." ‡ Lord Lyndhurst communicated with the Duke of Wellington, and the duke found that a large number of his friends were not unwilling to give their support to a government formed upon such a principle, and especially to resist the advice which had been given to the king by his retiring ministers. His majesty thought an extensive measure of reform should be carried. He, the

* "British Constitution," 1861, p. 270.
† May, "Constitutional History," p. 119.

* "Speeches of T. B. Macaulay, corrected by himself," p. 59.
† "Autobiography of a Workingman" (Somerville).
‡ Hansard, vol. xii. col. 993.

duke, was always of opinion that reform was unnecessary, and would prove most injurious. Nevertheless, he went about his task without any object of personal ambition. No part of the bill before parliament was safe, but undoubtedly a part of the bill would be less injurious than the whole bill. The duke very clearly pointed to a sufficient cause for his failure—he had differed with some right honorable friends with whom he had been for many years in habits of cordial union. Sir Robert Peel, the next night, in the House of Commons, made the whole course of the negotiation perfectly intelligible. Lord Lyndhurst had conferred with him, although no communication was then made by the express command of his majesty—and had asked whether he, Sir Robert Peel, would enter into the king's service at this crisis—whether he would accept that office which in political life is supposed to be the highest office of ambition, on the clear understanding that his majesty's past declarations with regard to reform should be fulfilled. "I answered," said Sir Robert, "under the influence of feelings which no reasoning could abate, that it would not be for my honor, or the advantage of the country, that I should accept office on the condition of introducing an extensive measure of reform." * The different courses taken by the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel were characteristic of the two men. The first impulse of the duke was to obey the wishes of his sovereign, not caring for a sacrifice of consistency. Sir Robert Peel took a broader view than that of a dutiful obedience to the wishes of his sovereign. He saw very clearly that no compromise of the principle of reform would now satisfy the expectations of the people. He had made a sacrifice of his consistency on a previous great occasion. He would now maintain it, and let others carry the measure which he held to be dangerous. These personal questions are, to a certain extent, of a temporary nature. More important and permanent are the constitutional questions which became prominent in this ministerial crisis. In the debate of the 17th the Duke of Wellington said, with reference to the proposed creation of peers: "I ask, my lords, is there any one blind enough not to see that if a minister can with impunity advise his sovereign to such an unconstitutional exercise of his prerogative, as to thereby decide all questions in this house, there is absolutely an end to the power and objects of deliberation in this house, and an end to all just and proper means of decision?" In answer to this question Lord Grey said: "And I ask, what would be the consequences if we were to suppose that such a prerogative did not exist, or could not be constitutionally exercised? The Commons have a control over the power of the crown by the privilege, in extreme cases, of refusing the supplies; and the crown has, by means of its power to dissolve the House of Commons, a control upon any violent and rash proceedings on the part of the Commons; but if a majority of this house is to have the power, whenever they please, of opposing the declared and decided wishes both of the crown and the people, without any means of modifying that power, then this country is placed entirely under the influence of an uncontrollable oligarchy." †

On the 15th of May it was announced in both houses that ministers had resumed their communication with his majesty. As the news went through the land the people everywhere settled down in patience to abide the result. On the 18th Lord Grey declared in the House of Lords that he now entertained a confident expectation of being able to carry the Reform Bill unimpaired and immediately. Upon what grounds did this confidence rest? Lord Grey and Lord Brougham had an audience of the king at Windsor, on the 17th. The king, it is stated, was alarmed, and manifested not only emotion but displeasure. He kept the two peers standing, contrary to usage, during their audience. He retained his private secretary, Sir Herbert Taylor, in the room during the whole time. Lord Grey and Lord Brougham declined to return to office unless the king gave a promise to the necessary creation of peers. The promise was most reluctantly given. Lord Brougham requested permission to have it in writing. The words of this document were as follows: "The king grants permission to Earl Grey, and to his chancellor, Lord Brougham, to create such a number of peers as will be sufficient to insure the passing of the Reform Bill—first calling up peers' eldest sons. (Signed) William R., Windsor, May 17th, 1832." * The power of creation was never called into exercise. The king, through Sir Herbert Taylor, employed his personal influence with the opposition peers to induce them to desist from further attempts to arrest the course of the Reform Bill. It has been stated that his private secretary—a man of remarkable sagacity and discretion—had communicated to some of the more vehement of the peers a narrative of what had passed at the interview at Windsor, and had thereby incurred a tremendous responsibility. There was no personal danger in his writing a circular letter to the anti-reform peers in general, stating "that all difficulties to the arrangements in progress will be obviated by a declaration in the house to-night from a sufficient number of peers, that, in consequence of the present state of affairs, they have come to the resolution of dropping their further opposition to the Reform Bill, so that it may pass without delay, and as nearly as possible in its present shape." The pressure of the royal will upon the peers was unconstitutional. "This interference of the king with the independent deliberations of the House of Lords was in truth a more unconstitutional act than a creation of peers." † But it overcame the difficulties of an alarming crisis. It saved the necessity of what was popularly called "swamping the House of Lords;" it averted the manifold dangers of a continued resistance to the wishes of the people; it removed a great embarrassment from the cabinet—for unquestionably the prime minister, the lord chancellor, and others would have hesitated to use at all, certainly to use to their full extent, the powers which were granted to them. The advice tendered by Sir Herbert Taylor was at once adopted. The Duke of Wellington withdrew after his explanation on the 17th, and did not return to the House of Lords till the night after the passing of the Reform Bill. His wise and patriotic example was followed by a sufficient number of peers to afford a decided majority for the ministers. On the 21st of May the discussion of the bill was resumed. The Duke of Newcastle, after several of the clauses had been passed, said, with bitter irony, that he would recommend to the committee to vote all the details of the bill at once, and send it up to a third reading. The business in committee was finished on the last day of May. On the 4th of June the bill was passed by a majority of eighty-four. The Commons next day agreed to the unimportant amendments proposed by the Lords, and on the 7th of June the English Reform Bill received the royal assent. The Reform Act for Scotland and the Reform Act for Ireland were also quickly passed—the Scotch bill on the 13th of July, the Irish on the 18th. After the experience of thirty years this measure has been described by one perfectly well acquainted with the theory and practice of parliament as "a measure at once bold, comprehensive, moderate, and constitutional; popular but not democratic, it extended liberty without hazarding revolution. . . That it was theoretically complete, and left nothing for future statesmen to effect, its authors never affirmed; but it was a masterly settlement of a perilous question." ‡

CHAPTER CCXXV.

Dissolution of parliament—Proceedings for elections under the Reform Act—Effect of changes in the system of representation—Condition of the nomination boroughs—Electoral changes in close corporations—The new representation—Metropolitan boroughs—Manufacturing towns—Scotland—Ireland—Approaching meeting of the reformed parliament—Fears of anti-reformers—Extension of popular literature during the crisis.

PARLIAMENT, having been prorogued on the 16th of August, was dissolved by proclamation on the 3d of December. A new parliament was then summoned. During the autumn and early winter the entire population had been engaged in preparing for that reconstruction of the entire framework of the representative system with which, according to some, a new and more glorious temple of liberty should be built up. According to others, this disjointed and dangerous scaffolding of modern experiment would perish in that whirlwind of

* Hansard, vol. xii. col. 1074.
† Ibid., col. 1006.

* Roebuck's "History of the Whig Ministry," vol. ii. p. 331. Mr. Roebuck states that the document is missing from the papers of Lord Brougham, but that it was seen by many persons at the time.
† May, vol. i. p. 120.
‡ May, "Constitutional History," p. 357.

anarchy which was soon to sweep over the land. The preparations for a general election were altogether so new—so entirely different from the rough and ready license long associated with the exercise of the suffrage—that many in England began to think with regret of the good old times when the oath at the election booth, amid the bluster of counsel and the cheers or hisses of the mob, was the sole test of the freeholder's or occupier's right to vote. What formalities were now to be gone through! On the 20th of June there was affixed on the door of every church and chapel a notice, requiring all persons who might be entitled to vote for knights of the shire in respect of property situate in that parish or township, to send the particulars of their claims to the overseers. Of the claims thus made the overseers were to prepare a list, and publish it in the same manner before the last day of July. A similar process, with some slight variation, was to be pursued in boroughs. The overseers were to prepare the list, and parties who had been omitted were to demand the insertion of their names. But now arises a second process which, whether in village or town, is for a fortnight to be a perpetual source of discussion and dispute at every market dinner-table and in every club-room. Objectors to the names in the lists are to send their objections to certain authorities. The cavillings are hushed for a while. The objections are made; but these are no more than the pleas for a judicial investigation. A new and strange machinery is to come into operation between the 15th of September and the 25th of October, to separate the wheat from the chaff. The great winnower is the revising barrister. A day or two of dispute in every county town and in every borough, and then the object is accomplished which is set forth in the act—"it is expedient to form a register." The lists are duly attested and copied into proper books. All the work of swearing and cross-examination and decision of the returning officer—who, if he were the mayor of a borough, had as little legal knowledge as mayors commonly possessed—was at an end. The marginal note to the statute describes in a few words what would be the result of this preliminary investigation—"no inquiry at the time of election, except as to the identity of the voter, the continuance of his qualification, and whether he has voted before at the same election."

The proclamation summoning a new parliament has gone forth. But what a change has taken place in the arrangements for the approaching hour of battle! For county elections the polling was to continue for two days, and to last during seven hours of the first day, and eight hours of the second. To accomplish this the counties were to be divided into convenient districts for polling. In the same way the elections for boroughs were to occupy only two days, and, if necessary, polling-booths were to be erected at separate places of the same borough. Not altogether would the immemorial election row, the speeches, the fun, and the fight below the hustings be discontinued. There would be a nomination day, on which protestations and pledges might be duly given, and the troublesome querist bowed off or hooted down. After the nomination the humors of an election were pretty nearly over. There was much real business to be done in committee-rooms, and zealous partisans hurried to and fro, and whispered magical words of encouragement to voters whose consciences were too scrupulous for a sudden resolve. Eight-and-forty hours saw the end of all this. The day of payment was to come for the unhappy candidate; probably the petition to the House of Commons against an undue return; the determination of a committee to put down bribery; the ranker growth of the weed after the scratching over of the ground on which it flourished.

If the modes of election were altered in this most revolutionary fashion, in places which had retained their old or acquired their new privilege of sending members to parliament, how much more revolutionary was the change which took away this right from fifty-six English boroughs returning collectively a hundred and eleven members, and which reduced the number of representatives in other boroughs so as to take a hundred and forty-three members out of the old scheme of representation.

The history of our ancient system of summoning to parliament for cities and boroughs is full of obscurity. It is difficult at first to understand how places which could never have been very populous or wealthy should have been selected, in common with towns which in very early times were great marts of commerce, possessing as they did all the organization of municipal government, which was so marked a characteristic of the life of England in the days of feudality. These seats of industry were fitted for electoral rights. Gradually many of the municipal authorities usurped the rights of the freemen, and became themselves the sole possessors of the franchise. The earliest record of the regular existence of the House of Commons is from the reign of Edward the First. The list, up to the time of Henry the Eighth, of cities and boroughs sending representatives is strikingly illustrative of the stability as well as the mutability of human affairs. Of the hundred and sixty-three places of this early period which had not intermitted their privilege at the time of the Reform Bill—returning collectively three hundred and thirteen members—there were only twenty-nine wholly disqualified, and twenty-five partially disqualified, for want of a sufficient population in 1832. Mr. Hallam was of opinion that it would be difficult to name any town of the least consideration in the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries which did not at some time or other return members to parliament; and he concluded that if we found any inland town or seaport which had never enjoyed the elective franchise, we must suppose that it had since emerged from obscurity. He subsequently qualified this opinion, although true in the main, by recollecting exceptions in the northern part of England, such as Sheffield and Manchester.* Of the petty boroughs of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries that passed into Schedule A, we can scarcely understand why the number should have been so few, except by referring to the undoubted fact that representation was often regarded by the burgesses as a burden rather than a privilege. Their old custom of returning members to parliament often dropped into disuse. John Paston, in 1472, writes to his brother, Sir John, "If ye miss to be burgess of Maldon, and my lord chamberlain will, ye may be in another place. There be a dozen towns in England that choose no burgess which ought to do it. Ye may be set in for one of those towns, if ye be friended."† In the reigns of Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth, there were forty-six new writs addressed to comparatively petty places with the exception of the city of Westminster. Few of these were derived from a popular principle, such as had influenced the early constitution of the House of Commons. They were called into parliamentary existence for the purpose of strengthening the government, whether Protestant or popish, in the revolutions of religion. Of the boroughs of Edward the Sixth, seven passed into Schedule A; of those of Mary, five were thus disfranchised; and of those of Elizabeth, sixteen. Of these comparatively modern seats of venality twelve were in Cornwall.

Of the fifty-six English boroughs which had been scheduled into a political death, the representative history would be exceedingly curious if it could be traced not merely from the dry rolls of parliament, but from the secret records of great peers, who held not only these very obscure places to do what they would with their own, but dominated over others which had their mark upon them in Schedule B, and even over others which had no mark at all. "What right," exclaimed Sydney Smith, during the discussions on the Reform Bill, "has this lord or that marquess to buy ten seats in parliament, in the shape of boroughs, and then to make laws to govern me?"‡ This was not a rhetorical flourish; the question was founded upon a well-known fact. "The Duke of Norfolk was represented by eleven members; Lord Lonsdale by nine; Lord Darlington by seven; the Duke of Rutland, the Marquess of Buckingham, and Lord Carrington, each by six. Seats were held, in both houses alike, by hereditary right."§ Marvellous is it to look back upon the condition of some of the nomination boroughs, which my lord handed over to his son just come from Eton, or to Vellum, the steward, or to Mr. Plumpkin, a neighboring country gentleman, or to the distant relation in the county militia who calls up the carriage at the opera, or to the barrister who has written an article in the "Quarterly"—as these nominees are described by the reverend humorist. Foremost is Old Sarum, which, in 1831, returned two members, absolutely with a population that stands in the census thus, ——, as too small to be enumerated. Nevertheless a ceremony of choosing two burgesses who should interpret his patriotic wishes in parliament was gone through by the one elector of the borough, who kept the ale-house at the foot of the venerable mound. Bramber borough, also returning two members,

* "Constitutional History," chap. xiii.
† "Paston Letters," Ramsay's edition, vol. ii. p. 71.
‡ Speech at Taunton.
§ May, "Constitutional History," p. 277.

was in Schedule A—borough and parish having twenty-one inhabited houses and six uninhabited, with a male population of fifty-six. The railway traveller approaching the Redhill station may look upon the picturesque woods and beautiful mansion of Gatton. Its glory is departed, for no longer come out upon the lawn the seven electors enjoying household suffrage to return the two right honorables who were nominated by the owner of that great house. Dunwich, once the seat of the first East Anglian bishop, was washed away by the sea; but it had not lost all its splendor, for out of its forty-four hovels came the half dozen voters who returned the Earl of Brecknock and a commoner to represent them in parliament. The changes in the coast-line had made Winchelsea desolate, but no changes of society could deprive Winchelsea of its glorious privilege of having as potent a voice in the legislature as Liverpool. Most valuable were such places as property, for the nomination to them was notoriously sold. The nomination for Gatton, without the estate, was held to be worth a hundred thousand pounds as an investment. There is a passage in Locke's famous "Treatise on Civil Government" which sufficiently shows that such anomalies of English representation existed at the time of the revolution, as they would continue to exist for nearly a century and a half later. "Things not always changing equally, and private interest often keeping up customs and privileges when the reasons of them are ceased, it often comes to pass that in governments, where part of the legislative consists of representatives chosen by the people, in tract of time this representation becomes very unequal and disproportionate to the reasons it was at first established upon. To what gross absurdities the following of a custom when reason has left it may lead, we may be satisfied when we see the bare name of a town, of which there remains not so much as the ruins, where scarce so much housing as a sheep-cote, or more inhabitants than a shepherd is to be found, sends as many representatives to the grand assembly of law-makers as a whole county, numerous in people and powerful in riches. This strangers stand amazed at, and every one must confess needs a remedy."

The electors of the favored nomination boroughs, whether voters by scot and lot, or potwallopers, or holding by burgage tenure, had little cause to weep over what some parliamentary orators called the extinction of ancient rights. They had a very small share in the division of the spoil. A leg of mutton and trimmings at the Chequers was their general reward for the discreet exercise of their noble privileges. The borough patrons, Whigs or Tories—for each party had a tolerably equal share in this species of property—put the purchase-money into their pockets at every election, without caring to oil the machinery which worked the mine. When Romilly bought his seat for Horsham of the Duke of Norfolk, the "free and independent electors" had little advantage of the cash. When George the Third, in 1779, wrote to Lord North, "If the Duke of Northumberland requires some gold pills for the election, it would be wrong not to satisfy him," * his grace of Northumberland's electors were necessarily content with a bread pill or two without the gilding. There was no insurrection in the decayed boroughs; no threatened march to London, when their electoral privileges were quietly buried, never again to be exhumed. Not so noiseless was the grief of the close corporations, who, in some ancient cities and manufacturing towns, returned the representatives of populous communities. Sad was the day of December when the mayor, ten aldermen, and twenty-four common-councilmen of the city of Bath found that their power of choosing the representatives of fifty thousand persons was come to an end. Dire was the grief when the bailiff and twelve burgesses of Buckingham could no longer do the bidding of the Lord of Stowe. With dejected looks the corporators of no very small number of boroughs had to go forth into the market-place to proclaim the writ that would cease to be a symbol of their exclusive power. And yet, in such case, what was called the respectability of a town was not wholly swamped in the flood of democracy. With singular inconsistency it was maintained, in the case of Bath, that "the first member elected by the new constituency was the very same gentleman whom the corrupt and jobbing corporators had returned for six or seven parliaments, as they had done his father for three parliaments before." † The grief was that the second member, whom the corporation generally chose from the families of the Marquess of Bath or the Marquess of Camden, was one of those "extraordinary missionaries whom Mr. Hume dispatched by the several stage-coaches, labelled and ticketed, and, for aught we know, specified in the way-bill, as members to be chosen for such and such a place." What has Bath gained by the change? asks the reviewer. It gained John Arthur Roebuck instead of the nominee of Lord Bath or Lord Camden.

Let us turn from what the Reform Bill destroyed in England to what it created or restored. Mr. May has pointed out that in 1776 John Wilkes proposed a scheme comprising "all the leading principles of parliamentary reform which were advocated for the next fifty years without success, and have been sanctioned within our own time." We refer to the "Parliamentary History," and find that the proposition of the famous demagogue, who then triumphantly sat in parliament for Middlesex, was to give an increased representation to the metropolis, to lop off the mean, venal, and dependent boroughs, and to permit "the rich, populous trading towns, Birmingham, Manchester, Sheffield, Leeds, and others, to send deputies to the great council of the nation." The motion of Wilkes was of course negatived without a division. The terms in which Lord North told him this would happen supply an amusing contrast to the political hypocrisy of half a century later, which maintained that "the rotten part of our constitution" was "a thing of beauty"—the ornament and safety of the state. The member for Middlesex, said the frank and good-humored minister, "would find it no easy task to prevail on those who had an interest in the boroughs, on which he bestowed so many hard names, to sacrifice to ideal schemes of reformation so beneficial a species of property." * The increased representation of the metropolis was effected by the Reform Bill in the creation of four new boroughs — Marylebone, Finsbury, the Tower Hamlets, and Lambeth. The increase of Marylebone had been going on for more than a century. After the building of Cavendish Square, in the reign of George the First, Marylebone became the most aristocratic district of London. There were five hundred and seventy-seven houses in the parish in 1739, and the number of persons who kept coaches was thirty-five. In 1831 the number of houses was eleven thousand six hundred and eight. The statistics of the nineteenth century would have little regard to the number of coaches as an index of the wealth of the people. The returns of assessed taxes afford a surer criterion. In 1831 the aggregate amount so paid for each one hundred persons was 168*l.* in the city, 150*l.* in Westminster, 120*l.* in Marylebone. Finsbury exhibited only three fourths of the wealth thus indicated by direct taxation, though its population was greater than that of Marylebone. The Tower Hamlets contained the poorest population, with the greatest commercial wealth. It was the seat of the docks and of ship-building yards. It was a vast maritime city, with all the inequalities of condition that belong to such a population. The Tower Hamlets paid only a fourth of the amount of assessed taxes collected in Marylebone. Lambeth was the seat of the principal manufacturing industries of London. Its population was considerably less than that of the other new metropolitan boroughs. Its large number of the smallest houses was balanced by its larger number of moderate-sized private houses, especially in its pleasant southern districts, which might then be called rural. Such were the populations of the metropolitan north that had succeeded "the archers of Finsbury and the citizens that come a-ducking to Islington ponds." † Such were the populations of the metropolitan south that had trodden out the memories of the Bishop of Winchester's palace, of the Liberty of the Clink, of the Bear Garden, and of the Globe.

The most important of the manufacturing towns which attained to the dignity of sending two members to parliament under the Reform Act were Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Sheffield, Sunderland, Wolverhampton, Bolton, Bradford, Blackburn, Halifax, Macclesfield, Oldham, Stockport, Stoke-upon-Trent, and Stroud. Brighton, a wealthy and fashionable watering-place, was included in this catalogue. Of the twenty-one less important new boroughs which were to return one member, the chief commercial towns were Ashton-under-Lyne, Bury, Dudley, Frome, Gateshead, Huddersfield, Kidderminster, Kendal, Rochdale, Salford, South Shields, Tynemouth, Wakefield, War-

* Letters of Lord North, appended to Lord Brougham's "Sketches of Statesmen," vol. i. p. 137, edition, 1855.
† "Quarterly Review," vol. xlix. p 267.

* "Parliamentary History," vol. xviii. cols. 1295–1297.
† Ben Jonson, "Every Man in his Humor."

rington, Whitby, Whitehaven, and Merthyr-Tydvil. To this catalogue were added Chatham and Cheltenham. What vast changes in the whole structure of society are indicated by this bare enumeration! With this list is associated all the history of the wondrous rise of the textile manufactures, dating from the times of Arkwright and Crompton; of the first rotatory steam-engine of Watt, erected at Warrington in 1787; of the power-loom of Cartwright. How suggestive it is of the vast changes in the smelting of iron from the time of the improved processes of Roebuck; of the opening of vast beds of coal that lay useless beneath the surface, and of the workings of copper and tin mines, whose treasures were drowned till the new power of mechanics had made them dry; of the numberless beautiful arts that had been called into life in the working of metals; of the discoveries of chemistry, which had done as much for the triumphs of industry as the inventions of machinery. If the opposers of the reform of 1832 could have put back the dial of a nation's progress for three more decades, we may ask how the population of Manchester and Salford, which in 1831 was two hundred and twenty-seven thousand, would have endured their position in 1861, when their population was four hundred and sixty thousand; how Birmingham, which in 1831 was a hundred and forty-two thousand, would have felt in 1861 with two hundred and ninety-five thousand; how Leeds, with its hundred and twenty-three thousand, would have been content when it had reached two hundred and seven thousand; how Sheffield, with its hundred and twenty-six thousand, would have remained quiet when it had reached a hundred and eighty-five thousand; how Bradford, with forty-three thousand, would have rested without representation with a hundred and six thousand. Since the era of the Reform Bill there have been other changes in the relative importance of industrial communities, but not so great as those we have glanced at. Macaulay, in his speech on the second reading of the first Reform Bill, exclaimed against the doctrine of finality: "Who can say that a hundred years hence there may not be, on the shore of some desolate and silent bay in the Hebrides, another Liverpool, with its docks and warehouses and endless forests of masts? Who can say that the huge chimneys of another Manchester may not rise in the wilds of Connemara?" * This is the poetry of eloquence. But it is a significant fact, illustrative of the same principle, that "another Liverpool" should have arisen on the sparsely populated south-western shore of the Mersey since Macaulay talked of industry and trade finding out new seats; that Birkenhead should have been by the statute of the 25th of Victoria constituted a parliamentary borough—the first borough obtaining the right of representation by the energy that in twenty years produced a port that might rival those of famous cities that had been growing for centuries.

We may add to this imperfect notice a few words about the Reform Act for Scotland. The number of its representatives had been determined by the Act of Union. Wilkes shrewdly said, in 1776, "I am almost afraid the forty-five Scottish gentlemen among us represent themselves." In 1831 the total number of county voters was about two thousand five hundred; the sixty-six burghs had an aggregate constituency of one thousand four hundred and forty. Edinburgh, with its population of a hundred and sixty-two thousand, had a constituency of thirty-three persons; Glasgow, with its two hundred and two thousand, rejoiced in the same number of capable men to save its inhabitants from the troublesome choice of a fit and proper person to represent them in parliament. The great authorities who domineered over the total Scotch electoral body of four thousand were under the dominion of the minister of the day who distributed patronage for the government, and of the succession of such ministers none was more active and adroit than the second Lord Melville. Those who went to parliament acted upon the sound principle of the Scotch county member who said, "that his invariable rule was never to be present at a debate or absent at a division, and that he had only once in his long political life ventured to vote according to his conscience, and that he found that on that occasion he had voted wrong." † Without entering minutely into a description of the wonderful local machinery by which this extraordinary system of representation was managed, and of which system Jeffrey, as lord advocate, justly boasted that he had "left not a shred or patch," it may be sufficient to say that the elective franchise in counties being enveloped in feudal and technical absurdities, and thus costing a heavy price to attain, it was beyond the reach, not only of the lower class, but even of the majority of the middle and many of the higher classes. Of the town members Edinburgh returned only one; fourteen were returned by groups of burghs, each electing a delegate and the four or five delegates so associated electing the representative. "Whatever this system may have been originally, it had grown, in reference to the people, into as complete a mockery as if it had been invented for their degradation. The people had nothing to do with it. It was all managed by town councils, of never more than thirty-three members, and every town council was self-elected, and consequently perpetuated its own interests. The election of either the town or the county member was a matter of such utter indifference to the people, that they often only knew of it by the ringing of a bell, or by seeing it mentioned next day in a newspaper; for the farce was generally performed in an apartment from which, if convenient, the public could be excluded, and never in the open air." *

The Reform Bill for Ireland, although contributing to the general improvement of the representation of the United Kingdom, was a much milder change of system than either the English or the Scotch bills. There was the same influence of great patrons in counties and boroughs; but the mode in which that influence was principally exercised, through the right of election in many places being vested in the corporations, was taken away by the Reform Act and vested in ten-pound householders. There were no disfranchising clauses in the act. The number of members was increased from one hundred to one hundred and five. The franchise, however, was comparatively very restricted. It was somewhat extended by a statute of the 13 & 14 Victoria, 1850.

The elections were over before the close of the year. According to the estimate of a journalist of that time, who was long famous for his scrupulous attention to the accuracy of minute details, there were two hundred and fifteen gentlemen who occupied seats for England in the last parliament who were not returned to the new one. Of these, one hundred and forty-eight were anti-reformers. In Scotland eighteen who were formerly in parliament were also not returned. In Ireland forty-two of the old members ceased to sit. Thirty of those who had thus lost their seats were reformers, but they were principally driven out by repealers. Altogether it was estimated that five hundred and eleven ministerialists and reformers were returned; and a hundred and forty-seven who, now designated as conservatives, were anti-ministerialists.†

And now the dreaded Reform Parliament was to assemble at the end of January, 1833. In 1835 a sensible traveller in England wrote to his friend in Germany: "Those who compared the Reform Parliament to the French national assemblies have happily been greatly mistaken in their calculations; otherwise, instead of the tranquillity and satisfaction in which England lives, the guillotine would be already at work." ‡ The crisis of terror through which many of the rich and fashionable classes had passed, and from which they had not yet emerged after six months' experience had shown them that chaos was not come again, is described by one who lived in the exclusive circles. Five days after the passing of the Reform Bill, Mr. Raikes thus writes in his diary: "I do not think that in all my experience I ever remember such a season in London as this has been; so little gayety, so few dinners, balls, and fêtes. The political dissensions have undermined society, and produced coolnesses between so many of the highest families, and between even near relations, who have taken opposite views of the question. Independent of this feeling, the Tory party—whose apprehensions for the future are most desponding, who think that a complete revolution is near at hand, and that property must every day become less secure—are glad to retrench their usual expenses, and are beginning by economy to lay by a *poire pour la soif*. § Those who have money at command are buying funds in America, or in Denmark, which they think least exposed to political changes." One of the chief terrors of the landed aristocracy,

* "Speeches," p. 32.

† Hansard, Third Series, vol. vii. col. 543, from a speech of Mr. Gillon, member for Selkirk.

* Cockburn, "Life of Lord Jeffrey," vol. i. p. 75.

† "Spectator," January 12, 1833.

‡ Von Raumer, "England in 1835," vol. iii. p 309.

§ "*Garder une poire pour la soif*"—"to keep a pear in case of thirst"—is equivalent to laying up something in case of want.

whether Whig or Tory, was that the corn laws would perish under the Reform Parliament. "The Unionists," writes Lord Eldon after the passing of the bill, "are, it seems, unanimous for a repeal of the corn laws. The abused and misled lower orders are all for this. It will ruin them." * The ex-chancellor—who held pretty much the same opinions about commercial freedom as the traders of Worcester, who denounced, in a petition to parliament, "the free-trade system" as "a reliance on the doctrines of certain speculative persons called political economists" †—the great lawyer, who was the smallest of statesmen, believed that the entire prosperity of the country depended upon the expenditure of "the landed gentlemen" with "tradesmen and manufacturers," and that the ruin of the lower classes would necessarily follow if the repeal of the corn laws were to produce the lowering of rents. Many years were to pass before the industry of England should be freed, even in a reformed parliament, from the crushing weight of corn laws. The great minister who effected their repeal was a most strenuous opponent of the Reform Bill during its troublesome and dangerous birth. Other reforms which were loudly called for or faintly suggested, and which were then denounced as "infamous projects," have, to a considerable extent, been realized during the course of thirty years. It was asked if Lord Teynham, the author of a pamphlet entitled "How it must Work," was of "sane mind," when he suggested the reduction of the national debt; the abolition of excise taxation; an ascending property tax; abolition of slavery; freedom to our colonies under a domestic form of government of their own; abolition of bounties and monopolies of every description; a general plan of education for the people; a revision of the free-trade system, including the navigation laws and the corn laws; a new legal code of cheap justice; a new municipal system. Accept the plan of Henry Francis, Lord Teynham, said the leader of the alarmists, "and then England will be brought back to a far more enviable state of civilization than that which she enjoyed in the days of the Heptarchy. We shall have neither agriculture nor commerce, neither manufactures nor trade; we shall none of us be embarrassed with superfluous luxuries; there will be no property worth preserving or contending about." ‡ Marvellous are the changes of opinion when freedom of speech and freedom of writing are established. What was denounced as individual madness thirty years ago has become the established belief of the sanest nation on earth. The terrors of the alarmists at the "infamous projects" of Lord Teynham seem as obsolete as the belief of King James that witches can raise storms and tempests in the air, either by sea or land.

There was a remarkable circumstance in the temper and habits of those called the working classes, during the political hurricanes of 1832, which we ought not wholly to pass over, although there may be a slight approach to egotism in the mention of it. While Jeffrey was exhorting his official friends in Scotland to "keep peace," there had been at work for two or three months a little instrument for calming political agitation, at no expense to the government, called "Chambers's Edinburgh Journal." There was a similar instrument in England, which was commenced to be published during the very heat of the Reform Bill, called the "Penny Magazine." In the first number of that weekly sheet, which was issued on the 31st of March, 1832, it was proposed to lead the popular mind to "calmer and, it may be, purer subjects of thought than the violence of party discussion or the stimulating details of crime and suffering." "We have, however," said the editor, "no expectation of superseding the newspaper, and no desire to supersede it. We hope only to share some portion of the attention which is now almost exclusively bestowed upon the folio of four pages, by those who read little and seldom." In looking back upon his work of that period—work which he regards as the best labor of his life—the author of this history is almost surprised at the boldness of the undertaking, when the whole country, in the opinion of many unprejudiced persons, was fast verging toward anarchy. The fact that, before the year was out, he had to record the regular sale of two hundred thousand copies warranted the calculation that there were about a million of readers for that miscellany alone. Forty years before, Burke had estimated that there were eighty thousand readers in this country. The sale of the two unexciting miscellanies of the reform period not only offered a proof of the vast increase of the desire for knowledge, but afforded a hope that the old system of governing by the ignorance of the masses was rapidly coming to an end.

* Twiss, vol. iii. p. 181. † Hansard, vol. xii. col. 1278.
‡ "Quarterly Review," vol. xlviii. pp. 553–554.

CHAPTER CCXXVI.

Opening of the new parliament—Election of the speaker—The king's speech—Mr. O'Connell's amendment—Declaration of Sir Robert Peel—Coercion Bill for Ireland passed by the Lords—Public health—Observance of the Sabbath—Coercion Bill in the House of Commons—The Coercion Bill passed—Financial measures—Cobbett's motion against Sir Robert Peel—Bill for the reform of the Irish Church—Abolition of slavery in the British colonies—Effects of the abolition—Limitation of labor in factories—Bank charter—East India Company's charter—Prorogation.

On the 29th of January, 1833, the new parliament was opened by commission. The act for abolishing the oaths to be taken before the lord-steward had come into operation, and a House of Commons was at once formed. The attendance of members was very large. One of the new representatives of Ireland, Mr. John O'Connell, has described some of the circumstances of that first meeting. His father, Daniel O'Connell, he says, led what might have been called his "household brigade"—namely, his three sons and two sons-in-law—down to the house. In the passage they met and were introduced to Cobbett, habited in a kind of pepper-and-salt garb, in fashion something between that of a Quaker and of a comfortable farmer, and wearing a broad-brimmed white hat, thrown back so as to give the fullest view of his shrewd though bluff countenance and his keen, cold-looking eye. The "household brigade" proceeded to take their seats upon the second bench on the opposition side, somewhat indignant at a long quizzing from Mr. Stanley's eye-glass. The great Irish orator was more modest in selecting his seat than others of the Radical party, who boldly ranged themselves upon the front bench, as if to awe the ministerial Whigs, who were immediately opposite. According to the Irish member's "Recollections," William Cobbett was among the most conspicuous of those who took this post of honor.* One who four days afterward records what he saw says, "On our entering the house, and turning our eyes to the treasury bench, the first person we saw, in the place of the black-whiskered, bluff, yeomanlike Lord Althorp, was the white-headed veteran of the Radicals, William Cobbett, who had taken his seat above the minister, and thus, as it were, installed himself as leader of the reformed House of Commons." †

The first business of the lower house was the election of a speaker. Mr. Hume, asserting the principle that it was necessary to have a speaker who should represent the opinions of the majority of the house, and believing that the majority were reformers, proposed Mr. E. J. Littleton, the member for the southern division of Staffordshire. He was seconded by Mr. O'Connell. Lord Morpeth, upon the principle of looking to the change which had taken place in the constitution of parliament, considered that it was most advisable to have all possible assistance to their proceedings from a gentleman of long practical experience and tried ability. He proposed the Right Hon. Charles Manners Sutton. The debate went on with little variation from the usual forms of parliamentary courtesy, when the broad-brimmed white hat of the singular man on the foremost place of the treasury bench was taken off, and up rose the author of the "Register," who had written that he was born "to be one of the greatest terrors to one of the greatest and most powerful bodies of knaves and fools that ever were permitted to afflict this or any other country." ‡ Out of that most powerful body of which he now formed a part some of the especial objects of his wrath had been withdrawn. But many objects of his old hatred still remained—many a country gentleman whose class he had denounced as unfeeling tyrants who squeezed the laborer for gain's sake; many "lords of the loom," who had been designated as "rich ruffians;" many of the "education-canters," who did not follow out his theory that nothing could "be good with regard to the laboring classes unless it made an addition to their victuals, drink, or clothing." Cobbett's style of speaking was as strange

* "Recollections and Experiences," by John O'Connell, Esq., M.P., 1849, vol. i. chap. 1.
† "Spectator," February 2. ‡ "Rural Rides," p. 18.

to the House of Commons as his habiliments. In supporting Mr. Hume's nomination of a speaker, he began with these very plain words: "It appears to me that since I have been sitting here I have heard a great deal of vain and unprofitable conversation." He objected to placing a man in the chair who had already received large sums of the public money. The right honorable gentleman had been for sixteen years in the office of speaker; he had received every year a salary of six thousand pounds, taken from the starving people of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Mr. Hume's motion was rejected by a majority of two hundred and ten, and Mr. Manners Sutton again became speaker.

On the 5th of February the king opened the parliament for "the dispatch of business," according to the formal expression of what is the duty expected from parliament. The dispatch of business in that one session is recorded in six volumes of Hansard, containing seven thousand seven hundred and forty-four columns of debate. Great measures were indeed discussed in both houses during that session, which lasted till the 29th of August. During this time the House of Commons had sat a hundred and forty-two days, upon an average of nine hours daily. The usual average had been four and a half or five hours. * The chief objects upon which the members of that house had thus vied with factory workers were suggested in the king's speech; the approaching termination of the charters of the Bank of England and the East India Company; the state of the Church, more particularly regarding its temporalities; the Church of Ireland; the necessity of intrusting the crown with greater powers for controlling and punishing the spirit of insubordination and violence in Ireland, which had greatly increased, and for preserving and strengthening the legislative union between the two countries. There were two other great measures, not indicated at the commencement of the session, that occupied the further attention of parliament—the regulation of infant labor in factories and the abolition of slavery in the West India colonies. To the task of dealing with many of these important subjects both houses applied themselves with a sedate and earnest spirit. But there was one topic in the king's speech which instantly called up a host of turbulent feelings, little in accordance with that spirit of brotherhood which some enthusiasts believed would in future render the House of Commons an assembly altogether laboring for the national good, and redeem it from its old character of the cockpit of party. The Irish members who followed the leadership of O'Connell came away "with hearts full of bitterness," after listening to the royal speech, believing that the only part of it which the king's infirmities or his inclinations allowed him to deliver with any distinctness was that in which he threatened Ireland.† The amendment was moved by Mr. O'Connell. Never, since on his own Irish ground of agitation he designated Mr. Stanley a "shave-beggar," had he ventured upon such coarseness as he now thrust upon the House of Commons. He described the echo of the king's speech as "a bloody and brutal address;" "a bloody, brutal, and unconstitutional address." Pity it was that the remarkable powers of O'Connell, the "Demosthenic directness and vehemence," as Jeffrey described the oratory of this great artist, were so often degraded into the utterance of a copious vocabulary of scurrility. Mr. Stanley replied to what he called "the eloquent and forcible invective" of the honorable and learned member for Dublin. The speech of the Secretary for Ireland was something far more telling than invective, although it contained sufficient bitterness to make lasting enemies. He set forth the system of outrages which prevailed in a land where the law was a dead letter; where the law was insufficient to meet the exigencies of insurrectionary crime—where no witness could afford to give evidence, where no jury could dare to convict, though the guilt of the culprit were as notorious as the sun at noonday. "No government could apply itself efficiently to the remedying of grievances unless it also possessed the power to make the laws respected."‡ The opening of Mr. Stanley's speech was received with cries of "Bravo" in the house, and even with applause in the strangers' gallery. He taunted Mr. O'Connell with the declaration that he would relieve Ireland "from the yoke of the Sassenach." The government now told him that his panacea of repeal "should be resisted to the death." Such was the spirit of courageous defiance that won for Mr. Stanley the name of "the Rupert of debate." Mr. O'Connell's amendment was finally rejected by a majority of three hundred and eighty-eight in a house of four hundred and sixty-eight: ayes, 40; noes, 428. Of his forty supporters, six were members for England, two for Scotland, and thirty-two for Ireland.

The debates upon the address occupied five nights. It certainly was a national benefit that much of the eloquence which had been expended, both in England and Ireland, for the excitement of popular assemblies, now harmlessly exploded in a place where the freedom of debate was indeed unlimited, but where no demagogue could make extravagant statements without receiving an immediate contradiction. It was curious that the great Irish agitator, in his eloquent invective, said no single word tending to raise a discussion about repeal. "He keeps it, and prudently keeps it," said Mr. Macaulay, "for audiences of a very different kind." O'Connell and Cobbett might in their hearts aspire to be the Danton and Marat of a new national assembly. But the House of Commons, with all its renovated spirit of democracy, was not so favorable a theatre for their coarser harangues as the hall of the Catholic Association or the farmer's table of a country town on market-day. There was some voice of the past in that old Chapel of St. Stephen, which proclaimed that liberty had there been won by the gentlemen of England, and that if it ceased to be a place where the habits of gentlemen could be preserved, it would cease to be a place worthy of the efforts which had been made by the people to renovate and exalt its character.

Looking beyond the almost solitary attempts of the English demagogue to speak in parliament so as to set the poor against the rich—hearing something more harmonious than the war-trump of the Irish leader to call his followers to skirmishes or pitched battles in which the reward of victory would be the repeal of the union—there were important lessons to be gathered from those five nights of debate introductory to the practical business of the session. They pretty conclusively showed, in the first place, that the expectations of the ultra-Tory party that the Reform Bill would be repealed—that another restoration, more joyful than the royal triumph of Charles the Second, would terminate the execrated career of the revolution of 1832 *—were sanguine hopes which would be quickly dispersed even by the breath of him who had most consistently opposed a reform in parliament. On the third night of the debate on the address, Sir Robert Peel thus declared himself: "The king's government had abstained from all unseemly triumph in the king's speech respecting the measure of reform. He would profit by their example, and would say nothing upon that head; but consider that question as finally and irrevocably disposed of. He was now determined to look forward to the future alone, and, considering the constitution as it existed, to take his stand on main and essential matters—to join in resisting every attempt at new measures which could not be stirred without unsettling the public mind and endangering public prosperity. . . . He was for reforming every institution that really required reform; but he was for doing it gradually, dispassionately, and deliberately, in order that the reform might be lasting."† Further, the apprehensions of many who in common with Lord Eldon thought they saw that monarchy, peerage, property, would inevitably sink under the rule and domination of democrats, were as signally disappointed. ‡ Sir Robert Peel, indeed, correctly describes the notices in the Order Book as promising motions for new laws on every imaginable subject; for simultaneous change in everything that was established. But the Order Book remains the principal historical record of schemes which were in great part the wind-bubbles of new members who thought that the spirit of innovation would best recommend them to the constituencies by which they had been chosen. Although upon great political questions the disposition to force extreme opinions was very small, yet a vast mass of crude notions was evidently afloat upon social questions, which many with their strong prejudices and small knowledge thought themselves qualified to discuss. The complaint that the new parliamentary system did not work well was not

* Hansard, 3d Series, vol. xx. col. 907: Statement of Sir Robert Inglis upon information derived from Mr. Rickman, an officer of the house.

† John O'Connell, vol. i. p. 9.

‡ Hansard, vol. xv. col. 196.

* See "Quarterly Review," vol. xlvii. p. 589.

† Hansard, Third Series, vol. xv. col. 385. Given also verbatim from Hansard, in Sir R. Peel's "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 69.

‡ Twiss, vol. iii. p. 216.

confined to the remnants of the anti-reform party. Jeffrey very frankly and truly wrote, after the House of Commons had risen for the Easter holidays: "The friction in the working of the machine, and the consequent obstruction of its movements, has been much greater than was ever known; and though this may grow less when it has been longer in use, as is the case with all new machines, I am afraid part of it is owing to the increased number of independent movements, and part, perhaps, to the want of the old oiling which can no longer be afforded." *

The House of Commons having endured for six nights the incessant labor and excitement of the debates on the address, had now a short interval of relaxation and calm, while in the upper house the question of coercive measures for the repression of Irish disturbances was discussed with the judicial temper of that assembly. On the 15th of February Lord Grey introduced the bill for the more effectual suppression of local disturbances and dangerous associations in Ireland. He stated that between the 1st of January and the end of December, 1832, there had been committed a total of nine thousand and two crimes—homicides, 242; robberies, 1179; burglaries, 401; burnings, 568; houghing cattle, 290; serious assaults, 161; riots, 203; illegal rescues, 353; illegal notices, 2094; illegal meetings, 427; injuries to property, 796; attacks on houses, 723; firing with intent to kill, 328; robbery of arms, 117; administering unlawful oaths, 163; resistance to legal process, 8; turning up land, 20; resistance to tithes, 50; taking forcible possession, 2. This enumeration sufficiently shows how large a proportion of the offences were out of the ordinary course of criminal acts. The proposition of the government was, to give the lord lieutenant power to forbid objectionable public meetings, and to introduce martial law into districts proclaimed to be in a state of disturbance. The bill was read a third time in the House of Lords and passed on the 22d of February. It was not till the 27th that the subject was introduced to the House of Commons. Meanwhile lighter topics might there be dealt with, by which personal hostility would not be so easily provoked. Joseph Pease, having been elected for the southern division of the county of Durham, appeared on the 8th of February to take his seat in the house. He objected to the oath tendered to him, and prayed to be allowed to make his solemn affirmation. The speaker having stated that without the sanction of the house he dared not allow this course, the subject was referred to a select committee. Although some members might have dreaded that the sturdy Quaker would refuse to take off his hat when he passed the speaker's chair, upon the report of the committee the affirmation was allowed to be substituted for the oath, the resolution being carried amid the cheers of the house. One of the greatest of social questions, the health of the people, was now brought into view by Mr. Slaney—a gentleman who has never ceased for thirty years to promote some sound measure of real popular advantage. He proposed that a committee be appointed to consider the best means of securing open places in the neighborhood of great towns for the healthful exercise of the population. Mr. Lamb, the secretary of state, regretted that too little attention had been paid to this subject at the passing of inclosure bills. On this occasion the expediency was suggested of throwing open the grounds of the Regent's Park, which had been kept so long closed to the public.† The table of the house had been covered with petitions praying for the better observance of the Sabbath, the greater part being presented by Sir Andrew Agnew. Upon the presentation of one of these petitions, it was explained that the proposed alteration of the law was to prevent the tyranny by which individuals who followed certain trades on that day were compelled by their masters to violate their consciences by working on the Sabbath. Mr. Cobbett brought his strong common-sense and plain English to deal with this point. A measure to prevent masters working men-servants on Sunday would be perfectly nugatory, unless it went into private families: "Were gentlemen backward in employing their coachmen, their grooms, and their footmen on Sundays? Why, these were a set of workmen who labored very hard, in Hyde Park, for instance. They were well dressed up, and looked very fine with their gold-headed canes, but he would be bound to say that if they had their choice they would much rather be at home with the maids." * The bill of Sir Andrew Agnew, which was truly described by Mr. M. D. Hill, the member for Hull, as "a bill for the desecration of the Sabbath by the rich, and for the observance of it by the poor"—which was termed by Lord Althorp "a bill of pains and penalties uncalled for and impolitic, not desired by the public, and not deserved by them"—was rejected on the 17th of May. We may lastly mention, before we proceed to notice the greater legislative measures of this session, that although there had been some mitigation of the Criminal Code so as to render capital punishments less frequent, there was yet much to be accomplished before the great truth was recognized by the legislature, "that laws which cannot be carried into execution without shocking the feelings of society and exciting sympathy for the offender are contrary to reason, inconsistent with morality, and opposed to the interests of justice." These were the words of a petition signed by five thousand inhabitants of the metropolis. On the debate upon this petition a hope was expressed that the session would not pass without a more general application of secondary punishments. Mr. Lamb said that the subject was under the consideration of government; that a gentleman had been sent out to America to investigate the system of secondary punishments, and the state of prison discipline established in that country. Thus, then, thirty years ago we were only preparing to inquire into one of the most complicated social questions of more recent times. The difficulties of the question—difficulties which have become far greater since the growth of the colonies has rendered the system of transportation almost impossible—seem principally to have induced Lord Eldon to maintain the doctrine, now happily obsolete—that the fear of death prevented the commission of those crimes against which it was directed. In a debate on the 25th of June, 1832, the ex-chancellor said, that after the experience of half a century he had never known a lawyer or a politician who was able to point out to him what to his mind was a satisfactory secondary punishment. The legal or the legislative mind had scarcely then associated, in the smallest degree, the notion of reformation with secondary punishment.

On the 27th of February, in the House of Commons, Lord Althorp moved the second reading of the Bill for the Suppression of Disturbance in Ireland. His speech was a temperate statement of facts, concluding with a forcible and almost eloquent inference from those facts: "We shall, doubtless, have divers declamations in praise of liberty, which no man wishes to gainsay; but the question is, Is it from a state of liberty that Ireland is to be rescued? Is she not to be rescued from a state of great and severe tyranny? Is she not to be rescued from a state of anarchy, where life has no safety, and property no security? Liberty is something more than a name, and the benefits of liberty are the protection of life and property—the protection of every man in doing that which pleases himself, and is not detrimental to society." † Very different in tone was the speech of Mr. Stanley on the same night. The terrific outrages which he detailed supplied the strongest arguments for the measure advocated by the government. But there was an object beyond the passing of this immediate measure which the secretary for Ireland steadily kept in view in his fervid denunciations. He would put down, if possible, the "political domination" which prevented the free expression of public opinion in Ireland. In his hands the great agitator experienced no mercy. He quoted the words of a ballad, which had been sung in the streets of Kilkenny, in which the Sassenach tyrants—"those cursed demons"—must quit the land, and poor Irish captives be liberated, "all by the means of our noble Dan." Mr. Stanley asked, with bitter emphasis, "Who was it that furnished to the ignorant people these topics of declamation, and then condemned the outrages which had been caused by the hatred and discontent which he had himself excited?" ‡ Mr. Stanley brought down a storm of indignation upon the head of Mr. O'Connell by referring to a speech made by him only a few days before at a meeting of the working classes, in which he had termed the members of the house "six hundred robbers or scoundrels." Henceforth it was "war to the knife" between these two great parliamentary orators. Whether it was politic to render peace impossible between the government and the astute leader of the Irish repealers may perhaps be doubted. Some

* Cockburn, "Life of Jeffrey," vol. i. p. 346.

† The Regent's Park was laid out in 1812. The admission of the public was confined to its outer roads for twenty-six years, they being entirely excluded from the inside of the park till 1838.

* Hansard, vol. xv. col. 1191. † Ibid., col. 1226.

‡ Ibid., col. 1282.

of his followers might have wavered under a milder treatment. Very few now disbelieve that the charge against the chief of Mr. O'Connell's lieutenants, that he privately said that ministers ought not to abate an atom of the bill, was substantially true. The cowardice of some who knew its truth, and had not the courage to support the member who, with more honesty than discretion, proclaimed it, permitted the allegation to be disposed of in the next session of parliament as "founded upon information that was erroneous." On the adjourned debate on the 1st of March, Sir Robert Peel supported the government in a speech of extraordinary power. He referred to the catalogue of crime in one province, in which were included one hundred and ninety-six murders and murderous attempts—crimes of insurrectionary violence. "One hundred and ninety-six murders! Why, you have fought great battles and achieved famous victories at a less cost of English blood! [An hon. member: No, no!] No! but I say emphatically, Yes! The battle of St. Vincent cost you less. The terrible bombardment of Algiers cost you less. With less profusion of English blood you rolled back the fiery tide which the exulting valor of France poured upon the heights of Busaco. But why do I talk of battles? Oh, how tame and feeble the comparison between death on the field of honor and that death which is inflicted by the hand of Irish assassins!" * The debate on the first reading of the Coercion Bill was carried on during five sittings. On the last night Mr. O'Connell spoke with his accustomed force. The bill was read a first time by a majority of three hundred and seventy-seven. It was read a second time by a majority of two hundred and seventy-nine. But it was in committee that the great agitator, who could there speak as often as he pleased, was most effective. "He was free," says his son, "to meet every charge, answer every argument, throw back every taunt and crush with overpowering ridicule every puny assailant." † The bill was read a third time on the 29th of March. It was sent back to the Lords for their approval of the alterations in some enactments which ministers had thought it prudent to make, and, being quickly passed, it received the royal assent on the 2d of April. During this conflict the opinions of Mr. Stanley had been so strongly expressed, and the mutual hostility of the agitators and the Irish secretary had become so personal, that he removed to the office of secretary for the colonies (vacated by Viscount Goderich, who became lord privy seal, by the title of Earl of Ripon), and was succeeded by Sir John Cam Hobhouse.

The difficulties of the government during the first session of the Reform Parliament did not arise out of the affairs of England or Scotland. Their financial measures were not very strong; they were compromises, for the most part, of large demands for the abolition of taxes, made by the independent members of the reform party. The chancellor of the exchequer, for example, thought the tax upon newspapers a bad tax, but he did not consider its repeal would confer a benefit equivalent to the loss the revenue would sustain. He would reduce the duty on advertisements; he would repeal the taxes on particular classes of servants, such as shopmen and bailiffs; he would reduce the duties on soap; altogether he would afford relief to the amount of more than a million and a quarter. This peddling mode of looking at the operation of taxes long continued to prevail, for neither the legislature nor the people yet understood that the most oppressive of all taxation was that which interfered with the free march of industry; that any partial reduction, without sweeping away the fiscal regulations which hampered the operations of commerce or manufactures, was comparatively worthless. A motion was made, on the 26th of March, by Mr. George Robinson, for a select committee to revise the existing system of taxation with a view to the repeal of those burdens which pressed most heavily upon productive industry, and to substitute an equitable tax on property in lieu thereof. The motion, opposed by the government, was negatived. One of the objects contemplated by a certain class of reformers was the return to a paper currency, they contending that the distress of the country—a distress which was always assumed rather than proved—was produced by our existing monetary system. Mr. Attwood, the member for Birmingham, moved for a select committee on this subject on the 22d of April, and after a debate of three nights an amendment of the chancellor of the exchequer was carried by a very large majority. Connected with this intricate subject, which of all others demanded the calmest consideration, was a violent motion of Mr. Cobbett, on the 16th of May, calling for an address praying his majesty to dismiss Sir Robert Peel from the privy council, as the author of the Currency Bill of 1819. The debate upon a proposition so utterly unreasonable and absurd was remarkable for a speech of Sir Robert Peel, in which, replying to the taunts of his present assailant and of others, that he was the son of a cotton weaver, he said, "they taunted him with the obscurity of his birth, as if they were themselves the descendants of the Courtenays and the Montmorencies. . . . So far from that taunt causing him any shame, he felt only proud." Cobbett, in rising to reply, was received with the strongest manifestations of disapprobation. Upon the division on his motion the ayes were four, the noes two hundred and ninety-eight. Lord Althorp then proposed that the resolution should not be entered on the minutes. The speaker explained that every proposition is entered upon the minutes the moment it is moved and seconded, and that therefore he must put the question, "that the proceedings be expunged." The house divided—ayes, two hundred and ninety-five; noes, four. There were two Irish members who voted with the minority. We record this to notice the mode in which a member of parliament, whether Irish, English, or Scotch, not absolutely devoid of the commonest principles of honesty, may be led by the violence of partisanship into a really dishonest action. Mr. John O'Connell says, "I was one of four unfortunates who, amid the laughter and jeers of the house, went out in favor of the motion when the division came. I did so, not for Cobbett's reasons, but my own—namely, the mischiefs done to Ireland by the object of his wrath." * The government was not less successful in supporting a measure in the House of Commons for the relief of the Jews from civil disabilities. That bill, however, was lost in the upper house. The lord chancellor was unsuccessful in carrying a bill for establishing courts of local jurisdiction in certain parts of the kingdom. It was introduced by him on the 28th of March. In the debate on the 24th of June it was opposed by all the law lords. They were most probably moved thereto by Lord Eldon, who denounced it as "a most abominable law bill of the chancellor's, one of the most objectionable I have ever seen proposed to parliament." † The bill was finally negatived by 134 to 122. In these minor questions success or defeat was not important to the stability of the government. The great questions of the session which followed the Irish Coercion Bill involved a real trial of strength.

The king in his speech, in calling attention to the state of the Church, and more particularly to the Church of Ireland, foreshadowed a contest that would last through his own reign and not be perfectly settled in another reign. Within a week after the meeting of parliament, the chancellor of the exchequer obtained leave to bring in a bill to alter and amend the laws relative to the Church Establishment in Ireland. On the 11th of March the bill was read a first time. It was brought forward during the heat of the debates on the bill for the repression of Irish disturbances. This bill for the reform of the Irish Church was considered by the ministers to be "a healing measure," necessary to be immediately passed. There were various delays which prevented the preliminary resolutions being debated till the 2d of April. The details of the measure of reform thus contemplated may be very briefly stated. The total revenues of the Irish Church were about £800,000 per annum. Upon these it was intended, after abolishing first-fruits, to impose a tax, varying according to the value of livings and bishoprics, exempting, however, all livings under £200 per annum. The sum thus obtained was to be applied under commissioners to the abolition of church-cess, the augmentation of poor livings, and the building of glebe-houses. Deans and chapters were to be abolished wherever they were unconnected with the cure of souls, and ten bishoprics were to be merged in those that were to be preserved. If by the act to be introduced any new value not properly belonging to the Church should be obtained, especially from the large increase that might be expected from letting episcopal lands, that value, estimated at three millions, should be appropriated to the exigencies of the state. In the passage of the bill through the house Mr. Stanley resisted this appropriation as an alienation of

* Hansard, vol. xvi. col. 95.
† John O'Connell, "Recollections," vol. i. p. 17.

* "Recollections," vol. i. p. 39.
* Twiss, vol. iii. p. 201.

Church property, and proposed that it should be paid into the hands of ecclesiastical commissioners appointed under the act. This alteration was stigmatized by Mr. O'Connell as the basest act which a national assembly could sanction. It was, however, carried by a large majority. The bill finally passed in the Commons by a majority of a hundred and eighty. The second reading was debated in the House of Lords for three nights, and was carried by a hundred and fifty-seven votes against ninety-eight. In the committee Earl Grey was defeated by a majority of two upon an important clause, upon which the committee was adjourned—a movement which looked like an intimation that ministers might resign if the bill were not carried in its integrity. This and other amendments were, however, submitted to, and the bill passed on the 30th of July. The Commons agreed to the amendments, and Mr. O'Connell, declaring that the Lords had not made the bill much worse than they found it, said that he received it only "as an instalment of a debt due to Ireland." There were at that time, as there still continue to be, many steadfast friends of the English Established Church who thought that this bill was really only an instalment of some healing measure that would make the Irish Church cease to be a danger and a reproach. There were many who thought, as Mr. Macaulay thought in 1845, when he said in parliament, "I am prepared to support my opinion that of all the institutions now existing in the civilized world, the Established Church of Ireland is the most absurd." On the other hand, there were many who supported the exclusively endowed Church of a minority, not only in the conscientious belief that its revenues ought not to be applied to secular purposes, but in the sanguine hope that, by preserving it in its integrity, it would remain a refuge and a bulwark until by the progress of enlightenment it might grow into a national church in the truest sense of the term. Thirty years have seen very slight approach to the realization of this hope.

It is refreshing to escape out of the region of party violence and personal animosity, to behold the legislature applying itself to the calm consideration of the best way to accomplish a righteous act of justice and mercy, of which the first condition of its accomplishment was that the country should make a great pecuniary sacrifice. In 1823 Mr. Canning had proposed that decisive measures should be taken for producing such a progressive improvement in the character of the slave population, by the amelioration of their condition, as would prepare them for a participation in civil rights and liberties.* In 1832 Lord Althorp, on the part of the government, in reply to a motion by Mr. T. Fowell Buxton for a select committee to prepare for the extinction of slavery in the British dominions at the earliest possible moment, moved an amendment which was essentially a repetition of the resolution of 1823. For nine years no sensible effects had been produced by that resolution. It was a friendly warning to the colonists, but it was unheeded by all the colonial legislatures, with the exception of some very slight improvements affecting the physical condition of the slaves, which they did not resist. Lord Althorp would not pledge himself to any immediate abolition of slavery, because he did not think that the slave population was in a condition to receive that boon beneficially for themselves. The pacific emancipation of great multitudes in slavery had been held by Mackintosh, as we have seen, as a problem so arduous as to perplex and almost silence the reason of man.† Ten years after his emphatic declaration the government boldly proposed to the Reform Parliament, not a compromise which might again postpone the decision of this question for another ten years, but a comprehensive and final measure. To the principle of this proposal there was scarcely any opposition; its details were considered in the spirit of a dignified liberality, worthy of a great nation preparing to do a great act. On the 14th of May Mr. Stanley, the secretary for the colonies, proposed five resolutions in a committee of the House of Commons. The first declared, "That it is the opinion of the committee that immediate and effectual measures be taken for the entire abolition of slavery throughout the colonies, under such provisions for regulating the condition of the negroes as may combine their welfare with the interests of the proprietors." The subsequent four resolutions were in substance as follows: 2, any children who should be under six years of age at the time of passing an act for the abolition of slavery were to be declared free; 3, all persons now slaves were to be entitled to be registered as apprenticed laborers, to acquire thereby all rights of freedom, under the restriction of laboring for their present owners for a time to be fixed by parliament; 4, to afford compensation to proprietors against a risk of loss by the abolition of slavery; 5, to defray any expense in establishing an efficient stipendiary magistracy, for the purpose of assisting the local legislatures in providing for the religious and moral education of the negro population.* In the introduction of this measure Mr. Stanley adverted to the heavy responsibility which devolved upon him. The interests, the comforts, the prosperity, perhaps the very existence, of a large population in the West India colonies hung upon the decision of those resolutions which he would have to submit—the generations yet unborn were to be affected for good or for evil by the course which the house might think proper to adopt: "Nor can I conceal from myself or from this house the immense influence on the population of foreign countries which must arise from the result of the mighty experiment which we now propose to make." ‡ The resolutions of the committee were modified in one or two points of importance. The term of apprenticeship for the field slaves was reduced from twelve years to seven; for the house slaves from seven years to five. The term for the expiration of slavery was subsequently further reduced. It was originally proposed to make a loan of fifteen millions to the colonial proprietors. Their acquiescence in the measure was secured by a positive gift of twenty millions. It is unnecessary to trace the progress of the bill for negro emancipation through the two houses. The debates were not of great length, and they exhibited no violence. Even the proposed grant, the interest of which was to be defrayed by an additional tax upon sugar, produced little remonstrance either from the parliament or the people. The bill was read a second time in the House of Commons, on Monday, the 22d of July, without a division. This was equivalent to the measure being substantially passed. Three days before William Wilberforce had arrived in London in a state of health that precluded all hope. The last time he spoke in parliament was on the case of the missionary Smith, on the 1st of June, 1824. His biographers, alluding to the second reading of the bill for the abolition of slavery, say, "The last public information he received was, that his country was willing to redeem itself from the national disgrace at any sacrifice. 'Thank God,' said he, 'that I should have lived to witness the day in which England is willing to give twenty millions sterling for the abolition of slavery.'" § He died on Monday, July the 29th. The bill was read a third time in the House of Commons on the 7th of August. On the 25th of June the resolutions of the committee of the lower house were adopted in the House of Lords. Upon the second reading of the bill Lord Brougham said that the measure was loudly demanded by the all but unanimous voice of the people of England. He concluded by saying, that after the exertions of more than a quarter of a century, it was no little gratification to him, and no little consolation for many disappointments and disquietudes, to have lived to see this great and good work brought so near to a consummation.‖ The bill was there read a third time on the 20th of August.

The freedom of the negro slaves was to commence under the system of apprenticeship on the 1st of August, 1834. Many had dreaded that there would be insurrections in some of the West India islands during the interval between slavery and freedom. There was no insurrection; little turbulent manifestation of impatience. Planter and slave had equally settled into a sober preparation for their future condition. There is a most interesting account of the first day of emancipation in Antigua, a passage of which we transcribe: "The first of August came on Friday, and the release was proclaimed from all work until the next Monday. The day was chiefly spent by the great mass of negroes in the churches and chapels. Thither they flocked as clouds, and as doves to their windows. The clergy and missionaries throughout the island were actively engaged, seizing the opportunity, in order to enlighten the people on all the duties and responsibilities of their new situation, and, above all, urging them to the attainment of that higher liberty with which

* *Ante*, p. 1161.

† *Ante*, p. 1161.

* Hansard, vol. xvii. col. 1230.

† Ibid., col. 1194.

‡ "Life of Wilberforce," by his Sons, vol. v. p. 370. By a mistake of the biographers, the bill is stated to have been read a second time on Friday, the 26th.

§ Hansard, vol. xx. col. 525.

Christ maketh his children free. In every quarter we were assured that the day was like a Sabbath. Work had ceased; the hum of business was still, and noise and tumult were unheard in the streets. Tranquillity pervaded the towns and country. A Sabbath indeed! when the wicked ceased from troubling and the weary were at rest, and the slave was freed from the master! The planters informed us that they went to the chapels where their own people were assembled, greeted them, shook hands with them, and exchanged most hearty good wishes." *

The influence on the population of foreign countries, to which Mr. Stanley alluded, was intensely felt by the abolitionists of the United States. Dr. Channing—one of the most earnest of this band who, amid neglect, calumny, and ridicule, have by perseverance become powerful enough to impart a moral character to the contest of the Northern States against the Southern—delivered an address at Lenox, on the anniversary of emancipation in the British West Indies. This emancipation, he said, "whether viewed in itself, or in its immediate results, or in the spirit from which it grew, or in the light of hope which it sheds on the future, deserves to be commemorated. In some respects it stands alone in human history." The eloquence of Dr. Channing had for its especial object to rouse his countrymen into an emulation of a high and generous deed, effected by a nation which America, as well as other nations, had been too ready to traduce as given over to the promptings of selfish ambition. There were passages in that address which appear to have sunk into the American mind to exhibit their fruits twenty years afterward: "The cause had nothing to rely on but the spirit of the English people; and that people did respond to the reasonings, pleadings, rebukes of Christian philanthropy, as nation never did before. The history of this warfare cannot be read without seeing that, once at least, a great nation was swayed by high and disinterested principles. Men of the world deride the notion of influencing human affairs by any but selfish motives; and it is a melancholy truth that the movements of nations have done much to confirm the darkest views of human nature. What a track of crime, desolation, war, we are called by history to travel over! Still history is lighted up by great names, by noble deeds, by patriots and martyrs; and especially in emancipation we see a great nation putting forth its power and making great sacrifices for a distant degraded race of men who had no claims but those of wronged and suffering humanity." At the hour at which we are writing on this great historical event, and considering its possible influence on foreign nations, there arrives a telegram from New York of the 7th of March, announcing that a message has been sent by President Lincoln to Congress, urging the passing of a resolution for co-operation with the Slave States, by means of pecuniary aid from the Federal revenues, for the gradual emancipation of the slaves.†

We mention the remarkable fact of Mr. Lincoln's proposition to Congress, chiefly to point out that the suggestion of pecuniary compensation to the slave-owners was not likely to be received by the planters of the Southern States, or even of the Border States, to whom it seems more peculiarly addressed, with any conviction that the position of the proprietors in the British West India colonies had been improved by the emancipation of the slaves a quarter of a century before. The owners of four millions of slaves have constantly alleged that the British government, by converting seven hundred thousand slaves into free laborers, had destroyed the prosperity of their West India colonies by practically repealing the divine law that all men must work—that by the sweat of his brow every man should eat his bread. They have pointed especially to the largest and most fertile of the British West India Islands—Jamaica—and they have maintained that from the 1st of August, 1834, may be dated the ruin of its towns, the desolation of its cane-fields, the bankruptcy of its sugar-growers. The emancipated negro, they affirmed, will not work. Such a consequence was indeed foretold during the debates on the Abolition Bill. It was said that of Jamaica two thirds were wood and bush—by bush being meant not unprolific but uncultivated ground—that it abounded in means of support; that the rivers teemed with fish; that the negroes possessed abundance of swine and poultry. Their numbers were too few to produce a competition for land; they would obtain it at a nominal rent, or become squatters. Would not the free laborers, it was asked, rather cultivate the soil on their own account than work for wages? These were the opinions of the Earl of Belmore.* The Duke of Wellington held that it was absurd to expect that the negroes in such a climate as that of the West Indies would work as regular agriculturists unless they were obliged to work.† To this argument Lord Brougham answered, that if it were the nature of the negro, under existing circumstances, to find a delight in cultivating his ground after his day's work was at an end, surely he would not so alter his nature as to refuse voluntary work when this new arrangement came into operation.‡ In too many cases the negro did refuse to work at the especial business of sugar cultivation, to which he had formerly been driven by the fear of the whip. Upon the growers of sugar-canes, who combined the business of the cultivator with that of the manufacturer in producing rum and sugar, the emancipation act, especially in Jamaica, came like a destroying blight. It was not a sudden uprooting of the solid foundations of a real prosperity, for every estate was incumbered and every planter embarrassed; but it destroyed the system which had still enabled the proprietors profitably to supply the markets with their produce by compelling the greatest amount of work at the smallest pay out of the slave population. When hired labor became dear, or impossible to be procured at all—when a white or colored population could not labor with the physical energy of the black under a tropical sun—there came insolvency, forced sales of estates, amazing reduction in the value of all property, families connected with West Indian interests reduced from opulence to poverty.

Ten years after the emancipation, while Exeter Hall still boldly maintained the unmixed good of the abolition of slavery, there were writers and speakers who denounced the eloquence of Exeter Hall as "rose-pink sentimentalism." Those who in 1833 dreaded that the negro would not work, were too true prophets of a certain amount of evil. While Lord Brougham and others had believed that the ordinary laws of demand and supply would operate upon the freed negro, the experience of a considerable period had shown, it was thus quaintly alleged, that they had not so operated: "The West Indies, it appears, are short of labor; as, indeed, is very conceivable in those circumstances. When a black man, by working about half an hour a day (such is the calculation), can supply himself, by aid of sun and soil, with as much pumpkin as will suffice, he is likely to be a little stiff to raise into hard work! Supply and demand, which, science says, should be brought to bear on him, have an uphill task of it with such a man. Strong sun supplies itself gratis, rich soil in those unpeopled or half-peopled regions almost gratis; these are his 'supply,' and half an hour a day, directed upon these, will produce pumpkin, which is his 'demand.' The fortunate black man, very swiftly does he settle *his* account with supply and demand—not so swiftly the less fortunate white man of those tropical localities. A bad case his, just now. He himself cannot work; and his black neighbor, rich in pumpkin, is in no haste to help him." § Ten years roll on, and still the black man "can listen to the less fortunate white man's demand, and take his own time in supplying it." ‖ One among the ablest of recent authors goes to the West Indies, in 1859, and describes, in Jamaica, the negro "lying at his ease under his cotton-tree, and declining to work after ten o'clock in the morning. 'No, tankee, massa, me tired now. Me no want more money.'" ¶ The first desire, says Mr. Trollope, of man in a state of civilization is for property. "The negro has no such desire." What is to be done? Englishmen, whether prompted or not by Exeter Hall, will not assent to the doctrine, to say nothing of the difficulty of its enforcement, "that no black man who will not work according to what ability the gods have given him for working, has the smallest right to eat pumpkin, or to any fraction of land that will grow pumpkin, however plentiful such land may be; but has an indisputable and perpetual right to be compelled, by the real proprietors of said

* Thorne and Kimball, "Emancipation in the West Indies," quoted by Dr. Channing, in his address on the 1st of August, 1842.
† "Times," March 20, 1862.

* Hansard, vol. xx. col. 511.
† Ibid., col. 518.
‡ Ibid., col. 522.
§ Carlyle, "Latter-Day Pamphlets: The Nigger Question;" first published in 1849.
‖ Ibid.
¶ Anthony Trollope, "The West Indies," p. 64.

land, to do competent work for his living." * The traveller through Jamaica may ride on for days and only see a "cane-piece" here and there; but very frequently on the roadside are to be seen the pleasant gardens or provision-grounds of the negroes. In these are cocoa-trees, bread-fruit trees, oranges, mangoes, limes, plantains, and other tall food-producing plants. The yam is there in great profusion, with a score of other edibles. "Then one sees also in these provision-grounds, patches of coffee and arrow-root, and occasionally also patches of sugar-cane." † So the black man, then, is not altogether idle. He has not wholly gone back in his free condition to a state of uncivilization. His oranges and his bread-fruit and his yam will grow with little labor. Having these he does not care for the half-crown a day which he would be paid for digging cane-holes. While in Jamaica there are eleven acres of land to one man, and that land will yield subsistence for scraping it, it is difficult to say how any new competition of free laborers could change the habits of the negro. The case is essentially different in Barbadoes, where there is no unoccupied land. This little island is fully peopled with negroes, and every negro works as a free laborer in the cane-fields or the mills, without hesitating to work after ten o'clock in the morning. The exportation of sugar from that island has been more than doubled since the emancipation. In some islands, such as St. Vincent, the exportation of sugar has declined one half. But the exportation of arrow-root has increased twenty-fold. In other islands immigrations of coolies have supplied the labor which the negro reluctantly performs. It has not displaced his labor, but has left him to the lazy but not wholly improvident enjoyment of his own provision-ground. The changes in the political circumstances of the world hold out to the West India proprietors some cultivation of equal importance with that of the sugar-cane. Some islands grow cotton, and they probably will grow much more. While there is lamentation, and no doubt justly, over the reverses of the planters in particular islands or districts, it is stoutly maintained that the colonies generally are flourishing. It is universally maintained that the negro is prospering.‡ This condition of things, after a quarter of a century's experience, is perhaps as satisfactory as could reasonably be expected. It is far more satisfactory than a persistence in the sin of slavery would have been. Most truly is it said by Mr. Trollope, that "the discontinuance of a sin is always the commencement of a struggle." Whether with the notable fact that "the black African alone of wild men can live among men civilized," § he will refuse to accommodate himself to the customary labors of civilization among the whites, is a problem not to be solved where the rich lands are so abundant that they yield no rent, for the inferior lands remain uncultivated. If this law of political economy be true, the time may not be very distant when the negro will cease to despise property, and, not having land for nothing, will not continue to sit "up to the ears in pumpkins, imbibing sweet pulps and juices." However that may be, the question of slavery or no slavery was not a question of imports and exports. The conscience of England could not rest happy under the load of injustice, and she at once threw off the burden and the shame.

While the British legislature was decreeing that within a few years no slave should exist in the empire, and was providing as far as it could for the moral and religious education of children who would instantly become free, a beginning was made in the reformation of a crying evil which, however, was surrounded with difficulties almost as great as those of negro emancipation. The condition of children in our factories had long been one of neglected education, of excessive labor, producing together the miserable effect of stunted intellects and diseased bodies. On the day when Mr. Stanley introduced his Bill for the Abolition of Negro Slavery, Lord Ashley moved that the house should go into a committee on the Factories Bill—a bill not only to prevent the overworking of children in factories, but to limit the hours of adult labor. The government proposed by Lord Althorp to refer the bill to a select committee. A commission had been appointed in a previous session with a view to obtain information, and it would be inconsistent to legislate without having had time to read their report, and the voluminous evidence which it contained. He contended that the effect of reducing the hours of labor might increase the power of foreigners to compete in the British market, thus causing the decline of the manufacturing interests of the country, and producing misery among the manufacturing population. He desired to see the insertion of a clause in the bill, by which protection to children properly so called would be increased, while adults should be left unshackled and unrestricted. He moved that the bill should be referred to a select committee, to whom it should be an instruction to make provision, 1st, that no child who had not entered upon its fourteenth year should labor more than eight hours a day; 2dly, for securing opportunities of educating the children during the times they were not employed; and 3dly, that a system of inspection be enforced throughout the factories so as to insure the execution of the above provisions. The amendment of Lord Althorp was opposed, not without considerable heat, upon the ground that delay would be caused if the matter were referred to a select committee; and that the protection should extend beyond those under the age of fourteen. The plea for instant legislation was one of the frequent manifestations that philanthropy too often exhibits of an infantine impatience for the cure of a malady, without stopping to consider the greater derangements of society which a sudden and strong remedy might induce. The proposition of the government was rejected by a majority of twenty-three. The bill went into committee; when Lord Ashley proposed to limit the labor in factories to ten hours daily till the employed were eighteen years of age. Lord Althorp moved as an amendment that the hours of daily work should be limited to eight until children should attain the age of fourteen. The committee divided against the proposal of eighteen years, rejecting it by a majority of a hundred and forty-five. Lord Ashley, finding, he said, that the noble lord had completely defeated him, surrendered the bill into his hands. The bill, whose operations were to commence on the 1st of January, 1834, provided regulations for the employment of children which were to come into gradual operation. School attendance was to be cared for, and medical superintendence was directed. Four factory commissioners were appointed to watch over the operation of the act. This first attempt at legislation upon a great social question was materially amended by the statute of the present queen (7 Vict. c. 15).

There were two other great questions before the parliament of 1833 which necessarily involved changes of system, by some accounted dangerous, by most received as an absolute necessity concurrent with the progress of society. One of these was the renewal of the bank charter, which would expire upon a year's notice after the 1st of August, 1833. A secret committee had been appointed in May, 1832. Its report, presented in August of that year, was printed, and the transactions of the great corporation would no longer be secret. A new charter was granted, for a limited period, by an act which received the royal assent on the 29th of August, 1833. The exclusive privileges of the governor and company were to end upon one year's notice given at the end of ten years after August, 1834. All other banks having more than six partners were restricted from issuing notes or bills within sixty-five miles of London. The notes of the bank and of its branches were to be a legal tender, except at the bank and its branches. Weekly returns of bullion and of notes in circulation were to be sent to the chancellor of the exchequer in order to publication in the London "Gazette." These were the more important provisions of the act. In another ten years the constitution of the bank was necessarily remodelled.

The charter of the East India Company had been renewed for twenty years in 1813, during which term they were to retain the exclusive trade to China. The trade to India was partially thrown open. In the session of 1833 the success even of the limited experiment of private trade had sufficiently shown that if British commercial intercourse with India should be freed from the restrictions that still pressed upon it, and that if China could be opened to general enterprise, a vast market would be created for our produce and manufactures. The charter was in 1833 renewed for twenty years. The territorial government of India was to remain in the hands of the company. Its existence as a commercial body was to be wound up after the 22d of April, 1834. All the regulations which interfered with the free admission of Europeans to India and their free residence there were to cease. The government of India was to be in

* "Latter-Day Pamphlets." † Trollope, p. 28.
‡ See "The Ordeal of Free Labor in the British West Indies," by W. G. Sewell (a Canadian); also in "Edinburgh Review," for January, 1862, an article on Mr. Sewell's book. § Carlyle.

a governor-general and councillors. A law commission was to be appointed to inquire into the jurisdiction of existing courts of justice and the operation of the laws. No native, nor any natural-born subject of the king resident in India, should be disabled from holding office on account of his religion, place of birth, descent or color. Slavery was to be mitigated, and abolished as soon as practicable. We shall have to show, in a future view of British industry, what vast results were accomplished by the assertion of the principle for which the traders of England had been contending for generations—that monopolies were injurious and ought to be abolished.

In the present chapter we have considered it important to display, at some length, the vast amount of work of the highest interest which was effected in the first session of the Reform Parliament. The prorogation took place on the 29th of August. There was no exaggeration in the boast of the speaker of the House of Commons when he thus addressed the king upon his throne: "Sire, in reviewing our labors of the last seven months, it may, I think, be truly said that the history of parliament will not furnish a session so wholly engrossed and overwhelmed with matters so various and so difficult in their character, and so deeply important to the vital interests of the empire, as this session."* We have seen that many of the discussions on "matters so various and so difficult" had abiding results; that the legislation of the year was the commencement of a succession of political and social improvements whose value we are now all ready to acknowledge. This was the first genial seed-time, when the "good seed" might be expected to fall into "good ground," and "bring forth fruit." Nevertheless men's minds were much divided upon the question of what was "good seed." Such division effectually prevented during this season of hope, as it has prevented for many succeeding years, any favorable result to the agitation of the question of the ballot. It was a subject in great part new to parliament, when, in 1833, Mr. Grote made this question his own, and continued for six years to maintain his conviction of the necessity for secret voting, with that temperate judgment, that unobtrusive learning, that calm philosophy, which subsequently he has devoted with rare success to labors probably more congenial than parliamentary excitement. On the 25th of April he moved, "That it is expedient that the votes at elections for members of parliament be taken by way of ballot." The principle of the ballot has been repeatedly expounded in more recent times, but never with greater success than during the period when the question was in the hands of Mr. Grote. Year after year he gained new adherents to the principle. He had one hundred and six supporters in 1833; he had two hundred and sixteen in 1839. Since 1848, under the advocacy of Mr. Henry Berkeley, its supporters have grown fewer and fewer every year. In 1848 it was carried by a small majority. "Such reaction of opinion," it has been observed, "upon a popular measure, is more significant of ultimate failure than a steady position, without progress indeed, yet without reverses." †

CHAPTER CCXXVII.

Poor Law Amendment Act—Commission for preliminary inquiry—Commissioners' report—Striking instances of parochial reform at Cookham and Southwell—State of the southern agricultural counties—Of the manufacturing districts—Violent opposition to the measure—The bill passed—Debate on the repeal of the union with Ireland—Irish Church—Resignations of Mr. Stanley and three of his colleagues—Resignation of Lord Grey—The Melbourne administration—The Budget—Prorogation—The Grey banquet at Edinburgh—The Houses of Parliament destroyed by fire.

The great measure of the session of parliament for 1834 was the passing of the act for "the amendment and better administration of the laws relating to the poor in England and Wales." That session was opened on the 4th of February, and concluded on the 15th of August. The speaker, in his address to the king on the day of prorogation, said that the Poor Law Amendment Bill had almost from the commencement to the close of the session occupied the unwearied attention of the Commons. It was impossible, he continued, for them to approach a subject of such infinite delicacy and such immense importance "without much of apprehension, and he might say, much of alarm." It was several years before the apprehension and alarm passed away; before the hope of the speaker could be generally entertained, "that its benefits will be as lasting as they will be grateful to all ranks and classes of society." The bill was brought in by Lord Althorp on the 17th of April. To understand the scope of the parliamentary proceedings, we must notice with some detail the preliminary steps of a commission which was appointed in 1832, "to make a full inquiry into the practical operation of the poor laws, and into the manner in which those laws are administered." These commissioners were also charged to report their opinion as to "what improvements might beneficially be made in these laws, and in the manner of administering them." This report was signed by Charles James Blomfield, Bishop of London; John Bird Sumner, Bishop of Chester; and by Sturges Bourne, Nassau W. Senior, Henry Bishop, Henry Gawler, W. Coulson, James Traill, and Edwin Chadwick—all known to the public for their capacity to deal with a question which had never yet been approached in a philosophical and courageous spirit of legislation.

The report of the commissioners, dated the 20th of February, 1834, was preceded by the publication of "Extracts from the information received," which volume was addressed to Viscount Melbourne, secretary of state for the home department. The commissioners, in their introductory letter to this volume, expressed their belief that, although only a small part of the evidence which they were preparing to report, it contained more information on the subject to which it related than had ever been afforded to the country. These extracts were very largely circulated; and they contributed in a remarkable manner to the establishment of the principle that the utmost publicity and the freest discussion afford the best security for an eventual triumph of sound statesmanship over popular prejudice, enabling a government resolutely to labor for the removal of a deeply-rooted mischief—a task whose difficulties might have appeared almost insurmountable when "the inveterate canker" had eaten into the heart of the largest portion of the community.

The annual amount of the poor-rate at the close of the American War in 1783 was 2,132,487*l.* In half a century—that is, in 1833—the amount had risen to 8,606,501*l.* The population of England and Wales in the first period was about eight millions; in the second period about fourteen millions. The poor-rate levy had increased 300 per cent; the population had increased about 75 per cent. Assuming that the increase of taxation, the fluctuation of the currency, and other disturbing causes, had contributed to produce this enormous increase, there could be no doubt in the minds of thinking men, that there was something beyond the mere pressure of the times which had long deranged the usual relation of labor and wages, and had produced, among the agricultural laborers especially, a reliance upon other means of support than their own industry and foresight. There had been several successful experiments of a parochial struggle against the mischievous system, which appeared to be rapidly proceeding to a consummation which would be equivalent to the whole rental of the country being swallowed up, not by poverty but by pauperism. Two or three remarkable men had been able to show, in their respective localities, that a consistent assertion of a principle might arrest the evil which a nation deplored, but of which few could see the way to a remedy. Of the parish of Cookham, in Berkshire, more than thirty years before the passing of the Poor Law Amendment Bill, the Rev. Thomas Whateley was the vicar. Under his active promotion and superintendence the most important reforms had been produced in an agricultural population, which, in common with the populations of all the southern counties, had sunk into the lowest state of pauper degradation. "The moral and intellectual character of the good old English laborer, who in former times had boasted with honest pride that he never was beholden to a parish officer, was destroyed altogether."* Upon the termination of Mr. Whateley's pastoral residence in Cookham for forty years, his parishioners presented him with a service of plate. In his address of thanks he told them that they, with no precedent to refer to, no authority to quote, had carried into active operation the great principles upon which the new Poor Law Amendment Bill was founded.

* Hansard, vol. xx. col. 901.
† May, "Constitutional History," vol. i. p. 373.

* Mr. Whateley's Evidence.

The destruction of the allowance system in aid of wages was the foremost of the principles to which Mr. Whateley alluded. You have effected, he said, "a saving of thirty thousand pounds to the rate-payers; but you did that which was worth more than double the money—you bettered the condition while you improved the manners and morals of the lower orders to a degree that is scarcely credible. . . . You have the satisfaction of having placed a Bible in every house, blankets upon every bed, fuel upon every fire, clothes upon every back, and plenty of wholesome food in every pantry." There was another great principle upon which the Poor Law Amendment Bill was founded. Southwell, in Nottinghamshire, deserves especial mention as having been the parish where, with the humble experience of an overseer of the poor, one of the most energetic, clear-headed, and truly benevolent poor-law reformers saw clearly what great effects would result from refusing out-door relief to the able-bodied poor, and offering the workhouse as a test of destitution. Mr. Nicholls, afterward Sir George Nicholls, in 1821, addressed a series of letters to the editor of the "Nottingham Journal," which were subsequently collected and published under the title of "Eight Letters on the Poor Laws, by an Overseer." In the parish of Southwell at that time there was living, under the shade of the magnificent collegiate church, a pauper population constantly supported in their demands upon the rates by a bench of magistrates assembled weekly in petty sessions. There was a paid overseer to assist the ordinary overseers; there was a workhouse maintained at a considerable expense, without order or discipline, which had become the resort of the idle and profligate of both sexes. Under the bench of magistrates and the paid overseer the circle of pauperism became so widened as to embrace nearly the whole laboring population. Self-reliance and provident habits were destroyed. "In youth and in age, in sickness and in health, in seasons of abundance and in seasons of scarcity, with low prices or with high prices, the parish was still looked to and relied upon as an unfailing resource to which every one clung, and from which every poor man considered that he had a right to obtain the supply of every want, even although such want was caused by his own indolence, vice, or improvidence."* The remedy for this evil was effected by discontinuing employment by the parish; by refusing allowances in aid of wages; by withholding the payment of rents of cottages; by excusing none from paying the poor's-rate; by establishing a school where the children of laborers burdened with large families might be fed and taught during the day; and by making workhouse relief the foundation of all other reforms. The workhouse principle insured the non-acceptance of parish relief unless under circumstances of actual want—such want being, at the same time, always certain of finding the relief of which it stood in need. By these energetic means the expenditure for the relief of the poor was reduced from 2006*l.* in 1820-21 to 517*l.* in 1823-24. The examples of Southwell, and of Bingham, a parish on the opposite bank of the Trent, "were therefore of infinite value to the commissioners, on whom had devolved the duty of devising a remedy for the abuses of the poor laws; and they were relied upon accordingly as instances of substantial reforms, founded upon and growing out of the practical application of a principle simple and effective, and that might be reasonably expected, wherever it was adopted, to be as effective as it had proved in the case of these two parishes." †

In the report of the commissioners of inquiry the workhouse of Southwell is described as one of the few instances of a place in which the aged and impotent are maintained in comfort, and the able-bodied supported, but under such restrictions as not to induce them to prefer it to a life of independent labor. Let us compare such a workhouse system with that which prevailed in parishes where the great ambition of the managers of the poor was to make the condition of the pauper infinitely superior to that of the independent laborer. Some of the details brought to light by the commission of inquiry are almost too ludicrous to be readily believed by those of the present generation. And yet no one who had experience of the parish business of the time of George IV. and William IV. would hesitate to admit their correctness to the fullest extent. Mr. Chadwick goes to the parish of St. Lawrence, Reading. The governor of the workhouse little knew the quality of the gentleman with whom he had to deal. Q. "What description of food do you give those under your charge?" A. "Good wholesome victuals as anybody would wish to taste. You shall taste it yourself. We give them all meat three times a week. The workingmen have a bellyful. We never weigh anything, and there is no stint, so as they do not waste anything. Then they have good table-beer and good ale." The querist then asked whether he might say that not only was the condition of those under the complacent governor's care better as regarded food, clothing, lodging, and comfort than the laborers who toil out of doors, but that they were under no uncertainty, and had no anxiety about providing for themselves. "Yes, sir; you may say that. You may say, too, that they are better off than one half of the rate-payers out of the house."* In this favored parish of Reading the management of the out-paupers was equally characteristic, they having nearly the same amount of wages allowed them without work as could have been obtained by independent laborers with hard work. It was the same everywhere. The pauper was the favored of God's creatures. Imposture and crime were bountifully rewarded, while industry and frugality met either with neglect or with persecution. There was a systematic slavery enforced in many parishes almost as cruel and certainly as demoralizing as the slavery in the West Indies. Mr. Hickson, a manufacturer at Northampton, a tradesman in London, and the owner of land at Stansford in Kent, thus describes his country experience. Some circumstance had occurred which obliged him to part with a hard-working, industrious man, who had saved some money, who had cows and pigs, and who lived in a well-furnished cottage. Mr. Hickson says, "He told me at the time I was obliged to part with him, 'While I have these things I shall get no work. I must part with them all. I must be reduced to a state of beggary before any one will employ me.' I was compelled to part with him at Michaelmas—he has not yet got work, and he has no chance of getting any until he has become a pauper; for until then the paupers will be preferred to him. He cannot get work in his own parish, and he will not be allowed to get any in other parishes."† When the hard-working, industrious man became utterly destitute he would most probably get work, but his spirit would be broken. He might become reckless—he would certainly become surly. The administrators of parish relief, before they administered to the actual necessities of a poor man, were always occupied in discussions about his character. It was this pottering about "character," about "governors" (that is, magistrates and overseers), "being appointed for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well," that produced grievous injustice under the old administration of the poor laws. The squire, the clergyman, and the farmer constituted themselves a tribunal for the suppression of vice and the encouragement of virtue, and they succeeded in producing either desperation or hypocrisy among the entire laboring population. If the junta was completed by the addition of a paid assistant overseer the discrimination was perfect. Those who have ever been conversant with the workings of the old system know that squalid filth was the test of destitution, and whining gratitude, as it was called, for the alms distributed was the test of character. If a laborer with a manly bearing came to the overseer or to the parish committee to remove some sudden calamity—if he asked something to prevent him selling his bed—he was insulted. The writer has seen the agonized tear of wounded pride start from the eye, and perhaps the groan of suppressed indignation escape from the lips—if the groan was heard, that man's "character" was gone forever. This pretence to discriminate between the good and the evil did much worse for the community than occasional injustice. It led away parish functionaries from the real object of their appointment—to administer relief to the indigent—into the belief that they were the great patrons of the whole laboring population, who could never go alone without their aid. They almost forced the condition of pauperism upon the whole working community by their beautiful system of rewards and punishments. They forgot that it was their business to give relief to destitution, and to destitution only, and so they established every sort of false test to guide them in the one duty of their office—to find out whether the

* "Statement of the Proceedings at Southwell, drawn up by Mr. Nicholls in 1834, at the request of the Inquiry Commissioners."

† "History of the English Poor Law," by Sir George Nicholls, vol. ii. p. 250.

* "Extracts from Information," pp. 216, 217.

† "Extracts of Evidence," p. 270. As to the operation of the Law of Settlement, see *ante*, p. 1119.

want was real, and, if so, to relieve it in a manner that would satisfy the necessity without destroying the honest pride of self-reliance.

The facts which we have thus touched upon as to the operation of the poor laws in the southern counties must not be considered as exhibiting the general condition of the agricultural peasantry in the North, and certainly not as paralleled amid the manufacturing population. The commissioners indeed say in their letter to Lord Melbourne that "the maladministration which was supposed to be confined to some of the agricultural districts appears to have spread over almost every part of the country and into the manufacturing towns." In the manufacturing districts there was a peremptory and comparatively sudden necessity for the extension of the allowance system arising out of the transition from hand to power-loom weaving. This vicissitude affected three fifths of the population of Lancashire, especially in the country places, where the power-loom was not used, but where its effects had reduced the wages of the country weavers to a minimum which was not adequate for their maintenance. In the manufacturing towns the power-loom created a new but partial demand for labor, especially for that of children. To mitigate the inevitable distress the allowance system was applied to able-bodied weavers. The farmers, in their management of the parish funds, could depress the rates of wages below the natural level. The manufacturers could not attempt—they certainly did not attempt—to imitate this practical oppression. The rate of wages of the hand-loom weavers did not sink lower than was to be expected as the natural result of an invention which compelled them to compete with the power of steam.*

On the 17th of April Lord Althorp moved that leave be given to bring in a bill to alter and amend the laws relative to the relief of the poor in England and Wales. It was absolutely necessary, he said, that there should be a discretionary power vested in some quarter to carry into effect recommendations calculated to introduce sound principles and the fruits of salutary experience into the administration of the poor laws. It was his intention therefore to propose that his majesty should be authorized to appoint a central board of commissioners, invested with extraordinary power to enable it to accomplish the object proposed. The bill introduced by Lord Althorp was founded upon the recommendations of the commissioners of inquiry. It had remained a month under the consideration of the cabinet, two of the commissioners, Mr. Sturges Bourne and Mr. Senior, occasionally attending to afford explanations.† The great value of the preliminary inquiry and of the able report of the commissioners, as well as the sedulous attention which was bestowed upon all the details by a committee of seven members of the cabinet, may be inferred from the fact that, with very slight modifications, the poor laws, as they are now administered throughout the country, by boards of guardians acting under a central board, have during twenty-eight years been prescribed by the legislation of 1834. The proposition of this great measure was very favorably received by the House of Commons. The second reading was carried by a large majority; ayes, 299; noes, 20.

Between the second reading on the 9th of May and the third reading on the 1st of July, a most powerful opposition had been got up against the measure. It was maintained, and of course popularly believed, that it was a bill of pains and penalties against the poor; that the endeavor to take the relief of the necessitous out of the hands of benevolent magistrates was to expose the poor to the grinding tyranny of centralization which could have no sympathy with local or individual wants. The metropolitan parishes whose select vestries had long enjoyed a fame for the most outrageous jobbery were among the loudest opponents of the measure. The sentiments of Marylebone were spoken by Sir Samuel Whalley, who maintained that the power proposed to be given to the commissioners, "to these bashaws, to these three-tailed bashaws, was subversive of all constitutional principles. . . . He believed that one of the effects of this measure would be that men of character would abstain from filling parochial offices, while those who undertook them must consent to be the degraded tools of the commissioners."‡ On the day of the second reading the Common Council of London had, with only two dissentient voices, agreed to a petition against the bill. Mr. Grote, one of the members for the city, nevertheless did not hesitate to express his approval of the main ends of the bill, and of the new machinery by which those ends were to be accomplished. He declared that so strong was his conviction of the absolute necessity of some large remedial measure as an antidote to the overwhelming evil of pauperism—so firm was his belief of the necessity of some central supervising agency—that if it were to cost him the certain sacrifice of his seat he should feel bound to tell his constituents that he dissented from them, and that he would do his best to promote the attainment of this necessary, and in the main valuable remedy.* Upon the third reading of the bill the ayes were 157, the noes 50. The duration of the measure was then limited to five years.

Between the passing of the bill by the Commons on the 2d of July and its proposed second reading by the Lords, Lord Grey had retired from the government, and Lord Melbourne had become the head of the administration. It was not till the 21st that Lord Brougham moved the second reading. "My lords," he said, "I should have been unworthy of the task that has been committed to my hands, if by any deference to clamor I could have been made to swerve from the faithful discharge of this duty. The subject is infinitely too important, the interests which it involves are far too mighty, and the duty correlative to the importance of those interests which the government I belong to has to discharge is of too lofty, too sacred a nature to make it possible for any one who aspires to the name of a statesman, or who has taken upon himself to counsel his sovereign upon the arduous concerns of his realm, to let the dictates of clamor find any access to his breast, and make him sacrifice his principles to a covetousness of popular applause."† Never were the qualities of the great orator more remarkably displayed than in this speech. Historical research, accurate reasoning, a complete mastery of facts, majestic rhetoric—all were brought to bear upon a subject which the mere utilitarian would have clothed with the repulsive precision of statistical detail. The measure was opposed by Lord Wynford; it was supported by the Duke of Wellington. The house divided upon the motion for the second reading: contents, 76; non-contents, 13. During the progress of the bill through both houses many of the clauses were strenuously resisted in committee. The amendments that were carried were, however, comparatively of little importance, and it finally received the royal assent on the 14th of August.

The three commissioners, Sir Frankland Lewis, Mr. John Lefevre, and Mr. Nicholls, entered upon the functions of their office on the 23d of August. On the 8th of August, 1835, they issued their first report, which clearly indicated the extent and complicated nature of the subjects which had come under their consideration, and furnished an evidence of the sagacity with which they had set in motion an organization which was to comprehend the whole of England and Wales. This vast machinery, which, in 1860, was in force in six hundred and forty-six unions, including 14,427 parishes, with an aggregate population of 17,070,938 souls, has become so complete in its working, and is so thoroughly applied by boards of guardians throughout the country, that the provisions of the Act of 1834, with its subsequent amendments, are perfectly familiar to the intelligent part of the community, and therefore any analysis of its enactments would be unnecessary in this place.

When the king closed the session of 1834 he with great justice complimented the two houses upon their extraordinary exertions, and expressed his deep sense of the care and labor which they had bestowed upon the public business. There was one quality of the House of Commons as conspicuous as its energetic industry—its patience under the most wearisome inflictions. That it should have endured six nights of debate on the question of the repeal of the union with Ireland—having the perfect certainty that nothing could be produced by Irish members on that subject which had not formed the staple of popular orations in many a mob-gathering, and that what could be replied would only be a rose-colored version of well-known facts—such a triumph of temper is a signal instance of meekness, only to be paralleled by that of a creature generally obstinate, and sometimes vicious, who was equally placid whether eating the bitter

* "Extracts," etc., p. 340.
† Nicholls, "History of the English Poor Law," vol. ii. p. 278.
‡ Hansard, vol. xxiii. col. 811.

* Hansard, vol. xxiii. col. 815.
† Ibid., vol. xxv. col. 212.

stem of an artichoke or the sentimental traveller's macaroon. One of the Irish members informs us how it became inevitable that such an infliction should fall upon the House of Commons. Mr. Feargus O'Connor insisted at the beginning of the session that the testing of the repeal question in parliament should no longer be delayed. Mr. O'Connell in vain remonstrated. A cry was got up in Ireland in support of Mr. Feargus O'Connor's patriotism; and, sorely against his will, and with very uncomfortable forebodings, the originator of the repeal movement had to yield, and give notice for an early day of subjecting it to a parliamentary discussion."* On the 22d of April Mr. O'Connell, in a speech which lasted nearly six hours, moved for a committee "to inquire and report on the means by which a dissolution of the parliament of Ireland was effected, on the effects of that measure upon Ireland, and on the probable consequences of continuing the legislative union between both countries." After a tremendous homily of the cruelties practised upon Ireland in barbarous times, and of the bribery by which the union was effected, the debate was adjourned. On the second night Mr. Spring Rice occupied as long a time in showing what benefits Ireland had derived from the union, and concluded by moving, as an amendment, that an address should be presented to his majesty, expressing the resolution of the house to maintain the legislative union inviolate, but persevering in giving its best attention to the removal of all just causes of complaint, and to the promotion of all well-considered measures of improvement. On the sixth night of the debate five hundred and twenty-three members voted for the address, only thirty-eight members voting with Mr. O'Connell. The address was sent up to the peers for their concurrence, which was given unanimously. It was presented to the king by deputations from both houses.

The consequence of the pledge of removing all just causes of complaint, and of promoting all well-considered measures of improvement, was, that the affairs of Ireland occupied the greater part of the session, split the Whig ministry into fragments, and rendered their future existence altogether precarious. On the 27th of May Mr. Ward, the member for St. Albans, having previously given notice of his intention to propose certain resolutions on the subject of the Irish Church, moved a resolution, "That the Protestant Episcopal establishment in Ireland exceeds the spiritual wants of the Protestant population; and that, it being the right of the state to regulate the distribution of church property in such manner as parliament may determine, it is the opinion of this house that the temporal possessions of the Church of Ireland, as now established by law, ought to be reduced." Mr. Ward's motion having been seconded by Mr. Grote, Lord Althorp rose and said, that during Mr. Grote's address circumstances had come to his knowledge which induced him to move that the further debate on the subject should be adjourned till the following Monday. Lord Althorp on that Monday explained his reasons for adjourning the debate, which were, that four of his colleagues had differed from the rest of the cabinet upon the question of appropriating the temporal possessions of the Church of Ireland; that consequently the cabinet could not agree upon the mode in which the resolution of Mr. Ward was to be met; and that during the speech of the seconder of the motion of the 27th he had learned that Mr. Stanley, secretary for the colonies, Sir James Graham, first lord of the admiralty, the Duke of Richmond, postmaster-general, and the Earl of Ripon, lord privy seal, had resigned their offices. Lord Althorp added that the course his majesty had been advised to adopt had been to issue a commission of inquiry. Mr. Ward expressed his willingness to agree to an address to the crown which affirmed the principle of his proposition, but declined withdrawing his resolution in the want of such affirmation. Upon this Lord Althorp moved the previous question, which was carried by a majority of two hundred and seventy-six, thus negativing Mr. Ward's resolution. The four vacancies in the ministry were filled up by Mr. Spring Rice being appointed secretary for the colonies, Lord Auckland first lord of the admiralty, the Marquess of Conyngham postmaster general (without a seat in the cabinet), and the Earl of Carlisle lord privy seal.

In the House of Lords, on the 6th of June, the proposed commission of inquiry into the state of the Irish Church was denounced by some peers as an "illegal and sacrilegious measure of prospective spoliation." Earl Grey, in a speech worthy of his high character and position, denied that the measure looked to anything that deserved the name of spoliation. The object of the commission was to collect facts, and he and his colleagues were prepared to act upon the commission so far as this—"that when it produces such a body of information as we expect, we will take it into consideration, and be prepared to act upon it honestly and conscientiously, with a view to the general interests of the country." In the course of his speech the prime minister pretty clearly intimated that he was tired of his position—he was tired of a systematic opposition of their lordships to salutary improvements in conformity with the spirit of the age—opposition conducted in a feeling of bitterness calculated to excite throughout the country a factious spirit of discontent.

Earl Grey disclaimed the imputation as most unjust, that the ministry would take the revenues of the Protestant Church and give them to the Catholic. Lord Brougham declared that he would as strenuously oppose as any noble lord on the other side of the house a proposition to give one single fraction of the fund to the Catholic Church. These ministers said this, well knowing the violent prejudices existing against any recognition of the church of the majority in Ireland. Dr. Arnold, a liberal thinker, but not a responsible politician, thought that the surplus of the Protestant Church ought to furnish the Christian people of Ireland with Catholic clergymen.* So thought the promoters of the union.

On the 9th of July the House of Lords exhibited the unusual spectacle of a great minister, overpowered by his feelings, wholly losing his presence of mind. The report of the committee on the Bill for the Suppression of Disturbances in Ireland having been brought up, Earl Grey said, "I rise, my lords—" He could proceed no farther. Again he said, "I rise, my lords—" The house cheered, as they had cheered before, but the prime minister could not proceed, and he sat down. The Duke of Wellington then considerately presented petitions, to afford Earl Grey time to recover himself. He at last rose, and tremulously said, "My lords, I feel quite ashamed of the sort of weakness I show on this occasion, a weakness which arises from my deep sense of the personal kindness which, during my having been in his service, I have received from my sovereign. However, my lords, I have a duty to perform which, painful as it may be, I must discharge; and in rising to propose to your lordships to agree to the report which has just been read, I have to state that I no longer do so as a minister of the crown, but as an individual member of parliament, strongly impressed with the necessity of passing this act to invest the government, in whatever hands the government may be placed, with the powers given by this bill, and which I believe to be necessary to the maintenance of the peace of Ireland."† In the course of his speech Earl Grey stated that on the previous day he had received the resignation of Lord Althorp, which he had transmitted to the king. Former breaches had considerably weakened the government; he felt that in losing the assistance of his friend the chancellor of the exchequer, whom he considered as his right arm, he saw no alternative, but was compelled, by irresistible necessity, to tender his own resignation. He had desired to resign previous to the commencement of the session. He had completed his seventieth year, and although he might have been able to discharge the duties of the office which he held under ordinary and easy circumstances, considering the present condition of affairs the duties imposed upon him were too much for his strength. The circumstances which immediately led to this decision of Earl Grey, as well as to that of Lord Althorp, although of great interest at the time, are now unnecessary to detail with minuteness. They were connected with the proposed renewal for one year of the Irish Coercion Bill, which had been moved by Earl Grey on the 1st of July. The only difference between that measure and the one which was about to expire was the omission of clauses by which certain offences might be tried by court-martial. There was a warm debate in the House of Commons on the 3d, in which it appeared that Mr. Littleton, the Irish secretary, had confidentially communicated to Mr. O'Connell that the Irish government had not demanded the insertion of the clauses prohibiting meetings. In the bill introduced by Earl Grey those clauses

* John O'Connell, "Recollections and Experiences," vol. i. p. 82.

* "Life," vol. i. p. 380.

† Hansard, vol. xxiv. col. 1305–6.

appeared. Lord Althorp had also intimated to Mr. O'Connell that they would not be inserted in the Coercion Bill. A majority of the cabinet had determined to introduce the bill in the form in which it was offered to the House of Lords by Earl Grey. Upon this decision the chancellor of the exchequer resigned. On the 10th of July the House of Commons adjourned for four days. On the 14th Viscount Melbourne stated in the House of Lords that his majesty had honored him with his commands to lay before him a plan for the formation of a new ministry. He had undertaken the task, but it was not yet completed.

The task which his majesty had first imposed upon Lord Melbourne was one of insurmountable difficulty. It was to effect "an union in the service of the state of all those who stand at the head of the respective parties in the country." * The king, in desiring Lord Melbourne "to enter into communication with the leading individuals of parties," specially mentioned the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, and Mr. Stanley. In an audience upon the 9th Viscount Melbourne had laid before his majesty some of those general objections which pressed forcibly upon his mind to unions and coalitions of opposing parties. He wrote to the king on the 10th that he considered the successful termination of such an attempt utterly hopeless. He had no personal dislikes or objections; on the contrary, for all the individuals in question he entertained great respect. In consequence of the communication to Sir Robert Peel, on the 13th of July, he wrote to the king that such an union as that proposed could not, in the present state of parties and the present position of public affairs, hold out the prospect of an efficient and vigorous administration. The king admitted on the 14th that the opinions which had been stated by Sir Robert Peel and by others, of the impracticability of his proposal, had appeared to him to be conclusive. The king had evidently imagined that if he could effect such a union of parties, the question of the Irish Church, upon which he had recently expressed himself very strongly, in answer to an address from dignitaries of the establishment, might be set at rest. The Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel were prepared to take office, if they had been invited to do so, "without conditions as to union with others of different political principles and party connections." † The king was not prepared at that time for so bold a step, necessarily involving a dissolution of parliament. On the 17th of July Lord Althorp stated in the House of Commons that Lord Melbourne had completed his arrangements for the new administration, under which Lord Duncannon would occupy the place vacated by the premier, Sir J. C. Hobhouse would be commissioner of the woods and forests, with a seat in the cabinet, and himself (Lord Althorp) would, at the desire of his majesty, resume his former office. The third reading in the House of Lords of the Coercion Bill was not proposed. In the Commons Lord Althorp brought forward a less restrictive measure, which was carried by a majority of a hundred and forty, and was finally passed on the 26th of July.

Parliament had now a few weeks to sit before the usual time of prorogation. The financial statement of the government for the year ending July 5th had to be made. The budget was a popular one. There was an estimated surplus of nearly two millions, and it was proposed to make various reductions in taxation. The repeal of the duty on almanacs was a concession to the opinion that taxes upon knowledge were among the most objectionable. The repeal of the house-tax was an unstatesmanlike deference to popular clamor. The far more objectionable tax upon windows was allowed to remain. Legislators had a glimmering of light as to the impolicy of that taxation which interfered with the processes of industry. Mr. Poulett Thomson, president of the Board of Trade, admitted that the relief to be experienced from the reduction of the house-tax, or any other direct tax, was little in comparison to that which would have been derived from the reduction of the taxes on glass, paper, and cotton. Yet as the house-tax had been a cause of general and loud complaint, it was right to take it off. Sir Robert Peel was not sure that those who clamored most suffered most; the removal of the house-tax was merely a bonus to the landlord; the removal of the glass-tax would be a bonus to every class of the community. Before the prorogation the Irish Tithe Bill was carried in the Commons, not as proposed by the government, but with an amendment moved by Mr. O'Connell, which provided that two fifths of the amount of tithes should be at once struck off, and the remaining three fifths paid to the clergy by the landlord. The peers wholly threw out the Tithe Bill four days before the prorogation of parliament; and O'Connell went home to his congenial work of exciting the people to violent resistance. Parliament was prorogued on the 15th of August.

While, during the vacation, Mr. O'Connell was publishing letters to Lord Duncannon, in which he declared that "Ireland had nothing to expect from the Whigs but insolent contempt and malignant and treacherous hostility," some of the leaders of the reform movement were damaging the Whigs more materially by painfully exhibiting the worst symptom of the weakness of the government—the hostile jealousy of two who had once formed the great strength of the cabinet. Looking back upon the journalism of this period, it is difficult to arrive at an impartial estimate of the merits or defects of the two chief combatants who entered the lists at the "free and gentle passage of arms" of Edinburgh, at the banquet to Lord Grey on the 15th of September. For some months Lord Brougham had been a mark for the attacks of the ultra-liberal press. Harmless exhibitions of that vanity which occasionally peeped out through his real greatness had brought down upon the chancellor a measure of indignation which is generally reserved for political crimes. In a tour through Scotland he made some oratorical displays, in which the reticence of the cautious statesman was abandoned in the excitement of popular applause. At Inverness the chancellor, in telling the burgesses that during four years he had experienced from his majesty only one series of gracious condescension, confidence, and favor, added words which were tossed about throughout the kingdom as "argument for a week, laughter for a month, and a good jest forever." "To find that the king lived in the hearts of his loyal subjects in the ancient and important capital of the Highlands, as it had afforded him (Lord Brougham) only pure and unmixed satisfaction, would, he was confident, be so received by his majesty when he (Lord B.) told him, as he would do by that night's post, of the gratifying circumstance." * At the Grey banquet, Earl Grey, in replying to his health, acknowledged the compliment of this great banquet in very dignified and touching words: "This most gratifying of all honors is not paid to a minister newly raised to power, in the vigor of his age, with a long career of active and useful services before him, and holding out an expectation to others of official benefits, not yet conferred. No, gentlemen, this proud mark of distinction has been given to a minister who has descended, I will not say has fallen, from power, whose official life has ended, whose long parliamentary career is hastening to a final close—to one when the balance has been struck between his promises and his performances; to one when the past is before his country for its judgment; and the future, as far as he is concerned, presents no object either for hope or for fear." † Lord Brougham, in replying to the toast of the lord chancellor and his majesty's other ministers, proclaimed the differences that existed between two classes of reformers—the hasty spirits who, hurrying into the wished-for harbor by the nearest channel, and, not inquiring whether there was a compass on board, would run their vessel into the breakers, and the more moderate, who would better provide for the safety of the voyage. "I wholly respect," he said, "the good intentions of these men, but when they ask me to sail in their vessel I must insist on staying on shore." Lord Durham had his opportunity of reply: "My noble and learned friend (Lord Brougham) has been pleased to give some advice, which I have no doubt he deems very sound, to some classes of persons—I know none such—who evince too strong a desire to get rid of ancient abuses, and fretful impatience in awaiting the remedies of them. Now I frankly confess that I am one of those persons who see with regret every hour which passes over the existence of recognized and unreformed abuses." The dispute was not yet ended. At a meeting at Salisbury Lord Brougham made some strong remarks upon Lord Durham. At another meeting at Glasgow, Lord Durham said that the chancellor had been pleased to challenge him

* Letter from Lord Melbourne to the king, July 10, 1834, inclosed in a letter from Lord Melbourne to Sir Robert Peel.

† See "Memoirs, by Sir Robert Peel," vol. ii. pp. 1 to 13.

* From "Inverness Courier," quoted in Fonblanque's "England under Seven Administrations," vol. iii. p. 99.

† "Annual Register for 1834," p. 142.

to meet him in the House of Lords. "I fear him not; I will meet him there."

There were two most unexpected events which deranged the completion of these hostile purposes. First, the two peers could not meet on the old battle-ground. The houses of parliament were destroyed by fire on the 16th of October. It was between six and seven o'clock on that evening that flames were seen bursting forth from the roof of the House of Lords, in that part of the building opposite to Henry the Seventh's chapel, and in the corner next Westminster Hall. By nine o'clock all the apartments of that portion of the parliament buildings including the Painted Chamber and the Library were in flames, and the whole interior was in a few hours destroyed. The fire extended to the House of Commons, first destroying the large offices of the house, and next seizing upon the chapel of St. Stephen. When all the interior fittings were destroyed, this building, which had been famous as the seat of English legislation from the time of Edward the Sixth, was a mere shell. It had stood in its strength and beauty like a rock amid the sea of fire, and had arrested the force which had till then gone on conquering and overthrowing. The speaker's official residence was also partially destroyed. There was one time when the destruction of Westminster Hall seemed almost inevitable. To those who mixed among the crowd in Palace Yard, and knew that the antiquities of a nation are among its best possessions, it was truly gratifying to witness the intense anxiety of all classes of people to preserve this building, associated with so many grand historical scenes. "Save the hall!" "Save the hall!" was the universal cry. There was a more efficient interposition than the destruction of the House of Lords to the purpose of the two peers to enter the lists where the Mowbray and Bolingbroke of modern times were to decide their quarrel.

"The king has thrown his warder down."

William the Fourth, without a word of preparation, intimated to Lord Melbourne, on the 14th of November, that his ministry was at an end.

CHAPTER CCXXVIII.

The king's dismissal of the Melbourne ministry—Sir Robert Peel's narrative of his appointment to the premiership—The Peel Administration formed—Parliament dissolved—The Tamworth Manifesto—Strong parliamentary opposition—Mr. Abercrombie elected speaker—London University charter—Irish Church—Repeated defeats of ministers—Resignation of Sir Robert Peel—Lord Melbourne's new ministry—Exclusion of Lord Brougham—His resolutions on the subject of education—Reform of municipal corporations—Report of the Commission of Inquiry—Conflict between the two houses—The bill passed—Departing glories of municipal pomp.

Much that was obscure in the circumstances connected with the extraordinary act of the king in the removal of his ministers has been brought to light in the "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel." In his "Memorandum as to my appointment to the office of First Lord of the Treasury in 1834, and to the administration over which I presided," he says: "The time will come when these records will be interesting, and may throw a light on the history of the period which they embrace." Sir Robert states that he left England for Italy on the 14th of October, 1834, little foreseeing the probability of his sudden recall, and having had no communication previously to his departure with the Duke of Wellington, or any other person, respecting the position and prospects of the administration which existed at the time when he quitted England. He treats with contempt the report that there had been some previous concert or understanding with the king in contemplation of events that took place in November. Sir Robert Peel was in Rome when a letter reached him from the king, dated November the 15th, in which his majesty says that, having had a most satisfactory and confidential communication with the Duke of Wellington on the formation of a new government, he called upon Sir Robert Peel to return without loss of time to England, to put himself at the head of the administration. The messenger at the same time brought a letter from the Duke of Wellington, pressing his immediate return home, and announcing that his grace held for the present the offices of first lord of the treasury and secretary of state for the home department, till Sir Robert should return. The copy of a letter from the king to Lord Melbourne was inclosed by the duke, in which the ostensible ground for the dismissal of Lord Melbourne is that Lord Althorp, by the death of his father, having been removed to the House of Peers, the general weight and consideration of the government would be so much diminished in the House of Commons as to render it impossible that they should continue to conduct the public affairs. The Duke of Wellington writes a confidential letter to Sir Robert Peel, accompanying his official dispatch, in which, plainly implying that the king was not quite justified in being "so ready to seize upon the first notion of difficulties resulting from Lord Spencer's death," he concludes by saying, "I don't think that we are at all responsible for his quarrel with them. It was an affair quite settled when he sent for me." Sir Robert Peel received this important communication on the night of the 25th of November. He left Rome the next afternoon. On his journey he had ample opportunities, he says, for considering various important matters coolly and without interruption. His habitual caution is strikingly manifested in his description of his meditations during his journey, which terminated in London on the 9th of December. "In my letters to the king and the Duke of Wellington from Rome, I had merely given an assurance that I would return without delay to England. As I should, by my acceptance of the office of first minister, become technically, if not morally, responsible for the dissolution of the preceding government, although I had not the remotest concern in it, I did not at once, upon the hurried statement which was sent to me of the circumstances connected with it, pledge myself to the acceptance of office. I greatly doubted, indeed, the policy of breaking up the government of Lord Melbourne at that time. I entertained little hope that the ministry about to replace it would be a stable one—would command such a majority in the House of Commons as would enable it to transact the public business. I was not altogether satisfied by the accounts I first received with the sufficiency of the reason for the dissolution of the late government—namely, the removal of Lord Althorp to the Lords—and the objections of the king to Lord John Russell as Lord Althorp's successor in the lead of the House of Commons." *

The sensation produced in London by the reported dismissal of the ministry was a natural consequence of the suddenness of the act, as it presented itself to the body of the people—of its really unconstitutional character, as it appeared to thoughtful and well-informed men. On the morning of Saturday, the 15th of November—the day when the Duke of Wellington was writing his confidential letter to Sir Robert Peel—the "Times" had this startling announcement, given in the words of a communication which had been received at an early hour that morning: "The king has taken the opportunity of Lord Spencer's death to turn out the ministry, and there is every reason to believe that the Duke of Wellington has been sent for. The queen has done it all." The act of the king was wholly without precedent. He might have become converted to the politics of the opposition. He might have been alarmed at the possible scandal of the quarrel between the chancellor and Lord Durham. But there was no disunion in the cabinet. The ministry had retained the confidence of parliament up to the last day of the session. They had pressed no opinions upon his majesty which could be disagreeable to him. The government of Lord Melbourne had more elements of conservatism than were agreeable to many reformers, and therefore appeared unlikely to excite the fears of the king and of his court. The sovereign has a constitutional right to dismiss his ministers, but it must be on grounds more capable of justification to parliament than the simple exercise of his personal will. The suddenness of the resolve rendered an arrangement necessary which could not be justified by any precedent, except on one occasion of critical emergency in the last days of Queen Anne.† The Duke of Wellington, from the 15th of November to the 9th of December, was first lord of the treasury and the sole secretary of state, having only one colleague, Lord Lyndhurst, who held the great seal at the same time that he sat as chief baron of the Court of Exchequer. This temporary government was called a dictatorship. "The great military commander" was told that he "will find it to have been much easier to take Badajoz

* "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. ii. p. 30.

† See a very able view of the constitutional question in Mr. May's "History," vol. i. pp. 120–125.

and Ciudad Rodrigo than to retake the liberties and independence of the people."* The famous caricaturist of the day, H. B., represented the duke multiplied into ten or a dozen members of the cabinet, seated at the council board. Journalists exclaimed, Why is the business of the country to be suspended till a stray baronet should return home from his pleasure tour? There were meetings and there were addresses, but there was no violence, and very little alarm. The majority of the people, whose zeal for a continued course of improvement had not been shaken by some reverses and shortcomings, knew perfectly well that what was called a conservative government could not meet the present parliament. There must be a dissolution to afford them any chance of a continuance in office. They would reserve their zeal for a practical issue of the contest between reform and conservatism.

And so, as to the inevitable necessity of a dissolution, thought Sir Robert Peel. In spite of his doubts of the policy of breaking up the government of Lord Melbourne, he had become convinced that he had no alternative but to undertake the office of prime minister instantly on his arrival. He at once waited upon the king, and accepted the office of first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer. With the king's permission he applied to Lord Stanley and to Sir James Graham, earnestly entreating them to give him the benefit of their co-operation as colleagues in the cabinet. They both declined. Lord Stanley manfully said, "The sudden conversion of long political opposition into the most intimate alliance—no general coincidence of principle, except upon one point, being proved to exist between us—would shock public opinion, would be ruinous to my own character, and injurious to the government which you seek to form."† When Sir Robert arrived he found one important question practically decided—the dissolution of the existing parliament. He does not appear to have been sanguine that the indications of a very great increase of the conservative strength in the new House of Commons would be sufficient to insure the stability of his government. He looked beyond the immediate present. "It would certainly be sufficient to constitute a very powerful conservative body controlling a future government leaning upon radical support." He tried to make a government as strong as he could with conservative materials. The re-establishment, he says, of the Duke of Wellington's government in 1830 would have saved him much trouble, but would have diminished the little hope he ever entertained of being able to make a successful struggle. So, amid the reproaches of those who regarded the minister as doing them positive wrong by not reinstating them in their former offices, he constructed a ministry of which the duke's name was a tower of strength, and of which Lord Lyndhurst as chancellor gave the assurance that it would have the support of one man of great talents. The high qualities of statesmanship which distinguished Lord Aberdeen were not yet sufficiently recognized. It was not a popular ministry, but it could not be held to comprise any of that band of violent anti-reformers who would have imperilled everything by resisting the declared opinion of the prime minister that he considered the Reform Bill as a final and irrevocable measure.‡

The facilities which the political constitution and the social habits of our country afford for the official expression of state policy were never more remarkably displayed than in the course adopted by Sir Robert Peel immediately that he had formed his administration. The prime minister was one of the representatives of Tamworth, a borough with a population under four thousand. To the electors of this comparatively unimportant place he addressed what has been denominated "the Tamworth Manifesto." It was not a hasty expression of individual opinion, but a declaration of the general principles upon which the government proposed to act, and the address was submitted to the cabinet for their consideration. Foreigners who were looking with intense anxiety upon the ministerial crisis in London might well be surprised that a little country town should be the first recipient of the government's confidential disclosures, and be thus the representative of the entire population of the United Kingdom. It is unnecessary to go over the various points of this long and comprehensive document. In his "Memoirs" Sir Robert Peel declares that he held no language and expressed no opinions in this address which he had not previously held while acting in opposition to the government; that he did not attempt to mitigate hostility by any new profession, or to court popular favor by promises of more extensive reforms than those to whose principles he had previously assented; that although he therein made an explicit declaration that he considered the measure of parliamentary reform final and irrevocable, that language was not new, but was used by him when he took his seat as a member of the first parliament summoned under the Reform Act.

The anticipations of Sir Robert Peel that the conservative party would be strengthened by a general election were, to a considerable extent, realized. So also was his apprehension that the increase of strength would not be sufficient to give stability to the new government. Before the parliament met it was calculated that the anti-ministerialists had a majority of a hundred and thirty-three, but that eighty-two votes were doubtful. Looking at the extraordinary efforts that had been made on both sides at this general election, and at the violence of party feeling which had been necessarily called forth, it appears almost surprising that, from the opening of parliament on the 9th of February the ministry should not have been driven from their position before the 7th of April. Temporary accommodation had been provided for the business of the two houses on the site of those destroyed by the fire on the 16th of October. On the 9th of February, when the House of Commons proceeded to the election of a speaker, a larger number of members were assembled than ever had been known before to have been congregated at one time. Six hundred and twenty-two members divided on the question whether Sir Charles Manners Sutton should be re-elected, or the Right Hon. James Abercrombie be chosen to fill the chair. The votes for Abercrombie were three hundred and sixteen; for Sutton, three hundred and six.

On the 24th of February the king opened the business of the session. The two last paragraphs of the king's speech expressed his majesty's reliance on the caution and circumspection which would be exercised in altering laws which affected extensive and complicated interests, and were interwoven with ancient usages; and that, in supplying that which was defective, or renovating that which was impaired, the common object would be to strengthen the foundations of those institutions in Church and State which are the inheritance and birthright of the people. In the House of Lords Viscount Melbourne moved an amendment upon the two paragraphs, to the effect that their lordships hoped his majesty's councils would be directed in the spirit of well-considered and effective reform, and lamenting the dissolution of the late parliament, as having interrupted and endangered the vigorous prosecution of measures to which the wishes of the people were directed. This amendment was negatived without a division. In the House of Commons Lord Morpeth proposed a similar amendment, which, after three nights' debate, was carried by a majority of seven, the numbers being 309 against 302. However the eloquence of Sir Robert Peel might fail to carry the complete approbation of the House of Commons, it unquestionably produced a powerful effect upon the country, inducing a very general desire that a fair chance should be given to the administration for carrying forward their professions into satisfactory results. It is my first duty, said Sir Robert Peel, to maintain the post which has been confided to me; to stand by the trust which I did not seek, but which I could not decline. Receive, at least, the measures which I propose; amend them if they are defective; extend them if they fall

---

* Lord Durham, Speech at Newcastle on the 19th of November.

† "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. ii. p. 39.

‡ Sir Robert Peel's cabinet was arranged as follows:

Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel	First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Lord Lyndhurst	Lord Chancellor.
Earl of Rosslyn	President of the Council.
Lord Wharncliffe	Lord Privy Seal.
Right Hon. H. Goulbourn	Secretary of State for the Home Department.
Duke of Wellington	Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Earl of Aberdeen	Secretary of State for the Colonies.
Earl De Grey	First Lord of the Admiralty.
Right Hon. Sir H. Hardinge	Chief Secretary for Ireland.
Lord Ellenborough	President of the Board of Control.
Right Hon. Alexander Baring	Master of the Mint and President of the Board of Trade.
Right Hon. Sir E. Knatchbull	Paymaster of the Forces.
Right Hon. J. C. Herries	Secretary at War.
Right Hon. Sir George Murray	Master-General of the Ordnance.

short of your expectations. "I offer you reduced estimates, improvements in civil jurisprudence, reform of ecclesiastical law, the settlement of the tithe question in Ireland, the commutation of tithe in England, the removal of any real abuse in the Church, the redress of those grievances of which the Dissenters have any just ground to complain. I offer you these specific measures, and I offer also to advance, soberly and cautiously it is true, in the path of progressive improvement. I offer also the best chance that these things can be effected in willing concert with the other authorities of the state—thus restoring harmony, insuring the maintenance, but not excluding the reform, where reform is really requisite, of ancient institutions." *

Satisfactory as such a declaration of general principles might appear to a large portion of the nation, those who were familiar, not only with the comparative strength of parties, but with the violent differences of opinion that would necessarily arise upon questions that would seem beyond the limits of party, would know perfectly well that the day of violent collision could not be far off. The government had been beaten in the choice of a speaker; it had been outvoted on the amendment to the address; its first diplomatic appointment could not be persisted in, for, on the 13th of March, the strong expressions used in the House of Commons as to the qualifications of the Marquess of Londonderry to be ambassador to Russia were sufficient to induce him to state in the House of Peers, on the 16th, that he had declined the post offered to him by the government. Another signal defeat of the ministry involved a question which some deemed to be one of principle, but which we may now regard as belonging to the ancient confusion of principle with intolerance. On the 26th of March Mr. Tooke moved for an "address to his majesty, beseeching him to grant his royal charter of incorporation to the University of London, as approved in the year 1831 by the then law officers of the crown, and containing no other restriction than against conferring degrees in divinity and in medicine." Mr. Goulburn, the member for the University of Cambridge, moved, as an amendment, that they should address the crown for a copy of the memorials in this case to the privy council, and a statement of the proceedings. The real objection, which sufficiently appeared in the speech of Sir Robert Inglis, the member for Oxford University, was contained in the fear that the motion for a charter to grant degrees only in arts and law was merely an attempt to get the small edge of the wedge in, and that the rest was sure to follow in time. The London University, it was implied, having no religious education in its system of instruction, was in a position of hostility to the Church. Sir Robert Peel supported the amendment. He was not opposed to some provision being made that should accord to Protestant Dissenters the power of acquiring academical distinctions; but he was opposed to a hasty resolve in favor of the terms on which the charter should be granted to the London University.† The original motion was carried by 246 to 136. Such were the skirmishes previous to the grand battle.

On the 30th of March Lord John Russell, after a debate of four nights, carried a resolution by a majority of thirty-three, that "the house do resolve itself into a committee of the whole house to consider the temporalities of the Church of Ireland." On the 3d of April Lord John proposed a resolution in that committee "that any surplus of the revenues of the Church of Ireland not required for the spiritual care of its members should be applied to the general education of all classes of the people without religious distinction." After a debate of two nights the resolution was carried by a majority of twenty-five. On the 7th of April the report of the committee was brought up. Lord John Russell proposed a resolution, "That it is the opinion of this house that no measure upon the subject of tithes in Ireland can lead to a satisfactory and final adjustment which does not embody the principle contained in the foregoing resolution"—namely, in the resolution agreed to on the previous night. Upon the division there appeared—ayes, 285; noes, 258; majority, 27.

The division of the 7th was fatal to the existence of the ministry. Sir Robert Peel's sagacity had distinctly seen that if the government were beaten upon the motion about to be made by Lord John Russell for the alienation from ecclesiastical purposes of any surplus revenues of the Irish Church, there would be no other course but for the government to resign. On the 25th of March he addressed "a cabinet memorandum" to his colleagues, in which he said, "Nothing can, in my opinion, justify an administration in persevering against a majority, but a rational and well-grounded hope of acquiring additional support, and converting a minority into a majority. I see no ground for entertaining that hope." * On the 8th of April the Duke of Wellington, in the House of Lords, said that, in consequence of the resolution of the House of Commons, the ministry had tendered their resignations to the king. Sir Robert Peel made a similar explanation to the House of Commons: "For himself, the whole of his political life had been spent in the House of Commons—the remainder of it would be spent in the House of Commons; and, whatever might be the conflicts of parties, he, for one, should always wish, whether in a majority or in a minority, to stand well with the House of Commons. Under no circumstances whatever, under the pressure of no difficulties, under the influence of no temptation, would he ever advise the crown to resign that great source of moral strength which consisted in a strict adherence to the practice, to the principles, to the spirit, to the letter of the constitution. He was confident that in that adherence would be found the surest safeguard against any impending or eventual danger, and it was because he entertained that belief that he, in conformity with the opinions of his colleagues, considered that a government ought not to persist in carrying on public affairs (after the sense of the house had been fully and deliberately expressed), in opposition to the decided opinion of a majority of the House of Commons." † The immense cheering of the house during this brief speech, and at its close, was in many respects a reflection of the general public opinion that no minister during a short term of power had conducted the public affairs, under the pressure of extraordinary difficulties, with greater temper, honesty of purpose, and strict adherence to constitutional obligations. "After a conflict of four months," says M. Guizot, "the vanquished had grown far greater than his conquerors." ‡ At any rate we may acknowledge that there was no individual among the victors who could fairly compete with the fallen minister in those qualities of practical statesmanship which consist not only in knowing what is best to do, but how and when to do it, and what to leave undone. The interest which the country generally felt in the duration of the ministry was not very vehement, nor, on the other hand, was there any intense desire for its fall. After three years of excitement the people rather desired a term of repose. An intelligent foreigner, Von Raumer, who came to London at this time, has described his sensations at the contemplation of the public calm during a great crisis. He goes on the 9th of April to the public dinner for the relief of decayed actors. The toasts, the music, the spouting, and the cheering greatly amuse him; but he says, "All these particulars lost their interest with me in comparison with one thought: In this very same hour the ministry was dissolved; and this dissolution was not (as it so often is in France) a mere concern of *coteries* and *tracasseries*, but had a real substantive meaning, and tended to real and efficient changes. What a deal of wit, good and bad—what angry passions—what hope and fear—what praise and blame—would have foamed over, like *champagne mousseux*, in such an hour, in Paris! Here not a trace of the kind. . . . It seemed as if all that was passing without were but a light ripple on the surface of the waters. The weal of England, her riches, her laws, her freedom, seemed moored to some immovable anchor in the securest and serenest depths of ocean, whence neither winds nor waves can ever tear them loose. The clouds which flit along the face of heaven, and so often seem, to us timid spectators, to portend a coming storm, may here be regarded as but the passing fleeces of a summer sky, or rather as the proof and the earnest of an equable and safe state of the atmosphere." §

On the 18th of April Viscount Melbourne, in moving the adjournment of the House of Lords, stated that the king had been pleased to appoint him first lord commissioner of the treasury, and that he and

* Hansard, vol. xxvi col. 242.

† In 1835 what is now known as "University College" was called, according to the original idea of its establishment, the "University of London." In 1837 the government institution of the "University of London," for conferring degrees on graduates of University College and King's College, and of other places of instruction, was established.

* "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. ii. p. 89.

† Hansard, vol. xxvii. col. 984.

‡ "Memoirs of Peel," p. 77.

§ "England in 1835," vol. i. p. 77.

his friends who had taken office had received from his majesty the seals of their respective departments. The other house would adjourn to the 12th of May, as some time must necessarily elapse before ministers in that house, waiting their re-election, could proceed to business. On the 12th of May the houses accordingly met.* The exclusion of Lord Brougham from the ministry, by putting the great seal in commission, was necessarily the subject of popular wonder. This exclusion was not to be explained at the time; it has never been satisfactorily explained at any subsequent period. The ultra-Liberals exulted that those principles which the chancellor had proclaimed at the Grey banquet had now no expression in the cabinet; the friends of education and of law reform lamented that the energy with which these great objects had been pursued was now to be confined to the independent exertions of a peer building his hope of success upon his own powers alone. It was a painful situation for one of such restless activity. To deliver elaborate judgments in the Court of Chancery; to be ready for every meeting of the cabinet; duly to be in his place on the woolsack at three o'clock, rarely abstaining from taking a part in debate; after the adjournment of the house to sit up half the night writing out his judgments; occasionally to dash off an article in the "Edinburgh Review;" discoursing, writing, haranguing, on every subject of politics, or science, or literature, or theology; and then suddenly to have all the duties of official life cut away from him—to sink into the state which he of all others dreaded and despised, that of a "dowager chancellor"—this, indeed, was a mortification not very easy to be borne, and we can scarcely be surprised if it were sometimes impatiently submitted to. Nevertheless there was a great career of usefulness before Henry Brougham. It would be a long career; and thus, after the lapse of a quarter of a century, we look back upon the unofficial labors of this remarkable man, to whom repose was an impossibility, and, measuring him with the most untiring of recorded workers, deem it marvellous that he has accomplished so much, and with few exceptions has accomplished it so well. He very soon proclaimed to the world that his comparative leisure would not be a season of relaxation. On the 21st of May he submitted to the House of Lords a series of resolutions on the subject of education. His speech was a most elaborate review of whatever had been done, and a practical exposition of what he thought remained to be done. In these resolutions will be found the germ of many of the principles which have become established axioms in the education of the people. The main feature of his plan was the establishment of a board of education, empowered to examine into the state of endowed charities, and to compel a due application of their funds. These resolutions collectively affirmed that although the number of schools where some of the elementary branches of education are taught had greatly increased, there was still a deficiency of such schools, especially in the metropolis and other great towns; they maintained that the education given at the greater number of the schools established for the poorer classes of the people is of a kind by no means sufficient for their instruction, being for the most part confined to reading, writing, and a little arithmetic; they called upon parliament to provide effectual means of instruction, doing nothing, however, to relax the efforts of private benevolence; they set forth that for the purpose of improving the kind of education given at schools for the people at large it was necessary to establish proper seminaries for training teachers. The resolutions of Lord Brougham were favorably received by the prime minister. The Bishop of Gloucester and the Archbishop of Canterbury expressed their general concurrence in the eloquent and instructive speech of the noble and learned lord, but they contended that in order to make education real and useful it must be founded on the basis of religion. Lord Brougham said that he was not unaware of the difficulties which surrounded this question on the subject of religion; but that he thought he should, at a future time, be enabled to lay before them a plan by which the objections which had been urged would be obviated. We have reason to believe that, at this time, an office analogous to that of minister of public instruction might have been within the reach of Lord Brougham. It may be doubted whether even his energy could have surmounted the difficulties presented in the religious aspect of the question.

On the 5th of June the great measure of the session was proposed by Lord John Russell. He asked, on behalf of his majesty's government, leave to bring in a bill to provide for the regulation of municipal corporations in England and Wales. The measure proposed by the government was founded upon the report of a commission appointed by the crown, which, during a year and a half of laborious and minute investigation, had inquired into the condition of more than two hundred corporations. Lord John Russell quoted the conclusion of this report, as calling for a safe, efficient, and wholesome measure of corporation reform: "We feel it to be our duty to represent to your majesty that the existing municipal corporations of England and Wales neither possess nor deserve the confidence or respect of your majesty's subjects, and that a thorough reform must be effected before they can become, what we humbly submit to your majesty they ought to be, useful and efficient instruments of local government."

The report of the commissioners on municipal corporations presents some interesting views of the early constitution of these bodies. The difficulty of accurately describing such early constitution is adverted to. Many of their institutions were established in practice long before they were settled by law. The examination of the charters by which a corporation is constituted was one of the duties prescribed to the commissioners. In some cases their report is confined to an enumeration of the early charters; in other cases a summary of their contents is given. The forms of the municipal government were defined by an express composition between the magistracy and the people in some towns. It is deemed probable that the powers of the local government, in all ordinary cases, were exercised by the superior magistracy, but that in extraordinary emergencies the whole body of burgesses was called upon to sanction the measures which interested the community. The difficulty of conducting business in such an assembly seems to have suggested the expedient of appointing a species of committee out of the larger body, which acted in conjunction with the burgesses, and which was dissolved when the business was concluded. These committees afterward becoming permanent, a governing body was created which in process of time became more and more independent of the general community. The greater number of the governing charters of corporations was granted between the reign of Henry VIII. and the revolution. The general characteristic of these documents is to effect directly what the lapse of several centuries had been gradually accomplishing—the removal of any control upon the governing body by the majority of their townsmen. Almost all the councils named in these charters were established on the principle of self-election. During the reigns of Charles II. and James II. many corporate towns were induced to surrender their charters, and to accept new ones which contained clauses giving power to the crown to remove or nominate their principal officers. In his apprehension of the speedy arrival of the Prince of Orange, in October, 1688, James II. issued a proclamation restoring all the municipal corporations to their ancient franchises, as contained in their earlier charters. Since the revolution the charters granted, including those of the reign of George III., exhibit a total disregard of any consistent plan for the improvement of municipal policy corresponding with the progress of society. In the greater number of cases the corporations had gradually parted with the duty and the responsibility belonging to good municipal government. By local acts of parliament the powers of lighting, watching, paving, and cleansing, supplying with water, and other useful purposes, had been conferred not upon the municipal officers, but upon trustees or commissioners, who were empowered to levy the necessary rates. A very small portion of the funds of the corporation was applied to any public purposes; large revenues were devoted to the support of what was called the dignity of the corporate body, the due sustenance of which dignity was amply provided for by periodical banquets. In some cases the corporation divided the surplus funds among themselves. Leases of corporate estates were also granted at low rents to the favored few in those boroughs where it was believed that public and personal property were identical. It is more painful to reflect that sometimes charity bequests, of which the corporations were trustees, were dealt with in the same corrupt manner. The mayor of the borough, annually elected out of the close body, was the chief magis-

* The cabinet as formed at this time was the same as in the list given at page 1224, with the exception that the great seal was in commission, Lord Cottenham being appointed chancellor in 1836.

trate ; and in nearly all the corporations criminal jurisdiction was exercised within the limits of the borough, and quarter sessions were held for the trial of prisoners. The recorder was appointed by the corporation, generally upon some principle of local favoritism, which excluded barristers of any general reputation in their profession. A high steward was the grand functionary who was the medium of the lofty patronage of some noble house, which, by the present of a buck for the mayor's dinner, secured the willing servility of successive magisterial grocers and drapers. The maintenance and regulation of the borough prisons were, of course, confided to the municipal officers. But previous to the establishment of a system of government inspection by a statute of 1835, it was impossible to imagine any more horrible dens of filth—any places of confinement more repugnant to our notions of the discipline that might lead to the reformation of the offender—than these city or borough prisons.

The commissioners of inquiry found that there were two hundred and forty-six municipal corporations in England and Wales. Of these, two hundred and thirty-seven formed the subject of investigation. In one hundred and eighty-six boroughs the governing body was found to be self-elected. The ancient corporations were elected by a constituency known as freemen. Birth, marriage with the daughter or widow of a freeman, servitude or apprenticeship, being a member of a guild or trading company, gave a claim to the rights of freedom or burgess-ship. In the greater number of cities and boroughs the freemen had ceased to exist as connected with the municipal body. There were some places, indeed, where the freedom, confined to a few persons, secured to them valuable privileges, such as exemption from tolls. But in nearly all cities and boroughs where freemen were recognized they possessed the pernicious right of exclusive trading within the limits of the municipality. The commissioners often found that the freemen had long ceased to consider themselves as forming any part of the corporation, which term in popular language was exclusively applied to the ruling body. One of the greatest struggles during the passage of the Reform Bill was to preserve what were called the rights of the freemen. It was a contest for the maintenance of those exclusive privileges injurious to the excluded many, corrupting to the privileged few, which it was the object of municipal reform to abolish. In many cases the freemen were non-resident, but were persons unconnected with the town who were appointed to maintain the interests of particular families. Where the freemen were resident and had exclusive privileges, the dues from non-freemen, as at Liverpool, were so onerous that they had little chance of competition with their enfranchised townsmen. Where the freemen generally had a voice in the election of municipal officers, the corruption at the annual elections, whether by liquor or by money, was so great that the lower class of freemen became systematically demoralized.

Looking then at the inquiry into municipal corporations as bringing to light in the greater number of cases a system which, to say the least, was a gross imposture, we can scarcely be surprised that the commissioners, in winding up their report, should have used some very expressive words : " We report to your majesty that there prevails among the inhabitants of a great majority of the incorporated towns a general and, in our opinion, a just dissatisfaction with their municipal institutions ; a distrust of the self-elected municipal councils, whose powers are subject to no popular control, and whose acts and proceedings, being secret, are unchecked by the influence of public opinion ; a distrust of the municipal magistracy, tainting with suspicion the local administration of justice, and often accompanied with contempt of the persons by whom the law is administered ; a discontent under the burdens of local taxation, while revenues that ought to be applied for the public advantage are diverted from their legitimate use, and are sometimes wastefully bestowed for the benefit of individuals, sometimes squandered for purposes injurious to the character and morals of the people."

The great object of the bill proposed by Lord John Russell was to open a free course to the beneficial operation of those subordinate bodies in the government of the country which were provided in our ancient institutions as an essential counterpoise to the central authority. It has been truly said that the diffusion of political duties and political powers over every part of the body politic is like the circulation of the blood throughout the natural body. In the case of municipal corporations that healthful circulation was essentially impeded by chronic diseases which required no timid practice effectually to subdue. The object of the Municipal Reform Bill was to place the government of the towns really in the hands of the citizens themselves ; to make them the guardians of their own property and pecuniary interests ; to give to them the right of making a selection of qualified persons from whom the magistrates were to be chosen ; in a word, to put an end to power without responsibility.

We may judge of the opposition which the Bill of Corporation Reform was likely to encounter from the mode in which it was regarded by Lord Eldon : "Its interference with vested rights shocked his sense of equity even more than the sweeping clauses of the Reform Act." To regard, he said, ancient charters as so many bits of decayed parchment was, in his eyes, "a crowning iniquity." * At this distance of time it is scarcely necessary to trace the course of the Municipal Reform Bill through both houses of parliament. The measure was in the House of Commons from the 5th of June to the 20th of July ; the great battles were fought in committee after the bill had been read a second time on the 15th of June. The chief struggle was for the preservation of the existing rights, privileges, and property of freemen. Upon the third reading there was an instructive exposition by Sir Richard Vyvyan, the member for Bristol, of the great principle upon which the bill was to be shown by the strictest of all logical proof to be utterly subversive of the constitution : "It was the vice of the present bill that at the expense of one principle it went to set up another. It was an attempt to set up generally the republican principle of representation upon the ruin of the principle of vested right. It was against that principle of the bill that he mainly protested, although he considered it vicious and dangerous in many other respects. And, let him ask, would the hereditary aristocracy support the principle of a bill which was against all hereditary right? Would the peers now declare that an old charter of incorporation was worthless than a patent of nobility on which the ink is scarcely dry? The peers had now to fight their own battle. The first step that they took in this instance would be irrevocable. They would have to decide, when this bill was sent up to them, whether their lordships were to be maintained on the doctrine of temporary expediency, or to preserve their privileges upon the principle of vested right." † The third reading of the bill was passed without a division.

The endeavor in the House of Lords to impair the efficiency of the measure for municipal reform was sufficiently prosperous to produce the danger of such a conflict between the upper and the lower houses as had scarcely before occurred since the time of the Long Parliament. The opposition to the bill in the House of Lords was headed by Lord Lyndhurst. It is unnecessary to say that the pre-eminent abilities of this great advocate were called forth in the most striking manner. His subtlety was far more dangerous, not only to this measure, but to the government which had adopted it, than all the impassioned violence of certain peers, who seemed to have come to the conclusion that this was a fit season for bringing to an issue the contest, as they deemed it, between aristocratic and democratic government. Their plan of campaign appeared to be carefully considered. It might have been more successful if, like a famous charge in modern warfare, the strength of the enemy had not been too much left out of consideration. They called to their aid an irregular leader, who, taking the sword and mace of an old captain of condottieri, laid about him with relentless fury, careless whether he damaged his own cause or that of his enemy. On the 30th of July, when the House of Lords determined to call in council to be heard on behalf of certain corporations, Sir Charles Wetherell addressed the house, which address was concluded on the following day. His violent invectives were no doubt contributory to the adoption of certain damaging amendments. But they had a more permanent effect. They produced through the country an irritation against the obstructive powers of the House of Lords. The people felt that the permission of that august body for the use by an advocate of the most insulting expressions toward the House of Commons was a proof that the House of Lords was out of harmony with the spirit of the age. When the amendments of the Peers were sent back to the House of Commons—in a debate in which Lord John Russell expressed a sober indigna-

* See Twiss, vol. iii. p. 246.
† Hansard, vol. xxix. col. 740.

tion at the license which had permitted counsel at the bar of the Peers to insult the other branch of the legislature, and Sir Robert Peel did not defend the language of the rash advocate, but maintained that it was extremely difficult to place any restriction on what counsel might please to express—Mr. Roebuck maintained that every act of the Lords proved that they contemned and hated the people, and that they were determined to show this contempt and hatred by insulting the people's representatives. The quarrel between the two houses was growing very serious. Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel, much to their honor, took the part of moderators in this great dispute. Sir Robert Peel, especially, while he contended that they should uphold the perfect independence of the House of Lords, expressed his willingness to make some concessions which would have the effect of reconciling the differences between the two houses. There were free conferences between a committee of the House of Commons and managers on the part of the House of Lords. After the last conference on the 7th of September, three days before the prorogation of parliament, Lord John Russell recommended that for the sake of peace, and as the bill, though deprived of much of its original excellence, was still an effective reform of municipal institutions, the house should agree to it as it then stood, reserving the right of introducing whatever improvements the working of it might hereafter show to be necessary. The Bill for Municipal Reform received the royal assent on the 9th of September.

Lord Eldon, in this perilous crisis of a contest between the Peers and the Commons, lamented that his infirmities prevented him from going down to the House of Lords—not to conciliate, not to reconcile the differences between the two houses—but to grapple with the proceedings altogether, and persuade the Lords utterly to reject the bill. Sitting "pale as a marble statue," and seeing terrible changes gradually darkening over all he had loved and venerated in corporate institutions,* we may venture to inquire if the outward glories of municipal power thus departing were as dear to his troubled soul as their ancient charters? What wonderful manifestations of grandeur were presented to the admiring eyes of the people by the majority of corporations as they existed in 1835! What processions were there on every possible occasion, of red gowns and blue, with mace-bearer and beadle! To walk in toged state to church, or to proclaim an election writ, or to open a gingerbread fair; to be adorned with golden chains as mayor and aldermen sitting on high in their tribunals at quarter sessions; to look venerable, clothed in scarlet and fur, at solemn supper in open hall, like the Tudor and Stuart kings, on fair-nights, holding the Pie-Powder Court, where the "dustifoot" might go for justice—these were indeed gorgeous displays. Magnificent pageants on the mayor's day existed in a few provincial cities and boroughs: Norwich had its "Whifflers" and its "Dragon." All the ancient and modern glories were to depart; even the mayor's feast was to be an inexpensive banquet, not defrayed out of the corporate funds. The mansion houses were to be let for warehouses. Well might the good ex-chancellor weep, having only one poor consolation, that the city of London was to be spared; that its lord mayor would still have the glorious privilege of interrupting for one day in the year the real business of three millions of people, to assert by his men-in-armor and his pasteboard Gog and Magog his pretended rule over a community of which only one thirtieth would be subject to his jurisdiction.

* See Twiss, vol. iii. p. 247.

CHAPTER CCXXIX.

Parliament—Session of 1836—Opposition of the Lords to the Irish Corporations Bill—Lord Lyndhurst—Alleged Lichfield House Compact—Tithe Commutation Act—Act for allowing counsel to prisoners—Act for regulation of prisons and for appointing inspectors—General Registration Act—Reduction of stamp on newspapers—Reduction of paper duty—Foreign politics—Belgium—Spain—France—Conspiracies against Louis Philippe—Enterprise of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte at Strasbourg—Parliament—Illness of King William IV.—His death—His character—Accession of Queen Victoria—Ministry at her majesty's accession—Table of treaties—Table of national debt.

The disposition which had been manifested in the session of 1835 by the majority of the House of Lords, threatening something beyond a passing difference wih the majority of the House of Commons, became stronger and more confirmed in the session of 1836. The compromise upon the English Municipal Reform Bill had averted, in some degree, the apprehension of a perilous conflict between the two branches of the legislature. The question of corporation reform in Ireland was to be disposed of in the session of 1836, with an absolute indifference to the opinions of the Commons. In 1835, on the reading of that bill a third time in the lower house, at so late a period of the session as the 13th of August, Mr. Sinclair, a Scotch member, anticipating the probable course that would be taken by the Lords when in the next session it should be sent to the Upper House, said that it must pass through the ordeal of an assembly in which the laws of truth and justice would not be set at naught—in which vested rights would not be invaded—in which no bill would pass for the destruction of the Protestant Establishment in Ireland, by transferring the influence from property, which in a preponderating ratio was in the hands of Protestants, to Roman Catholics, who in point of numbers would in most cases obtain the pre-eminence.* It is easy to judge from this declaration how sustained and bitter would be the controversy upon the subject of Irish corporations in the session of 1836, in which a new bill was brought in and passed by the House of Commons on the 28th of March. On the 18th of August of that year, just previous to the prorogation, Lord Lyndhurst, who had with infinite courage and ability directed the triumphant strategy of the Tory peers, took a review of the business of the session, in which, with unmeasured sarcasm, he taunted the government with its failure in carrying certain measures which had been recommended in the speech from the throne on the 4th of February. "And this, my lords, is a government! Was there ever, in the history of this country, a body of men who would have condescended so low as to attempt to carry on the government under such circumstances? In this house they are utterly powerless; they can effect nothing."† Sir Robert Peel, in a dinner-speech at the Merchant Tailors' Hall, had warned his hearers not to depend upon the prerogative of the crown or the influence or authority of the House of Lords, as bulwarks against the storm and struggle of events. The royal prerogative, the authority of the House of Lords, were most useful, nay, necessary, in our mixed and balanced constitution; "but you must not strain those powers." The dangerous opinion was gradually gaining ground that the House of Lords was an obstructive body, and that their policy was determined by the will of some one peer who dominated over their general inertness. "It has generally yielded," says Mr. May, "with an indolent facility, to the domination of one or two of its own members, gifted with the strongest wills. Lord Thurlow, Lord Eldon, the Duke of Wellington, and Lord Lyndhurst have swayed it, at different times, almost with the power of a dictator."‡ Mr. Hume, in the House of Commons on the day of prorogation, had his own review of the business of parliament during the twenty-eight weeks of its sitting. He was not alone in the expression of his opinion when he asked whether it were possible that the Commons could allow the Lords any longer to continue their opposition to all measures of real reform? They had lost nearly a session. "If he lamented one thing more than another, it was to see the high-minded noblemen of England led by such a man as was now at their head." Such personalities were not confined to attacks in one house upon members of the other house. The bitterness of Lord Lyndhurst's invective stimulated even the placability of Viscount Melbourne, to "refer him to what was once said by the Earl of Bristol of another great statesman of former times (the Earl of Strafford), to whom the noble lord might, I think, be not inapplicably compared, and of whom it was said, 'The malignity of his practices was hugely aggravated by his vast talents, whereof God had given him the use, but the devil the application.'"§ The experience of the session of 1836 had produced among men of moderate opinions a very unwilling conviction of the necessity for remodelling the upper house. The altered circumstances of the succeeding year had a sensible influence in assuaging this dangerous access of fever in our constitutional system. But an equally beneficial change in public opinion was produced by the calm conviction that this had not been

* Hansard, vol. xxx. col. 615. † Ibid., vol. xxxv. col. 1293.
‡ "Constitutional History," vol. i. p. 268.
§ Hansard, vol. xxxv. col. 1304.

"a lost session." Several measures of real utility had struggled into life amid the rivalries, the jealousies, the political hatreds, of the opposing parties of each house. It is with these measures and with their permanent effects that the historian of the progress of a nation is best satisfied to deal, leaving the course of party struggle to the annalists of the immediate present.

Before we altogether escape from the bitterness of party conflicts in the sessions of 1835 and 1836, chiefly excited by Irish questions, we may remark that a great deal of the heat of the conservative party is to be attributed to the very general belief that the Whig party had made a compact with Mr. O'Connell and his followers, by which their hostility was to be averted on the distinct understanding that they were fully to participate in the sweets of office. Upon Lord Melbourne's announcement, in April, 1835, that he had been appointed to the premiership, Lord Alvanley asked him on what terms he had negotiated with Mr. O'Connell? Lord Melbourne answered that he had made no terms with Mr. O'Connell. Nevertheless in debate after debate it was affirmed or implied that a treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, between the Whig government and the Irish repealers had been concluded on the last accession of the Whigs to power. The locality where this negotiation was completed was as distinctly pointed out as the house at Uxbridge, which was the seat of the treaty between Charles the First and his parliament, or the orchard at Hal, where Boufflers and Portland settled the terms of the Peace of Ryswick. A careful topographer does not hesitate to tell us, speaking of St. James's Square, and of No. 13 Lichfield House, built by Athenian Stuart, and so called from Anson, Earl of Lichfield, that "here the Whigs and O'Connell often met, and the 'Lichfield House Compact' with O'Connell was formed by the Whigs in 1835." * Mr. John O'Connell says, "Stupid affairs enough were those meetings in the dusty unfurnished drawing-rooms of that dingy-fronted mansion." They got lectures on propriety and moderation, and vague promises of great things to be done at some future period, and some glimpses of a want of cordial feeling toward them and their English associates. Of the compact he says, "It was an utter and unredeemed calumny. No such compact ever was made. No engagement, no stipulation, no barter, no compromise of any kind, species, or description, took place then or at any time." † Enough, however, was admitted to give point to the virulence of Lyndhurst and the gentler sarcasms of Peel.

During the short administration of Sir Robert Peel he submitted to a committee of the House of Commons the details of a measure for facilitating the settlement of the vexatious tithe question in England and Wales. He proposed to establish a commission to superintend the voluntary commutation of tithe in parishes, and to remove the impediments in the way of an easy accomplishment of such voluntary principle. The committee agreed to the proposed resolution for a payment in money in substitution for tithe, to be charged upon the titheable land in each parish, such payment to be subject to variation at stated periods according to the prices of corn. On the 9th of February, in the session of 1836, Lord John Russell introduced the government plan, which was founded upon the same principle as that of Sir Robert Peel, of a money payment instead of a payment in kind, but differing from it as establishing something more effective than a mere voluntary commutation. By the measure of Lord John Russell a voluntary commutation was in the first instance to be promoted; but in case of no such agreement a compulsory commutation was to be effected by commissioners. The object of the Tithe Commutation Act, which was finally passed, was to assimilate tithes as much as possible to a rent-charge upon the land. That charge was to be determined by taking the averages of the corn-returns during seven preceding years; and a fixed quantity of corn having been previously determined as a proper portion for the tithe-owner, the amount of money payment was to be settled by a septennial average of the price of corn. The opposition to this measure assumed no party character. The clergy did not feel their interests to be invaded. The land-owner and farmer had for years complained that no institution was more adverse to cultivation and improvement than tithes, as Dr. Paley had long before declared. The clergy were disposed to believe that the plan of the same sagacious political philosopher to convert tithes into corn-rents would secure the tithe-holder a complete and perpetual equivalent for his interest. This measure, with subsequent statutory improvements, has worked successfully under the management of three commissioners. To one of the most wise and energetic of these commissioners, the late Rev. Richard Jones, may be ascribed many of the early triumphs over the difficulties of carrying this measure into practice, and the subsequent general conviction that it is calculated to remove all grounds of discord and jealousy between the clergy and their parishioners, and thus add security and permanence to the property of the Church.

Another measure of the session of 1836, which amply refuted the opinion that legislators in either house could only look at great social questions through the mists of party, was the passing of the bill for allowing counsel to prisoners. The final debate upon the bill in the House of Lords was remarkable for a most honorable declaration of Lord Lyndhurst, that his former opposition to the measure had been converted into a hearty approval of it. In an interesting volume by Mr. Matthew Davenport Hill * we have a succinct and very complete history of the course of public opinion on the question of counsel to prisoners. He shows that even Judge Jeffreys had told a jury that he thought it a hard case that a man should have counsel to defend himself for a twopenny trespass, but that he should be denied counsel where life, estate, honor, and all were concerned. It was not until 1824 that any attempt was made in parliament to remove this disability under which prisoners labored. In that year Mr. George Lamb, the brother of Lord Melbourne, brought the subject before the House of Commons. He was supported by Sir James Mackintosh, Dr. Lushington, and Mr. Denman. Mr. Canning was favorable to the change, but the speech of Mr. Attorney-General Copley had converted him into an opponent of the measure. Sydney Smith, in 1826, drew a picture of the cruel oppression involved in the disability of the prisoner's counsel to address a jury: "It is a most affecting moment in a court of justice, when the evidence has all been heard, and the judge asks the prisoner what he has to say in his defence. The prisoner, who has (by great exertions, perhaps, of his friends) saved up money enough to procure counsel, says to the judge 'that he leaves his defence to his counsel.' We have often blushed for English humanity to hear the reply, 'Your counsel cannot speak for you; you must speak for yourself.' And this is the reply given to a poor girl of eighteen—to a foreigner—to a deaf man—to a stammerer—to the sick—to the feeble—to the old—to the most abject and ignorant of human beings!" † In 1834 the Prisoners' Counsel Bill was introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Ewart. The debate was on the second reading, when Mr. Hill, then member for Hull, seconded Mr. Ewart's motion. The measure was passed by the House of Commons without a division, but was rejected by the Lords. It was brought forward again by Mr. Ewart in 1835—when it dropped on account of the late period of the session—and in 1836. In the latter year it was carried by a majority of forty-four. It was then introduced to the House of Lords by Lord Lyndhurst. It was on that occasion that he made his honest recantation of his former opinion. He had come to a conviction that the evils and inconveniences of allowing counsel to prisoners had been greatly exaggerated, and ought not to be put for a moment in competition with that which the obvious justice of the case so clearly demanded. Twice did the House of Lords debate this question, but the measure passed without a division. Lord Abinger, formerly Mr. Scarlett, might have great doubts as to the policy of the bill, and be afraid of their lordships becoming too much in love with theory; but no expression of doubt, no plea for delay, could stand up against the united opinions of such men as Lord Denman, Lord Cottenham, then chancellor, and Lord Lyndhurst. It is a remnant, said Lord Lyndhurst, of a barbarous practice. The continuance of it is against the great current of authority. It is contrary to the practice of all civilized nations. An alteration was essential to the due investigation of truth.

We have incidentally referred to the important act that was passed, in the session of 1835, for effecting greater uniformity of practice in the government of prisons in England and Wales, and for appointing inspectors of prisons in Great Britain. This most salutary statute

* Cunningham, "Handbook of London."
† "Recollections," vol. i. p. 133.

* "Suggestions for the Repression of Crime, contained in Charges delivered to Grand Juries of Birmingham."
† "Edinburgh Review," vol. xiv. p. 5, quoted by Mr. Hill.

was founded upon reports of a select committee of the House of Lords. The Duke of Richmond, who was the promoter of this inquiry, labored most assiduously in the collection of the evidence upon which the measure of reform was to be founded, himself with other peers visiting many of the ill-regulated dens where the old criminal became more hardened in his iniquity, and the youthful offender was systematically trained to a maturity in guilt. The report of the Lords' committee proposed that entire separation between the prisoners should be enforced, except during the hours of labor and of religious worship and instruction. Many persons out of the large number examined by the committee were governors or chaplains of jails in the country, and they all, without a dissentient voice, concurred in opinion as to the contaminating influence of prisons as they were then conducted. They held that the associations of prisons were destructive to every casual offender. The country jails, especially those under corporate management, could only be regarded as great nurseries of crime. There was no religious instruction, no education of juvenile prisoners, no employment. The country jails and houses of correction were better managed, some system of discipline being observed. But none of the jails in corporate towns could present a more disgusting example of the contaminating influence of an ill-managed prison than the great jail of Newgate, under the jurisdiction of the lord mayor and aldermen of London. In the session of 1836, when the inspectors appointed under the act of 1835 had made their first report, the management of prisons again came under the consideration of parliament. This report drew attention to what the Duke of Richmond described as "the dreadful state of the city jails." The visits of the inspectors had produced a correction of some of the most striking evils of the country jails, and he trusted that before the next session they would find the great jail of the city of London not in a worse condition than the prisons in other parts of the country. It was on this occasion that an earnest conviction of the horrors of the jail system with regard to juvenile offenders was manifested in a manner which promised at no distant time the establishment of reformatories. The Marquess of Lansdowne acknowledged that although this country abounded with the means of juvenile employment, yet the number of juvenile offenders exceeded that of any country in Europe. He announced that Lord John Russell, the secretary for the home department, was preparing, at least as a matter of experiment, the means of establishing a place of detention having the character of an asylum or refuge, where children yet young in crime, but who were the victims of ignorance, of abandonment, of desertion by their parents, or were totally incapable of distinguishing between right and wrong, should be saved from condemnation to any prison whatever.* The act for the government of prisons was not as yet extended to Scotland, except as regarded the appointment of inspectors. The first inspector of the Scotch prisons was Mr. Frederic Hill. From his early reports there is no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that they were absolutely worse than the worst in England. Dirt, idleness, drinking, gambling, fighting, and stealing were their distinguishing characteristics. Prisoners of different ages, tried and untried—thieves, deserters, persons convicted of petty assaults—all were herded together, almost secure from observation, and wholly unprovided with useful employment. It was, says Mr. F. Hill, in his report of 1838–39, "a system under which the smuggling of forbidden articles into the prisons, smoking, drinking, gambling, swearing, the use of obscene language, stealing from each other, cheating, quarrelling, fighting, and various acts of tyranny, are of common occurrence, and under which robberies are planned to be executed after the offenders shall have left prison." †

One of the most important measures toward a more complete system of national statistics was brought forward by Lord John Russell in the session of 1836. On the 12th of February he introduced the bill for the general registration of births, deaths, and marriages. At the same time he brought forward a bill for amending the law regulating the marriages of dissenters, which regulation was connected with the establishment of a general civil registration. With regard to the second bill it was shrewdly anticipated by Sir Robert Peel that, when no point of honor was concerned, many of the dissenters, particularly the female portion of them, would prefer being married in church. There were no intolerant prejudices opposed in the legislature to the passing of the bill which permitted marriages to be solemnized in the presence of the district-registrar. To the other bill no stickler for antiquity could prefer the parochial registry established by Secretary Cromwell exactly three hundred years before this measure was to come into operation, to one general system which under responsible officers should supersede the variable entries of sixteen thousand parishes, so often lost or mutilated, and so difficult to be referred to even when properly preserved. The important office of superintendent-registrar was created by this statute. The poor law unions were divided into districts for which registrars were appointed, with a superintendent-registrar in each union. The regulations by which a complete registration of births and deaths is accomplished are now familiar to every father and mother, and every occupier of a house in which any birth or death may happen, who are bound to furnish information of the fact to the registrar. Mr. Porter, in his valuable "Progress of the Nation," says, "The establishing of a department for the systematic registration of births, marriages, and deaths, in England and Wales, has been of great use in the examination of questions depending upon various contingencies connected with human life." Certified copies of the entries of births and deaths are sent quarterly by the registrar to the superintendent-registrar, and by him to the registrar-general. It is from this source that we derive the knowledge of many most interesting facts connected with the progress of the population—facts which the scientific knowledge and the literary skill of the heads of the registrar-general's department have redeemed from the ordinary dulness of statistics to constitute some of the most attractive reading of the public journals. The registrar-general's annual report enables the legislature to form a tolerably accurate estimate of the increment of the population in the decennial intervals of a census.

In this session there were two most important changes proposed by the government with reference to journalism and the general commerce of literature. On the 20th of June the chancellor of the exchequer moved "that the duty payable upon every sheet whereon a newspaper is printed shall in future be one penny." The newspaper stamp for many years had been fourpence. Among the opponents of this measure one county member complained that already the mails were so heavily laden on a Saturday night with newspapers that it was hardly safe to travel by them. The chancellor of the exchequer had anticipated that the penny stamp would produce quite as much as the fourpenny stamp. "If he is right," said Sir Charles Knightley, "then the quantity of newspapers must be more than trebled, and if so, there must be a tax raised for their conveyance." The proposition of the chancellor of the exchequer was carried by a majority only of thirty-three, and with some alterations finally passed the House of Lords. The other measure was a reduction of the duty on paper. Lord Francis Egerton, himself a man of letters, in presenting a petition before the government proposition was introduced, claimed for this subject the best attention of the house on account of the effect which the state of the law produced on literature, especially upon cheap literature. By the act to repeal the existing duties on paper, which received the royal assent on the 13th of August, the varying duties, according to the class or denomination, were merged in one uniform duty upon all paper of three halfpence per pound. The relief to the publishers of cheap works was as as timely as it was important. We may instance that it came to save the "Penny Cyclopædia" from extinction in the fourth year of its struggle against heavy loss, under the opposing conditions of paying at the highest rate for literary labor, and selling at as low a rate as that of works in which the quality of the authorship was a secondary consideration.

The great interest of events at home after the French Revolution of 1830 has precluded us from giving even a passing notice of foreign politics. Since that time, indeed, the peace of Europe had not been materially disturbed so as to influence the political action of the British government. Belgium had quietly settled down into a constitutional monarchy, subsequently to the fortunate period for that country when Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg was chosen king in 1831. In that year the boundaries of the new kingdom were defined, and the peaceable possession of his territory was guaranteed by the five great powers to this most sagacious and discreet of sovereigns. The stability of the Belgian monarchy appeared to be still more effect-

* Hansard, vol. xxxv., Debate of August 12.

† "Crime: its Amount, Causes, and Remedies," by Frederic Hill, p. 180.

ually secured by the marriage of King Leopold, in 1832, to the eldest daughter of Louis Philippe, King of the French. At the close of the parliamentary cession of 1836 it was lamented in the king's speech that Spain was the only exception to the general tranquillity of Europe; that the hopes entertained of the termination of the civil war in that country had not been realized. Under the treaty of quadruple alliance, whose object was the restoration of internal peace in Spain, Great Britain had afforded to the queen of that country the co-operation of a naval force. Ferdinand the Seventh, who died in 1833, had left by his will his infant daughter Isabel, as heir to his throne. The queen-mother, Christina, was appointed queen-regent. The brother of Ferdinand, Don Carlos, immediately disputed the title of Isabel, maintaining that by the Salic law females were excluded from the sovereignty of Spain. The civil war which ensued lasted till 1840. The partisans of Don Carlos were then finally defeated; but the contest was attended with so many circumstances of bitter and cruel animosity that the Spanish nation became greatly demoralized, and the old glories and prosperity of the country appeared to be altogether passing away. The intervention of our government and the whole scope of the quadruple treaty of 1834 were the objects of severe parliamentary censure. The British Legion, under the command of Lieutenant-General Sir De Lacy Evans, which acted with the consent of our government in aid of the Queen of Spain, accomplished some brilliant exploits, and was generally successful against the Carlist troops; but these triumphs were bought with severe losses. The intervention of Great Britain, whether direct or indirect, excited little sympathy at home; for popular opinion was gradually reaching the conviction that the safety and prosperity of our country were best maintained by leaving foreigners to fight out their own quarrels, always provided that the honor of the nation should not be compromised by apathy or inertness.

During the six years in which Louis Philippe had been king of the French, his reign had not been exempted from solicitudes of a more painful nature than the ordinary cares of monarchs. In the first two years of his rule events had been in some degree propitious to him. The Duke of Reichstadt, the son of Napoleon, died in 1832. His presence in France might at any time have raised up a host of Bonapartists, whose movements might have been exceedingly dangerous to the citizen king. The attempts of the Duchess of Berri to excite an insurrection in favor of her son, the Duke of Bordeaux, had signally failed. Freedom of debate in the chambers and the liberty of the press appeared the best guarantees for the security of the constitutional government. But the unrestricted power of speaking and writing was not used with moderation. The license of the press and the occasional hostility of the chambers produced a counter-disposition on the part of the king to struggle against what he believed to be the evils of the representative system. There were constant changes of administration since Lafitte took the reins of government in November, 1830. In 1831 Lafitte was succeeded by Casimir Perier, who had a premiership of something more than a year and a half. From October, 1832, to September, 1836, there had been nine changes of ministry—Soult, Guizot; Soult, Broglie; Soult, Thiers; Gérard; Bassano; Mortier; Broglie, Humann; Broglie, D'Argout; Thiers. In September, 1836, the heads of the cabinet were Molé and Guizot. During these changes, and the consequent excitement of parliamentary conflicts, there had been more than one conspiracy of which the great object was to assassinate the king. The 28th of July, 1835, was the second day of the fêtes to commemorate the Revolution of 1830. Louis Philippe, with his three sons and a splendid suite of military officers, was riding through the line of the national guard, drawn up on the Boulevard du Temple, when an explosion resembling a discharge of musketry took place from the window of a house overlooking the road. Fourteen persons, among whom were Marshal Mortier and General de Virigny, were killed upon the spot. A shower of bullets had been discharged by a machine consisting of twenty-five barrels, which, arranged horizontally side by side upon a frame, could be fired at once by a train of gunpowder. The king was unhurt. The police rushed into the house and seized the assassin, who was wounded by the bursting of one of the barrels. He proved to be a Corsican named Fieschi, who maintained that he had no object in this wholesale massacre but his desire to destroy the king. Another attempt upon the life of Louis Philippe was made in 1836, by a man of the name of Alibaud, who fired into the king's carriage, the queen and his sister being with him. A third attempt was made in the same year by another desperado, named Meunier. In the history of such fearful manifestations of wickedness or madness, there is nothing more remarkable than the extraordinary escapes of Louis Philippe as if he bore a charmed life.

More interesting at the present day than these brutal attempts at assassination was the failure of an enterprise which contemplated, without any apparent organization, the overthrow of a strong government by a young man of twenty-five, who relied only upon his name, his abilities, and his daring. Charles Louis Napoleon, the youngest son of Louis Bonaparte, King of Holland, and of Hortense Eugénie, daughter of the Empress Josephine by her first husband, had so dwelled upon his boyish remembrances of his illustrious uncle, that when in 1832 the Duke of Reichstadt died, and he became, according to a decree of 1804, heir to the throne, the natural course of his ambition was to assert his claim against one whom he regarded as a usurper. Louis Philippe was always apprehensive of the rivalry of this young man. He had refused him permission to return to France in 1830. He had farther influenced the government of Rome to order him to quit the papal territory. Escaping from Italy, he resided with his mother in the Château Arenenberg in Switzerland, where he devoted himself to the study of politics and of military science, and became known in Europe as a writer of diligent research and unquestionable ability. Whatever study he pursued and whatever ideas he promulgated had evidently some bearing upon what he implicitly believed would be his great future.

The ordinary relations of the attempt of Louis Napoleon—availing himself of the general unpopularity of the king of the French to risk the result of a popular commotion to overthrow the Orleans dynasty—have recently received a new interest from the official revelations of M. Guizot. He relates that on the evening of the 31st of October the minister of the interior brought to him a telegraphic dispatch received from Strasbourg dated on the evening of the 30th, which announced that about six o'clock that morning Louis Napoleon "traversed the streets of Strasbourg with a party of . . . . ." A mist which enveloped the line of telegraph had left the remainder of the dispatch uncertain. Guizot and the minister of the interior repaired instantly to the Tuileries, where they found the whole cabinet assembled. All was conjecture. Instructions were drawn up founded upon many possible contingencies. The ministers remained with the king nearly the whole night, expecting news which came not. During those hours of suspense the queen, the king's sister, the princes, entered again and again to ask if anything had transpired. "I was struck," says M. Guizot, "by the sadness of the king, not that he seemed uneasy or subdued, but uncertainty as to the seriousness of the event occupied his thoughts; and these reiterated conspiracies, these attempts at civil war, republican, legitimist, and Bonapartist, this continual necessity of contending, repressing, and punishing, weighed on him as a hateful burden. Despite his long experience and all that it had taught him of man's passions and the vicissitudes of life, he was and continued to be naturally easy, confiding, benevolent, and hopeful. He grew tired of having incessantly to watch, to defend himself, and of finding so many enemies on his steps." *

The next morning, the 1st of November, an aide-de-camp of the commandant at Strasbourg brought to the perplexed king and his ministers a solution of the telegraphic mystery. Louis Napoleon, having the support of a colonel who commanded a battalion, had presented himself at the barrack of a regiment of artillery, and was received with shouts of "Long live the Emperor." At another barrack the attempt of the prince upon the fidelity of the troops was repulsed, and he and his followers were arrested by the colonel and other officers of the forty-sixth regiment of infantry. The affair was over in a few hours without bloodshed. One only of the known adherents of Louis Napoleon, M. de Persigny, his intimate friend, effected his escape. On ascertaining the result of this rash enterprise, Queen Hortense, whose affection for her son was most devoted, hurried to France to intercede for him with the government. From Viry, near Paris, she addressed her supplications to the king and M. Molé. M. Guizot says, "She might have spared them. The reso-

* "Memoirs to Illustrate the History of My Time," vol. iv. p. 197; 1861.

lution of not bringing Prince Louis to trial, and of sending him to the United States of America, was already taken. This was the decided inclination of the king and the unanimous advice of the cabinet." The adventurer was brought from the citadel of Strasbourg to Paris, where he stayed only a few hours. He was then taken to L'Orient, where he embarked on the 14th of November in a frigate which was to touch at New York. The sub-prefect of L'Orient waited on the prince when he was on board, inquired whether he would find any resources when he arrived in the United States, and being told that none were at first to be expected, the prefect placed in his hands a casket containing fifteen thousand francs in gold, which the king had ordered him thus to appropriate. Louis Napoleon remained in the United States till October, 1837, when, hearing of the illness of his mother, he encountered the risks of a return to Europe, and was with Hortense at her death. The French government demanded his extradition from Switzerland. The cantons refused to comply; but Louis Philippe enforced his demand by the irresistible argument of an army, and the prince withdrew to England. The fashionable circles of London regarded him merely as a man of pleasure, and he was popular in country houses from the spirit with which he could follow hounds in a fox-chase. His attempt at Strasbourg had only excited laughter here. He was not generally regarded as possessing any force of character that would justify a lofty ambition.

On the 31st of January, 1837, parliament was opened by commissioners. The most important passage in the royal speech had reference to the state of the province of Lower Canada. It is unnecessary here to enter upon the history of those discontents which ended in insurrection. Grievances were removed and revolts were put down at no distant period; from which time the course of events may be regarded as a whole. Few of the proceedings of parliament during a session which circumstances had rendered unusually short acquired a legislative completion. Lord John Russell proposed the government plan for introducing poor laws into Ireland. The dissolution of parliament interrupted the progress of the bill. The chancellor of the exchequer proposed a measure for the abolition of church-rates, which was strenuously opposed, and finally was abandoned by the government. Lord John Russell introduced a series of bills for the further amendment of the criminal law. These also were to stand over till another session. Only twenty-one public acts, none of which effected any important changes, received the royal assent of King William the Fourth.

On the 9th of June a bulletin issued from Windsor Castle informing a loyal and really affectionate people that the king was ill. It announced that he had suffered for some time from an affection of the chest, which had confined him to his apartment, had produced considerable weakness, but had not interrupted his usual attention to business. There was less apprehension of a serious result from it being generally known that his majesty, previous to his accession to the throne, had been subject to violent attacks of what is called the hay-fever. This malady had returned. From the 12th of June bulletins were regularly issued till the 19th. The irritation of the lungs had then greatly increased, and respiration had become exceedingly painful. By the king's express desire the Archbishops of Canterbury and York prepared a prayer for his restoration to health, which on the 16th was ordered by the privy council to be used immediately before the Litany. On Sunday, the 18th of June, the symptoms assumed a more alarming character, and it was announced in the bulletin of the 19th that his majesty on that day had received the sacrament at the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury. On Tuesday, the 20th of June, the last of these official documents was issued. His majesty had expired that morning at twelve minutes past two o'clock.

The lapse of a quarter of a century has enabled us to appreciate the justice of those parliamentary eulogies on the character of William the Fourth which immediately followed his death.* In the House of Lords Viscount Melbourne dwelt upon his zeal and assiduity in the discharge of the public business; upon his fairness and sense of justice—"most fair, most candid, most impartial, most willing to hear, to weigh, and to consider what was urged even in opposition to his most favorite opinions." The Duke of Wellington bore distinct testimony to the total absence of vindictive feelings in the late king. The opposition of the duke when prime minister to the views of the lord high admiral had compelled him to resign that great office which he was most anxious to retain; and yet on his accession he employed the duke in his service, and manifested toward him the greatest kindness. Earl Grey described him as truly "a patriot king"—one whose most anxious desire was to decide what was best for the country over which he ruled. Lord Brougham entirely agreed in what had been said of the amiable disposition, the inflexible love of justice, and the rare candor by which the character of William the Fourth was distinguished. In the House of Commons Lord John Russell panegyrized the conduct of the late king toward his ministers as marked by sincerity and kindness. He was in the habit of stating his opinions frankly, fairly, and fully; never seeking any indirect means of accomplishing an object, but in a straighforward and manly way confined himself to an open, simple, and plain attempt to impress the minds of others with the opinion which he might at the moment entertain. If his constitutional advisers differed from him and still continued to be his servants, he left them wholly responsible for carrying into effect the course of policy which they recommended. His devotion during his last illness to the public business was the same as it had been through his whole reign. During a period of great suffering whatever required immediate attention received immediate notice. On the last day of his life he signed one of those papers in which he exercised the royal prerogative of mercy. Sir Robert Peel bore the same testimony to the king's utter forgetfulness of all amusement, and even of all private considerations, that could for a moment interfere with the most efficient discharge of his public duties.

It is impossible to read these testimonies to the public virtues of William the Fourth, given by the most eminent men of the two great parties in the state, without subscribing to their general truth. They did not overdo their praise. They did not attempt to represent their late master as a sovereign of eminent ability, of a highly cultivated understanding, of great refinement. They spoke of him as a man who honestly endeavored to understand the important questions upon which he had to decide, and faithfully to do his part of letting his ministers work out their own policy without meddling and without intrigue. It was certainly a beautiful part of the character of the king that he did not treasure up the grievances of the Duke of Clarence. Queen Caroline's solicitor-general, who had denounced him as a slanderer, became his lord chief justice. The Duke of Wellington, who turned him out of a lucrative office, which he could ill-afford to give up, was retained as his prime minister when he came to the crown. It is impossible not to see in how marked a manner, although it might have been without a direct intention, the traits most dwelt upon in the public character of William the Fourth were in forcible contrast with the public and private life of the Regent and of George the Fourth. This contrast was evidently in the mind of the preacher who thus spoke of the monarch then unburied: "When he entered into his palace he did *not* say, 'All this is my birthright; I am entitled to it—it is my due. How can I gain more splendor? how can I increase all the pleasures of the senses?'"*

We have noticed one slip in the prudent course of the constitutional government of the sailor-king—his abrupt dismissal of the ministry of Lord Melbourne. This mistake has been ascribed, and perhaps not untruly, to the influence of the family by whom he was surrounded. For many years the Duke of Clarence enjoyed as much domestic happiness as the Royal Marriage Act permitted to him. Mrs. Jordan, one of the most fascinating of actresses, lived with him in all the relations of a faithful and affectionate wife, except that of the sacred inviolability of the nuptial tie. This lady bore him ten children. The world did not look unkindly upon this union. The five sons and five daughters were affectionately cherished by their father; and when state reasons led the Duke of Clarence to marry in 1818, the excellent sense and kindly nature of the Princess Adelaide of Saxe Meiningen were shown in her treatment of the Fitzclarences. When she became queen her own court was a model of correctness; but the presence there of her husband's offspring was no offence against its decorum, except to the few whose strictness bordered on uncharitableness. This family were freely received into the highest

* See Debates in both Houses on the Queen's Message, June 22d, Hansard, vol. xxxviii.

* Sydney Smith, "Sermon at St. Paul's."

society. There, however successful had been the reforms of the Greys and Russells, Toryism, and indeed very mild Whiggism, looked with apprehension upon any farther progress in the battle against decayed institutions. For a season the king caught the fears of those around him, and he changed his government. When Lord Melbourne returned to office he had not to complain of an obstructive power behind the throne.

It was five o'clock on the morning of the 20th of June when the doors of Kensington Palace, where the Princess Victoria dwelt with her mother, were opened to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the lord chamberlain, and the physician of William IV., Sir Henry Halford. They had come direct from the dark chamber of death at Windsor, to tell the youthful princess, who had attained the age of eighteen on the 25th of May, that she was queen of one of the greatest among the nations. The intelligence had been momently expected. The household was astir at that early hour of the sunny morning, the three messengers were at once in the presence of their sovereign lady. Lord Melbourne had an audience at nine o'clock. At eleven the state apartments of Kensington Palace were filled with members of the privy council of the late king—peers, cabinet ministers, the two archbishops, the lord mayor of London, right honorable commoners. The Duke of Cumberland, now King of Hanover, and the Duke of Sussex, were conspicuous in that historical group which Wilkie has painted. The doors of the council chamber were opened, and Queen Victoria entering with the Duchess of Kent, pale but perfectly self-possessed, took her seat at the head of the council table. The lord chancellor administered the oaths prescribed for the sovereign's accession, the privy councillors took the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and then for the first time was heard by her assembled subjects that exquisitely modulated voice which for a quarter of a century has lent a charm to the formal periods of a speech from the throne. The opening sentence of the queen's declaration had a graceful simplicity, which appeared more like the natural effusion of the heart than the elaborate composition of a ministerial adviser:

"The severe and afflicting loss which the nation has sustained by the death of his majesty, my beloved uncle, has devolved upon me the duty of administering the government of this empire. This awful responsibility is imposed upon me so suddenly and at so early a period of my life that I should feel myself utterly oppressed by the burden were I not sustained by the hope that Divine Providence, which has called me to this work, will give me strength for the performance of it, and that I shall find in the purity of my intentions, and in my zeal for the public welfare, that support and those resources which usually belong to a more mature age and to long experience."

The queen's demeanor on that eventful morning impressed every one who was present, not only with profound admiration, but with confident hope of a glorious future. Truly did Sir Robert Peel say of this demeanor that there is something which art cannot imitate and lessons cannot teach. There was evidence of a high and generous nature in her solemn expression of regret at the domestic calamity which had just occurred; in her manifestation of a deep and awful sense of the duties she was called upon to fulfil; in the becoming and dignified modesty of all her actions. When the newspapers described how, on the next day, Victoria, the queen, appeared at a window overlooking the courtyard of St. James's Palace, "dressed in black silk, with a crape scarf over her white tippet, and a little black chip bonnet"—when they told how, looking "paler than usual," she wept as she acknowledged the plaudits of the people, such plaudits "as never could be surpassed"*—there were few among her subjects who did not put up a prayer for the happiness of this young creature, exposed so early to all the temptations of luxury and all the bewilderments of power. But there was little fear. There was confidence—as she had been brought up in the unobtrusive simplicity of her mother's life—as her natural abilities had been diligently cultivated—as from her childhood she had learned the great lessons of self-denial—as she was well-grounded in religious principle—that the perils of such greatness would be escaped. Never were the feelings of the nation more nobly expressed than by a voice from the pulpit of the metropolitan cathedral:

"What limits to the glory and happiness of our native land, if the Creator should in his mercy have placed in the heart of this royal woman the rudiments of wisdom and mercy; and if, giving them time to expand, and to bless our children's children with her goodness, he should grant to her a long sojourning upon earth, and leave her to reign over us till she is well stricken in years! What glory! what happiness! what joy! what bounty of God!"*

* "Spectator," June 24th.

MINISTRY AT THE ACCESSION OF QUEEN VICTORIA.

Cabinet.

Marquess of Lansdowne	Lord President of the Council.
Lord Cottenham	Lord High Chancellor.
Viscount Duncannon	Lord Privy Seal and First Commissioner of Land Revenue.
Viscount Melbourne	First Lord of the Treasury.
Right Hon. T. Spring Rice	Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Earl of Minto	First Lord of the Admiralty.
Lord John Russell	Secretary of State for the Home Department.
Viscount Palmerston	Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Lord Glenelg	Secretary of State for the Colonies.
Sir John Cam Hobhouse	President of the Board of Control.
Lord Holland	Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.
Right Hon. C. P. Thomson	President of the Board of Trade.
Viscount Howick	Secretary at War.

Not of the Cabinet.

Earl of Lichfield	Postmaster-General.
Right Hon. Henry Labouchere	Master of the Mint and Vice-President of the Board of Trade.
Sir Henry Parnell	Paymaster-General of the Forces.
Right Hon. Sir R. H. Vivian, Bart	Clerk of the Ordnance.
Sir John Campbell	Attorney-General.
Sir R. M. Rolfe	Solicitor-General.

Great Officers of State.

Duke of Argyll	Lord Steward.
Marquess of Conyngham	Lord Chamberlain.
Earl of Albemarle	Master of the Horse.

Ireland.

Earl of Mulgrave	Lord-Lieutenant.
Lord Plunkett	Lord High Chancellor.
Viscount Morpeth	Chief Secretary.

Scotland.

Right Hon. John A. Murray	Lord Advocate.
Andrew Rutherford, Esq.	Solicitor-General.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF TREATIES.

(Continued from vol. vii. p. 1094.)

1815 March 23: Treaty of Vienna between Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, confirming the principles of the Treaty of Chaumont, March 1st, 1814, on which they had acted; and uniting Belgium to the Netherlands under the sovereignty of the King of the Netherlands.

1815 June 8: Federative Constitution of Germany signed at Vienna.

1815 July 3: Convention of St. Cloud between Marshal Davoust on the one part, and Wellington and Blücher on the other, by which Paris was surrendered to the allies, who entered it on the 6th.

1815 August 2: A convention signed at Paris between Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, styling Napoleon the prisoner of those powers, and confiding his safeguard particularly to the British government.

1815 September 14: A convention entered into at Vienna, whereby the duchies of Parma, etc., were secured to the Empress Maria Louisa, and on her demise to her son by Napoleon.

1815 September 26: The treaty denominated the Holy Alliance ratified at Paris by the Emperors of Austria and Russia and the King of Prussia.

1815 November 5: A treaty ratified at Paris between Great Britain and Russia respecting the Ionian Islands, which were declared to form a united state under the sole protection of the former power.

1815 November 20: Peace of Paris, between France on the one part and Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia on the other, establishing the boundaries of France, and stipulating for the

* "Works of the Rev. Sydney Smith," vol. iii. p. 320.

garrisoning of several of the fortresses in France by foreign troops for three years.

1818 October 9 : A convention entered into by the great powers of Europe, assembled at Aix-la-Chapelle, on the one part, and the Duke de Richelieu on the other, whereby it was stipulated that the army of occupation should quit the French territory on the 30th of November ensuing ; it was also agreed that the remaining sum due from France to the allies was 265,000,000 francs.

1819 August 1 : Congress of Carlsbad.

1820 October 20 : Congress of Troppau.

1820 October 24 : Treaty between Spain and America : Florida ceded to the United States.

1821 May 6 : The Congress of Laybach, which had been for some time attended by the sovereigns of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, finally broke up, having issued two circulars stating it to be their resolution to occupy Naples with Austrian troops, and proscribe popular insurrection.

1822 August 25 : Congress of Verona.

1824 February 4 : A convention between Great Britain and Austria laid upon the table of the House of Commons, by which the former agreed to accept 2,500,000*l.* as a final compensation for her claims upon the latter power, amounting to 30,000,000*l.*

1825 February 28 : Convention between Great Britain and Russia ; frontier of north-west coast of America settled.

1825 April 17 : France recognizes the independence of St. Domingo.

1825 April 18 : Treaty of Amity between Great Britain and Columbia.

1825 October 18 : Treaty between Great Britain and Brazil for abolition of slave trade.

1829 July 6 : Treaty of London between Russia, France, and Great Britain, for the settlement of the affairs of Greece.

1829 September 14 : Peace of Adrianople, between Russia and Turkey, by which Russia acquires the protectorate of Moldavia and Wallachia.

1830 May 7 : Treaty between Turkey and the United States. American vessels allowed to pass to and from the Black Sea.

1830 November 2 : The independence of Belgium recognized by England and France.

1831 The commercial union of the northern states of Germany, known as the Zollverein, commenced under the auspices of Prussia.

1831 November 15 : A treaty signed between Great Britain and France, for a settlement of the points of dispute between Holland and Belgium, to which Holland acceded March 13, 1838.

1833 July 8 : Treaty at Constantinople between Turkey and Russia, by which it was stipulated that the Dardanelles should be shut to all foreign vessels of war.

1834 April 22 : Quadruple Treaty between Great Britain, France, Spain, and Portugal, in support of the two queens, Isabella and Maria.

1835 Supplementary Treaties with Portugal and Spain, by the former of which the Methuen Treaty with Portugal was annulled.

1840 July 15 : Treaty signed in London between Great Britain, France, Austria, Russia, Prussia, and Turkey, for the settlement of the dispute between Turkey and Mehemet Ali.

1841 July 13 : Convention at London between the European Powers and Turkey, by which the closing of the Dardanelles against ships of war is made general to them all while Turkey is at peace.

1842 August 29 : Treaty of Nankin with China, by which several ports were opened to the British trade, Hong-Kong ceded, and an indemnification of $21,000,000 paid.

1845 May 29 : A convention signed in London between Great Britain and France for the suppression of the slave trade.

1846 November 16 : Austria, Russia, and Prussia revoke the treaty of 1815, constituting Cracow a free republic, and restore the territory to Austria. Soon after the kingdom of Poland is incorporated with Russia. Great Britain, France, Sweden, and Turkey unite in a protest against these proceedings.

1849 August 6 : Treaty of Milan, between Austria and Sardinia.

1850 February 27 : Treaty at Munich, between Austria, Bavaria, Saxony, and Würtemberg, to form a Southern German Union against the pretensions of Prussia.

1850 April 19 : Treaty at Washington between Great Britain and the United States, respecting a ship-canal through the state of Nicaragua, to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

1850 July 2 : Treaty of Peace between Prussia and Denmark, Prussia withdrawing from the support of the Duchies of Holstein and Schleswig ; and on July 4 a protocol was signed in London between Great Britain, France, Prussia, and Sweden, guaranteeing the integrity of the Danish territories.

CHAPTER CCXXX.

Social condition of Great Britain at the period of the accession of Queen Victoria—Occupations of the people—Growth of cities and towns—London—Increase of houses—Supply of food—Improved means of communication affecting that supply—Cheapening of the necessaries of life—Conveyance of mails by railways—Limited postal accommodation—Public health—Inquiry into the sanitary condition of the laboring classes—Exposure of the unfitness of many dwellings for healthful occupation—Work rooms without ventilation, such as those of tailors and milliners—Public arrangements influencing the sanitary condition of the laboring population—Neglect and ignorance universal—Want of drainage—Inadequate water supply for the preservation of cleanliness—Public baths and wash-houses unknown—Interments within the precincts of large towns—Public walks not provided—State of the factories—Number of workers in textile manufactures—Beginnings of improvement—Mining population—Employment of children and women in mines—Agricultural laborers—Operation of the new poor law—Neglect of the laborers by the richer classes—Miserable cottage accommodation—Dorsetshire laborers—Field employment of women and children—Crime in England and Wales—Juvenile delinquency—General state of education—First aid of the state to voluntary exertions—Increase of schools and scholars—Limited ability to read and write among the adult population—General aspects of English society.

In the celebrated description by Macaulay of "the state in which England was at the time when the crown passed from Charles the Second to his brother," he rests its necessary imperfection upon the "scanty and dispersed materials" from which it was composed. In now attempting a description of the state in which the United Kingdom was at the time, or about the time, when the crown passed from William the Fourth to his niece, we have not the same apology for its incompleteness. The materials from which it must be composed are embarrassing, not from their scantiness, but from their fulness—not from their dispersion in scarce and curious tracts, in private letters and diaries, in the observations of foreigners, in estimates of national wealth resting upon no solid bases, in county histories, in meagre newspapers, in old almanacs. In 1837 we were passing out of the transition state of very imperfect statistics to the period when every aspect of our social condition was to be delineated ; when every dark corner was to be explored ; when every fact connected with education, public health, crime and punishment, industrial employment, pauperism, was to be recorded and tabulated—the period of commissioners and boards—the period when, according to Sydney Smith, "the whole earth was, in fact, in commission." Out of several hundred official reports we may to some extent learn what we were a quarter of a century ago, and be enabled to answer the question, "Are we improved ?"

In commencing our survey of what Shakespeare, in his famous comparison of "the state of man in divers functions" with the working of "the honey-bees," calls "a peopled kingdom," we beg to repeat what we said at the outset of this history, that we do not apply the term "people" to any distinct class or section of the population. We especially protest against the abuse of the term "people" which some among us have adopted from the modern literature of France, when they assume that the non-capitalist portion of the industrious classes are exclusively "the people." The intelligent public officers to whom has been committed the superintendence of the census during the last twenty years have classified the "occupations of the people" as the occupations of the entire community.

The census of 1841 is sufficiently near the date of the accession of Victoria to furnish a tolerably correct estimate of the various functions performed in that great working-hive of which she was the queen-bee. In the spring of that year, out of the entire population of England, Wales, and Scotland, amounting to nearly nineteen millions, nearly eight millions, male and female, were distinctly classified by their occupations. They were the supporters of the residue of the population, including children of all ages. Speaking in round numbers, three millions were engaged in commerce, trade, and manufactures ; a million and a half in agriculture ; seven hundred thousand were laborers not agricultural ; a hundred and thirty thousand formed the army at home and abroad ; two hundred and eighteen thousand were employed on the sea and in inland navigation ; sixty-three thousand were professional persons, clerical, legal, and medical ; a hundred and forty thousand were following miscellaneous pursuits as educated persons ; seventeen thousand were in the government civil service ; twenty five thousand were parochial and other officers ; eleven hundred thousand were domestic servants ; five hundred thousand were persons of independent means ; and two hundred thousand were alms-people, pensioners, paupers, lunatics, and

prisoners. This wonderful variety of stations and pursuits constitutes the distinctive character of modern British civilization. All are held together upon that great principle which Plato sets forth in emphatic words: "It is not alone wisdom and strength which makes a state simply wise and strong. But order, like that harmony called the diapason, is diffused throughout the whole state, making both the weakest and the strongest and the middling people concent the same melody."

A very large proportion of the three millions of the people engaged in commerce, trade, and manufacture were necessarily to be found in the cities and towns. In 1811, at the commencement of the regency, there were in England only twelve of the cities and towns whose population exceeded thirty thousand; in Scotland there were four above that number. In 1841, taking the same limits of places as in 1811, there were thirty-two cities and towns in England with a larger population than thirty thousand, and in Scotland six. In the course of thirty years the London of one million ten thousand people had become the dwelling-place of one million seven hundred thousand;* Manchester and Salford, which thirty years before 1841 numbered a hundred and ten thousand, held two hundred and ninety-six thousand; Liverpool, of one hundred thousand, had reached two hundred and sixty-four thousand; Birmingham, with eighty-five thousand, had added a hundred and five thousand to its number; Leeds, with sixty two thousand, had added ninety thousand; Bristol, with seventy-six thousand, had added forty-six thousand. Sheffield, Rochdale, Norwich, Nottingham, each under forty thousand, had about doubled their numbers. Plymouth and Portsmouth had grown in a less proportion. In Scotland, Edinburgh had increased from a hundred and two thousand to a hundred and sixty-six thousand; Glasgow from a hundred thousand to two hundred and seventy-four thousand; Paisley, Aberdeen, Greenock, had doubled their numbers, each exceeding sixty thousand. Of non-commercial places the extensions of Brighton and Cheltenham were the most remarkable; in thirty years they had quadrupled their populations. The growth of the smaller provincial seats of trading and manufacturing industry was as remarkable as the instances we have selected of the greater places. Of the sixty-eight chief cities and towns of Great Britain whose comparative population is exhibited in decennial periods by the census of 1841, the total amount of the population was two million six hundred and ninety-two thousand at the commencement of the regency, and five million three hundred and forty-one thousand three years after the crown passed to Queen Victoria. During the period of thirty years, when the population of sixty-eight principal towns had increased 100 per cent, the aggregate population of England and Scotland had increased only 54 per cent—that is, from twelve million to eighteen million five hundred thousand.

The one million seven hundred thousand of the people of London in 1841 were inhabiting two hundred and sixty-three thousand houses. Since 1811 the number of houses in the metropolitan district had increased in a much higher proportion than the increase of population. There had been rapidly going on since the peace, not only in London but in every part of the country, that want which appears never to be satisfied—the demand for more houses, whatever number of houses are built. In London, during the half century from 1811 to 1861, there has ever been an increasing number of the people ready to pay rent—people beginning housekeeping, people seeking better house accommodation than the old dwellings, people turning their city houses into warehouses, and daily going to and fro in search of health in suburban air. One of the most curious social problems at the period of the queen's accession, as it had been the marvel of several previous generations, was the apparent difficulty of feeding even five hundred thousand, much more a million, a million and a half, two millions of human beings, collected together in places more or less densely peopled, comprised within a circle whose radius was four miles from St. Paul's.

In 1841 the metropolitan district of the registrar-general comprised a population of nearly nineteen hundred thousand on a radius considerably smaller than that of the plan given in the census of 1831, which, in a radius of eight miles, comprised a population a little under eighteen hundred thousand.

A proclamation of Elizabeth against the extension of London exhibits the dread of the government that the increasing multitudes "could hardly be provided of sustentation, of victual, food, and other like necessaries for man's relief, upon reasonable price." The economists of our own day have shown how visionary would be such a dread under the self-regulating movements of the present social organization. The greatest wonder that London presented to a New Zealander who was brought to England some years ago, was the mystery of feeding an immense population, as he saw neither cattle nor crops. The enormous number, and the fluctuations in their number, of the persons to be fed; the quantity and variety of the provisions to be furnished; the necessity in most cases for their immediate distribution in convenient localities; the accurate proportion of the supply to the demand, so as to be ample without waste—these considerations point to the difficulty, as well as the paramount importance, of furnishing their daily rations to a host far greater than any army which a commissariat upon the grandest scale could undertake to sustain even for a single day. "This object," says Dr. Whately, "is accomplished far better than it could be by any effort of human wisdom through the agency of men who think each of nothing beyond his own immediate interest—who, with that object in view, perform their respective parts with cheerful zeal, and combine unconsciously to employ the wisest means for effecting an object the vastness of which it would bewilder them even to contemplate."*

What appeared to the economist so vast an undertaking in the London of 1831 must at the first glance have appeared a greater difficulty in 1841, when the population had still gone on rapidly increasing. But during that decennial period the means of communication had been so largely increased that the certainty of the supply of food, both as to its abundance and the time occupied in its transit, could be more accurately measured. The corn-barge was still duly sailing from the maritime counties to the port of London, to bring the produce of many thousand acres for sale in Mark Lane; the steamboat was also moving up the Thames to bring corn quickly from the ports of the Baltic; and the first steamships from England had crossed the Atlantic in 1838 to contribute to the transportation of that supply of foreign produce which was scantily poured in till the fetters of protection were knocked off. The cattle of Smithfield were still travelling in vast droves from the north by Highgate, and from the eastern counties by the Whitechapel Road; but the Birmingham Railway was already bringing large numbers to market in better condition and at a lower cost than were effected by the drovers' toilsome march. That railway and the few others that were gradually being opened brought also to London large quantities of country-killed meat. In the smaller articles of produce, London, by the agency of steam-vessels, had now an almost inexhaustible supply from foreign ports. Fresh vegetables and fruits came to Covent Garden Market from Portugal; the Pas de Calais sent millions of eggs from its small farms; and the eggs which Ireland exported to England, as well as Scotch eggs and English eggs brought in coasting vessels, justify the calculation that the London population had in the first year of the queen an annual supply of a hundred millions of eggs collected from sources which were not accessible thirty years before. In 1813 a great meeting of noblemen and gentlemen was held in the Thatched House Tavern, St. James's, to establish a fish association, the object of which was to insure a better supply of that luxury of the wealthy in the metropolis. It was scarcely in the contemplation of this meeting that the humbler markets where the poor congregate should ever have an adequate supply of a perishable article, then brought up the river by hoys dependent upon wind and tide, or carried by stage-coaches at a large increase of the first cost. It has been stated in an interesting little volume † that when salmon were brought from Scotland in sailing vessels, one cargo in three was totally spoiled from the voyage being protracted by adverse winds. The steamboats were in 1837 delivering some hundred tons of salmon from Scotland to Billingsgate. A few years later the railways from the southern coast were rendering the turbot and the sole almost as cheap in the London markets as in the fish-shops of the fashionable

* In the census of 1841 more extended limits of London were given as adopted by the registrar-general, which gave the population as 1,873,676.

* Introductory Lectures on Political Economy, 1831.

† "Our Exemplars, Poor and Rich," p. 123.

watering-places near which they were taken. Within the last ten years the electric telegraph has come to the aid of the railway, by apprising the fish-dealers in London when there is a glut of fish—as of mackerel, which is sometimes taken in extraordinary quantities. Instead of perishing on the shore, the mackerel thus finds its way to thousands of consumers, "alive, alive, O!" as the itinerant dealer was allowed to proclaim on a Sunday morning in the old days of slow conveyance.

As important as the equalization of prices in the necessaries of life by improved means of conveyance, was the more rapid communication beginning to be effected in the transmission of letters. The railway system was so far established in 1838 that an act of parliament was passed in that year for providing for the conveyance of mails by railroads. The mails between Manchester and Liverpool were conveyed by railroad as early as 1830; but between London and every town in Great Britain the comparatively slow mode of conveyance continued to prevail. Upon the reduction of the newspaper stamp from fourpence to a penny in 1835, the dispatch of newspapers through the post-office was so greatly increased that some of the mails were obliged to run without their usual number of passengers, the contractors being indemnified for their loss. The addition to the old mode of conveyance enabled day-mails to be dispatched, when the routine of the post-office had been revolutionized by Rowland Hill. The organization which was necessary to insure the triumph of a cheap and uniform rate of postage was so little developed when the queen came to the throne, that there were only three thousand post-offices in England and Wales, while the number of parishes was eleven thousand. It was estimated that a fourth of the population were entirely destitute of postal accommodation. Four hundred of the registration districts, the average extent of each being nearly twenty square miles, were without a post-office. Yet when we consider what was the cost of postage at that time, we may possibly come to the conclusion that the facilities afforded for sending and receiving letters were ample. The number of chargeable letters in 1839 was in the proportion of four letters per annum to each individual of the population of England and Wales; three in Scotland; one in Ireland. Large as this number may seem when compared with the period of Mr. Palmer's reforms in 1784, when the first mail-coach left London, we can only judge of its comparative littleness when we learn that the average of England and Wales in 1861 was in the proportion of twenty-four letters to every one of the population, nineteen in Scotland, and nine in Ireland. A representative of the spirit which sees nothing but evil in every great social improvement wrote thus in his diary of July 8th, 1839: "The chancellor of the exchequer, in bringing forward his budget, has proposed that the postage on a single letter should be reduced to one penny. This will increase the number of idle scribblers, be of little benefit to the lower classes who seldom have occasion to write, and is likely only to advantage the commercial houses and bankers who can well afford to pay the postage."* The greatest benefit to his country which the organizer of cheap postage has effected—a benefit which he may contemplate with the honest pride of every man who feels that he has not lived for himself alone—is that he has given a motive for education to "the lower classes," who now often "have occasion to write;" that he has linked together the affections of households that have become separated by distance, so that even to the colonist in Australia a letter can now find its way as cheaply as it once travelled from London to Windsor.

The distribution of the food of London to its two hundred and sixty-three thousand houses was accomplished more by the agency of shopkeepers than by the stall-sellers at markets. The costard-monger, who derived his name from the apple which he sold, was still the great purveyor of vegetables in the silent streets of the suburbs. He had almost wholly passed away from the busy streets. The orange-woman standing on the pavement with her basket had nearly ceased to traffic. The millions of oranges that steam had brought ripe from the Antilles were to be found in every quarter where there was a fruit-shop or a stall. The public places of refreshment in 1837 were not essentially different from those of the beginning of the century, as far as regarded the chop-house and the eating-house. But there were two important changes. The institution of clubs had materially contributed to the luxurious comforts of the higher classes at a far less expense than that of the old tavern, and the two thousand coffee-houses that had sprung up in London, where the artisan could obtain his cup of tea or coffee for three halfpence or twopence and read the newspapers and periodical works, was an advance indicating a very different state of society from that which prevailed in the exclusive days of the regency.

Valuable to every class of the London population as was the partial cheapening of some of the necessaries of life by the gradual equalization of prices produced by improved conveyance, the physical and moral condition of the great bulk of the people would have been little improved as long as they were compelled to crowd in districts undrained, in perishing houses ill-ventilated, in pestilential courts and alleys, from which typhus especially and every form of contagious and epidemic disease never departed. It is difficult, with all the recorded experience of the better time that has succeeded the first awakening to the consideration of the great question of public health, to believe that we are only looking back a quarter of a century when we trace what the humbler classes of London and of all other great towns were enduring when Victoria became our sovereign. Three years before her majesty's accession the public mind was roused, in some degree, to the consideration of this evil in the metropolis by a distinguished architect, Mr. Sydney Smirke; and before a road was made from the east end of Oxford Street direct to Holborn, he pointed out that there was a district—known by the names of the Rookery and the Holy Land—the retreat of wretchedness, the nest of disease, the nursery and sanctuary of vice. There was scarcely a single sewer in any part of it. Where the plague once raged there was then constant fever. There were houses in which squalid families were lodged in the proportion of twenty-four adults and thirty children to nine small rooms. There were lodging-houses in which sixty persons occupied nightly a pestilential den of filth and depravity. There were many such places in other quarters of the town. Under the authority of the poor-law commissioners, in 1838, Dr. Arnott and Dr. Kay made a laborious investigation into the prevalence of fever in the metropolis, and Dr. Southwood Smith carried on similar inquiries into some of the causes of sickness and mortality to which the poor are peculiarly exposed. When their reports were published, even thoughtful men, as well as those who had rarely looked below the glittering surface of society, were little prepared for such a revelation of the details of the mass of vice, misery, and disease which existed in close contiguity with the most opulent parts of the great city. In 1839 an address to her majesty from the House of Lords prayed that a similar inquiry should be instituted with regard to the laboring classes in other parts of England and Wales; and such an inquiry was in 1840 required to be extended to Scotland. This duty was undertaken by the poor-law commission; and their report, prepared by Mr. Chadwick, embraced the evidence not only of their assistant commissioners, but of numerous medical men of the highest authority. The miserable dens of the working classes in London, inhabited not exclusively by the lowest in condition and in morals, were not unfrequently surrounded by the luxurious mansions of the rich and fashionable, and commonly by the well-constructed houses of the middle ranks. The proportions in which each class bore up against the ills which flesh is heir to are indicated, however imperfectly, by returns of the comparative mortality among the average of a town population. The lowest in the scale of well-being indicated by duration of life were the mechanics, laborers, and their families; the highest in the scale were the families of the gentry and professional persons; the medium place was that of the tradesmen and their families. Comparative poverty, no doubt, had a large share in this result; but the peculiar character of the dwellings of each, and the habits of filth and intemperance induced by the total unfitness of many tenements for healthful occupation, had a much larger share in that astounding difference in the death-rate, which showed that the families of the most opulent classes lived twice as long as those of their least fortunate neighbors. In closed courts, where the sunshine never penetrated, where a breath of fresh air never circulated, where noxious vapors filled every corner from the horrible cesspools, where the density of population was so excessive as in itself to be sufficient to produce disease, where a single room was often occupied by a whole family without regard to age or sex—the wonder is how the poor lived at all, uncared for by the

* Raikes's "Diary," vol. iii.

rich, who knew them not—neglected by their employers, who in some trades exposed them to labor in workshops not far superior in ventilation to the Black Hole of Calcutta. Among these careless and avaricious employers the master-tailors were the most notorious, who would huddle sixty or eighty workmen close together, nearly knee to knee, in a room 50 feet long by 20 feet broad, lighted from above, where the temperature in summer was 30 degrees higher than the temperature outside. Young men from the country fainted when they were first confined in such a life-destroying prison ; the maturer ones sustained themselves by gin, till they perished of consumption, or typhus, or delirium tremens.* One of the most eminent of our living physiologists says, "Mr. Chadwick has shown that many are driven to drinking gin as affording a temporary relief to the feelings of depression and exhaustion produced by living in a noxious atmosphere."† The overworked class of milliners and dressmakers employed in the larger work-rooms of London, ill-ventilated, and rendered doubly injurious by the constant habit of night-work, when the air was still more deteriorated by gas and lamplight—this suffering class of young women was being constantly renewed, more than one half dying of lung diseases before they had attained the average age of twenty-eight.

In the general report of 1842, next in importance to the inquiry into the condition of the residences of the laboring classes was the investigation into the public arrangements external to the residences which influenced the sanitary condition of the mass of the population. In London, in the seats of manufacturing industry, in the ports, in the boroughs with a moderate number of inhabitants, in the smallest towns and villages, there was ample evidence of neglect and ignorance, so manifest, and yet so little observed by the people themselves and by the local authorities, that after twenty years of remedial measures we look back with horror upon the state of the towns in which the father of a family of the present day passed his infancy and boyhood. It was the same throughout the land, whether under the palatial walls of Windsor Castle, or under the crescents of Bath built upon the brows of the hills, or in the steep lanes climbing up to the Cathedral of Durham, or in the open channels in the wynds and closes of the romantic city of Edinburgh, or in the enormous seats of factory labor in Lancashire and Yorkshire, or in Liverpool, the great emporium of commerce, which was fast rivalling London—wherever there was a want of drainage there were always disease, and misery, and families rendered destitute by premature deaths. In Liverpool there were eight thousand cellars occupied by thirty thousand people, few of which cellars, from the absence of drains and sewers, were entirely free from damp, and most of them were inundated after a fall of rain. In a report laid before the British Association for the Advancement of Science it was stated that the proportion of the population of Liverpool that lived in cellars was 13 per cent, of Manchester 11¼ per cent, of Salford 8 per cent, of Bury 3¾ per cent. In Ashton, Staleybridge, and Dukinfield, where only about 1½ per cent of the population lived in cellars, the death-rate was abundantly kept up by the common practice, rendered necessary by the insufficient dwelling accommodation, of three, four, five, and even six persons sleeping in one bed.

In the poorer districts of London, such as Whitechapel, and in nearly every city and town of Great Britain, the supplies of water were wholly inadequate to preserve the cleanliness and consequent health of the laboring population. It had been ascertained in all sanitary inquiries that an adequate supply of water had a most advantageous effect on the health of the people. In 1841 there was not a house of the laboring classes in the Whitechapel district in which the water was laid on. Where the poor had to fetch water from the pump or from the plug in the street at a considerable distance, they would rarely take the trouble to obtain the supply, without which their dwellings and their persons would be marked by that absence of cleanliness which is almost always accompanied by a low state of morals.

At the commencement of the queen's reign there was no public provision in London, nor as far as we know in any of the provincial towns, for promoting cleanliness among the poor by the establishment of public baths and wash-houses. In 1832, when the cholera first appeared in England, there was a poor woman named Catherine Wilkinson, who was so impressed with the necessity of cleanliness as a preventive to the disease, that she encouraged her neighbors to come to her comparatively better house, which comprised a kitchen, a parlor, three small bedchambers, and a yard, for the purpose of washing and drying their clothes. The good that was manifest induced some benevolent persons to aid her in extending her operations. The large amount of washing done in one week in a cellar, under the superintendence of this excellent woman, represented the amount of disease and discomfort kept down by her energetic desire to do good without pecuniary reward. Such was the origin of public baths and wash-houses which Catherine Wilkinson had the satisfaction of seeing matured in Liverpool in 1846, in a large establishment under the corporation, to the superintendence of which she and her husband were appointed. In 1844 an association for promoting cleanliness among the poor hired an old building in the midst of a dense and indigent population near the London docks, and fitted it up as a bath-house and a laundry. What has been since done by this first step in the promotion of cleanliness among the poor is one of the most interesting circumstances in our social progress. A quarter of a century ago London was behind every other country in Europe in a provision for convenient and inexpensive public baths. A warm bath, if such could be found without traversing five hundred streets, would have cost the mechanic as much as a week's dinners. Such a bath may now be procured for twopence.

Equally injurious to health as an insufficient supply of pure water was the prevailing custom twenty years ago of burying the dead in towns. In March, 1842, a select committee of the House of Commons was appointed to consider the expediency of framing some legislative enactment (due respect being paid to the rights of the clergy) to remedy the evils arising from the interment of bodies within the precincts of large towns or of places densely peopled. Their report averred that England exhibited, especially through its capital, "an instance of the most wealthy, moral, and civilized community in the world, tolerating a practice and an abuse which has been corrected for years by nearly all other civilized nations in every part of the globe." A supplement to the general sanitary report was prepared by Mr. Chadwick in 1842 on the subject of interment in towns. It is full of the most curious facts, which contributed to awaken public attention to this national disgrace. The parochial divisions of the metropolis and the rapid increase of the population in each division had filled the graveyards, in the very heart of the densest neighborhoods, in a manner which was truly described by a witness before the parliamentary committee as "sickening and horrible." Liverpool and Manchester had established cemeteries long before London had attempted this partial remedy of an enormous evil. In 1832 an act was passed for the formation of a cemetery at Kensal Green. The cemeteries of Norwood and Highgate were added some eight or ten years later, but all these were for the opulent. The parish graveyards still continued open in their constantly increasing abomination. It was the same nearly in every other city and large town, till almost absolute powers were given to the government to put down the evil by the strong hand.

A committee of the House of Commons was appointed in 1833 to consider the best means of securing open spaces in the vicinity of populous towns, as public walks and places of exercise calculated to promote the health and comfort of the inhabitants. London had its parks in the West End ; but the east, inhabited by a dense population, presented no opportunity to the toiling artisan to enjoy the fresh air without a long walk beyond the region of chimneys. In the seats of the three great manufactures of the kingdom, cotton, woollen, and hardware, while the wealth of the large towns had increased in proportion to the increase of population, no provision had been made to afford the people the means of healthy exercise or cheerful amusement. Debasing pleasures naturally took the place of innocent recreations.

In 1831 one of our most lucid prose writers, whose beauty of style was not altogether based upon a solid foundation of wisdom, speaks of the factory system, which was an inevitable consequence of the application of invention and discovery to manufactures, as "a wen, a fungous excrescence from the body politic : the growth might have

* Compare the vivid descriptions in "Alton Locke" with the evidence in the "Sanitary Report" of 1842, pp. 98 to 104.

† "Psychological Inquiries." By Sir Benjamin C. Brodie, Bart. 3d edit., p. 78.

been checked if the consequences had been apprehended in time." * He describes this system as one "which in its direct consequences debases all who are engaged in it; a system that employs men unremittingly in pursuits unwholesome for the body and unprofitable for the mind." In 1841 the total number of persons engaged in the cotton manufacture was about half a million. The total number employed upon all textile fabrics in Great Britain was eight hundred thousand, of which number about four hundred and fifty-three thousand were males and three hundred and forty-six thousand were females. Many of the evils which Southey exaggerates, in the dread which ultra-Toryism had of artisans and factory-workers—of all whom they believed could not be regimented into obedience, as they imagined to be possible with the agricultural laborers—had in 1833 begun to be remedied by legislative interference. These evils had grown up in the rapid development of the powers of the steam-engine; but in 1841, when the textile factories employed five hundred and fifty-five thousand of both sexes above twenty years of age, and two hundred and forty-five thousand under twenty years, the number of very young children had been greatly reduced, the hours of labor were rendered more moderate, and the education of children, with a proper regard for their health, was a duty to be provided for.† Much remained to be done, but a beginning had been made. Independently of the unwholesome dwellings in which many of the factory operatives were compelled to abide at the epoch of which we are writing, their health was better cared for, during their hours of labor, than in the miserable workshops in which too many artisans then earned their bread.

In 1841 the number of persons employed under ground in mines was about a hundred and ninety-four thousand—about an eighth of the total numbers employed in the cultivation of the surface. More than one half of this number were employed in coal-mines. In 1840 a commission was appointed to inquire into the employment of the children of the poorer classes in mines and collieries. The report of that commission, presented to parliament in 1842, exhibited in some mining districts a state of things, with regard not only to children but to women, which could scarcely be paralleled by any of the barbarous practices which have contributed to make negro slavery so abhorrent to the feelings of the people of England. Till this report was presented, few were aware that a child of six years of age, with a girdle round his or her waist, to which was attached a chain passing under the legs and fastened to a cart, had thus to drag a load on all fours through avenues not so good as a common sewer. Children and women who were not employed in dragging loads by the girdle and chain had to carry loads of coal on their backs up steep ascents, equal in distance to the height of St. Paul's, fourteen times a day. An old Scotchwoman said to one of the commissioners, "You must just tell the Queen Victoria that we are quiet, loyal subjects; women people here don't mind work; but they object to horse-work; and that she would have the blessings of all the Scotch coal-women if she would get them out of the pits, and send them to other labor." Through the employment of children the seeds of painful and mortal disease were sown, which were steadily developed as they advanced to maturity; but their moral corruption, through their subjection to uneducated and ferocious men and the indiscriminate employment of girls and boys, was as serious an evil, of which the evidence was perfectly clear. Children of seven years of age, of amiable temper and conduct, who went for one season into the collieries, returned greatly corrupted, and, as one witness emphatically said, "with most hellish dispositions." The effect of this employment upon women was to produce a total ignorance of all domestic duties; it wholly disqualified them from even learning how to discharge the duties of wife and mother. This awful misuse of the labor of children and women proceeded not from the necessities of the collier's family, but from his own gross and sensual indulgences. It was in evidence that many of the miners worked only eight or nine days in a fortnight, and then spent the large earnings of two thirds of their working time in drinking and gambling. Throughout the Staffordshire collieries cock-fighting was the ordinary amusement of the population. Their vices had been transmitted from father to son; the employment of women and children was a relic of former days of barbarous ignorance in the general community. In these cases the slave-driver of his wife and children was the father of the family. But there was another species of slavery in the apprenticeship of orphan boys or paupers to "butty" colliers—those who took assistants or partners in their work.* It was the custom of many of these hard taskmasters to take two or three apprentices at a time, supporting themselves and families out of the labor of these unfortunate orphans, who from the age of fourteen to twenty-one never received a penny for themselves, by a servitude in which there was nothing to learn beyond a little dexterity readily acquired by short practice. The cruelties which were sometimes endured by these unhappy boys appear now to belong to the times of Elizabeth Brownrigg; yet there is nothing in the story of her whipping her apprentices to death that could not be exceeded by the admission of a collier that he had been in the habit of beating his apprentice with a flat piece of wood in which a nail was driven, projecting about half an inch. There are middle aged men at the present time among us who, having escaped from the horrors of a pit-boy's life twenty years ago, detail the cruel punishments that were inflicted by those who knew no mode of enforcing obedience but that of brutal severity.

The total number of agricultural laborers in Great Britain in 1841 was a little above one million one hundred and thirty-eight thousand, of which number fifty-six thousand were females. Since 1811 the proportion of the agricultural to the commercial and miscellaneous classes of the people had been gradually diminishing. The general condition of the agricultural laborers of the south, at the period of passing the act for the amendment of the poor law, has been already indicated. † The amended law had been in operation for three years, when a parliamentary inquiry was instituted upon complaints of its administration. The evidence regarding three rural unions occupied nine tenths of the labors of the committee. In 1834 the laborers had manifested a lawless spirit of opposition to the operations of the new law. In 1837 they had become aware that the intention of the amended law was to raise them to a better condition instead of grinding them down. They had increased wages and greater regularity of employment; they had not to endure the degradation of receiving as alms what they had a right to demand as the wages of their industry. Undoubtedly there was individual suffering in the transition from the allowance system to the stern refusal of aid to the able-bodied laborer. In 1840 a great thinker, who had looked below the surface of immediate evils, thus wrote: "Let us welcome the new poor law as the harsh beginning of much, the harsh ending of much! Most harsh and barren lies the new plougher's fallow-field, the crude subsoil all turned up, which never saw the sun; which as yet grows no herb; which has 'out-door relief' for no one. Yet patience: innumerable weeds and corruptions lie safely turned down and extinguished under it; this same crude subsoil is the first step of all true husbandry; by Heaven's blessing and the skyey influences, fruits that are good and blessed will yet come of it." ‡ But the time was yet distant when what was wanting in the new poor law toward placing the agricultural laborer in his proper relation to the whole social system would be supplied, not by what is called the charity of the rich, but by their feeling of brotherhood toward those who sat with them in the same place of worship, and whose children were christened in the same font as their children. There was a great deal to be done by education before the agricultural laborer could be rendered provident and moral by instruction; before the poor should cease to be abject and the rich should cease to be overbearing; before the friendly intercourse between man and man, which religion and philosophy equally prescribe, should stand in the place of that proud reserve and that suppressed insolence which were the remaining badges of feudality. The time was still distant when, to say nothing of the sympathy arising out of an enlarged public sentiment, land-proprietors and rich cultivators would be ashamed to let the laborers and their families inhabit cottages inferior to the thatched stables and cattle-sheds of the slovenly farm yards of a quarter of a century ago. A recent writer says of Dorsetshire, that "the next thing after the advent of Judge Jeffries that gave the county a

* Southey, "Colloquies," vol. i. p. 171.
† *Ante*, p. 1208.

* "Butty. A working companion; a comrade. Not so general with us as among the miners and colliers."—"Miss Baker's North amptonshire Glossary."
† Chap. ccxxvii. pp. to 1209 1211.
‡ "Chartism," by Thomas Carlyle, p. 22.

downright shake from end to end was the crusade of S. G. O." * What was that crusade of one who seldom put his lance in rest except to tilt against some armor-clad oppressor? The publicity given by this famous correspondent of the "Times" to the miserable condition of the Dorsetshire laborers produced a controversy in parliament, in which facts alleged against the neglect of the landowners and farmers of that county were attempted to be disproved. The "Times" then employed a commissioner to see with his own eyes what was the real condition of a county held to be chronically behind the age. That report was entirely confirmatory of all that had been alleged of the excessively low rate of wages, which in most cases was about seven shillings a week; of the oppression exercised over the laborer who did job-work, by his master giving him whatever the master liked; of the system of paying the laborers partly in kind, when they were compelled by the farmers to take an inferior quality of corn called "grists" at a price equal to or above the market price of the best grain; and of the disgraceful state of the laborers' cottages, small, inconvenient, and so entirely unfit for the decent accommodation of a family that in some cases nine persons slept in one room. Lord Sidney Godolphin Osborne (S. G. O.), Rector of Bryanstone, near Blandford, in Dorsetshire, had in 1842 testified to the physical and moral injuries to the laborer of a dwelling of the most confined space without anything like proper drainage. His evidence was taken by one of the special assistant commissioners, who reported "on the employment of women and children in agriculture." Of the early employment of children of both sexes in the fields the greatest evil was to be found in their removal from school before they had acquired the commonest rudiments of knowledge. The employment of women was injurious in their being withdrawn from the proper superintendence of their families, and in that consequent absence of domestic comfort which in most cases drove the laborer to the beer-shop.

In 1836 a commission was appointed to inquire as to the best means of establishing an efficient constabulary force in the counties of England, for the prevention of offences, the detection of criminals, and the protection of property. The report of this commission showed that there was an average of a hundred thousand commitments annually of the able-bodied population, and that from eleven thousand to twenty thousand persons were constantly in jail. Crimes of violence were gradually decreasing, though crimes characterized by fraud were increasing in a still greater proportion. The criminal population of London and of a few of the larger towns had been kept within narrower bounds than in the time of George the Fourth, by the establishment of a vigilant police force. In the rural districts there was no power but that of the parish constable to prevent the most extensive system of depredation. Even the laboring classes were constantly plundered of the produce of their gardens and garden allotments. "There is no protection for us," said a laborer to a clergyman near Bath. The altered character of criminal punishments, as exhibited in the sentences passed in the years before and after the accession of the queen, is very remarkable. In 1834 four hundred and eighty persons were sentenced to death; in 1838 a hundred and sixteen. In 1834 eight hundred and ninety-four persons were sentenced to transportation for life; in 1838 two hundred and sixty-six; in 1834 two thousand four hundred were sentenced to transportation for seven years; in 1838 under nineteen hundred. There was a proportionate increase in the sentences of minor punishments. The number sentenced to terms of imprisonment or to summary punishment was eleven thousand five hundred in 1834; it was thirteen thousand in 1838. The percentage of criminals unable to read and write was, in 1840, 33.32 for England and Wales. The proportion of criminals unable to read and write was seven per cent more in the agricultural counties than in the manufacturing and mixed counties.

It was found, upon an average of five years, 1838 to 1842, that more than one third of those committed for trial at the assizes were under twenty years of age. The records of summary convictions exhibited a frightful amount of juvenile delinquency. It was estimated that in London thirty thousand of those who have been called the Arabs of civilization, depending from day to day on the uncertain support of mendicancy and plunder, were under sixteen years of age. There was a district lying near Westminster Abbey, called "The Devil's Acre," where depravity was universal; where professional beggars were fitted out with all their appliances of imposture; where there was an agency office for the hire of children to be carried about by forlorn widows and deserted wives to move the compassion of street-giving benevolence; where young pickpockets were duly trained in the art and mystery which was to conduct them in due course to an expensive voyage for the good of their country. A Scotch gardener, Andrew Walker, attempted to weed the Devil's Acre, and in 1839 set up a school in a stable for reclaiming and instructing the wretched children who swarmed around him. This was the beginning of "Ragged Schools" in London. In that year died John Pounds, the Portsmouth cobbler, who for many years had been rescuing poor children in a similar way, in the populous town where he earned a scanty living. In the course of his benevolent career he had been the gratuitous instructor of five hundred children, who without him would have swelled the numbers of the criminal population. When the queen came to the throne there was not a ragged school in London, Liverpool, Manchester, or Birmingham. Bristol was the first great town in which such an institution was organized. Aberdeen led the way in Scotland, to attempt the abatement of juvenile delinquency by the establishment of industrial schools.

In that sermon upon the accession of Victoria with whose prophetic aspirations we concluded our last chapter, the preacher, taking a short view of the duties which devolved upon the young queen—what ideas she ought to form of her duties, and in what points she should endeavor to place the glories of her reign—says, "First and foremost, I think the new queen should bend her mind to the very serious consideration of educating the people. Of the importance of this I think no reasonable doubt can exist. It does not in its effects keep pace with the exaggerated expectations of its injudicious advocates, but it presents the best chance of national improvement."

A quarter of a century is past since these words were uttered. The necessity that was first and foremost in the thought of the sagacious divine and the especial application of his words can only be adequately measured and properly understood by referring to the fact that up to the period of the accession of Queen Victoria the government had scarcely considered it a part of its duty to interfere with the course of private benevolence in rendering assistance to the general education of the people. In 1834, however, Lord Althorp, then chancellor of the exchequer, had proposed a vote of 20,000*l.* for assisting in building school-houses. This sum was to be placed at the disposal of the treasury; but the government was to take the recommendations of the National Society and of the British or Lancasterian Society in its appropriation. Grants of nearly similar amount were made by parliament in 1835, 1836, and 1837. During those four years a sum, double to that contributed by parliament, had been supplied by the private funds of individuals toward the erection of schools. The same private funds, in addition to the old endowed charities, had been deemed sufficient to carry on the great work of rescuing the people out of the thick darkness in which too many of them were groping their way through life. In February, 1839, the government first constituted a board of education, consisting of five privy councillors, with the president of the council as the head of the board. It was proposed that the distribution of the votes of parliament for the promotion of education should be confided to this board, which was especially charged with the formation of normal schools. In June of that year a vote of 30,000*l.* was proposed by the government, and was only carried by a majority of two in the House of Commons. After a debate of three days two hundred and seventy-three members voted an amendment to the ministerial proposition, praying the queen to revoke the order in council by which the board of education had been appointed. An address of the same character was carried by a large majority in the House of Lords. But the government, with a firmness for which every poor child born in the reign of Queen Victoria has cause to be grateful, persevered in its plan.

We have thus anticipated the regular course of our notice of parliamentary proceedings that we may proceed to the last, but not the least important, point of our estimate of the social condition of the great body of the people at the accession of the queen. In the debate of June, 1839, Mr. Wyse, one of the lords of the treasury, who, as member for Waterford, had during several sessions labored with

† "Quarterly Review," April, 1862, p. 285.

unwearied diligence to rouse the House of Commons to sanction even the faintest beginnings of a national system of education, boldly maintained that, instead of standing the highest in rank in point of civilization, this country might be regarded as being almost the lowest in comparison with other European nations, in the general diffusion of knowledge among the people. He instanced the evils which were constantly experienced of want of education in the elements of science, in matters of every-day life, and in the general pursuits of industry. The farmers were almost wholly ignorant of agriculture as a science; the greater number of them kept indifferent accounts, and many of them none. They were jealous of their laborers, discouraged the education of their children, and made no attempts to improve their social condition. In the towns the gross ignorance of all sanitary arrangements prevented any desire for the improvement of the condition of the lower classes being made available. The people, whether of town or country, whether in the wynds of Glasgow or the cultivated fields of Norfolk, were equally incapacitated by the want of education from rising above the misery and degradation of their social condition. Calculating that there were three million of children in England to be supplied with instruction, half of whom were left in a state of complete ignorance, he maintained that through the effects of this ignorance there were large masses of the population either actually in the commission of crime or preparing for it. Most truly did he say that the inattention of the upper classes led to the dislocation of the lower classes from them, and they were thus often induced to adopt Chartism and infidelity. The religious education as given in this country was not sufficient.* As an especial illustration of this remark, Mr. Wyse referred to an extraordinary occurrence in 1838, when a band of fanatics near Canterbury manifested an amount of ignorance which appeared rather to belong to the superstitions of barbarous countries than to the England of the nineteenth century. We reserve the relation of this outbreak of the grossest ignorance for our next chapter.

Popular education had been making progress in England since 1818.† Taking the public and private schools, it appears as to day schools that while in 1818 there was a scholar for every 17.25 persons, in 1833 there was a scholar for every 11.27 persons. As to Sunday-schools it appears that while in 1818 there was one Sunday scholar for every 24.40 persons, in 1833 there was one scholar for every 9.28 persons. The day scholars in 1833 had more than doubled those of 1818; the Sunday scholars were three times as many. Between 1811 and 1841 there had been above thirteen thousand schools established, of which five thousand four hundred were public schools, and eight thousand seven hundred private schools. ‡ The increase of public schools in the period between 1831 and 1841 had been equal to the total increase in the three decennial periods from 1801 to 1831. The increase from 1831 to 1841, in the numbers of schools where the children of the laboring classes could be taught in the schools to which the state had begun to lend a grudging assistance, had slowly proceeded, amid the disputes of the advocates and the opponents of popular education in the abstract, and of churchmen and dissenters, who, essentially differing as to the religious elements in the instruction of the poor, resisted the interference of the state at all. The increase of schools eight or ten years before the accession of the queen had produced very little visible effect upon those growing into young men and women. In 1838, upon a comparison of statistical returns in some agricultural and manufacturing districts, the conclusion was come to that, speaking roughly, it might be safely asserted that less than one half of the adult population of England could write and that less than three fourths could read. §

If we were to attempt to pass from the condition of the poor and lowly to any minute view of the condition of the rich and powerful, we should necessarily be in the region of vague generalities instead of having our course marked out by trustworthy statistics. We must therefore conclude this imperfect notice of the social condition of the kingdom by a few remarks, having reference to all classes, derived from the observations of others rather than from our own impressions.

An Englishman whom circumstances had compelled to relinquish the fashionable society of the regency for a residence in Paris, returns to London in 1841. He finds the great capital very much altered, and in some respects, such as the buildings and parks, considerably improved. The change of society, he says, has become very apparent within the last few years. "It was called, and perhaps justly, in my time, dissipated; but the leaders were men of sense and talent, with polished manners and generally high-minded feelings." * One of the most distinguished of Frenchmen comes as ambassador to England in 1840, and regarding with a philosophical intelligence both the great and the humble, he thus contrasts the past with the present. Looking back to the end of the eighteenth century, he says that there were at that time, even in the elevated classes of English society, many remains of gross and disorderly manners. Precisely because England had been for centuries a country of liberty, the most opposite results of that liberty had been developed in startling contrasts. A puritan severity was maintained side by side with the corruption of the courts of Charles II. and the first Georges; habits almost barbarous kept their hold in the midst of the progress of civilization; the splendor of power and of riches had not banished from the higher social regions the excesses of a vulgar intemperance; even the elevation of ideas and the supremacy of talent did not always carry with them delicacy of taste, for the Sheridan who had been electrifying parliament by his eloquence might the same night have been picked up drunk in the streets. This picture of M. Guizot is not an overcolored one. The union of dissipation with sense and talent and high-minded feelings was not absolutely necessary to the existence of the better qualities. M. Guizot goes on to say, "It is in our time that these shocking incongruities in the state of manners in England have vanished, and that English society has become as polished as it is free—where gross habits are constrained to be hidden or to be reformed—and where civilization is day by day showing itself more general and more harmonious." Two conditions of progress, he continues, which rarely go together, have been developed and attained during half a century in England: the laws of morality have been strengthened, and manners have at the same time become softer, less inclined to violent excesses, more elegant. "Steam," says Mr. Raikes, "has here dissolved the exclusive system, and seems to have substituted the love of wealth for both the love of amusement and of social distinction." There is some truth in this; but the moralist will have no difficulty in making his choice between a profligate exclusive society and one less brilliant, perhaps less educated, where wealth and learning and refinement are more diffused. Mr. Raikes tells us of gaming clubs, the members of which died early, often by their own hands; and how those who survived often looked back to the life at the fashionable club as the source of their embarrassments.† He tells us of frequent duels, which formerly ended more fatally than when he returned to England. Duelling was not banished then; it was not ridiculed and despised, as it is now. As long as manners were "gross and disorderly," duelling was inevitable; it was almost necessary. The eminent writer and statesman, whose testimony to the social condition of England we are glad to quote, says that the double progress of a stricter morality and a refinement of manners was not confined to the higher and middle classes, but was very apparent among the bulk of the people. "The domestic life, laborious and regular, extends its empire over these classes. They comprehend, they seek, they enjoy more honest and more delicate pleasures than brutal quarrels or drunkenness. The amelioration is certainly very incomplete. Gross passions and disorderly habits are always fermenting in the bosom of obscure and idle misery; and in London, Manchester, or Glasgow there are ample materials for the most hideous descriptions. But take it all in all, civilization and liberty have in England, during the course of the nineteenth century, turned to the profit of good rather than of evil. Religious faith, Christian charity, philanthropic benevolence, the intelligent and indefatigable activity of the higher classes, and good sense spread among all classes, have battled, and now battle effectually, against the vices of society and the evil inclinations of human nature. When one has lived some time in England one feels to be in an atmosphere cold but healthy, where the moral and social health is stronger than the moral and social maladies, although these abound

* Hansard, vol. xlviii. cols. 529 to 538.
† See *ante*, p. 1174.
‡ See Education Report, Census 1851, pp. xix. xx.
§ "Penny Magazine," vol. vii. p. 324.

* Raikes's "Diary," vol. iv. p. 181.
† "Diary," vol. iii. p. 85.

there." * Such impressions of English society are written under the date of 1840. The sentence "when one has lived some time in England" seems to carry us to the time when M. Guizot found a home among us. But, at any rate, in 1840 that change was beginning, which it is one of the greatest glories of the reign to have seen steadily advancing—a better understanding between rich and poor, high and lowly, of their relative duties—something far safer and happier than arrogant assumption or haughty indifference—than envious discontent or grovelling servility—in their habitual intercourse.

CHAPTER CCXXXI.

Separation of Hanover from Great Britain—Departure of the King of Hanover—The queen meets the parliament—Dissolution—Ministry at the queen's accession—The new parliament—Canada—Insurrection in Canada—Lord Durham appointed lord high commissioner—Resigns his office—His report—Coronation of the queen—Prorogation—Review of the session—Canterbury fanatics—Career of John Thom—Proclaims himself the Messiah at Boughton—The three days' march of his deluded followers—Neglect of education in the district—The tragedy of Bosenden Wood—Meeting of parliament—Chartism—Condition of the laboring classes—Jamaica—Resignation of the ministry—Failure in the attempt to form a new administration—The Bedchamber question—Disloyal Tories—Chartist riots—Insurrection at Newport—John Frost and others tried for high treason.

From the hour that the crown of these kingdoms devolved upon Queen Victoria dates a change which was a real blessing in the relations of the sovereign to the continent of Europe. Hanover was at that instant wholly separated from Great Britain. By the law of that country a female could not reign except in default of heirs male in the royal family. But in addition to the great advantage of separating the policy of England wholly from the intrigues and complications of a petty German state, it was an immediate happiness that the most hated and in some respects the most dangerous man in these islands was removed to a sphere where his political system might be worked out with less danger to the good of society than among a people where his influence was associated with the grossest follies of Toryism and the darkest designs of Orangeism. On the 24th of June the Duke of Cumberland, now become Ernest Augustus, King of Hanover, left London. On the 28th he made a solemn entrance into the capital of his states, and at once exhibited to his new subjects his character and disposition by refusing to receive a deputation of the Chambers, who came to offer him their homage and their congratulations. By a proclamation of the 5th of July he announced his intention to abolish the representative constitution, which he had previously refused to recognize by the customary oath. We shall have little further occasion to notice the course of this worst disciple of the old school of intolerance and irresponsible government, and we may therefore at once state that he succeeded in depriving Hanover of the forms of freedom under which she had begun to live, ejected from their offices and banished some of the ablest professors of the University of Göttingen, who had ventured to think that letters would flourish best in a free soil, and reached the height of his ambition in becoming the representative of whatever in sovereign power was most repugnant to the spirit of the age.

The funeral of William the Fourth had taken place at Windsor on the 9th of July. On the 17th the queen went in state to parliament. The chronicles of the time are eloquent in their descriptions of the enthusiasm with which her majesty was received, and of the extraordinary concourse of ladies of rank in the House of Lords to do honor to the rare occasion of the presence there of the third female sovereign who had thus met the lords and commons assembled in parliament. In the speech from the throne her majesty stated that among the useful measures which parliament had brought to maturity she regarded with peculiar interest the amendment of the Criminal Code and the reduction of the number of capital punishments. She hailed this mitigation of the severity of the law as an auspicious commencement of her reign. "It will be my care," she said, "to strengthen our institutions, civil and ecclesiastical, by discreet improvement wherever improvement is required, and to do all in my power to compose and allay animosity and discord." These were not words of course. They were the key-note of that harmony which, during the progress of a quarter of a century, has superseded in a great degree the harsh discords which had too long distinguished the contests of parties and of principles. The parliament was prorogued, and was dissolved the same evening.

The ministry which Queen Victoria found at her accession * was one whose general character was in harmony with the opinions in which she had been educated. Viscount Melbourne, the first lord of the treasury, was at her hand to guide and assist her in the discharge of the technical business of her great office. The daily duties of the sovereign are of no light nature. Many of the complicated details of the various departments of the state must pass under the eye of the constitutional monarch for approval, and a vast number of documents can only receive their validity from the signature of the sovereign. During the elections, which were over early in August, the party contests assumed a tone not entirely constitutional; for the adherents of the ministry alleged to their constituents that in supporting them they were exhibiting their loyalty to the queen, while the adverse party maintained that her majesty had only passively adopted that administration of her uncle which she found established. But amid these fluctuating demonstrations of political management there was one feeling predominant, which was certainly favorable to the duration of the ministry—that of a deep and growing attachment to the person of the young sovereign. Never was there a more enthusiastic demonstration of popular feeling than when, on the 9th of November, the queen went in state to the city to dine with the lord mayor at Guildhall. In less than a fortnight after the gorgeous banquet and the universal excitement of a general holiday in London, the real business commenced which was to test the position of the government. On the 15th of November the new parliament met. Mr. Abercrombie was re-elected speaker without opposition. On the 20th the queen in person opened the new parliament. The most important paragraph in her majesty's speech was, "I recommend to your serious consideration the state of the province of Lower Canada." At the opening of the last parliament of King William the Fourth a similar expression of solicitude as to the condition of Canada is found in the king's speech. We shall endeavor to trace as briefly as possible how the discontents which existed at the beginning of 1837 broke out into open insurrection at the end of that year, and how they were finally allayed.

In the House of Commons on the 6th of March, 1837, Lord John Russell brought forward a series of resolutions which declared that since the 31st of October, 1832, no provision had been made by the legislature of the province of Lower Canada for defraying the charges of the administration of justice, and for the support of the civil government within the province; that for four years the payments in arrear had amounted to a large sum which the House of Assembly, in answer to a recommendation of the governor, declined to discharge by a vote of supply, declaring, among other things, that it persisted in the demand of an elective legislative council, and a free exercise of its control over all the branches of the executive government. The resolutions of Lord John Russell expressed the refusal of the British legislature to accede to these demands, although it was held expedient to adopt certain improvements in the legislative council and in the executive council. These resolutions were passed by large majorities in both houses. The promulgation in Canada of the determination of the British Government was a signal for revolt. On the 22d of December the government announced in both houses of parliament that there was an open insurrection and rebellion in Lower Canada, and it was in consequence proposed that the adjournment for Christmas should be for a shorter period than originally intended. The debate on this occasion shows how completely it had become a creed of those who held strong democratic opinions that the dominion of England in America should at once be brought to a conclusion. "Great," said Sir William Molesworth, "would be the advantages of an amicable separation of the two countries." The civil war which Sir William Molesworth considered almost inevitable would, he believed, involve this country in a contest with the United States of America. A passage in the philosophical baronet's speech

* Guizot, "Mêmoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps," tome v. 1862.

* See List, p. 1191.

is worth considering, although a quarter of a century has passed over since its utterance: "How powerful soever the central government of the United States may be when it goes along with the wishes of the people, it is most feeble when the people are opposed or indifferent to its commands, or when one or more of the sovereign states are desirous of evading its decrees. It is exactly in a case like this that the central government of that republic is weakest; for how anxious soever it may be from general views of policy to prevent all interference in the affairs of Canada—all hostilities with this country—yet its people will see in this struggle but a repetition of their own glorious struggle for independence; they will behold in the conduct of England toward Canada the sequel of those despotic and unjust principles which a little more than half a century ago caused them to shake off our yoke."* The ultimate consequence of this temporary estrangement of the popular party in Canada from the Imperial Government was the establishment of a better system of policy. This change had been strenuously advocated by colonial reformers, who contended that all which was needed to preserve our colonies was "a clear demarcation of their rights from ours, a full exemption from all control in the matters which solely regarded them, with a supervision only on the part of the empire in matters strictly of imperial concernment." This view, it is added, "may be said to have rendered Canada loyal." †

Between the adjournment and the reassembling of parliament important events had taken place in Canada. On the 14th of December the rebels were defeated at St. Eustace, their leaders saving themselves by flight. On the 29th of December the United States steamboat Caroline, which was laden with arms and ammunition for the insurgents, was attacked and burnt on the territories of the United States. This act was committed under the orders of the governor, Sir Francis Head. It produced a long controversy between the two governments, and was justified by the necessity of defending the British territory, which had been assaulted from the American side. The President of the United States subsequently forbade the attacks of the citizens of the republic on neighboring states. On the 5th of January, 1838, the insurgents, headed by Dr. Mackenzie, surrounded Toronto, but were repulsed by Sir Francis Head. Such was the course of the insurrection, when, on the 22d of January, in the House of Commons, Lord John Russell moved for leave to bring in a bill by which, for a certain time, the calling of an assembly in Lower Canada, which was a duty incumbent on the governor for the time being, might be suspended, and authority be given to meet the present emergency, and to provide for the future government of the province. He thought with respect to the principal question on which the alleged grievances of the Canadians were based, a satisfactory adjustment might, in the course of time, be arrived at. He proposed that a high functionary should be sent out, who should be conversant with matters of administration, with the most important affairs which are from time to time brought before parliament, as well as with the affairs of the various states of Europe, and, moreover, that it should be implied by his nomination that he was favorable to popular feelings and popular rights. He then announced that her majesty had been pleased to intrust the conduct of this affair, with the high powers implied in the appointment, to the Earl of Durham, who had accepted the office. Lord Durham, in his place in the House of Lords, stated that he did not go to Canada for the purpose of suspending the constitution, but in the endeavor to provide for the extraordinary state of circumstances produced by the rebellious part of the Canadian community, that would render it impossible for the constitution to continue in operation. "I go," he said, "not for the purpose of exercising that power, that species of discreditable power, as the noble and learned lord [Brougham] calls it, which is to be vested in me; but in the first place to restore, I trust, the supremacy of the law, and next to be the humble instrument of conferring upon the British North American provinces such a free and liberal constitution as shall place them on the same scale of independence as the rest of the possessions of Great Britain." ‡

Lord Durham landed at Quebec on the 29th of May, 1838. The history of the administration of Canada by her majesty's high commissioner furnishes a remarkable proof of how great and salutary changes may be effected in the government of a great dependency, by the union of firmness and conciliation, and by the application of liberal political principles in the place of a continued system of coercion and tutelage. Lord Durham had at his side an adviser, a person of eminent ability and with large views of statesmanship—Mr. Charles Buller. All went well for a few months. The rebellion was dying out. The French population had given up their notion of being supported by the borderers of the United States, and were conciliated by seeing that no difference was to be made between British and French subjects. A general amnesty was published, and measures were taken for inquiring into the feasibility of a plan for constituting a federal union of the British North American provinces. The measure which Lord Durham pursued with regard to the disposal of the rebel prisoners was successful in the colony, but obnoxious to many of influence in the legislature of Great Britain. By an ordinance of the 28th of June it was declared that eight rebel leaders in the jail of Montreal who had acknowledged their guilt should be transported to Bermuda; that sixteen other rebel leaders who were named had fled, and that if any of either class should return without permission and be found in the province, they should suffer death. On the 7th of August Lord Brougham made a strong attack upon what he described as the "appalling fact of fourteen persons, and M. Papineau making fifteen, being adjudged to suffer death, if they appeared in Canada, not one of those individuals having been previously tried. Such a proceeding was contrary to every principle of justice, and was opposed to the genius and spirit of English law, which humanely supposed every accused party to be innocent until he was proved to be guilty."* On the 10th of August Lord Melbourne announced that her majesty's government had counselled the disallowance of the ordinance. When Lord Durham received the news of this censure of his administration he resolved to resign his great office; and on the 9th of October he issued a proclamation, according to the terms of the Indemnity Act which Lord Brougham had proposed and carried, which proclamation was a humiliating abrogation of the ordinance of the 28th of June. Lord Durham at the same time published a document in which he justified the policy pursued by him since his arrival in Canada, and announced his determination of resigning his government. He did not wait to obtain leave for his return. This was a grave error. He arrived home in a state of wretched health, produced by the irritation of a proud and sensitive nature working upon a feeble constitution. The censure implied in the abrogation of the ordinance of Lord Durham was a severe measure toward a man whose great hope was to have secured the allegiance and prosperity of Canada by a system of high policy which was utterly opposed to the old methods of colonial government. Great lawyers at home differed as to the legality of the course which he pursued. The eloquence of Lord Brougham in denouncing it as an illegal act of despotic authority met with supporters among those who hated Lord Durham's liberal policy. He came home a broken-hearted man; and his career, which might otherwise have been so glorious, terminated in his death in 1840, but not without the noble satisfaction he derived from establishing his policy in his counsels to his successor, Mr. Poulett Thompson. During the voyage home his report on the affairs of British North America, which is attributed to the pen of his friend Mr. Charles Buller, was in great part prepared. It is a most able view, not only of the particular circumstances of the provinces which were placed under Lord Durham's government, but generally of colonial administration. A passage in the conclusion of this report is now of higher interest than the occurrences to which it had a special reference. "The experiment of keeping colonies and governing them well ought at least to have a trial ere we abandon forever the vast dominion which might supply the wants of our surplus population, and raise up millions of fresh consumers of our manufactures and producers of a supply for our wants. The warmest admirers and the strongest opponents of republican institutions admit or assert that the amazing prosperity of the United States is less owing to their form of government than to the unlimited supply of fertile land, which maintains succeeding generations in an undiminishing affluence of fertile soil. A region as large and as fertile is open to your majesty's subjects in your maj-

* Hansard, vol. xxxix. col. 1465.
† "Secularia," by Samuel Lucas, M.A., p. 265.
‡ Hansard, vol. xl. col. 243.

* Hansard, vol. xliv. col. 1022.

esty's American dominions." At that time emigration from the United Kingdom was upon a very limited scale. The vast resources of Australia were yet undeveloped. In 1837 the emigrants to the North American colonies were about 30,000, and to the United States 36,000; to the Australian colonies and New Zealand the number was only 5000. In 1838 the emigration to America was reduced to one fourth of the amount of the previous year, while that to Australia was trebled. From 1815 to 1838 the annual average of emigrants to all places during the 24 years was 38,376. From 1839 to 1852, when what is termed the Irish Exodus was in full operation, and the gold discoveries had been made in Australia, the annual average during the 14 years was 181,612. The realization of the great triumph of science in accomplishing the passage by steam power alone across the Atlantic offered new facilities for emigration. The first vessels which solved this problem were the Sirius and the Great Western; the one having accomplished the voyage to New York in twenty days, the other in sixteen days. We may conclude this rapid notice of the affairs of our American colonies by stating that, after a series of defeats in November, especially one on the 17th near Prescott in Upper Canada, the insurrection was wholly suppressed. In 1840 an act was passed for the union of the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada as one province, under one legislative council and one assembly.

The coronation of the queen at Westminster Abbey took place on the 28th of June. The splendors which had attended the coronation of George the Fourth were to some extent dispensed with. There was no solemn procession of the estates of the realm. There was no banquet in Westminster Hall, with its accompanying feudal services. But there was a gorgeous cavalcade which more than realized the pomp of ancient times, when the king came "from the Tower of London to his palace at Westminster through the midst of the city, mounted on a horse, handsomely habited, and bareheaded, in the sight of all the people." Charles the Second was the last king who thus went to his coronation in procession from the Tower. Queen Victoria went from Buckingham Palace through the line of streets from Hyde Park Corner, where the houses were not hung with tapestry, as of old, but where galleries and scaffolding were raised throughout the line, and the windows were filled with ladies whose enthusiasm was as hearty as that to which Elizabeth bowed. Never were the streets more crowded. Never were the cheers of an enormous multitude—swelled, it is said, by two hundred thousand persons from the country—more deafening than when the queen passed along; the last of a cavalcade in which, next to herself, the persons most greeted by the popular voice were the Duke of Wellington and his old opponent Marshal Soult, who came as a special ambassador on this occasion. The day was remarkable, not only for the entire absence of accidents, but for the wonderful forbearance of that class who are most usually active on public occasions; there being only seven persons brought to the police stations for picking pockets. The day was observed throughout the kingdom as a general holiday, with public dinners, feasts to the poor, and brilliant illuminations. On this occasion, when the attachment of the people to their young queen was so universally manifested, some might recollect an eloquent passage of a speech made by Lord Brougham in the House of Lords six months before, in which he qualified his opposition to some of the details of the Civil List: "Not any one among you all can rejoice more sincerely than I have done in the enthusiasm of affection which has burst from all her subjects, to greet the accession of the reigning monarch. They have generously let expectation usurp the place of gratitude. They have taken counsel with hope, rather than experience. For as memory scatters her sweets with a cold and churlish hand, it has been found more pleasing to array the object of the general love in the attire of fancy; and as fervent a devotion has been kindled toward the yet untried ruler, as could have glowed in her people's bosom after the longest and most glorious reign, in which she should have only lived and only governed for the country's good; by some chronic miracle escaping all error and all failure, and only showering down blessings upon mankind. I heartily rejoice in this enthusiasm, and I do not complain of it as premature. I rejoice in it because it must prove delightful to the royal object of it. I rejoice still more because I know that it will stimulate the queen to live for her country, in order to earn the affections which have already been bestowed, and justify the opinion which has been formed, and is so fondly cherished upon trust. But most chiefly do I rejoice, because it extinguishes forever all apprehensions of the English people's loyalty and trustworthiness; puts to shame all who would represent them as disaffected toward monarchical institutions; demonstrates the safety of intrusting them with an ample measure of political rights; and teaches to statesmen this great practical lesson, that the more we extirpate abuse from our system, the more searching we make our reforms, the more we endear the constitution to the people by making them feel its benefits—the safer will be the just rights of the monarch who is its head, and the stronger will be the allegiance of the subject who cheerfully obeys." *

Parliament was prorogued by the queen in person on the 16th of August. The chief measures which had occupied the discussions in both houses were the settlement of the civil list and the state of Canada. Other measures, which provoked less conflict, were not less important. In his review of the measures of the session the speaker emphatically dwelt upon the provision made for the destitute in Ireland. He said that no measure like the introduction of a poor law into a country circumstanced as Ireland is with respect to the number and condition of its population, could be proposed without incurring heavy responsibility; but that looking at what had been done on this subject by former parliaments with respect to England, they had thought that the time was come when they might legislate for Ireland with safety and with a reasonable prospect of success. The Irish Poor Law Statute was in great degree founded upon three comprehensive reports of Mr. Nicholls. The speaker expressed a hope that the execution of that most important law would be watched over and guided by the same prudent and impartial spirit which governed the deliberations which led to its enactment. It was felt by every one conversant with the subject, that no better prospect could be afforded of the probable realization of this hope than the immediate determination of the government that Mr. Nicholls should proceed to Ireland for the purpose of carrying the new law into operation, which he had, in great part, planned, basing it upon the most searching inquiry and the most careful consideration. Among the other important measures of the session were a mitigation of the law of imprisonment for debt, the abridgment of the power of holding benefices in plurality, and the abolition of composition for tithes in Ireland, substituting rent-charges payable by those who had a perpetual interest in the land. In his address to her majesty the speaker adverted to "the improving opinions and increasing knowledge of the educated classes of the community." He probably considered that the time was distant when there would be "improving opinions and increasing knowledge" among the bulk of the population who could scarcely be recognized as "educated classes." A circumstance which occurred during this session furnished a sufficient proof of the necessity for exertion before the labors of parliament to maintain respect for our laws and institutions by salutary amendments should be generally appreciated.

A month before the coronation of the queen, that manifestation of popular ignorance took place in Kent to which we alluded in our last chapter. The reports of the parliamentary discussions upon the subject at the beginning of June in that year are under the head of "Canterbury Fanatics." The debates to which these occurrences gave rise were little more than personal and party squabbles; except in the argument of Mr. Hume that such an exhibition of brutal ignorance, in a district within fifty miles of London, where the people were surrounded by country gentlemen of great wealth, and where there was a large body of clergy, presented an occasion for endeavoring to arouse the government to the absolute necessity of a comprehensive system of education for the people.† Little as the attention of parliament was aroused by the proceedings of a band of Kentish fanatics, the notice of foreign countries was painfully directed toward this contradiction of our boasted advance in civilization as an event almost inconceivable in the nineteenth century.‡

About the beginning of the year 1832 a stranger made his appear-

* "Speeches of Henry Lord Brougham," vol. iv. p. 337.

† Hansard, vol. xliii. col. 547.

‡ See "Annuaire Historique" for 1838, p. 487. This most extraordinary episode in the history of the first year of the reign of Queen Victoria appearing to us as something more important than a mere outbreak of local fanaticism, we thought it our duty to ascertain by personal inquiry if any elucidation of these events could be obtained from witnesses still living in the district where they occurred.

ance at Canterbury who attracted a good deal of notice by his commanding figure and handsome features. He represented himself as a Jew, which character was in some degree supported by his ample beard at a time when such an ornament was not common among Englishmen. He gradually put forth pretensions of superior sanctity, and mysteriously intimated that he had a mission to fufil of no common nature. Devotees soon surrounded him, not wholly of the lowest and most ignorant class, but comprising a few having wealth and respectable position. Parliament was prorogued in August of that year, after the passing of the Reform Bill, and the electors of Canterbury began to look out for proper persons to represent their opinions, whether reforming or conservative. The handsome Jew had then become Sir William Courtenay, the expectant heir of great estates, and a Knight of Malta. There were two candidates for the suffrages of the citizens in the ministerial interest—the Hon. Richard Watson and Viscount Fordwich. Two conservative baronets came forward to oppose them, but quickly withdrew. No other candidate of known character appearing in the field, a knot of citizens calling themselves conservatives put forward Sir William Courtenay. He came on the hustings in a velvet coat, "like a mountebank," said some irreverent newspapers. He was proposed and seconded at the election by two conservative tradesmen; members of the liberal professions, and even a clergyman of the Church of England, all of conservative politics, voted for him;* and the adventurer, who was manifestly an impostor or a madman, actually obtained three hundred and seventy-eight votes. Such was the undiscriminating violence of party feelings at the crisis of our great constitutional reform. Defeated in the object of his ambition, he retired to Herne Bay, which was then more distinguished as a resort of smugglers than as a fashionable watering-place. In some affray between the coast-guard and a band of these free-traders, Sir William Courtenay came forward as a witness, subjected himself by his evidence to an indictment for perjury, and, having been convicted under his proper name of John Nicholls Thom, was sentenced to a term of imprisonment. He underwent some portion of the penalty of the law until his extravagances rendered it necessary to transfer his safe keeping from the county prison to the county lunatic asylum. In the fourth year of Thom's confinement—namely, in August, 1837—his father and mother-in-law presented themselves to Lord John Russell, the home secretary, who was residing at Endsleigh in Devonshire, to express their deep distress at the continued confinement of their son; stating that they had been told by his keepers that there was no danger likely to arise from his liberation; promising that the utmost care should be taken of him by themselves; and affirming that he had sufficient property to pay for any expense attending upon such care.† Upon these assurances Lord John Russell, in his official capacity, took measures for obtaining Thom's release; and having recommended that a pardon should be granted in the case of the prisoner, which was equivalent to an order for his discharge, he was taken away from the asylum in October by some person not accustomed to the treatment of lunatics. The visiting justices had not opposed this discharge. During the winter of 1837 and the spring of 1838 the unfortunate man, who had been described by the medical superintendent of the asylum simply as a lunatic fancying himself a knight, and having a right to an estate and to a castle, was living in farm-houses and cottages in a rural district between Canterbury and Faversham, and there acquired a most extraordinary influence over the deluded people among whom he dwelt. From the subsequent parliamentary proceedings connected with this case, it appeared that Thom had been engaged in extensive mercantile transactions in Cornwall, had left Truro for Liverpool in May, 1832, for the purpose of selling a quantity of malt, and, after having written a sane and affectionate letter to his wife, had never returned to his home with the money derived from this sale, and had passed entirely out of the notice of his family while he was pursuing the high destinies of Sir William Courtenay.

On the pleasant high-road to London, about six miles from Canterbury, is the village of Boughton-under-Blean. On the right of the road before reaching Boughton is an extensive wood called Bosenden. The parish of Herne Hill on the north adjoins Boughton, as does Dunkirkville, a populous non-parochial place, on the south. Boughton Church is a mile from the village. The hamlets of Goodnestone, Graveney, and Selling lie at short distances around. No district can present a more thoroughly English character of quiet beauty. Broad meadows, rich corn and clover lands, hawthorn hedges bursting into blossom, scattered cottages with pretty gardens, farm-houses with apple and cherry orchards—the scene altogether, such as we beheld it on a morning of May, seemed of all others the most ill suited for such a tragedy as had been here witnessed on a similar May morning. The winter of 1837–8 was one of extraordinary severity. The spring was cold and raw. The price of wheat was steadily rising. The laborers were suffering through the inclement season, and both farmers and laborers were complaining of the operation of the new poor law which compelled the employer to pay wages to his laborers instead of sending them to the poor-rates, and which refused relief to the able-bodied except under the workhouse test. Sir William Courtenay, as he was still called, went about among the discontented of both classes, to proclaim himself a great social reformer. He told the laborers that all laws were made for their oppression, and that their greatest enemy was the new poor law. He told the farmers that they were oppressed by their landlords, and that the time would come when they should live upon the land without paying rent. On such matters his harangues on the village green or around the blacksmith's shop were not essentially different from what Mr. Fielden, the member for Oldham, and his friends Mr. Feargus O'Connor and the Rev. J. R. Stephens, were telling the people at Manchester at this very time, calling upon them to shed the last drop of their blood rather than submit to that law of devils which had filled the country with poor law bastilles, which were intended to be a chain of barracks to be garrisoned by the military and by Russell's Rural Police.* But Courtenay had far more powerful means of arousing the ignorant than those possessed by the common demagogues who afflicted the land in the first decade of the reign of Victoria. He told them that not only was his worldly rank so great that he was to sit on her majesty's right hand on the approaching day of the coronation, but that he was really the Messiah; that no harm could befall him whatever force came forth against him; that if he anointed them with oil and gave them the sacrament no bullet could touch them; but that if they disobeyed his commands he should rain fire and brimstone upon them and then call them to judgment. At the entrance of Boughton village there is a little public-house, the Woodman's Hall. In a room of that house the frantic impostor used to perform his impious rites. The old landlord, with whom we conversed, did not like to acknowledge his share in this fanaticism, but he was not unwilling to speak of the tall and stout man whom he had heard preach of a Sunday afternoon—"Oh! he was a fine man, and talked so grand." It was Monday morning the 28th of May when the landlord of the Woodman's Hall saw Courtenay coming over the fields from Fairbrook, a yeoman's house where he was harbored. There were many people with him whom he compelled to go on, as he threatened to shoot them if they hung back, for he had two pistols in his hand. Away they went, and four days after the old publican had heard him preach that he was the Messiah, he saw him lying dead in Bosenden Wood with many others who fell with him. "Ah, it was a sad job."

At the head of a large troop of willing or terrified followers, about a hundred in number, Courtenay sallied forth from Boughton on that morning of the 28th of May, with a flag of white and blue and the device of a rampant lion. A broken loaf was also carried upon a pole. They marched by one of the pretty by-roads to Goodnestone, near Faversham. Here some of the multitude attempted the old and ready process of redressing their wrongs by putting a lighted match to a bean-stack; but lo, it would not burn; and this was a miracle wrought by the power of him they worshipped. To Herne Hill they next proceeded, where Courtenay required that his people should be fed, and without delay their wants were supplied. Sometimes praying with the fanatics on their knees, occasionally performing some piece of imposture, such as firing at a star to bring it down, he led them into Bosenden Wood. The night was coming on, and before the people dispersed he said they should have music from heaven to attest his mission. There was method in his madness, for there was a confederate up a tree with a flute. Supper was given them at a

* Hansard, vol. xliii. cols. 1108, 1112.
† Lord John Russell's Statement, Hansard, vol. xliii. col. 1099.

* "Spectator," June 9, 1838.

farm-house, and they slept in the barns. An intelligent tradesman of middle age who lives in Boughton parish, on the road to Herne Hill, described to us the movements of Courtenay and his followers on that day. He knew most of those who believed in him and were among his train. They were not all ignorant laborers. There were small farmers among them, with some of whom Courtenay had been living, going about from house to house. They not only had confidence in his divine mission, but were assured that every man should have an estate in land, and should enjoy plenty, as well as eternal happiness. Many of the more decent people who followed him were at the present time ashamed to speak of it. There was one who was now an office-bearer in a Wesleyan congregation who would speak frankly of the circumstances, and acknowledge the folly of which he had been guilty. But the greater number of the rabble were horribly ignorant. They could not well be otherwise. At Dunkirk, with a large population, there was then no church and no clergyman. There were no national or Lancasterian schools for the children in any of the villages. The people were utterly neglected by their rich and educated neighbors. The Wesleyans had their meetings in cottages, but they had then no chapel. The statements of this sensible tailor of Boughton were perfectly in accordance with the details of the education of this district presented by Mr Wyse in parliament in 1839. Out of fifty-one families at Herne Hill, there were forty-five persons above the age of fourteen, of which number only eleven could read and write. Forty-two out of a hundred and seventeen children were at school, but they learned little, and those who had left school and could once read the New Testament could not do so now. The Sunday-schools were inefficient, as the children could never be brought to connect what they learned with their practice in life. In the ville of Dunkirk there were a hundred and thirteen children, of whom only ten could read and write, thirteen could do so a little, and the remainder not at all. Of a hundred and nineteen children in Boughton, thirty-two attended the Sunday-school, but only seven went to a school where writing was taught.* All with whom we conversed were strongly impressed with the belief that the occurrences which they deplored were wholly attributable to the neglect of education, and to the indifference of the superior clases to the welfare of their poorer neighbors. Out of evil comes good, said an honest wheelwright of Selling. After the outbreak the Dunkirk gentry built a church. The Boughton people were ashamed of what Dunkirk people did, and built a national school. Clergy and dissenters bestirred themselves, and church, chapel, and schools in a few years rose up and flourished.

With the dawn of the 29th of May the fanatics were on their march from Bosenden Wood. Along the great road they tramped for ten miles till they reached Sittingbourne—along that road where the fields on each side looked like one garden to the foreigner who travelled from Dover—along that road which exhibited such beauty to the eyes of a sanguinary republican in 1792 that he exclaimed, "Oh, what a pity, what a pity, if they set about to revolutionize this fine country!"† If the ignorant enthusiasts who followed an impious madman along that road in 1838 had gathered in any formidable numbers, there might have been scenes even worse than the days of terror in France—scenes that would have revived the memories of the Anabaptists of Münster. John Thom and John Matthias present a remarkable parallel in their fates. The baker who made himself master of Münster, and, calling himself its king, undertook with thirty followers to disperse a military force which came against him, perished with all around him at the first onset with regular soldiery. The factor of Truro, who styled himself King of Kent, stood up to do battle with a detachment of the 45th Foot regiment, who had seen a hundred fights, and he and eight of his wretched disciples fell at the first volley. The circumstances of the catastrophe may be shortly told. From Sittingbourne the rabble marched during two days through a circle of villages on the south of the great road—Newnham, Eastling, Throwley, Sheldwich, Lees, Selling. The leader prayed and preached—promised and denounced—the peasants knelt—they obtained food at yeomen's houses—they gathered more and more in numbers—farm-laborers quitted their field-work—women threw down their hoes and left the beans unweeded. The third night closed upon this mad march as they once more entered Bosenden Wood, and lay down in barns or under the leafy canopies of that spring-time. On Thursday morning, the 31st, three men appeared in the camp to search for a farmer's laborer who had been seduced from his employment to follow a man who promised that all should have plenty without work. One of these, a constable, bore a warrant to arrest the servant who had offended against the law. Thom took as effectual a method to resist intruders as did his great predecessor Cade when he hanged the clerk of Chatham—Thom instantly shot the constable. Drawing his sword, he hacked the body of his victim, and cried out to the people, "Now, am I not your Saviour?" Two of the fanatics then knelt at his feet. One of them, who still lives to repent his folly as he quickly repented it for a year in Maidstone jail, was asked by Thom whether he would follow him in the body, or go home and follow him in heart; upon which he sprang to his feet and exclaimed, "Oh, be joyful! the Saviour has accepted me. Go, go on—till I drop I'll follow thee." The murder of Mears, the constable, caused a messenger to be sent to Canterbury for military aid. A party of a hundred men immediately marched in two divisions. One division under Major Armstrong proceeded into the centre of the thick wood, about a mile and a half from the road. Here a party of fifty or sixty men made their appearance, led on by one who answered the description of the person called Courtenay. Lieutenant Bennett, with his section of the soldiers, advanced toward these men, one of whom carried a white flag. The lieutenant and the leader of the fanatics each advanced till they were within two rods of each other. Courtenay commenced running; jumped over the trunk of a tree; there was a shot; and Lieutenant Bennett fell. The soldiers screamed with horror; there was a rush upon them with bludgeons by the frantic rabble, led on by Courtenay; another man was shot by them; the command was given to the soldiers to fire; Courtenay and eight others of the rioters were killed; several were severely wounded. Those who did not fly in time were apprehended, and were subsequently tried. Three were sentenced to death, which was commuted for transportation; and six others were imprisoned for a year. The wretched cause of this bloodshed and misery, at once madman and impostor, was buried in the churchyard of Herne Hill. Not a stone marks where he lies under the green turf. But years passed over before the peasants ceased to visit that grave, firmly believing that his coming to life again would take place, although the promise he had given to the poor women who lived in the farm in the wood, that if he were killed, and she poured water on his face, he would assuredly revive, was not fulfilled.

Three hundred years before these events there was a display of fanaticism of a very different nature at Adlington, in Kent, not twenty miles from Bosenden Wood. Elizabeth Barton belonged to an age "when the pretensions to miraculous powers, which still lingered round the shrines of a thousand saints and martyrs, imposed to some extent upon the clearest understandings."* The statute by which she and five others were attainted states that she deluded by her false revelations a great multitude of the king's subjects "inclined to newfangleness." The followers of John Thom were also inclined to newfangleness, but their fanaticism was not connected with the superstitions of a perishing faith or the devices of a cunning priesthood. It was the ignorance that had no foundation of religious belief or secular knowledge; the ignorance that had not been reached by the divine or the schoolmaster; the ignorance which was a reproach to the nation, and especially discreditable to the richly endowed church under whose proudest seat of Christian instruction such a state of society had grown up. Although forming an exceptional illustration of the degrees in which knowledge had advanced during the nineteenth century, these events are yet suggestive of how much was required to be done before England should arrive at the state of social improvement which marks the greatest difference between the first year and the twenty-fifth year of the reign of Queen Victoria.

When the parliament was opened by the queen on the 5th of February, 1839, a passage in the royal speech had reference to a state of domestic affairs which presented an unhappy contrast to the universal loyalty which marked the period of the coronation. Her majesty

* Hansard, vol. xlviii. col. 538. These statistics, quoted by Mr. Wyse, were furnished from a report made to the Central Society of Education on the state of the peasantry at Boughton, Herne Hill, and the ville of Dunkirk, near Canterbury, by F. Liardet, Esq., published in 1838.

† *Ante*, vol. vii. p. 975.

* *Ante*, vol. ii. p. 256.

said: "I have observed with pain the persevering efforts which have been made in some parts of the country to excite my subjects to disobedience and resistance to the law, and to recommend dangerous and illegal practices." Chartism, which for ten subsequent years occasionally agitated the country, had then begun to take root. On the previous 12th of December a proclamation had been issued against illegal Chartist assemblies, several of which had been held, says the proclamation, "after sunset by torchlight." The persons attending these meetings were armed with guns and pikes; and demagogues, such as Feargus O'Connor and the Rev. Mr. Stephens at Bury, addressed the people in the most inflammatory language. The existence of Chartism was a painful and almost an appalling fact, of far deeper significance than the discontents of ignorant masses of the manufacturing population stirred up by unscrupulous leaders. Thinking men felt that there was something rotten in the composition of society—a gangrene that must be removed before the body-politic could be sound and healthful. The state of the laboring classes was the subject of anxious solicitude, in their want of employment or their low wages, partly arising out of the great changes produced by scientific applications to industry, at a time when an unsound commercial and fiscal policy forbade the developments of skill, under the influence of increasing capital, to be a general blessing. The evils of unrestricted competition, in its operation upon a superabundant population of artisans and factory workmen, were then very slightly mitigated by any considerate feelings of the employer for the employed. There was no sympathy—there was in most parts a jealous antagonism—between the two classes. Dr. Arnold wrote to a friend in 1839, "Men do not think of the fearful state in which we are living. If they could once be brought to notice and to appreciate the evil, I should not even yet despair that the remedy may be found and applied; even though it is the solution of the most difficult problem ever yet proposed to man's wisdom, and the greatest triumph over selfishness ever yet required of his virtue." * It was seen, however imperfectly, at that period, what a resource England, Scotland, and Ireland possessed against the evils of over-population—against the terrible competition for a bit of potato ground, or for a hand-loom, or for a seat in a tailor's pestilent garret—in all which forms of unprofitable labor there was the sweat of the brow but not the earning of the bread. These sufferings were taking place "in a world where Canadian forests stand unfelled, boundless plains and prairies unbroken with the plough; on the west and on the east, green desert spaces never yet made white with corn; and to the overcrowded little western nook of Europe, our terrestrial planet, nine tenths of it yet vacant or tenanted by nomades, is still crying, Come and till me, come and reap me!" † The eloquent expounder of the miseries of that unhappy time has a hopeful prophecy of a better future: "Is it not as if this swelling, simmering, never-resting Europe of ours stood, once more, on the verge of an expansion without parallel; struggling, struggling like a mighty tree again about to burst in the embrace of summer, and shoot forth broad frondent boughs which would fill the whole earth? A disease; but the noblest of all—as of her who is in pain and sore travail, but travails that she may be a mother, and say, Behold, there is a new man born!" ‡ It was not only the benevolent schoolmaster and the philosophic man of letters who were perplexed by the condition of the working classes. M. Guizot records that in his first intercourse with Sir Robert Peel in 1840, what struck him most of all was Sir Robert's constant and earnest solicitude with regard to the condition of the laboring classes in England. "There is," he often said, "too much suffering and too much perplexity in the condition of the working classes; it is a disgrace as well as a danger to our civilization; it is absolutely necessary to render their condition less hard and less precarious. We cannot do everything, far from it; but we can do something, and it is our duty to do all that we can." § Was Sir Robert Peel then thinking that the time might come when he should "leave a name sometimes remembered with expressions of good-will in the abodes of those whose lot it is to labor, and to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow, when they shall recruit their exhausted strength with abundant and untaxed food, the sweeter because it is no longer leavened with a sense of injustice?" *

The document called "The People's Charter," which was embodied in the form of a bill in 1838, comprised six points—universal suffrage, excluding, however, women; division of the United Kingdom into equal electoral districts; vote by ballot; annual parliaments; no property qualification for members, and a payment to every member for his legislative services. These principles so quickly recommended themselves to the working classes that in the session of 1839 the number of signatures to a petition presented to parliament was upward of a million and a quarter. The middle classes almost universally looked with extreme jealousy and apprehension upon any attempt for an extension of the franchise. The upper classes for the most part regarded the proceedings of the Chartists with a contempt which scarcely concealed their fears. This large section of the working population very soon became divided into what were called physical-force Chartists and moral-force Chartists. As a natural consequence, the principles and acts of the physical-force Chartists disgusted every supporter of order and of the rights of property, and left the whole educated community very unwilling to sanction any measure which would rectify the anomaly of which many sound-hearted and right-thinking workingmen complained—that the Reform Bill of 1832 had set up an invidious and irrational barrier against the claim of the artisan to the rights of citizenship, and had settled the question as to who was qualified to choose a representative in parliament by the arbitrary and varying test of occupying a tenement at an annual rent of ten pounds. There were many of the best men among a class rapidly growing into the ability to judge temperately and honestly on all political questions who deeply felt this exclusion, and they resented it the more when they were confounded with the physical-force slaves of the brutal demagogues that disturbed England in 1839.

At the opening of parliament it was stated in the queen's speech that in the West Indies the period fixed by law for the final and complete emancipation of the negroes had been anticipated by acts of the colonial legislatures, and that the transition from the temporary system of apprenticeship to entire freedom had taken place without any disturbance of public order and tranquillity. But although the emancipation had taken place without any excesses on the part of those who had now become free men, responsible only to the laws, the planters in Jamaica were in a state of moody discontent at the altered relations between the capitalist and the laborer, and they testified their displeasure by opposition, often frivolous and always stubborn, to the desire of the imperial government to protect the negroes from cruelties and oppressions. Local legislation came to a stand. Lord Melbourne and his colleagues determined to adopt a strong measure, by proposing to parliament a suspension of the constitution of Jamaica for five years, during which period the affairs of the colony would be administered by a provisional government. A motion to this effect was brought forward on the 9th of April by Mr. Labouchere. It was a great occasion for a trial of the strength of parties. Counsel were heard at the bar of the House of Commons against the bill, and it was not till the 6th of May that the parliamentary discussions on this subject were brought to a close by a division in which two hundred and ninety-four voted with the ministry, and two hundred and eighty-nine against them. This slender majority showed upon how frail a foundation rested the tenure of office by the Melbourne ministry. On the 7th of May Lord John Russell announced the resignation of ministers upon the ground of not having such support and such confidence in the House of Commons as would enable them efficiently to carry on the public business. Upon the resignation of her servants the queen had consulted the Duke of Wellington, who recommended that Sir Robert Peel should be sent for. The attempt to form a new administration failed, and Lord Melbourne and his colleagues returned to power in a week. On the 13th Sir Robert Peel, having received her majesty's permission to explain the circumstances under which he had relinquished the attempt to form an administration, made that explanation in the House of Commons. The queen's most ingenuous truthfulness was conspicuous in these negotiations. Her majesty at once asked Sir Robert Peel whether he

* "Life," vol. ii. p. 164.
† Carlyle, "Chartism," p. 112.
‡ Ibid., pp. 112, 113.
§ Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 83.

* Sir R. Peel's speech on the resignation of ministers, June 29, 1846.

was willing to undertake the duty of forming an administration, at the same time telling him that it was with great regret that she parted with the administration which had just resigned. The next day Sir Robert submitted to her majesty the names of those he proposed to associate with him. No objection was raised as to the persons who were to compose the ministry or to the principles on which it was to be conducted. But a difficulty suggested itself to the minds of Sir Robert and his friends. He again waited upon the queen to state to her majesty the necessity of making some change in the appointment of ladies to fill the great offices of her household. Her majesty consulted her ministers, and on the 10th wrote the following note: "The queen, having considered the proposal made to her yesterday by Sir Robert Peel, to remove the ladies of her bedchamber, cannot consent to adopt a course which she conceives to be contrary to usage, and which is repugnant to her feelings." Sir Robert, it seems, took an especial objection that the wife of Lord Normanby, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and the sister of Lord Morpeth, the chief secretary, were in the closest attendance upon the queen. He and his party had wholly disapproved the policy of conciliation which was advocated by the Irish administration, and they thus objected to the continued position about the royal person of the Marchioness of Normanby and the Duchess of Sutherland. Upon the abstract constitutional question it is now generally felt that Sir Robert Peel was right. Immediately after he had declared his inability to form an administration unless the ladies of the bedchamber were removed, the ministry recorded their opinion in a cabinet minute that they held it "reasonable that the great offices of the court, and situations in the household held by members of parliament, should be included in the political arrangements made in a change of the administration; but they are not of opinion that a similar principle should be applied or extended to the offices held by ladies in her majesty's household." The cabinet had precedents to support their view. Lady Sunderland and Lady Rialton had remained in the bedchamber of Queen Anne for a year and a half after the dismissal of their husbands from office, and it was the uniform practice that the ladies of the household of every queen consort should be retained on changes of administration, notwithstanding their relationship to men engaged in political life.

The discussions in and out of parliament which arose upon this question were protracted and violent. The people generally were inclined to think that an attempt had been made to treat the queen with harshness by removing from her presence ladies who had become her personal friends—ladies exemplary in their private lives, and whose accomplishments shed a grace over the court of a female sovereign. Meetings were held in various parts of the country to express approbation of her majesty's conduct. These were no doubt to some extent meetings influenced by political considerations; but the sentiments there expressed were consonant with the general opinion that the queen was worthy of the most respectful sympathy with her actions and feelings. It is painful to relate that from this period was manifested, on the part of some who, disdaining the name of conservatives, clung to the extremest Tory opinions, a virulence that did not even exempt from their personal attacks the conduct and character of the sovereign. To those of the present day who have not traced the course of politics in the early part of the queen's reign it would seem impossible to believe that a member of parliament, at a public dinner at Canterbury, should have designated the sovereign who has secured to an unparalleled extent the love and veneration of her subjects, as one who thought that if the monarchy lasted her time it was enough; that this party firebrand should have been cheered when he talked of the abdication of James the Second as a precedent not to be forgotten. It would seem impossible to imagine that the colonel and officers of a regiment should have brought themselves under the censure of the commander-in-chief for having sat at a conservative dinner, at Ashton-under-Lyne, to listen to "expressions most insulting and disrespectful toward the queen."* Mr. Macaulay—who, in May, 1839, had been returned as member for Edinburgh, upon the elevation of Mr. Abercrombie to the peerage, when he retired from the office of speaker—thus expressed himself on the first night of the session in 1840, in burning words that must have been bitterer to some than the contempt of good and quiet subjects: "A change has come over the spirit of a part, I hope not the larger part, of the Tory body. It was once the glory of the Tories that, through all changes of fortune, they were animated by a steady and fervent loyalty which made even error respectable, and gave to what might otherwise have been called servility something of the manliness and nobleness of freedom. A great Tory poet, whose eminent services to the cause of monarchy had been ill requited by an ungrateful court, boasted that

> 'Loyalty is still the same,
> Whether it win or lose the game;
> True as the dial to the sun,
> Although it be not shined upon.'

Toryism has now changed its character. We have lived to see a monster of a faction made up of the worst parts of the Cavalier and the worst parts of the Roundhead. We have lived to see a race of disloyal Tories. We have lived to see Tories giving themselves the airs of those insolent pikemen who puffed out their tobacco-smoke in the face of Charles the First. We have lived to see Tories who, because they were not allowed to grind the people after the fashion of Strafford, turn round and revile the sovereign in the style of Hugh Peters. I say, therefore, that, while the leader is still what he was eleven years ago, when his moderation alienated his intemperate followers, his followers are more intemperate than ever."*

Let us contemplate this violence of the fierce and unscrupulous partisans who professed to serve under the leadership of Sir Robert Peel, but who were most indignant that his great measure of Catholic emancipation was attended with some practical results—let us view these Tory agitators going about the country proclaiming that the poor laws were a system of wholesale murder, that children were tortured in factories for the amusement of the mill-owners, and that the corn laws were the only restraint upon the power of the manufacturers to oppress their work-people—and then let us ask ourselves how the country could have been full of this madness and folly without inducing the physical force Chartists to believe that their time for action was at hand. The first serious demonstration of this revolutionary spirit was made at Birmingham in a series of outbreaks and contests between the police, the military, and the mob, which lasted from the 4th to the 15th of July. There were smashing of windows and street-lamps; bonfires made of goods pillaged from warehouses; houses burned down. The community of this thriving seat of manufactures where workmen had ample wages and could afford to be ten pound householders, was kept in terror till the riots were put down by the necessary employment of the military under judicious regulation. There were the same demonstrations at Sheffield, with the disposition too common in that place to think lightly of secret murder. The most violent outbreak took place later in the year. At Newport, in Monmouthshire, there was a magistrate of the borough, named John Frost, who in the previous February had used violent language at a public meeting at Pontypool. Lord John Russell was greatly blamed for treating this insolent demagogue with some leniency, and for not at once removing him from his position as a magistrate. In a few months, however, he earned his degradation by new violence. During the summer and autumn he was organizing an insurrection in the country near Newport, where there was a large population engaged in labors connected with the mineral wealth of the district. The attorney-general, on the trial for high treason in which this Chartist organization ended, described the country as, in a great degree, wild and mountainous, abounding in every part with mines of coal and iron, of late years worked to a considerable extent. In a district, he said, where fifty years before there were scarcely any inhabitants, save the scattered huts of a few shepherds and mountaineers, there was then a dense population, amounting to upward of forty thousand. Those who know the wonderful country from which the Usk and the Taff, assisted by railroads running into the hearts of the mountains, bring their rich freights to Newport and Cardiff, will comprehend how those towns alone now comprise more than fifty thousand inhabitants. It was arranged by the insurgents that on the night of Sunday, the 3d of November, three divisions from various points were to march upon Newport and take possession of the town while the inhabitants were asleep. The weather was such as to prevent the completion of these arrangements. The

* See Annual Register (then a vehicle of conservative politics), 1839, pp. 311, 312.

* Macaulay's "Speeches," p. 201.

divisions from Nant-y-Glo and Pontypool did not join their leader at the time appointed, but after waiting till daylight he marched into the town with five or six thousand followers about ten o'clock. The Mayor, Mr. Phillips, was very imperfectly prepared for resistance to this rabble, who came into the town five abreast, armed with guns, bludgeons, pikes, and pickaxes. Mr. Phillips, with his party of special constables and about thirty soldiers, had taken his position in the West Gate Inn, which stands in the market-place. The insurgents moved up to the door of the inn and called upon those within to surrender. The demand was of course refused. A volley from the street was then discharged against the bow-window of the room. The wooden pillars of the porch still show by bullet-holes the sort of conflict that here took place. Almost at the instant of the first street-firing, the rioters broke open the door of the inn and poured into the house. There would have been a massacre of the civil and military guardians of the peace had not the officer in command given orders to fire as the Chartists were rushing down thepassage. A volley soon put to flight the terrified assailants. The mayor distinguished himself by the gallantry which befits an English gentleman. He, with Lieutenant Gray and Sergeant Daley, fearlessly opened each one of the three shutters of the window that looked upon the street. A shower of slugs was immediately poured in upon them, and Mr. Phillips and several others were wounded; but the construction of the window enabled the military to pour a raking fire upon the mob, who soon fled in all directions. The soldiers then made a sortie and effectually cleared the streets. Frost and two other of the leaders, Zephaniah Williams and William Jones, were quickly apprehended. On the 1st of January they were tried at Newport, under a special commission, before that able and constitutional judge, Sir Nicholas Tindal. They were each found guilty of high treason, and received the capital sentence, which was finally commuted to transportation for life. Within the last few years the chief delinquent has been allowed to return. Sir Thomas Phillips was knighted by her majesty, and was received at court with signal honor.

CHAPTER CCXXXII.

The system of penny postage first comes into operation—Mr. Rowland Hill—Opposition to the proposed change—Postage stamps—Marriage of the queen to Prince Albert of Saxe Coburg—Privilege of parliament—Stockdale *v.* Hansard—Attempt upon the queen's life—Prorogation—Affairs of the Levant—Treaty of alliance—Exclusion of France—Prince Napoleon lands near Boulogne—Failure of his attempt to produce an insurrection—Differences of England and France on the affairs of the East—War threatened—M. Thiers and Lord Palmerston—Naval successes against Mehemet Ali—Interment at Paris of the remains of Napoleon—Session of parliament—The anti-corn-law league—Declarations of the ministry on questions of free trade—Debates on the sugar duties—Ministers defeated on the question of the sugar duties—Meeting of new parliament—Amendment to the address carried—Resignation of ministers.

On the morning of the 10th of January, 1840, the people of the United Kingdom rose in the possession of a new power—the power of sending by the post a letter not weighing more than half an ounce upon the prepayment of one penny, and this without any regard to the distance which the letter had to travel.* At this time, when the system of a universal penny postage has been in operation two-and-twenty years—when the number of letters transmitted by the post has increased from 76 millions in 1839 to 593 millions in 1861, an increase of 680 per cent—it is more interesting to look back upon the difficulties of achieving such a result than to trace the gradual success which in a few years put an end to all opposition to a system so pregnant with national advantage. To the sagacity and the perseverance of one man, the author of this system, the high praise is due, not so much that he triumphed over the petty jealousies and selfish fears of the post-office authorities, but that he established his own convictions against the doubts of some of the ablest and most conscientious leaders of public opinion. The government adopted his views reluctantly, strengthened in their hesitation by such a clear-headed supporter of the government as Sydney Smith. Temperate opposers of the government, such as the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, saw great danger and little good in the project. Mr. Rowland Hill, in 1837 published his plan of a cheap and uniform postage. A committee of the House of Commons was appointed in 1837, which continued its inquiries throughout the session of 1838, and arrived at the conviction that "the mode recommended of charging and collecting postage, in a pamphlet published by Mr. Rowland Hill," was feasible, and deserving of a trial under legislative sanction. The committee examined a great number of mercantile and other authorities, the questions and answers contained in their report amounting to nearly twelve thousand. There were necessarily strong differences of opinion among the witnesses, many even of the most favorable to a reduction to a uniform rate considering that a penny postage was too low. Lord Ashburton, although an advocate of post-office reform, held that the reduction to a penny would wholly destroy the revenue. Lord Lowther, the postmaster-general, thought twopence the smallest rate that would cover the expenses. Colonel Maberly, the secretary to the post-office, considered Mr. Hill's plan a most preposterous one, and maintained that if the rates were to be reduced to a penny the revenue would not recover itself for forty or fifty years. The committee, after a long struggle between its members, negatived both a penny and a three-halfpenny rate as inadequate, and finally recommended the adoption of a twopenny rate. Public opinion, however, had been brought so strongly to bear in favor of a penny rate, that the chancellor of the exchequer, Mr. Spring Rice, on the 5th of July, 1839, proposed a resolution, "That it is expedient to reduce the postage on letters to one uniform rate of a penny postage, according to a certain amount of weight to be determined—that the parliamentary privilege of franking should be abolished, and that official franking be strictly limited—the house pledging itself to make good any deficiency that may occur in the revenue from such reduction of the postage." A bill was accordingly passed to this effect in the House of Commons, its operation being limited in its duration to one year, and the treasury retaining the power of fixing the rates at first, although the ultimate reduction was to be to one penny. This experimental measure reduced all rates above fourpence to that sum, leaving those below fourpence unaltered. With this complication of charge the experiment could not have a fair trial, and accordingly, on the 10th of January, 1840, the uniform half-ounce rate became by order of the treasury one penny. The final accomplishment of this great reform presented a signal example of the force of public opinion when brought to bear upon a subject unconnected with party feelings, and the demonstration of whose necessity had been established not by passionate appeals for public support and sympathy, but by patient investigation and conclusive reasoning. This was the high merit of the man who conceived the scheme of post-office reform; and the manifest earnestness of his character and the invincibility of his logic mainly conduced to establish those convictions in the public mind which eventually settled all doubts. Lord Melbourne, in moving the second reading of the bill, assigned as a conclusive answer to the question, how he could venture to tamper with so large a sum as that derivable from the post-office revenue, that "there was such a general demand from all classes of the community for a measure of this nature, that it was a very difficult matter to withstand it."* In 1840 the number of letters sent through the post had more than doubled, and the legislature had little hesitation in making the act of 1839 permanent, instead of its duration being limited to the year which would expire in October. A stamped envelope, printed upon a peculiar paper, and bearing an elaborate design, was originally chosen as the mode of rendering prepayment convenient to the sender of a letter. A simpler plan soon superseded this attempt to enlist the fine arts in a plain business operation. The plan of prepaying letters by affixing a stamp bearing the head of the ruler of the country came into use here in May, 1840. The habit of prepayment by postage stamps has now become so universal throughout the world that in 1861 the system was established in eighty different countries or colonies; and there were between six and seven hundred varieties of stamp known to the post-office authorities. Even in the Sandwich Islands the postage stamp was in use.†

On the 16th of January parliament was opened by the queen in

* *Ante*, p. 1227.

* Hansard, vol. xlix. col. 1214.

† Report of the postmaster-general, 1862.

person. The first paragraph of her majesty's speech contained an announcement which had been previously made to the privy council. "Since you were last assembled, I have declared my intention of allying myself in marriage with the Prince Albert of Saxe Coburg and Gotha. I humbly implore that the Divine blessing may prosper this union and render it conducive to the interests of my people as well as to my own domestic happiness, and it will be to me a source of the most lively satisfaction to find the resolution I have taken approved by my parliament." The preliminary measures of the legislature for the naturalization of Prince Albert and for granting him an annuity produced some discussion—first, upon the subject of precedence, and, next, as to the amount of the annual sum to be granted. The one question was settled by omitting from the bill of naturalization all mention of precedence; the other by a reduction of the ministerial proposition of an annuity of 50,000*l.* to one of 30,000*l.* The distresses of the country fully justified the decision of the majority who supported the grant of a smaller sum. The good sense of the queen and of Prince Albert prevented the slightest expression of discontent at the vote of the House of Commons, which was carried by the union of the conservative party with those generally classed among radicals. The marriage took place on the 10th of February, and it was welcomed with general festivities throughout the country. There was a welcome of a higher kind from those who knew something of the character and acquirements of the young prince; from those who were aware that he had received a public education at the University of Bonn, and that his abilities were as conspicuous as his total freedom from all desire to find "a royal road to learning." But the people generally rejoiced in this union because it was understood to be one of affection, and which gave that earnest of domestic happiness which offered a solid foundation for the discharge of public duty. The modest answer of Prince Albert to the congratulatory messages of the houses of parliament evidently expressed the feelings of one who was careful to weigh the words which he uttered. To the Marquess of Lansdowne and other peers who had attended upon his royal highness with the congratulations of the Peers, he said, "I return to the House of Lords my warmest thanks for the message which you have now delivered. I learn with lively satisfaction their approbation of the choice which her majesty has made, and it will be the study of my life to justify the favorable opinion which you have now expressed."

There was a subject which occupied the attention of parliament during this session which excited considerable public interest at the time, but which must be dismissed by us as briefly as possible. It was the question of privilege of parliament. In 1837 the privilege of the House of Commons came into conflict with the jurisdiction of the law courts. There had been similar conflicts in earlier times, and the opinions of great lawyers were by no means settled as to the powers of courts of law in matters of privilege. The words of the Bill of Rights would appear to have settled that "debates and proceedings in parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of parliament." But since the revolution there had been several occasions in which there was a clashing of jurisdictions. The House of Commons was probably taken by surprise when, in the case of Stockdale against Hansard—which was an action for libel against the printer of the House of Commons, contained in a report of the inspector of prisons, published by order of that house—Lord Chief Justice Denman declared that the fact of the House of Commons having directed Messrs. Hansard to publish all their parliamentary reports was no justification for them, or for any bookseller who publishes a parliamentary report containing a libel against any man. A committee of parliament was then appointed to inquire into this question. The house resolved that the publication of its reports was essential to the constitutional functions of parliament; that the House of Commons has a sole and exclusive jurisdiction to determine upon its privileges; and that for any court or tribunal to assume to decide upon matters of privilege inconsistent with the determination of either house is a breach and contempt of the privileges of parliament. Stockdale was defeated upon the first trial. He commenced a second action, when the Queen's Bench again decided against the privileges of the house. Upon a third action, which was undefended, Messrs. Hansard were instructed by the House of Commons not to plead; judgment consequently went by default; and the damages were assessed in the sheriff's court at six hundred pounds. Then ensued a contest between the house and the sheriffs. As in all cases in which personal interests are held to be arbitrarily attacked, the sheriffs had a large amount of public sympathy when they as well as Stockdale were committed to the custody of the sergeant-at-arms. The sheriffs were kept in close custody for having refused to obey the order of the house for restoring the money which they had levied upon Hansard, holding that they were bound by their duty to the Court of Queen's Bench to refuse their obedience to the order. There were other actions arising out of these vexatious proceedings; but the main question was finally settled by the passing of an act, which received the royal assent on the 14th of April, 1840, by which proceedings, criminal or civil, against persons for publication of papers printed by order of either house of parliament, were to be stayed by the courts, upon delivery of a certificate and affidavit to the effect that such publication was by order of parliament. Mr. May has very clearly stated the necessity for this measure, which was one of compromise. "No course was open to the Commons befitting their high jurisdiction and dignity, by which the obedience of courts and plaintiffs could be insured: their power of commitment was at once impotent and oppressive; yet they could not suffer their authority to be wholly defied and contemned. Hence their proceedings were inevitably marked by hesitation and inconsistency. In a case for which the constitution has made no provision, even the wisdom of Sir Robert Peel and the solid learning of Mr. Sergeant Wilde were unequal to devise expedients less open to objection." *

The houses of parliament were proceeding in due course in the discussion of various important matters—such as a rupture with China, the reform of the municipal institutions of Ireland, measures for further carrying into effect the reports of the ecclesiastical commissioners, and the corn laws—when they were startled by a circumstance which produced a similar amount of alarm and indignation throughout the kingdom. As the queen, with Prince Albert, was riding up Constitution Hill in an open carriage, a pistol was fired at them, and in about half a minute there was a discharge of a second pistol. Neither of the royal couple were injured, and they both preserved remarkable presence of mind. Lord John Russell, in moving the next day for a joint address with the House of Lords to congratulate her majesty on her escape, stated that the queen, immediately after the attempt, proceeded to the house of her mother to relieve her mind under the anxiety in which she might have been thrown by exaggerated reports; and that on her return her majesty showed herself in her usual manner to her subjects, affording a proof at once of her safety and of the kindness and fortitude of her character.† The youth, named Oxford, who had committed this atrocious crime was a barman at a public-house. He was tried at the Old Bailey on the 9th of July. Witnesses were produced to prove that he was insane. Dr. Connolly held that he was of unsound mind. Dr. Chowne considered the doing a criminal act without a motive was a proof to some extent of an unsound mind—what was called moral insanity. Chief Justice Denman cautioned the jury against the dangerous doctrine that the commission of a great crime without an apparent motive was in itself proof of insanity. Sir Benjamin Brodie has written some sensible remarks upon the acquittal of the boy Oxford upon the ground of moral insanity. We give these remarks of an eminent physiologist because juries are too often embarrassed by opinions and arguments which, if taken without great qualification, would have the effect of impairing the safer belief that every person not absolutely a lunatic is responsible for his actions: "It seems to me that juries have not unfrequently been misled by the refinements of medical witnesses, who, having adopted the theory of a purely moral insanity, have applied that term to cases to which the term insanity ought not to be applied at all. It is true that the difference in the character of individuals may frequently be traced to difference in their organization, and to different conditions as to bodily health; and that, therefore, one person has more and another has less difficulty in controlling his temper and regulating his conduct. But we have all our duties to perform, and one of the most important of these is, that we should strive against whatever evil tendency there may be in us arising out of our physical constitution. Even if we admit (which I do not admit in reality) that the impulse which led

* "Constitutional History," vol. i. p. 454.
† Hansard, vol. liv. col. 1047.

Oxford to the commission of his crime was at the time irresistible, still the question remains whether, when the notion of it first haunted him, he might not have kept it under his control, and thus prevented himself from passing into that state of mind which was beyond his control afterward. If I have been rightly informed, Oxford was himself of this opinion; as he said, when another attempt had been made to take away the life of the queen, "that if he himself had been hanged, this would not have happened." *

Parliament was prorogued by the queen on the 11th of August. The royal speech touched upon some important points in the foreign relations of the country. Her majesty congratulated the parliament upon the termination of the civil war in Spain, the objects for which the quadruple engagements of 1834 had been contracted having been accomplished. Differences with the government of Naples had been put into a train of adjustment by the mediation of France. Her majesty was "engaged, in concert with the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, the Emperor of Russia, and the sultan, in measures intended to effect the permanent pacification of the Levant, to maintain the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire, and thereby to afford additional security for the peace of Europe."

The events which had rendered the intervention of the European powers necessary for the pacification of the Levant were these: Mehemet Ali, the Pasha of Egypt, had in 1831 invaded Syria, in a war which he waged against the Pasha of Damascus. Egypt and Syria were both integral parts of the Ottoman dominions, and Mehemet Ali was bound to yield obedience to the command of the sultan. He refused to withdraw his troops from Syria; and in 1832 the Sultan Mahmoud and his powerful viceroy were at open war. The Turkish government was saved from utter ruin by the aid of its most formidable enemy, Russia. But the victories of Mehemet Ali had secured for him the possession of Syria, yet only as a vassal of the Porte. A war between the sultan and his viceroy was prevented for six years by the mediation of England, France, and Russia. But in 1839 the sultan could no longer endure the ambition of his great vassal, who evidently designed to subject all Arabia to his sway; and Mahmoud sent an army across the Euphrates to recover Syria. A signal victory of Mehemet Ali preceded the death of Mahmoud on the 1st of July, 1839. His successor, Abd-ul-Mejid, was only in his sixteenth year. The Pasha of Egypt was encouraged in his resistance by the youth and apparent weakness of the new sultan, who was surrounded by treacherous officers. The influence of Mehemet Ali was so powerful at Constantinople that the Capitan Pasha (high admiral) took the Turkish fleet through the Dardanelles to Alexandria and delivered it over to the sultan's rebellious viceroy. The strong will and propitious fortune of Mehemet Ali seemed to threaten the dissolution of the Turkish Empire. The European powers tendered their mediation, which the sultan accepted. He offered Mehemet Ali the hereditary sovereignty of Egypt instead of remaining a vassal, but the ambitious pasha required to have Syria as well. France, although formally bound by a treaty of 1839 to act in co-operation with England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, had her own policy as to a settlement of the Syrian question, and declined entering into the views of the other four powers. Lord Palmerston resolved to conclude a treaty for the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire without the co-operation of France. The treaty of alliance to which allusion was made in the queen's speech was signed at London on the 15th of July, 1840.

The exclusion of France from the European alliance was very nearly precipitating us into a war with the government of Louis Philippe. M. Thiers, then president of the council, evinced no desire to calm that passionate agitation which burst out in France in the belief that the nation had been insulted. The Duke of Wellington, with his usual strong sense, rightly interpreted the disposition of the people and of the government of this kingdom. In a private letter of the 5th of October he thus expressed himself: "God send that we may preserve peace between these two great countries, and for the world! I am certain that there is no desire in this country on the part of any party, I may almost say of any influential individual, to quarrel with, much less to do anything offensive toward France. But if we should be under the necessity of going to war, you will witness the most extraordinary exertions ever made by this or any country, in order to carry the same on with vigor, however undesirable we may think it to enter into it." * Upon the conduct of Lord Palmerston, then secretary of state for foreign affairs, there was some diversity of opinion at home. Even members of the cabinet were not wholly in accord with his policy, and many of the public held that he was rash and obstinate. His policy was signally triumphant. Although the cry of the Parisians for a few months was, "Guerre aux Anglais," the French government found that their country was not in a condition to go to war, and that the popular cry for hostilities had some association with revolutionary tendencies. After the lapse of twenty-one years, M. Guizot has published his "Memoirs" of that stirring time when he was ambassador in England. His intelligent and candid revelations may present to those who are curious to trace the movements and counter-movements of two such adroit players in the great game of politics as M. Thiers and Lord Palmerston, a juster view of the causes of this temporary interruption of the friendly feelings between the two governments and of the policy of the British minister for foreign affairs than they could otherwise derive from the contemporary expressions of opinion either in England or in France.

The resolutions of the four powers upon which the treaty of the 15th of July was founded had become known in London on the 23d. At the anniversary of the 28th of July, when sixty thousand men were under arms in Paris, the popular desire for war was shown in the most marked manner. M. Guizot was perplexed by the contrast of the uneasiness of Lord Melbourne and Lord John Russell with the decided language of Lord Palmerston. In answer to the ambassador's dispatches, M. Thiers had only one word to reply, "*Tenez ferme*," † but the warlike minister invited him to a meeting with the king and himself at the Château d'Eu on the 7th of August. Guizot left London for this interview on the 6th. While he was crossing the Channel to Calais another person was crossing the Channel to Boulogne, to be the hero of what was then described as "a wild attempt to excite civil war, made by a maniac of the Bonaparte family." ‡ The maniac of 1840 became the emperor of 1852.

On the 7th of July the French frigate La Belle Poule, commanded by the Prince de Joinville, had sailed for the purpose of receiving at St. Helena, and transporting to France, the remains of the Emperor Napoleon. To this somewhat strange request of the government of Louis Philippe made by M. Guizot the English cabinet accorded its consent, Lord Palmerston giving a courteous reply to the demand, while he was unable to conceal a passing smile. At this time Prince Louis Napoleon was residing at Carlton Gardens, in London, and M. Guizot had been required to keep an eye on his movements. The ambassador described the refugee as being constantly in the park; as frequently also at the opera, where aides-de-camp stood behind him in his box. In public they were bragging and ostentatious. Their private life was idle and obscure. In spite of their tall talk M. Guizot thought there was little of reality in their boastful projects. The French foreign office, however, believed that some attempt would be made by this party of Bonapartists, although their action would be confined to a very narrow circle.

On the 4th of August a steam-packet, the City of Edinburgh, which had been hired as for a party of pleasure, left the port of London, bearing Prince Louis Napoleon, Count Montholon, and about forty officers and attendants. Arms and ammunition, military uniforms, horses and carriages, and a large quantity of specie, had been previously taken on board, with a tame eagle that the prince had taught to feed out of his hand. The steam-packet dropped down the river, took a French pilot on board at Gravesend, and made for the French coast, where it arrived on the evening of the 5th. Between two and three miles to the north of Boulogne is the miserable village of Wimereux, around which, in 1803, a camp was formed of a portion of the grand army for the invasion of England. The country here is barren, and a few hovels lie between the sand-hills on the shore. Here, at the mouth of a petty stream, Napoleon caused a port to be formed, which at the end of six months was capable of containing a hundred and seventy vessels. It is now choked up and altogether decayed. Here, then, surrounded by associations with

* Brodie's "Psychological Inquiries," 3d edition, p. 98.

* Raikes's "Private Correspondence with the Duke of Wellington," etc., p. 156. † Guizot, "Mémoires," tome v. p. 255.
‡ "Spectator," August 8.

the memory of the great emperor—in the harbor which his army had dug out of the sands, and in view of the column which they had raised to his glory—the nephew landed with his followers at four o'clock on the morning of the 6th. Those of military rank had exchanged their ordinary dress for the uniform then worn by French officers. The invading band, who had been joined from Boulogne by a young lieutenant of the 42d, named Aladenise, and three soldiers, marched toward the town, bearing a tricolored flag surmounted by an eagle. There were few persons about at that hour except two or three officers of the customs, who were compelled to march with them. Upon arriving at the guard-house in the Place d'Anton, an attempt to seduce the soldiers failed, and the party marched to the Quai de la Caserne. The barrack there, now given up to peaceful purposes as a vast storehouse, was occupied by the 42d regiment. The officers slept out of the barrack, and had not arrived at five o'clock when Lieutenant Aladenise called up the soldiers, ordering them to take their arms and march with the nephew of the emperor to Paris; Louis Philippe, he told them, had ceased to reign. The proposed march was, however, interrupted by the arrival of Captain Puygelier and two other officers. To the splendid offers that were made to the captain and his companions they turned a deaf ear. The captain was as unmoved by the threats of some of his men as by the promises of the adventurers. To the shouts of *Vive le Prince Louis* he replied *Vive le Roi*. A scuffle ensued, when a shot was fired from a pistol which Louis Napoleon had in his hand, by which a grenadier was wounded. The prince was not absolutely charged with a murderous intention in thus discharging his pistol, but it was implied that this part of the affair was an accident, or at least unpremeditated. Immediately after this the barrack-yard was cleared of the intruders, and they marched to the Haute Ville, distributing proclamations and throwing about money. They fancied they could seize arms in the old château for the purpose of arming the population, but their course was stopped by the sub-prefect of Boulogne, who, in the name of the king, commanded them to disperse. He was answered by a blow on the head with the eagle which one of the officers carried. They tried to force the door of the château. During this time the rappel had called out the National Guard, who marched out toward Wimereux, to do battle with a large force which they were told had landed there. It was now six o'clock. Failing in the attempt to force the château, unsupported by any portion of the population, there was nothing left to the adventurers but flight to the place of their debarkation. With a mad movement of defiance they marched on the Calais road, and then stopped at the Napoleon column, instead of proceeding over the hill to Wimereux. The first stone of the column had been laid by Marshal Soult in 1804. Left unfinished under the empire, it had been proceeded with under Louis XVIII., "as a monument of peace." Louis Philippe, whose doubtful policy was to revive the national appetite for glory which belonged to the memory of Napoleon, was in 1840 finishing this column. But the statue of the great emperor by which it is crowned was not placed there till 1841. The prince and his party surrounded the monument, while the eagle-bearer entered the column to plant the standard on its summit. He was left to mount the dark stairs while his leader and his companions made a hasty retreat before the large force that was now coming against them. The soldiery, commanded by Captai Puygelier, with the Nation al Guard and gendarmerie under the orders of the sub-prefect and the mayor, rendered resistance vain. Some fled into the fields. Louis Napoleon and five or six others got down to the sands to the north of the harbor. The prince threw himself into the sea and swam to a little boat. The National Guard fired upon the fugitives, of whom one man was killed and another dangerously wounded. An inhabitant of Boulogne, who had been one of the National guard in 1840, expressed to us the indignation which he felt at beholding men who were swimming for their lives being fired upon when their power of doing mischief was at an end. Louis Napoleon swam back and surrendered himself. He was taken to the dungeon of the château, where he remained two days before being conveyed to Paris.

The trial of the prince and of nineteen other conspirators took place on the 6th of October before the Chamber of Peers. Louis Napoleon maintained a bold front upon his trial. In the speech which he addressed to his judges he said, "I represent before you a principle, a cause, a defeat: the principle, it is the sovereignty of the people; the cause that of the empire; the defeat, Waterloo. The principle you have recognized; the cause you have served; the defeat you desire to avenge." He was sentenced to imprisonment for life; his companions to various terms of confinement. The prison of Louis Napoleon was the fortress of Ham in the department of Aisne. The six years of solitude which he there passed were not unprofitably employed in study. In 1846 he escaped in the dress of a workman, and again found a refuge in England. The Paris press of 1840 teemed with denunciations against the ministers of Queen Victoria, maintaining that they had encouraged the prince in his project, being angry with the government of Louis Philippe. It was asserted that Lord Palmerston had made a visit to Louis Napoleon, or had been visited by him, previous to his departure. Lord Palmerston found it necessary to assure, upon his honor, le Baron de Bourqueney, who represented the French embassy in the absence of M. Guizot, that neither he nor Lord Melbourne had seen Louis Napoleon for two years, nor any one of the adventurers who had accompanied him.*

The conferences at the Château d'Eu were soon terminated. The King of the French went to Boulogne to express his thanks to the inhabitants for their loyalty on the 6th of August. To a deputation of the English he said that affairs between France and England were taking a favorable turn. M. Guizot returned to England, and was satisfied by the cordiality of his reception by the authorities and populace of Ramsgate that the English people bore no ill will toward France. Arrived in London he found an invitation from the queen to visit her at Windsor, where he met the King and Queen of the Belgians, Lord Melbourne, and Lord Palmerston. With Leopold he had many confidential discussions, the sagacious king manifesting the strongest desire that the amicable relations between England and France should be preserved. M. Guizot says that not a word of politics passed between him and Lord Palmerston or Lord Melbourne. He was satisfied that Leopold's attempts to shake the resolution of the foreign secretary had produced no effect, that the situation was in no degree changed, and that events would follow the obscure course indicated by the treaty of the 15th of July. In a few days he had a private after-dinner talk with Lord Palmerston. One part of that conversation still preserves its interest. "Is it true, my lord," said Guizot, "that you are increasing your fleet by several vessels?" This question had reference to the Mediterranean fleet. "Yes," replied Lord Palmerston, "we will raise it to sixteen vessels—you, at this moment, have raised yours to eighteen. Moreover, you have five new ships building, which will give you a preponderance which we cannot accept." † Mr. Cobden shows that in 1840–41 the accustomed proportion of the French navy to ours underwent a great and sudden derangement, and that instead of being content with two-thirds of our force, the French navy approached almost to an equality with our own.‡ M. Thiers, a few weeks later, contempated an increase of 150,000 men to the French army, making a total of 639,000.§ It was not raised to this height, but it was greatly increased. The Duke of Wellington, at the beginning of 1841, wrote: "I very much fear the consequences of these larg armaments. It would almost appear that it was the interest of France to recommence the war in Europe." ‖ One consequence of the feeling in France that produced these armaments was the interruption to two important treaties with England. M. Guizot on the 2d of September wrote to M. Thiers: "If you conclude at the same time with England a treaty on material interests—the treaty of commerce, and a treaty on a great moral interest—the abolition of the slave trade, that will produce a great effect and a good effect upon the English public." ¶ At this period Mr. Porter, of the Board of Trade, had been sent to Paris to negotiate a commercial treaty. "I will receive Mr. Porter well," replied M. Thiers, "but it is a serious thing to consent to a treaty of commerce in our present situation. Nevertheless I comprehend the inconveniences of a refusal. . . . I must hold counsel as to the treaty about the negroes. I dread to make treaty upon

* The details of this extraordinary attempt are to be collected from the proceedings on the trial of the conspirators, given in "Annuaire Historique," 1840, p. 268 to p. 291. See also Guizot's "Mémoires," tome v. p. 258 to p. 264.

† Guizot, "M moires," tome v. p. 282.

‡ "The Three Panics," p. 5.

§ Guizot, tome v. p. 342.

‖ Raike's "Private Correspondence," p. 248.

¶ Guizot, tome v. pp. 299, 300.

treaty with folks who have done so ill by us."* We have heard Mr. Porter say that one morning Thiers dipped his pen in the ink to sign the treaty, but suddenly said that he would wait another day. When that day came Mr. Porter had been ordered to proceed no further in the business. He believed that Thiers was sincere. He farther believed, most unjustly, that Lord Palmerston was the instrument of Russia. Mr. Porter—one of the most honest and confiding of men—was in some degree under the same influence as many other persons ordinarily of calm judgment. He surrendered his judgment to a monomania which acquired a plausible shape in the hands of a man of great talent and powers of persuasion, who talked of "treason" and "Russian gold" in a way that attracted many followers. These, by their frantic denunciations of Lord Palmerston at "Urquhartite meetings," constrained even his political enemies to vindicate his personal honor.† The foreign secretary remained unmoved either by the extravagances of a feeble minority in England or the threatenings of a war-majority in France. He vindicated his policy by the promptitude of his acts.

The four powers had determined that the ports of Syria and Egypt should be declared to be in a state of blockade. Our Mediterranean fleet was under the command of Sir Robert Stopford, and his second in command was Charles John Napier. While in August Admiral Stopford was blockading the port of Alexander, Captain Napier was blockading Beyrout. On the 9th of September Admiral Stopford was before Beyrout with the English fleet and a few Turkish and Austrian vessels. On the 10th the bombardment of the town and fortress commenced, which continued till the 16th, when the Egyptian troops abandoned the place. Meanwhile Napier, who had landed with 5000 men, had routed the army of Ibrahim Pasha, and had taken Saida by storm. On the 3d of November the allied squadron commenced hostilities against the famous fortress of St. Jean d'Acre, which was considered to be almost impregnable. It was bombarded through that day. In the night the Egyptian troops quitted the town, and it was taken possession of by a party of Turks and Austrians. The bombardment of St. Jean d'Acre was remarkable as being the first occasion on which war-steamers had been employed in battle. To the rapidity of movement of four English steamers, which enabled them to take the most advantageous positions, it was in some degree owing that so strong a fortress was reduced by the cannon of ships of war in so short a time, and with scarcely any loss to the assailants. When the thanks of the House of Lords were voted to Admiral Sir Robert Stopford and to Commodore Sir Charles Napier, the Duke of Wellington stated that he considered the achievement of St. Jean d'Acre one of the greatest deeds of modern times. He thought it his duty on this occasion to warn their lordships that they must not always expect that ships, however well commanded, or however gallant their seamen might be, were capable of commonly engaging successfully with stone walls.‡ The decided naval successes led to the final submission of Mehemet Ali. The British government, with the other powers, had recommended that if he yielded in a reasonable time, gave up possession of the Turkish fleet, and evacuated Syria, Adana, Candia, and the holy cities, he should be reinstated as Pasha of Egypt, and have an hereditary tenure of his pashalic. On the 2d of December he accepted the terms proposed. The contest was at an end.

Looking at the execution of the treaty of the 15th of July, M. Guizot frankly acknowledges the errors of the policy of the French government. "We had attached to this question an exaggerated importance; we had regarded the interests of France in the Mediterranean as more associated than they really were with the fortunes of Mehemet Ali." France had, he says, believed that Mehemet Ali would have been able to resist all the efforts of the four powers united, when it was finally shown that an English squadron would be sufficient to subdue him. These errors, he continues, were public, national, everywhere spread, and maintained in the chambers as well as in the country, in the opposition as well as in the government: "The hour of disappointment was come, and it was the cabinet over which M. Thiers presided which had to bear the burden."§

Louis Philippe refused his assent to the warlike speech which M. Thiers proposed for the opening of the chambers. The ministry resigned, and Soult and Guizot were their successors.

The belligerent spirit which had been called forth in France by these differences between the English and French governments were not likely to subside into cordial friendship under the influence of a pageant which recalled the glories and the humiliations of the empire. The population of Paris had the gratification of a magnificent spectacle on the 15th of December, when the remains of Napoleon were interred in the Church of the Invalides. The procession has been described as wearing more of a triumphant than a funeral air. Long cavalcades of troops were succeeded by a few mourning coaches; grenadiers of the Old Guard and Mamelukes followed the splendid car on which was placed the body. Imperial eagles veiled with crape were carried by eighty six non-commissioned officers. Even to the sword and the hat of the emperor, which were laid upon the coffin, the whole solemnity was calculated to call up remembrances of the past which were not favorable to the security of the reigning family. There was no tumult, but there were demonstrations of popular feeling which showed that the pacific policy of the king and of his new ministry was not so welcome to the populace as M. Thiers and war with Europe.

The public interest in foreign affairs became merged in the more immediate importance of the discussions upon great subjects of domestic policy, which signalized the session of parliament opened by the queen on the 26th of January, 1841. This session will be memorable, not more for the defeat of the Whig government after ten years of power, than for the unexpected adoption of the principles of free trade by that government, after a long period of indecision, if not of hostility to any vital changes, especially in regard to the corn laws. In February, 1839, Mr. Villiers was not supported by the members of the cabinet, with the exception of Mr. Poulett Thompson, in his motion that evidence should be taken at the bar of the house on the operation of the corn laws. Lord John Russell had, however, declared to his constituents at Stroud that the time had come for a change in the corn laws, which he considered as indefensible in principle. The motion of Mr. Villiers was negatived by a majority of a hundred and eighty-one. Between the session of 1839 and that of 1841 a most effective agitation against these laws had been carried on throughout the country. Associations were established in Manchester and in other great manufacturing and commercial towns for promoting the principles of free trade, and their scattered efforts were effectually combined by the formation of the Anti-Corn-Law League. This name was adopted by a convention of three hundred delegates assembled in London at the opening of the session of 1839. Large sums were subscribed for the purpose of circulating tracts, and for engaging lecturers to enlighten public opinion upon the injurious operation of the corn laws and other laws called protective. These efforts produced necessarily strong convictions in the minds of many of the thinking part of the community. But the principle of abandoning protection for agriculture could scarcely be expected to find favor with any large portion of landlords and cultivators, who believed that a fall in prices would be the ruin of their property and the bane of their industry. The class of mechanics and factory-workers were too ready to believe the fallacy proclaimed in parliament, that a fall in the price of food would inevitably produce a lowering of the wages of labor. The Chartists always presented themselves in force at the anti-corn-law meetings, to maintain the one panacea for the distress of the country—universal suffrage. It is difficult therefore to imagine that when Lord John Russell, on the 7th of May, 1841, announced the intention of government to propose a fixed duty on the importation of foreign corn, instead of the sliding scale which was then in operation, the cabinet had come to this resolve solely with the object of obtaining some popularity that might eventually compensate them for the gradually increasing loss of their strength in parliament. The popular opinion was decidedly against them. The interests that would be affected by free trade were too deeply rooted in old habits and traditions—the benefits were too remote—to be swayed by the convictions of believers in the doctrine that legislation ought first to have regard to the general good—that of the consumers. Members of the government were necessarily open to the charge of inconsistency. Lord Melbourne, on the 3d of May, was twitted by the Duke of Buckingham that in the previous year,

* Guizot, tome v. pp. 299, 300.
† See "Quarterly Review," vol. lxvi. art. viii.
‡ Hansard, vol. lvi. col. 254.
§ "Mémoires," tome v. p. 644.

upon the motion of Earl Fitzwilliam "that it is expedient to reconsider the laws relating to the importation of foreign corn," he had opposed the motion, believing that the advantages to be gained by the change were not worth the evils of the struggle. Lord Melbourne answered this reproof by stating that the words which he used also conveyed his opinion that a time might come and circumstances might arise when this question must be taken into consideration. Those circumstances had arisen; that time in his opinion had now come when it was found necessary, in order to meet the exigencies of the country, to adopt wide and extensive financial measures. Sir Robert Peel, in Part III. of his memoirs relating to "Corn Laws, 1845–46," says that at the close of the session of 1845 "the progress of discussion had made a material change in the opinions of many persons with regard to the policy of protection to domestic agriculture, and the extent to which that policy should be carried."* He names Lord John Russell and Lord Melbourne as having adopted, as well as himself, the opinions upon this subject generally prevalent at an early period of his public life among men of all parties. It would seem, therefore, rather unjust not to give the Whig cabinet of 1841 some credit for being influenced by "the progress of discussion," instead of repeating the charge commonly made against them of having rushed into free-trade principles "to make a bid for popularity" when the agitation of the league had produced its effect upon public opinion. Little effect had been produced in 1841. What Lord John Russell proposed was not accepted by the league, which in point of fact repudiated his plan of a fixed duty, demanding an absolute freedom from all duty upon foreign corn.

The "wide and extensive financial measures" to which Lord Melbourne alluded on the 3d of May were brought forward in propositions by the chancellor of the exchequer in his budget, to raise the duty on colonial timber, reducing that on Baltic timber, and to keep the existing duty on colonial sugar, lowering the duty on foreign sugar. These propositions were really a considerable step in the direction of free trade. The proposal in reference to the sugar duties was brought forward by Lord John Russell in a committee of ways and means on the 7th of May. During eight nights was this proposal debated with all the zeal that was stimulated by the fears of West India merchants and Canadian timber merchants, and by the more influential terrors of the landed interest. All saw in this abandonment of the principle of protection a dismal future of the general ruin of domestic industry. It was expected, moreover, in this protracted debate that the result would involve the fall of the Whig government, which had prematurely and rashly espoused the free trade doctrines. A necessary consequence would be the restoration to power of the conservative party, who, it was supposed, would always hold to the principles of protection, which Toryism had never willingly relaxed even when under the pressure of the economical doctrines of Canning and Huskisson. The importance of these debates on the sugar duties has necessarily in a great measure passed away; but it is interesting to look back upon the opinions maintained by two of the most accomplished debaters of that day—Sir Robert Peel and Lord Palmerston. Sir Robert Peel maintained that if the principle of free trade announced by the government was that, without reference to any other consideration, we should go to the cheapest market, he could not concur in it. "In a country of such complicated relations as this, the rigid application of such a principle would involve us in inextricable confusion." Never, on the other hand, were free-trade principles more ably advocated than by Lord Palmerston. "We intend to supply the deficiency of the revenue by striking a blow at some of the great monopolies which have hitherto retarded the prosperity of the country. . . . The question is, whether the great springs of our national industry shall be relieved from some of those artificial obstructions which have hitherto retarded their development, or whether the sources of our national prosperity shall, for the benefit of private interests and of privileged classes, continue to be choked up. The question is between free trade (and by free trade I mean trade open to competition) on the one side and monopoly on the other. The question is between reason and prejudice: between the interests of the many and the profits of the few. . . . Protection, in the sense in which the word is used by those who now oppose the plan of the government, is a tax levied upon the industry and skill of the mass of the community to enable a few to remain indolent and unskilful. Such protection is not only erroneous in principle, but, after all, utterly useless to those for whose particular benefit it is maintained. Show me a trade that is free, by which I mean open to fair competition, and I will show you a trade carried on with intelligence, enterprise, and success." From his own official experience he adduced many examples that "protection is a game that two can play at." He showed conclusively that it was impossible that a great country like England could go on protecting, as it was called, its various interests, and that other countries should not follow its example.*

In his reply, which concluded the last night of the debate, Lord John Russell emphatically asserted the principle of a free trade in corn. The noble lord the member for North Lancashire (Lord Stanley) "had said, that the producer of corn could not depend upon his own skill and industry, but must rely upon the sunshine or the storm for the abundance or scarcity of his crop. That was true as to the producer of a particular country; he must depend upon a higher power. But the same power that directs the storm had given a remedy for any local disadvantage, for such was the bounty and benevolence of Providence that if in one country there was a bad season and a deficient crop, another was blest with a good season and an abundant harvest. It was fortunately in the power of man, by his skill and ingenuity, and the means they gave of traversing the ocean, to take advantage of the beneficence of the Creator. If that intercourse were not permitted by short-sightedness and error, do not let it be said that it was to the infliction of Heaven that a deficiency of food was to be attributed. Let the blame be laid where it was due. Let the laws be blamed which defeated the magnificent scheme by which plenty would be given to all the nations of the world, more or less depending upon each other, and keeping up a kindly and a beneficial intercourse. Let the laws be blamed which blasted the fair prospects of a nation, and inflicted the curse of sterility, barrenness, and scarcity upon a land where plenty might reign, and marred the gracious designs of Providence by unjust legislation." †

Upon the question of the sugar duties the ministers were defeated by a vote of 317 to 281. With this majority of 36 against them it was expected that there would have been an immediate resignation. The notice to quit did not expel the tenants of Downing Street. On the 27th of May Sir Robert Peel moved "that her majesty's ministers do not sufficiently possess the confidence of the House of Commons to enable them to carry through the house measures which they deem of essential importance to the public welfare; and that their continuance in office under such circumstances is at variance with the spirit of the constitution." This resolution was carried by a vote of 312 to 311. On the 7th of June Lord John Russell stated that the ministry had determined to appeal to the country. On the 22d the parliament was prorogued by the queen, and the dissolution was proclaimed the next day.

When the new parliament met on the 19th of August, 1841, it had been ascertained with tolerable accuracy that the results of the elections were wholly unfavorable to the continued existence of the ministry. What was called the conservative principle was not only triumphant over the free-trade principle boldly proclaimed at the last hour by the Whigs, but many of their former supporters, now known as the Radical party, were either distinctly hostile toward the ministry or very lukewarm in their support. The parliamentary trial of strength was close at hand. Mr. Charles Shaw Lefevre was re-elected speaker without opposition. The queen did not open the parliament in person, the speech being read by the lords commissioners. With the absolute certainty that a change of administration would very quickly ensue, some expressions in the speech from the throne must have appeared rather as the challenge to a future contest from a retreating force to an enemy about to drive it from the field, than as the measured and conciliatory language of the sovereign to those ranged in battle array on either side. The attention of parliament was in this speech called to the revision of duties affecting the productions of foreign countries. It would be for parliament to consider not only whether some of those duties were unproductive to the revenue, but were vexatious to commerce; whether, further,

* "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. ii. p. 98.

* Hansard, vol. lviii. col. 655. † Ibid., col. 666.

the principle of protection, upon which others were founded, was not carried to an extent injurious alike to the income of the state and the interests of the people. Her majesty also expressed her desire that the parliament should consider the laws which regulated trade in corn. It would be for them to determine whether those laws did not aggravate the natural fluctuations of supply, embarrass trade, derange currency, and diminish the comfort and increase the privations of the great body of the community. Lord Stanley, on a subsequent night, expressed his regret that the speech had been so framed as to be liable to misconstruction in the eyes of the country; that its recommendations appeared to be the recommendations of the crown, and not of the ministers who constitutionally advised the crown. Lord John Russell answered that he thought it was generally understood that the speech from the throne was the speech of ministers; the speech was the result of the advice of ministers, and ministers alone were responsible for it. M. Guizot shrewdly observes that with the sagacity of party spirit the adversaries of Sir Robert Peel estimated more accurately than perhaps he did himself the difficulties which awaited him. "Retiring with every possible advantage, the Whigs charged Sir Robert Peel to repair their faults and to perform their promises." *

In the House of Commons an amendment to the address was moved by Mr. Stuart Wortley, to the effect that the public expenditure having for several years exceeded the annual income, the house was convinced of the necessity of adopting measures for the purpose of remedying so great an evil; that it was the duty of the house humbly to submit to her majesty that it was essential to the satisfactory results of their deliberations in reference to the subjects to which their attention had been especially directed, and other matters of public concern, "that your majesty's government should possess the confidence of this house and of the country, and respectfully to represent to your majesty that that confidence is not reposed in the present advisers of your majesty." The debate on the address was continued four nights. The speeches by the leaders of the two parties, Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell, were necessarily the most important. Sir Robert Peel, in concluding his address, said, "If I accept office, it shall be by walking in the open light and in the direct paths of the constitution. If I exercise power, it shall be upon my conception—perhaps imperfect—perhaps mistaken—but my sincere conception of public duty. That power I will not hold unless I can hold it consistently with the maintenance of my own opinions, and that power I will relinquish the moment I am satisfied that I am not supported in the maintenance of them by the confidence of the house and of the people of this country." † The conclusion of Lord John Russell's speech was equally emphatic: "I have only to express my conviction that if this country is governed by enlarged and liberal counsels, its power and might will spread and increase, its influence will become greater and greater; that liberal principles will prevail, and civilization will be spread to all parts of the globe; that you will bless millions by your dominion and mankind by your example." ‡ On the 27th of August the house divided on Mr. Wortley's amendment, when in a house of six hundred and twenty-nine members the government was in a minority of ninety-one. In the House of Lords, where an amendment to the address, similar to that of the Commons, had been proposed by the Earl of Ripon, the majority against ministers was seventy-two. Her majesty's answer to the amended address of the House of Commons conveyed the only decision which could be made by a constitutional sovereign. "Ever anxious to listen to the advice of the parliament, I will take immediate measures for the formation of a new administration." The resignation of ministers was announced in both houses on the 30th of August.

The biographer of Sir Robert Peel has said, "Never perhaps had a first minister united at his accession so many elements and guarantees of a safe and strong government. But he was called on to perform the most difficult of tasks—a task essentially incoherent and contradictory. He was obliged to be at once a conservative and a reformer, and to carry along with him, in this double course, a majority incoherent in itself, and swayed, in reality, by immovable and untractable interests, prejudices, and passions." * Sir Robert Peel has given his own testimony to the difficulties which beset his path at the very onset of his attempts as a commercial reformer. One of his first acts was to propose to his colleagues a material change in the corn law of 1828. He had also to propose a removal of the prohibition which existed on the import of foreign cattle and meat. "These changes," he says, "although they gave little satisfaction to the most eager opponents of the corn law, and were indeed denounced by some as perfectly nugatory, were not effected without great murmuring and some open opposition to the government on the part of many of its supporters. The Duke of Buckingham resigned his seat in the cabinet rather than be a party to them, nor was it an easy matter to procure the unanimous adoption of the measures I proposed by the remaining members of the government." †

THE MINISTRY AS FORMED BY SIR ROBERT PEEL.

Cabinet.

Lord Wharncliffe	Lord President of the Council.
Lord Lyndhurst	Lord High Chancellor.
Duke of Buckingham‡	Lord Privy Seal.
Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel	First Lord of the Treasury.
Right Hon. Henry Goulburn	Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Earl of Haddington	First Lord of the Admiralty.
Right Hon. Sir James Graham, Bart	Secretary of State for the Home Department.
Earl of Aberdeen	Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Lord Stanley	Secretary of State for the Colonies.
Lord Ellenborough§	President of the Board of Control.
Earl of Ripon	President of the Board of Trade.
Right Hon. Sir Henry Hardinge	Secretary at War.
Right Hon. Sir E. Knatchbull, Bart	Paymaster-General.
Duke of Wellington	Without office.

Not of the Cabinet.

Lord Lowther	Postmaster-General.
Lord Granville Somerset	Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.
Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone	Vice-President of the Board of Trade and Master of the Mint.
Earl of Lincoln	First Commissioner of Land Revenue.
Right Hon. Sir George Murray	Master-General of the Ordnance.
Sir Frederick Pollock	Attorney-General.
Sir William Webb Follett	Solicitor-General.

Great Officers of State.

Earl of Liverpool	Lord Steward.
Earl Delawarr	Lord Chamberlain.
Earl of Jersey	Master of the Horse.

Ireland.

Earl de Grey	Lord Lieutenant.
Sir Edward Sugden	Lord High Chancellor.
Lord Eliot	Chief Secretary.

Scotland.

Right Hon. Sir William Rae, Bart	Lord Advocate.
Duncan M'Neil, Esq.	Solicitor-General.

CHAPTER CCXXXIII.

War with China and war with Afghanistan—Commercial relations with China—Beginnings of the opium war—Its moral aspects—Debates in parliament—Chusan captured—Treaty made at Canton repudiated by the emperor—Canton attacked—Arrival of Sir H. Pottinger—Capture of Chin-Kiang-Foo—Treaty of Nanking—Afghanistan—Lord Auckland, Governor-General of India—Causes of the Afghan war—British army crosses the Indus—The Bolan Pass—Siege of Ghuznee—Cabul entered in triumph—Shah Soojah restored—False security at Cabul—Afghan plots—Massacre of Burnes—The British army in peril—Massacre of MacNaghten—Capitulation of the British—The retreat from Cabul—Ladies and

* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 91.
† Hansard, vol. lix. col. 429.
‡ Ibid., col. 449.

* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 89.
† "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol ii. p. 100.
‡ His grace resigned January 31st, and was succeeded by the Duke of Buccleuch.
§ Lord Ellenborough accepted the Governor-generalship of India, and was succeeded by Lord Fitzgerald and Vesci, October 23d.

children given up—Destruction of the army—One survivor arrives at Jellalabad—Sale's defence of Jellalabad—Arrival of General Pollock—Cabul retaken—Release of the prisoners—The army returns to India—Lord Ellenborough's proclamations—Gates of Somnauth.

At this point of our domestic history it may be convenient to take a rapid view of the events connected with two distant wars in which the country was now engaged—a war with China and a war in Afghanistan. Briefly referring to the origin of each of these serious contests, we shall conduct the narrative to the period when peace was concluded with the Chinese government, and when terrible calamities in India were overcome and security was again won by the triumphs of our arms. We begin with China.

In the session of parliament which was opened on the 16th of January, 1840, it was announced, in the speech of the queen, that "events had happened in China interrupting commercial intercourse." The circumstances attending this interruption were debated in the House of Commons on the 7th, 8th, and 9th of April, upon a resolution moved by Sir James Graham, to the effect that the interruption in our commercial and friendly intercourse with China and the hostilities which had since taken place were mainly to be attributed to the want of foresight on the part of her majesty's advisers, and especially in their neglect to furnish the superintendent at Canton with powers and instructions calculated to provide against the growing evils connected with the contraband trade in opium. As the circumstances which led to this first war between Great Britain and the Chinese empire are really more important than any minute details of the events of the war, we must, as briefly as we can, relate what was the position of affairs up to the time when the discussion on Sir James Graham's motion took place.

By the new charter of the East India Company, granted in 1833, the company's monopoly of the China trade was abolished. It had probably not been sufficiently considered that serious collision with a government that had so long and so pertinaciously insisted upon the exclusion of foreigners would be the natural consequence of the position in which the trade with China was now placed. The change was calculated to inspire vague fears of aggression among those who were not unacquainted with the fact that the merchants who, not a century before, had humbly asked for permission to establish a trade in India were now the masters of that country, and that the descendants of Aurungzebe were their pensioners. The Chinese, however, had got accustomed to the East India Company, whose officers pretended to no public capacity, who came as humble merchants, and who kept up a quiet sleepy trade. In this intercourse there were occasional quarrels between the natives and the foreigners, but their traffic, whether legal or illegal, kept on its jog-trot course by the adroit management of the company's agents, who could calculate to a nicety the amount of bribery that was necessary to propitiate a Chinese official. The British legislature upset all this; abolished supercargoes, vesting their authority in king's officers instead of mercantile agents; and authorized the executive to employ a superintendent, with instructions to get into direct communication with the Chinese authorities. The number of European ships, merchants, and seamen rapidly increased. The contraband trade in opium was suddenly augmented. In the first ten years of the present century the exports of opium from India to China averaged about 2500 chests; in 1833 they exceeded 23,000 chests, having risen from 13,000 chests in the previous year; and the subsequent average of five years was about 19,000 chests.* Opium was always an article prohibited by the Chinese government, or rather by the public acts of the court of Pekin. The provincial authorities invariably nullified everything which was done by the superior power to discountenance the illicit trade, so that when the government of Pekin attempted to put down that traffic between Lin-tin and Canton, the viceroy of Canton substituted himself for the other opium smugglers, so that the whole affair bore the aspect of a juggle among the Chinese authorities. † The imperial government of China increased the severity of the law against opium smuggling, but still the smuggling went on, and especially increased on the east coast. There was a belief in 1837–8 that the trade would be legalized. A mandarin in high authority at Pekin, having sounder notions about smuggling than had prevailed in Europe with some persons, proposed that the sale of opium should be legalized, it being admitted like other goods with a duty of seven dollars a chest, while the expense of smuggling amounted to forty dollars. In a very able state paper he argued that the increased severity of the law against opium had only tended to increase the amount of the bribe paid to the official underlings for their connivance. The unfortunate mandarin was banished for his liberal advice, and the imperial government adopted more violent but less effectual measures to put down the opium trade.* There were two motives which influenced the court of Pekin. They were alarmed at the rapid drain of silver for the purchase of opium, and they had to protect the interests of native poppy-growers. Lord Palmerston quaintly said, in the debate on the 9th of April, "The fact was that this was an exportation-of-bullion question, an agricultural-interest-protection question."† The Chinese authorities were at last brought into open collision with the resident British merchants. In consequence of an attempt to strangle a Chinese opium-smuggler in front of the factories at Canton, there was an affray between the Europeans and the Chinese. Captain Elliot, the superintendent at Canton, issued a notice requiring all British-owned vessels trading in opium to leave the river within three days. But this measure did not conciliate the high commissioner from the imperial court, Lin-Tsih-Sew, who in 1839 commanded all opium in British ships, whether in the Canton River or on the coast of China, to be given up. All the foreign residents being forbidden to leave China, Captain Elliot joined his countrymen in the factories, which were surrounded by Chinese soldiers. More than twenty thousand chests of opium were delivered up and destroyed. War was now imminent. Captain Elliot applied for a naval force, and in October two English frigates were blockading Canton. These were attacked by Chinese war-junks, which were beaten off with great loss. In January, 1840, an imperial edict directed all trade with Great Britain to cease forever.

Thus commenced what has been called the Opium War. Putting aside the consideration of the treatment of this subject, as a party question—one which so nearly involved the fall of the ministry that in a house of five hundred and thirty-three members they had only a majority of nine upon Sir James Graham's motion—it is startling, after this lapse of time, to trace the very different views which its moral aspects presented. The combatants were fighting about the color of a shield which showed its blackness on one side and its whiteness on the other. The representative of the British government, it was argued by the supporters of the ministry, had been treated in a manner contrary to all public law, and the whole body of English traders had been subjected to imprisonment and indignities in consequence of offences in which they had no participation. Exact reparation for these injuries, said Mr. Macaulay. In one of his dispatches Captain Elliot described his arrival at the factory in the moment of extreme danger. "As soon as he landed he was surrounded by his countrymen, all in an agony of distress and despair. The first thing which he did was to order the British flag to be brought from his boat and planted in the balcony. The sight immediately revived the hearts of those who had a minute before given themselves up for lost. It was natural that they should look up with hope and confidence to that victorious flag, for it reminded them that they belonged to a country unaccustomed to defeat, to submission, or to shame; to a country which had exacted such reparation for the wrongs of her children as had made the ears of all who heard of it to tingle; to a country which had made the Dey of Algiers humble himself to the dust before her insulted consul; to a country which had avenged the victims of the Black Hole on the field of Plassey; to a country which had not degenerated since the great Protector vowed that he would make the name of Englishman as much respected as ever had been the name of Roman citizen."‡ "I am not competent," answered Mr. Gladstone, "to judge how long this war may last, or how protracted may be its operations, but this I can say, that a war more unjust in its origin, a war more calculated in its progress to cover this country with permanent disgrace, I do not know, and I have not read of." He asked, with reference to the eloquent description of the British flag planted on the balcony at Canton, "How comes it to pass that the sight of that flag always raises the

* MacCulloch's "Commercial Dictionary," article Opium.
† Speech of Mr. Charles Buller, Hansard, vol. liii. col. 788.
* Davis's "Chinese," chap. iv. † Hansard, vol. liii. col. 940.
‡ Maculay's Speches, p, 227.

spirit of Englishmen? It is because it has always been associated with the cause of justice, with opposition to oppression, with respect for national rights, with honorable commercial enterprise; but now, under the auspices of the noble lord, that flag is hoisted to protect an infamous contraband traffic, and if it were never to be hoisted except as it is now hoisted on the coast of China, we should recoil from its sight with horror, and should never again feel our hearts thrill, as they now thrill with emotion, when it floats proudly and magnificently on the breeze." * Such were the contrary views in 1840 of the nature of this war; such are the contrary views which still prevail among those who write upon this war. The China merchants of London, in a memorial to Lord Palmerston, expressed their opinion that unless the measures of the government were followed up with firmness and energy, the trade with China would no longer be conducted with security to life and property. This was the commercial point of view. The sentimental point of view is that, confident in our military power and the comparative ignorance of the Chinese in the arts of war, we forced upon them the contraband drug which the government would have kept out of the reach of the intemperate. The opponents of the Whig ministry in 1840 did not, however, deny the necessity of a hostile demonstration with respect to China. Sir Robert Peel said that, "after what had passed, British honor and the British name would be disgraced unless some measure were taken to procure reparation for the injuries and insults which had been committed on us. . . . Again and again I say, do not enter into this war without a becoming spirit—a spirit becoming the name and character of England. Do not forget the peculiar character of the people with whom you have to deal, and so temper your measures that as little evil as possible may remain. Remember that the character of the people has lasted for many generations; that it is the same now that was given to them by Pliny and many subsequent writers. It is your duty to vindicate the honor of England where vindication is necessary, and to demand reparation wherever reparation is due." †

A small naval force having been left in the Canton River to maintain a blockade, the British fleet sailed northward along the coast of China. The first important operation of the war was the capture on the 5th of July, by the squadron, of the city of Ting-hai in Chusan. The Chusan Islands, upon the possession of which the maritime intercourse of the eastern coast of China essentially depended, were captured after a slight resistance. Admiral Elliot arrived as plenipotentiary at Chusan on the day on which the city was taken, and he dispatched to Ning-po a letter from Lord Palmerston to be transmitted to the Emperor of China at Pekin. The authorities at Ning-po refused to receive or to forward the letters. A blockade was consequently declared of the east coast, from Ning-po to the mouth of the Kiang. Captain Elliot in August entered the Pei-ho, which flows past Pekin on the south. The letter of Lord Palmerston was now forwarded, and on the 30th of August a conference was held between Captain Elliot and the emperor's minister Keshen, who was subsequently appointed imperial commissioner, Lin having been deprived of his office. Admiral Elliot somewhat indiscreetly consented to transfer the negotiations for peace to Canton, thus neutralizing the effect that had been produced by the successes at Chusan, and by the approach of British vessels of war to the vicinity of Pekin. The admiral soon after resigned. A truce which had been announced by Admiral Elliot was violated, in the midst of the negotiations, by an edict that all Englishmen and ships should be destroyed wherever they were met with near China. The forts Chuen-pe and Tae-cok-tow on the Canton River were now stormed and captured, and the Chinese squadron of war junks collected in Anson's Bay was destroyed. Negotiations were then resumed; and on the 20th of January Captain Elliot issued a circular stating that a treaty had been agreed to by Keshen, the conditions of which were that Hong-Kong should be ceded to England; that six million dollars should be paid by the Chinese; that the trade should be opened within ten days; and that there should be direct official communication between the two countries on equal terms. Formal possession was taken of Hong-Kong, and Chusan was evacuated—not too soon, for the troops left there had been greatly reduced by the unhealthiness of the climate. Keshen proclaimed that the English barbarians were now obedient to order, and that all affairs were perfectly well settled. But on the 11th of February an imperial edict was received from Pekin by the commissioner at Canton, disapproving and rejecting the conditions agreed to by him. The war was now resumed with increased vigor.

On the 2d of March General Gough—who had entered the British army in 1794, had greatly distinguished himself in the Peninsular war, and in 1837 was in command of a division of the Indian army—arrived in China to take the command of the British land forces. From the renewal of hostilities to the end of April there had been armistice upon armistice, during which the attempts of Captain Elliot to negotiate were repeatedly defeated by the intervention of the imperial government. Keshen was degraded and deprived of his office for consenting to these suspensions of hostility, the imperial edicts proclaiming, "It is difficult for heaven and earth to bear any longer with the English." General Gough saw that this temporizing policy would only prolong the war, and be more injurious to the Chinese themselves than its vigorous prosecution. He determined to attack Canton. It was resolved to make the principal points of debarkation of the British forces to the north-west of the city, while another column was to take possession of the factories, which had been ceded to the Chinese. The attack upon the factories was very soon successful. The point chosen for debarkation on the north-west was about five miles by the river line above the factories. The troops were landed on the 23d, and early on the morning of the 24th proceeded to the attack. General Gough describes the heights to the north of Canton. They were crowned by four strong forts, and the city walls ran over their southern extremity. The intervening ground between the point of landing and the forts was undulated, and intersected by hollows under wet paddy cultivation. The walls of Canton, of brick on a foundation of red sandstone, were about twenty feet thick, and varied in height from twenty-five to forty feet. At this time there were twenty thousand Tartar troops, famous for their courage and daring, garrisoning the city. On the 24th the two western forts were captured with comparatively small loss, and "in little more than half an hour after the order to advance was given, the British troops looked down on Canton within a hundred paces of its walls." * It was intended next day to assault the city itself, but the attack was prevented by a flag of truce being hoisted on the walls. Captain Elliot wrote to the general, requesting him to suspend hostilities, as he was employed in a settlement of the difficulties. The terms were little different to those which had been formerly agreed to, and to which the Chinese government had refused its assent. General Gough observed upon this termination of the conflict: "Whatever might be my sentiments, my duty was to acquiesce; the attack, which was to have commenced in forty-five minutes, was countermanded, and the feelings of the Chinese were spared. Of the policy of this measure I do not consider myself a competent judge; but I say 'feelings,' as I would have been responsible that Canton should be equally spared, with the exception of its defences, and that not a soldier should have entered the town farther than the fortified heights within its walls." The terror induced by the operations of the fleet and army extorted from the authorities of Canton the payment of six million dollars as a ransom for the city.

Although trade was resumed in Canton, peace was still distant. The imperial edicts still breathed vengeance against the "barbarians;" the British government disapproved the arrangements of Captain Elliot. Sir Henry Pottinger, who arrived as plenipotentiary on the 10th of August, took the chief direction of the affairs which had so long been in the hands of the superintendent. He immediately published a copy of his credentials, authorizing and empowering him "to negotiate and conclude with the minister vested with similar power and authority on the part of the Emperor of China, any treaty or agreement for the arrangement of the differences now subsisting between Great Britain and China." He also issued a notification, in which, after stating his anxiety to promote the prosperity of all her majesty's subjects and other foreigners, he went on to say that "it was his first duty distinctly to intimate for general and individual information, that it was his intention to devote his undivided energies and thoughts to the primary object of securing a speedy and satisfactory close of the war; and that he therefore could allow no consideration connected with mercantile pursuits and other interests to interfere with the strong measures which he might find it neces-

* Hansard, vol. liii. col. 818. † Ibid., col. 923.

* General Gough's dispatch, "Annual Register," 1841, p. 282.

sary to authorize and adopt toward the government and subjects of China, with a view to compelling an honorable and lasting peace."

To the end of 1841 there were various successes achieved by the land and naval forces, which gave the British possession of many large fortified towns, among which were Amoy, Ting-hai, Chin-hai, Ning-po, and Shang-hai. The Chinese were nevertheless persevering in their resistance, and in most cases evinced a bravery which showed how mistaken were the views which regarded the subjection of this extraordinary people as an easy task. To the end of June these successes had produced no overtures from the imperial government evincing a real desire for a pacification. The British fleet on the 13th of June entered the great river Kiang, and on the 6th of July advanced up the river, and cut off its communication with the Grand Canal, by which Nanking, the ancient capital of China, was supplied with grain. The point where the river intersects the canal is the city of Chin-Kiang-foo. "This city, with its walls in excellent repair, stands within little more than half a mile from the river; the northern and the eastern faces upon a range of steep hills; the west and southern faces on low ground, with the Imperial Canal serving in some measure as a wet ditch to these faces. To the westward the suburb through which the canal passes extends to the river and terminates under a precipitous hill." * On the morning of the 21st the city was stormed by the British, in three brigades. The resistance of the Tartar troops was most desperate. Our troops fought under a burning sun, whose overpowering heat caused some to fall dead. The obstinate defence of the place prevented its being taken till six o'clock in the evening. When the streets were entered, the houses were found almost deserted. They were filled with ghastly corpses, many of the Tartar soldiers having destroyed their families, and then committed suicide. The city, from the number of the dead, had become uninhabitable. On the 9th of August the British fleet, proceeding up the river, had arrived before Nanking. General Gough determined to storm this fortified city, containing half a million of inhabitants. The debarkation was suspended, upon a communication from Sir Henry Pottinger that he was negotiating with high officers of the empire who had now the direct authority of the emperor to treat for peace. The treaty was finally signed before Nanking on board the Cornwallis on the 29th of August, by Sir Henry Pottinger on the part of Great Britain, and by Ke-ying, Elepoo, and Neu-Kien, on the part of the Emperor of China. Its most important provisions were as follows: Lasting peace and friendship were to be maintained between the two empires; China was to pay to Great Britain twenty-one millions of dollars within four years; the ports of Canton, Amoy, Foo-choo-foo, Ning-po, and Shang-hai, were to be thrown open to British merchants, consular officers were to be allowed to reside at these ports, and just tariffs, as well as inland transit duties, established and published; Hong-Kong Island to be ceded in perpetuity to Great Britain; all British subjects, whether natives of Europe or of India, then in confinement in any part of the Chinese empire, to be unconditionally released; an amnesty to be published by the emperor to all Chinese subjects on account of their having held service under the British government or its officers; correspondence between the officers of the two governments to be conducted on terms of perfect equality. On receipt of the emperor's assent to the treaty, and of the first six million dollars of the indemnity, the British forces were to retire from Nanking and the Grand Canal, and the military posts at Chin-hai were to be withdrawn; but the islands of Chusan and Ku-lang-su were to be held till the whole amount of the indemnity was paid and the ports opened. On the 8th of September the emperor signified his assent to the treaty, which, on the last day of the year, received the ratification of the great seal of England.

On the 10th of September, 1838, Lord Auckland, the Governor-General of India, who had entered upon his office at the end of 1835, proclaimed in general orders his intention to employ a force beyond the north-west frontier. On the 1st of October he published a declaration of the causes and objects of the war. The ostensible object was to replace Shah Soojah on the throne of Cabul, the troubles and revolutions of Afghanistan having placed the capital and a large part of the country under the sway of Dost Mahomed Khan. Shah Soojah, driven from his dominions, had become a pensioner of the East India Company, and resided in the British cantonment of Lodiana. Dost Mahomed had in May, 1836, addressed a letter to Lord Auckland which conveyed his desire to secure the friendship of the British government. He was desirous of obtaining the aid of the British against Persia, whose troops were besieging Herat, and to recover Peshawur from Runjeet Singh, the ruler of the Punjaub. The governor-general in 1837 dispatched Captain Alexander Burnes as an envoy to Cabul. He was received with great courtesy. His instructions did not allow him to give any hopes of British assistance to Dost Mahomed. Soon after the arrival of Burnes a Russian envoy arrived at Cabul, who was liberal in his promises, but whose authority was afterward disavowed by his government. In the posthumous narrative by Sir Alexander Burnes of his journey to Cabul, he says that the tranquillity which had dawned on the east and the invasion of Afghanistan by the Persians on the west "had a prejudicial effect at Cabul, which was further heightened by the presence of an agent from Russia, who reached the place soon after my arrival. To the east, the fears of Dost Mahomed Khan were allayed—to the west they were increased; and in this state of things his hopes were so worked upon that the ultimate result was his estrangement from the British government."* Captain Burnes carried back with him a belief that Russia was meditating an attack upon British India, having established her influence in Persia; that Dost Mahomed was treacherous; and that the true way to raise a barrier against the ambition of Russia was to place the dethroned Shah Soojah upon the throne of Cabul, as he had numerous friends in the country. The alarm of the possible danger of a Russian invasion through Persia and Afghanistan led to the declaration of war against Dost Mahomed in the autumn of 1838, and to the preparation for hostilities under a governor-general whose declared policy, at the commencement of his rule, was to maintain the peace which had been scarcely interrupted since the conclusion of the Birman war. But it is not to the apprehensions alone of the envoy to Cabul or the impressions produced by him upon the sensitiveness of the governor-general that we must wholly impute the resolve to put forth the British strength in a distant and dangerous expedition. There was a universal impression throughout India that some imminent danger was about to assail us on the north-west; that a powerful combination of hostile powers, of which Russia was the head, was about to pour down upon our territories, whose arrival would be the signal for a general rise among the neighboring states and in our own provinces.† This general feeling of alarm was confirmed by representations made to the governor-general from all the intelligent men who were in the government, or connected with the different districts in India.‡ Unquestionably there was a panic, and under such circumstances the heaviest charge against Lord Auckland would have been that he remained in supine indifference.

On the 14th of February the Bengal division of the army under Sir Willoughby Cotton crossed the Indus at Bukkur. The Indus is here divided into two channels, one of which is nearly five hundred yards in breadth. The passage of eight thousand men with a vast camp-train and sixteen thousand camels was effected without a single casualty. Sir John Cam Hobhouse, in moving the thanks of the House of Commons to the Indian army, in February, 1840, read a glowing description of this passage. "It was a gallant sight to see brigade after brigade, with its martial music and its glittering arms, marching over file by file, horse, foot, and artillery, into a region as yet untrodden by British soldiers." He quoted also from a periodical publication an eloquent allusion to the grand historical contrasts of this expedition. "For the first time since the days of Alexander the Great a civilized army had penetrated the mighty barrier of deserts and mountains which separates Persia from Hindustan; and the prodigy has been exhibited to an astonished world of a remote island in the European seas pushing forward its mighty arms into the heart of Asia, and carrying its victorious standards into the strongholds of Mohammedan faith and the cradle of the Mogul Empire."§ The Bengal army was preceded by a small body of troops under the orders of Shah Soojah, and it was followed by the Bombay division under the command of Sir John Keane. Into an almost unknown and untrodden country twenty-one thousand troops had entered through the

* "Annual Register," 1842, p. 273.

* "Personal Narrative," p. 143.

† Letter of General Cubbon from Bangalore, quoted by Lord John Russell in debate, March 1st, 1843—Hansard, vol. xlvii. col. 154.

‡ Lord John Russell—Hansard, vol. xlvii. col. 154.

§ Hansard, vol. li. col. 1330.

Bolan Pass. Sir Willoughby Cotton, with the Bengal column, entered this pass in the beginning of April. Beloochee rulers had rendered him all the aid in their power, but the Beloochee freebooters were murdering stragglers and cutting off baggage and cattle. The passage of this formidable pass, nearly sixty miles in length, was accomplished in six days. For the first eleven and a half miles into the pass the only road is the bed of the Bolan River. The mountains on every side are precipitous and sterile; not a blade of vegetation of any kind being found, save in the bed of the stream. There was no sustenance for the camels, unless it were carried for their support during six days, and thus along the whole route their putrefying carcasses added to the obstacles to the advance of the army.* At length the column emerged into the open country. Havelock, who now, after twenty-three years' service, had been promoted to the command of a company, has described how the eye swept with delight over a wide plain bounded with noble mountain ranges, how the carol of the lark mounting up in the fresh morning air broke charmingly on the English ear.†

The Bombay army sustained considerable loss from freebooters in their passage through the Bolan Pass, but the two columns were enabled to unite at Candahar, and to proceed to the siege of Ghuznee, under the command of Sir John Keane. On the 22d of July the British forces were in camp before this famous city, built upon a rock, towering proudly over the adjacent plain. The intelligent officers of the army could not have viewed without deep interest this stronghold of Mohammedanism, where the tomb of Sultan Mahmoud, the conqueror of Hindustan, was still preserved, and where Mohammedan priests still read the Koran over his grave. The sandal-wood gates of this tomb, which in 1025 had been carried off from the Hindoo temple of Somnauth in Guzerat, were to acquire a new celebrity at the close of this Afghan war by an ostentatious triumph, not quite so politic as that of the Sultan Mahmoud. At Ghuznee, Mohammedanism maintained its most fanatical aspect. On the day before the final attack, Major Outram attempted with part of the Shah's contingent to force the enemy from the heights beyond the walls. He describes that over the crest of the loftiest peak floated the holy banner of green and white, surrounded by a multitude of fanatics, who believed they were safe under the sacred influence of the Moslem ensign. A shot having brought down the standard-bearer, and the banner being seized, the multitude fled panic-stricken at the proof of the fallacy of their belief.‡ This was desultory warfare. But it had been determined that three hours after midnight, on the morning of the 23d, the fortress and citadel should be stormed. Ghuznee was regarded by the Afghan nation as impregnable. It had a garrison of three thousand five hundred Afghan soldiers, with a commanding number of guns, and abundance of ammunition and other stores. The Cabul gate was blown open by a terrific explosion; the storming party entered the gate; a few moments of darkness and confusion, and then the foremost soldiers caught a glimpse of the morning sky, and, pushing gallantly on, were soon established in the fortress.§ In two hours from the commencement of the attack Ghuznee was in the hands of the British forces. There were great doubts, almost universal doubts, at home as to the policy of this Afghan war. There could be no doubt as to the brilliancy of this exploit. The Duke of Wellington gave his warmest testimony to the merits of the officer who had achieved this success. The duke went farther. Carefully reserving his opinion as to the origin of the war, he declared, in assenting to the vote of thanks to the army of the Indus, that he had had frequent opportunities of noticing the arrangements made for the execution of great military enterprises, but that he had never known an occasion on which the duty of government had been performed on a larger scale, on which more adequate provisions had been made for all the contingencies which might have occurred, or in which more attention had been paid to the wishes of the officers, the comforts of the soldiers, and all those considerations which are likely to make a war successful.‖

On the 29th of July the British army quitted Ghuznee. It entered Cabul in triumph on the 7th of August. Shah Soojah, restored to his sovereignty, was once more seated in the Bala-Hissar, the ancient palace of his race. Dost Mahomed had fled beyond the Indian Caucasus. The country appeared not only subjected to the new government but tranquil and satisfied. There was a notion at one time of withdrawing the greater part of the forces, but it was finally determined that the first division of Bengal infantry with the 13th queen's regiment should remain in Cabul and Candahar, and that Ghuznee and Jellalabad should be occupied by native regiments. One division of the Bombay army, which was returning home, effected the capture of the strong fortress of Khelat, with a view to the deposition of the Khan, who had conducted himself hostilely and treacherously toward the British. To the forces remaining in Cabul there were a few months of ease and recreation. As the spring and summer advanced insurrections began to break out in the surrounding country. Dost Mahomed had again made his appearance, and had fought a gallant battle with the British cavalry, in which he obtained a partial victory. Despairing, however, of his power effectually to resist the British arms, he wrote to Cabul, and delivered himself up to the envoy, Sir William MacNaghten, claiming the protection of his government. He was sent to India, where a place of residence was assigned to him on the north-west frontier, with three lacs of rupees (about 30,000*l.*) as a revenue. But the danger of the occupation of Afghanistan was not yet overpast. The events of November and December, 1841, and of January, 1842, were of so fearful a nature as scarcely to be paralleled in some of their incidents by the disasters of the mutiny of 1857.

In September and October, 1841, the direction of affairs at Cabul was almost wholly in the hands of Sir William MacNaghten, the envoy. Sir Alexander Burnes was also there, but without any official appointment. The chief command of the army was committed to Major-General Elphinstone, an old Peninsular officer, but whose energy had passed into a state of nervous debility, totally unfitting him for any sudden emergency. Shah Soojah was complaining that he had no real authority, and that he did not understand his position. Burnes was equally dissatisfied that at Cabul he was without employment, consulted at times, but possessing no responsibility. An administrative change was at hand. MacNaghten was appointed governor of Bombay, and Burnes looked forward to the attainment of a sphere of duty suited to his abilities, as the successor of MacNaghten. The British at Cabul were in a condition of false security. The army was in cantonments, extensive, ill-defended, overawed on every side. Within these indefensible cantonments English ladies, among whom were Lady MacNaghten and Lady Sale, were domesticated in comfortable houses. Sir Robert Sale had left Cabul in October, expecting his wife to follow him in a few days. The climate was suited to the English; and our officers, true to their national character, had been cricket-playing, riding races, fishing, shooting, and, when winter came, astonishing the Afghans with skating on the lakes. After the catastrophe which we shall have to relate, an unfinished memorandum was found among the papers of Sir William MacNaghten, in which he says, "I may be considered culpable for not having foreseen the coming storm. To this I can only reply that others, who had much better opportunities of watching the feelings of the people, had no suspicion of what was coming."* All looked with complacency upon the profound tranquillity around them, as that of an unclouded morning—all

> "Regardless of the sweeping whirlwind's sway,
> That, hush'd in grim repose, expects his evening prey."

On the night of the 1st of November there was a meeting of Afghan chiefs, who were banded together, however conflicting might be their interests, to make common cause against the Feringhees (foreigners). One of these, Abdoollah Khan, who had been active in his intrigues to stir up disaffection, had an especial quarrel with Burnes, who had called him a dog, and had said that he would recommend Shah Soojah to deprive the rebel of his ears. He proposed that at the contemplated rising on the 2d of November the first overt act should be an attack on the house of Burnes. Lady Sale, in her journal of that day, says, "This morning early all was in commotion in Cabul; the shops were plundered, and the people were all fighting." Before daylight an Afghan who was friendly to Burnes came to report to him that a plot had been hatched during the night which had for its

* Outram, "Rough Notes of the Campaign," pp. 71, 72.
† Kaye, "History of the War in Afghanistan," vol. i. p. 408.
‡ Outram, "Rough Notes of the Campaign," p. 111.
§ Kaye, vol. i. p. 447. ‖ Hansard, vol. li. col. 1174.

* Kaye, vol. ii. p. 3.

chief object his murder. The Vizier arrived with the same warning. Burnes was incredulous, and refused to seek safety either in the king's fortress-palace, the Bala Hissar, or in the British cantonments. A mob was before his house. Perfect master of the language of the people, he harangued them from a gallery. At his side stood his brother Charles, and Lieutenant Broadfoot, who had arrived to perform the office of military secretary to Burnes when he should be the highest in place and power. The mob clamored for the lives of the British officers, and Broadfoot was the first to fall by a shot from the infuriated multitude. The insurgents had now forced their way into Burnes's garden, upon the culture of which he prided himself, and they called to him to come down. Charles Burnes and the servants of the house had been firing from the gallery. A Mussulman from Cashmere, who had entered the house, swore by the Koran that if they would cease firing, he would convey the brothers in safety to the Kuzzilbash (Persian) fort. The three entered the garden, when the betrayer proclaimed to the insurgents "This is Secunder Burnes." The brothers were instantly struck down, and were cut to pieces by the Afghan knives. Sir Alexander Burnes, who thus perished in the thirty-sixth year of his age, was of the same family as the great Scottish poet, his grandfather being the brother of the father of Robert Burns. He was one of those remarkable men who have won their way to high distinction in the service of the East India Company through their intimate knowledge of the Oriental languages, associated with that indefatigable spirit of inquiry and observation which have made Hindostan and the neighboring countries so familiar to the nation that was gradually advancing to supreme dominion over two hundred millions of men. He is described as one of an impulsive temperament, whose mind was subject to fluctuations of opinion—sometimes an alarmist, more frequently sanguine and over-confident. "His talents were great; his energies were great. What he lacked was stability of character." *

From the 2d of November to the 23d of December the position of the British at Cabul became more and more perilous. At the beginning of the insurrection some vigorous resolve, some demonstration of the power of the British arms, might have insured safety, if not ultimate triumph. There were four thousand five hundred good troops in the cantonments, but there was no one effectually to lead them against the rebels in the city. There were about six hundred British troops in the Bala Hissar. MacNaghten at the beginning of December urged General Elphinstone to retire from the cantonments, and place the remainder of the troops in that fortress, in which they would be in a position to overawe the populace. The last alternative was to march at once to India, and turn with the desperate courage of the lion at bay upon their surrounding foes. General Sale and General Nott were expected with reinforcements, but they were themselves hemmed in by enemies. The public events of this distressing time are told with the clearness and spirit of the intelligent historian by Mr. Kaye. The alternations of hope and fear among the unhappy residents, especially the women, are recorded in the journal of Lady Sale. In the first week of December the troops in cantonments were threatened by the near approach of starvation. The camp followers were living upon the carcasses of dead camels. Negotiations were going on with the Afghan chiefs for the safe retreat of the army, and for a supply of provisions. They were protracted from day to day, the Afghans requiring as a first condition that the forts in the neighborhood of the cantonments should be given up. They were evacuated; and then the enemy looked down with triumphant derision upon those who, within their defenceless walls, were perishing, while the supplies which had been promised them were intercepted by a rabble from the city. Every day added to the expected difficulties of the retreat. The winter was setting in. On the 18th of December snow began to fall. MacNaghten, wearied and almost desperate amid the bad faith and insulting demands of the chiefs, received on the evening of the 22d a proposal from Akbar Khan, the son of Dost Mahomed, which even Elphinstone, enfeebled as he was by illness and generally inapt to offer a decided opinion, regarded as treacherous. On the morning of the 23d, according to the proposal that had been made to him, MacNaghten, with three friends, Lawrence, Trevor, and Mackenzie, went out about six hundred yards from the cantonment for a conference with Akbar Khan, the Sirdar (the title which the chief assumed). The envoy had desired to propitiate him by sending that morning the present of a beautiful Arab horse. On a hill-side Akbar Khan's servants had spread some horse-cloths over the fallen snow. The party were invited to dismount and sit down. The Afghans were gathering around them in numbers—a circumstance which corroborated the suspicions of Lawrence and Mackenzie. In an instant they were seized from behind. The two who were best prepared by their apprehensions for some plot against their lives contrived to escape. Trevor was murdered; Akbar Khan rushed upon MacNaghten in the endeavor to seize and detain him. "The look of wondering horror that sat upon his upturned face will not be forgotten by those who saw it to their dying days. The only words he was heard to utter were, *Az barae Khoda* ('for God's sake!')."* Akbar Khan drew a pistol from his girdle—it was one of a pair which MacNaghten had presented to him the previous day—and he shot the unarmed envoy through the body. Wonderful to relate, not a gun was fired from the British cantonments, not a soldier went forth to avenge the murder of the British minister. On Christmas-day intelligence arrived that reinforcements were on their way from India. Major Pottinger, who now took the place of the unfortunate MacNaghten as political agent, exhorted the military chiefs either to fight their way to Jellalabad, or forcibly to occupy the Bala Hissar. They preferred to capitulate. At a council of war on the 26th a treaty was ratified, which contained the humiliating conditions that all the guns should be left behind except six; that all the treasure should be given up, and forty thousand rupees paid in bills, to be negotiated upon the spot; and that four officers as hostages should be detained to insure the evacuation of Jellalabad by General Sale. On the 6th of January, 1842, on a morning of intense cold, the army, consisting of four thousand five hundred fighting men and twelve thousand followers, began to move out of the cantonments. So tedious was the progress, chiefly caused by the disorderly movements of the camp-followers, that, at six o'clock in the evening, the rear-guard was leaving the walls of the cantonments which the advanced guard had quitted at half-past nine in the morning. The order and discipline which could alone save an army retreating in the midst of a hostile population had no place in that confused mass, who were without food or fuel or shelter. Akbar Khan came up with a body of six hundred horsemen to demand other hostages as security for the evacuation of Jellalabad. On the 8th, Pottinger, Lawrence, and Mackenzie were placed in his hands. Akbar Khan declared that he also came to protect the British and Hindoos from the attacks of the Ghilzyes, one of the most fanatic of the Mussulman tribes of Afghanistan. His authority appears to have been exerted with all sincerity to interfere between these cruel assailants and their victims; but it was manifested in vain. The disorganized force entered the pass of Khoord-Cabul, which for five miles is shut in by precipitous mountains, with a torrent rushing down the centre. On the hill-sides were the unrelenting Ghilzyes, who shot down the fugitives without a chance of their being resisted or restrained. In this pass three thousand men are stated to have fallen. "The ladies were mostly travelling in kujavas (camel-panniers), and were mixed up with the baggage and column in the pass. Here they were heavily fired on."† Lady Sale, who rode on horseback, was shot in the arm. Her son-in-law was here mortally wounded. On the 9th Akbar Khan, who had arrived with his three hostages, "turned to Lawrence and said that he had a proposal to make, but that he did not like to do so lest his motives might be misconstrued; but that, as it concerned us more than himself, he would mention it; and that it was, that all the married men with their families should come over and put themselves under his protection, he guaranteeing them honorable treatment, and safe escort to Peshawur. He added that Lawrence must have seen from the events of the day previous—the loss of Captain Boyd's and Captain Anderson's children—that our camp was no place of safety for the ladies and children."‡ Lawrence and Pottinger urged the acceptance of this proposal upon General Elphinstone. There were ten women and thirteen or more children; six married men went with them, with two wounded officers. It was better to trust to Akbar Khan for the protection of these helpless women and children than to continue their exposure to the attacks of the cruel tribes whom the

* Kaye, vol. ii. p. 13.

* Kaye. † Lady Sale's 'Journal.' ‡ Ibid.

Sirdar could not restrain, and to the horrors of a continued march in a most inclement season. "There was but faint hope," says Lady Sale, "of our ever getting safely to Jellalabad; and we followed the stream. But although there was much talk regarding our going over, all I personally know of the affair is, that I was told we were all to go, and that our horses were ready, and we must mount immediately and be off."

On the 10th of January the small remnant of the force that had left Cabul on the 6th continued its march toward Jellalabad. The native regiments were nearly annihilated by cold and hunger and the Afghan knife. The frost-bitten Asiatics, who still crawled to a narrow defile, were unable to make any resistance. The dying and the dead soon choked up the narrow gorge between the precipitous spurs of two hills. There was now not a single Sepoy left. Not more than a quarter of the men who had left Cabul now survived. The European officers and soldiers scarcely numbered five hundred. They would have fought with the energy of desperation, but they were hemmed in by the crowd of camp-followers, who from the first had rendered their march as dangerous as the assaults of their enemies. The next day Akbar Khan invited General Elphinstone and two English officers, Brigadier Shelton and Captain Johnson, to a conference. The Sirdar required that the three should remain as hostages for the evacuation of Jellalabad. Elphinstone implored the Afghan to permit him to return and share the fortune of his troops. The two officers were equally unwilling to leave their doomed comrades. But resistance was in vain. On the evening of the 12th the march was resumed. They had to struggle with the dangers of the Jugdulluck Pass, in which the steep road ascends through a dark defile. As they approached the summit they found a barricade of bushes and branches of trees. Here the relentless enemy was in waiting. A general massacre ensued, in which many of the remaining officers perished. Twenty officers and forty-five European soldiers were able to clear the barricade. The next morning they were surrounded by an infuriated multitude. They were as one to a hundred; most of them were wounded; but they were resolute not to lay down their arms. They all perished except one captain and a few privates, who were taken prisoners. Out of those who had been in advance of the column in the pass, six reached Futtehabad, within sixteen miles of Jellalabad. These last companions in misery were three captains, one lieutenant, and two regimental surgeons. Five were slain before the sixteen miles were traversed. General Sale's brigade had held possession of Jellalabad from the morning of the 13th of November, when they took the place from the Afghans by surprise. From time to time they heard rumors of the perilous position of the British force in Cabul. At last a letter, addressed to Captain MacGregor, the political agent, arrived from Elphinstone and Pottinger, stating that an agreement having taken place for the evacuation of Cabul, they should immediately commence their march to India. In the absence of any security for the safe conduct of the troops to Peshawur, they resolved to disobey these instructions, and not to surrender the fort, whose defences they had been assiduously laboring to improve. The Afghan chief who bore the letter had been appointed governor of Jellalabad. On the 13th of January a sentry on the ramparts saw a solitary horseman struggling on toward the fort. He was brought in, wounded and exhausted. The one man who was left to tell the frightful tale of the retreat from Cabul was Doctor Brydon.

The refusal of Sale and MacGregor to surrender Jellalabad was that heroic determination to face the danger which in almost every case makes the danger less. Akbar Khan lost no time in besieging Jellalabad. Sale had well employed his enforced leisure in repairing the ruinous ramparts and clearing out the ditch. He had made the place secure against the attack of an army without cannon. But the garrison was not secure against the approach of famine. Akbar Khan with a large body of horse was hovering around to prevent the admission of supplies. On the 19th of February a serious misfortune called forth new energies in these resolute men. An earthquake to a great extent rendered the labor vain which had been so long employed in the repairs of the works. By the end of the month the parapets were restored, the breaches built up, and every battery re-established. At the close of March, being at the last extremity for provisions, the garrison made a sortie, and carried off five hundred sheep and goats. It was known to Sir Robert Sale that General Pollock was advancing to his relief. The time was come when a vigorous attack on the enemy without might have better results than a protracted defence. On the morning of the 7th of April three columns of infantry, with some field artillery and a small cavalry force, issued from the walls of Jellalabad to attack Akbar Khan, who with six thousand men was strongly posted in the adjacent plain. The columns were commanded by Colonel Dennie, Colonel Monteath, and Captain Havelock, who led the attack. In leading his column to storm a square fort Colonel Dennie fell. Every point attacked by the three columns was carried, and the victory was completed by a general assault upon the Afghan camp. In a few hours the battle was over. Two days before this victory General Pollock had forced the Khyber Pass, which General Wild had previously attempted without success. This was an achievement in which the bravery of troops would have been thrown away if the arrangements of the general had been less skilful. The Afghans made no attempt to resist the progress of the troops till they were at the entrance of the pass. They relied upon being able to destroy them from the precipices that overhung the road. The heights were carried on both sides, and the Afghans themselves in the pass were exposed to that fire from above which had been so perilous to the British army in its former marches through the mountainous barriers of their country. It is considered that if Pollock had moved precipitately with his main column into the pass, he would probably have been driven back with great slaughter, but that the precaution he took in crowning the heights and turning the enemy's position secured him, though not without some fighting the whole way, a safe passage.* On the 16th of April Pollock's advanced guard was in sight of Jellalabad; and the two little armies were united in the exulting hope that it would be for them to retrieve the disasters which had befallen the British arms. Lord Ellenborough had arrived at Calcutta as governor-general on the 25th of February. The close of Lord Auckland's rule in India was clouded with misfortunes which fell heavily upon a proud and sensitive man. His policy was proved to be a mistake. Nothing in the annals of our country had ever exhibited so disastrous an issue to a war undertaken in the confidence that it would avert the possibility of an impending danger. When, on the 30th of January, the utter destruction of the army of Cabul was known at Calcutta, the governor-general published a proclamation containing brave words. A new governor-general had arrived, who, appointed by a new administration, had been among the most vehement denouncers of the Afghan war.

The interest attached to the remaining history of this war is the interest attached to the hopeful anticipation of Lord Auckland in his proclamation of the 31st of January. The calamity which had overtaken the British arms was, he said, "a new occasion for displaying the stability and vigor of the British power, and the admirable spirit and valor of the British Indian army." The successes of Sale and Pollock had renewed the confidence of our countrymen in India that the storm would soon be overpast. They had interrupted the hopes of those native powers who believed that the rule of the Feringhees was coming to an end. Shah Soojah had been for some time able to maintain himself in the citadel of Cabul after he had been left to his own resources. He finally perished by assassination. The English ladies, children, and officers, who were treated as prisoners rather than as hostages, were carried from fort to fort. General Elphinstone died at Tezeen on the 23d of April. At the end of April General England had forced the principal pass between Juettah and Candahar, and early in May had joined his forces to those of General Nott at Candahar. Ghuznee, which was in the possession of the Afghans, was recaptured by him on the 6th of September. General Pollock had been detained by sickness and other impediments at Jellalabad to the end of August. He then fought his way through the passes, and was joined by General Nott. On the 15th of September the British standard was flying on the Bala Hissar of Cabul. The prisoners of Akbar Khan had been hurried toward Turkistan. The khan who had charge of them agreed with the English officers, for the future payment of a sum of rupees and an annuity, that he would assist them to regain their freedom. The advance of the army upon Cabul secured the aid of other chieftains. On the 15th of September the hostages, the ladies and the children, had quitted the forts of the

* Kaye, vol. ii. p. 338.

friendly khan, and were proceeding toward Cabul, when, on the 17th, they were met by a party of six hundred mounted Kuzzilbashes, under the command of Sir Richmond Shakespear, who had been sent by General Pollock to rescue them from their perils. On the 19th a horseman met the party alternating between hope and fear, to say that General Sale was close at hand with a brigade. The husband and the father met his wife and widowed daughter. Their happiness produced "a choking sensation, which could not obtain the relief of tears." The soldiers cheered; a royal salute from mountain-train guns welcomed them to the camp; the joy was proportioned to the terrible dangers that were overpast. On the 1st of October a proclamation was issued from Simla by Lord Ellenborough, which stated that the disasters in Afghanistan having been avenged upon every scene of past misfortune, the British army would be withdrawn the Sutlej. On the 12th of October the army began its march back to India. Dost Mahomed was released, and returned to his sovereignty at Cabul.

Of the proclamation dated from Simla on the 1st of October there was much adverse notice in parliament. Mr. Macaulay maintained that it was antedated; for that on the 1st of October the release of the captives on the 19th of September could not have been known to the governor-general; and that knowing of this joyful event on the 12th he omitted all mention of it, that he might have the childish gratification of insulting his predecessor in the vice-royalty, by dating on the same day on which, in 1838, Lord Auckland had published his unfortunate declaration of the causes and objects of the war. But there was another proclamation by Lord Ellenborough which his ministerial friends could scarcely vindicate, and which brought down upon him the bitterest denunciations of his political enemies. It was as follows:

"*From the Governor-General to all the Princes, and Chiefs, and People of India.*

"My Brothers and my Friends,

"Our victorious army bears the gates of the temple of Somnauth in triumph from Afghanistan, and the despoiled tomb of Sultan Mahomed looks upon the ruins of Ghuznee.

"The insult of eight hundred years is at last avenged. The gates of the temple of Somnauth, so long the memorial of your humiliation, are become the proudest record of your national glory; the proof of your superiority in arms over the nations beyond the Indus.

"To you, princes and chiefs of Sirhind, of Rajwarra, of Malwa, and of Guzerat, I shall commit this glorious trophy of successful war.

"You will yourselves, with all honor, transmit the gates of sandalwood through your respective territories to the restored temple of Somnauth.

"The chiefs of Sirhind shall be informed at what time our victorious army will first deliver the gates of the temple into their guardianship, at the foot of the bridge of the Sutlej."

The Hindoo temple of Somnauth was in ruins, and it was maintained by those to whom the pompous words of the proclamation were distasteful, that the governor-general meant to restore it, and thus to manifest a preference for one of the great rival creeds of India—a preference which the policy of England expressly forbade. This might be a wrong inference from the words of the proclamation. But to despoil the tomb of a worshipper of Mahomed, that honor might be done the worshippers of Vishnu, was to offer an outrage to those sensibilities which more than any other cause made and still make the British rule in India so like treading on beds of lava.

CHAPTER CCXXXIV.

Continuation of the previous notices of English literature—Law of copyright—Mr. Sergeant Talfourd's long struggle to amend the law—Mr. Carlyle's petition—Sergeant Talfourd's bill rejected—Lord Mahon's bill—Mr. Macaulay's amendments—Application of the act to copyrights about to expire—Authors recently deceased—Novelists—Theodore Hook and the Silver-fork School—Ephemeral critics and writers without knowledge—Utilitarianism—Changes in the character of literature—Historians—Macaulay—Hallam—Carlyle—Lingard—Fraser Tytler—Palgrave—Kemble—Forster—Mahon—Napier—Mitford—Thirlwall—Grote—Arnold—Novelists—Bulwer Lytton—Dickens—Ainsworth—Thackeray—Serials—Prevalence of fiction—Kitchen literature—Miss Martineau's tales illustrative of political economy—Social aims of novelists—Dickens—Mrs. Gaskell—Kingsley—Thackeray's novels—Poets—Tennyson—Browning—E. Barrett Browning—Thomas Hood—Union of pen and pencil—Theology—Milman—Robertson—Political Economy—Science—Criticism—Antiquarian inquiry—Travels—Book trade—Newspapers.

Before we enter upon a narrative, which may be best given continuously, of the great historical period from 1841 to 1846, during which Sir Robert Peel was prime minister, we purpose to introduce a chapter on the literature of that period and of the period immediately preceding. We shall attempt this in connection with the subject of the new law of copyright, which was finally settled in the session of 1842.

In the present volume we have devoted a chapter to English literature in the three latter decades of the reign of George the Third, and have given a chronological table of the principal writers of the present century, with the exception of those who were living at the end of 1861. We propose in this chapter to point out a few of the more prominent instances of the beneficial operation of the Copyright Act of 1842 with reference to the families of authors then recently deceased. Its benefits to living authors, whether in the maturity of a high reputation or rising into public notice, need not be illustrated by individual instances. The oldest writer with a dependent family, and the youngest writer who had given hostages to fortune, felt a comfort and a relief in its salutary provisions against the uncertainty of the future with regard to the descendants "of those who devote themselves to the most precarious of all pursuits."* What is now called "the Victorian Era" of literature, in contrast with "the Georgian Era," had established its most prominent characteristics, and had produced the greater number of its eminent writers, at the period when the new law of copyright came into operation. We therefore do not essentially narrow the range of our view of "the Victorian Era" when we take our standpoint in the sixth year of the queen's reign. Although this view must be incomplete with regard to some popular writers of the more immediate present, it relieves us from the invidious task of making any pretension to estimate the value of new reputations; leaving us to speak chiefly of those whose foremost place in the long file of illustrious contemporaries had been for the most part settled by continuous public opinion in the first decade of the queen's reign. Of these contemporaries we shall consider it most becoming to speak with the brevity of a bibliographer rather than with the elaborate judgment of a critic.

In the session of 1842 "an act to amend the law of copyright"—the act now regulating literary property—was passed, after a struggle that had endured five years. In 1837 Mr. Sergeant Talfourd first drew the attention of the House of Commons to the law of copyright, as it then existed under the statute of the 54th of George the Third, which gave to the author of a book or his assigns the sole liberty of reprinting such book for the term of twenty-eight years from the date of publication, and if the author should be living at the expiration of that term, for the residue of his natural life. The proposition of Sergeant Talfourd was to extend the term of copyright in a book to sixty years, reckoned from the death of the writer, in addition to its duration during his life. The opposition to this proposal, on every occasion on which it was debated, was of a mixed character. There were legislators who altogether denied the inherent natural right of an author to a property in his labors. These maintained that it was for the public interest that he should labor without reward, or at any rate that he should receive as little as possible in the shape of a money reward, the love of fame being deemed by them amply sufficient to secure to the public an adequate supply of the best books. Others, who did not go quite so far, maintained that the existing term under the act of George the Third—"an act to amend the several acts for the encouragement of learning by securing the copies and copyright of printed books to the authors of such books and their assigns"—was amply sufficient for the remuneration of authors. Others more reasonably opposed Sergeant Talfourd's bill, upon the ground that the term which he suggested would in many cases give a monopoly for eighty years and even for a hundred years. There was a class of publishers then, as there always will be, who were only debarred by the laws against piracy from reducing to practice the philosophical theory that an author should work for nothing

* "Pickwick Papers," 1837; Dedication to Sergeant Talfourd.

to make books cheap. One of these kept a very accurate account of the original date of a publication by a living author, and could calculate the chances of his life according to the most trustworthy tables of mortality. There was a worthy citizen and merchant-tailor of London of the days of Queen Elizabeth, who kept a most exact register of the funerals of the great and wealthy in his time. It was in the way of business, for he was "a furnisher of funeral trappings."* So was it in the way of business that the industrious publisher of Cheapside in the days of Queen Victoria recorded, with Christian satisfaction, the final release of those who, after long battling with fortune, left by the expiry of their copyright no heritable title to the property which they had created. Such encouragers of learning stoutly petitioned against any alteration of the law. There were few petitions for the bill, but there was one which amused and edified the House of Commons in 1839. Of this remarkable and characteristic document we give a sentence or two: "The petition of Thomas Carlyle, a writer of books, Humbly showeth, That your petitioner has written certain books, being incited thereto by various innocent or laudable considerations, chiefly by the thought that said books might in the end be found to be worth something. . . . That your petitioner does not undertake to say what recompense in money this labor of his may deserve: whether it deserve any recompense in money, or whether money in any quantity could hire him to do the like. That this his labor has found hitherto, in money or money's worth, small recompense or none: that he is by no means sure of its ever finding recompense; but thinks, that, if so, it will be at a distant time, when the laborer will probably no longer be in need of money, and those dear to him will still be in need of it."

The various discussions on the Copyright Bill, during five sessions of parliament, brought forward many curious points of literary history. The almost universal range of the learning of Mr. Macaulay had a great effect in inducing the house in 1841 to reject Mr. Sergeant Talfourd's bill. He argued against the public injury of a monopoly of sixty years that the boon to authors would be a mere nullity, but that considered as an impost upon the public it would be a very serious and pernicious reality. He maintained that there would be the danger that, when an author's copyright should remain for so long a period in the hands of his descendants, many valuable works would be totally suppressed or grievously mutilated.† On that occasion Sergeant Talfourd's bill was rejected by a majority of seven. His long-continued advocacy of the extension of copyright is held to have been unsuccessful "chiefly through the efforts of Mr. Macaulay, who, strange to say, strained every nerve to defeat a measure calculated to give independence to a class of which he himself was so bright an ornament."‡ This judgment upon the conduct of a great writer toward his fellows is more than unkind, coupled with the entire suppression of the fact that in the next session of parliament, when "the tardy act of justice was done to literary men," the benefits conferred upon them were greatly increased, not only by the insertion of clauses known to have originated with Mr. Macaulay, but by his proposition for an extension of time more practically beneficial than that proposed by Lord Mahon. On the 3d of March, 1842, his lordship obtained permission to bring in a bill to amend the law of copyright, his plan being that the existing term of twenty-eight years should stand—he would make no addition to the term that was certain—but that the copyright should last twenty-five years after the author's death. Mr. Macaulay proposed a different plan. He would make no addition to the uncertain term, but would add fourteen years to the twenty-eight years which the law allowed to an author. The illustrations from the history of literature, ancient and modern, foreign and domestic, which Mr. Macaulay brought forward, went to prove that the most valuable works of an author being generally produced in the maturity of his powers, his proposition would give a longer term of copyright than that of Lord Mahon. "To 'Lear,' to 'Macbeth,' to 'Othello,' to the 'Faery Queen,' to 'Paradise Lost,' to Bacon's 'Novum Organum' and 'De Augmentis,' to Locke's 'Essay on the Human Understanding,' to Clarendon's History, to Hume's History, to Gibbon's History, to Smith's 'Wealth of Nations,' to Addison's Spectators, to almost all the great works of Burke, to 'Clarissa' and 'Sir Charles Grandison,' to 'Joseph Andrews,' 'Tom Jones,' and 'Amelia,' and, with the single exception of 'Waverley,' to all the novels of Sir Walter Scott, I give a longer term of copyright than my noble friend gives. Can he match that list? Does not that list contain what England has produced greatest in many various ways, poetry, philosophy, history, eloquence, wit, skilful portraiture of life and manners?"* Sir Robert Peel supported the amendment upon the original proposal, but at the same time he "admitted the weight of the argument founded upon the necessity for an author to provide for his family after death, and on this account he should be glad, if possible, to combine the two propositions, and besides the forty-two years of the amendment, to give an author's family a right for seven years after his death." Mr. Macaulay was against this suggestion. The proposition for the term of forty-two years certain was carried by a majority of seventy-nine; that for a further term of seven years commencing at the time of the author's death was carried by a majority of fifty-eight. The extension of term was to apply not only to future publications, but to books previously published in which copyright still subsisted at the time of the passing of the act. There was an exception, however, in cases of existing copyright to the extension of the term to be enjoyed, when the copyright should belong to a publisher or other person who should have acquired it for other consideration than natural love and affection, in which case it should cease at the expiration of the existing term, unless the extension should have been previously agreed to between the proprietor and the author. The provisions of the act of 1842 which had reference to an increased and increasing class of literary works—cyclopædias, reviews, magazines, or works published in a series of books or parts—were of the utmost importance both to the interests of publishers and of authors, which interests, rightly understood, are one and the same.

There were no attempts to conceal, on the part of the advocates for the extension of copyright, that one of the objects of that extension was to benefit the family of Sir Walter Scott, and to give an assurance to the venerable age of Wordsworth that the advantage to himself or his family in the popularity which had followed his early period of neglect would not suddenly cease. In the House of Lords, Lord Campbell, who warmly advocated the bill, expressed his belief that the copyright of some of the works of the great author of the "Waverley Novels" was about to terminate, and without the assistance of this bill it was doubtful whether the descendants of that illustrious man could continue to occupy Abbotsford.† The case with regard to Scott's works was this: the copyright in four of his poems was expired at the passing of the act—the "Lay of the Last Minstrel," published in 1805, ceased to be copyright in 1833; and so "Marmion" in 1836, "Don Roderick" in 1839, "Rokeby" in 1841. The copyright of "The Lord of the Isles" would expire in 1842, when the copyright of "Waverley" would also be at an end. It was a favorite argument that a monopoly such as was contemplated by an extended period would have a tendency to keep up a high price in books. Lord Mahon very truly said that "the general diffusion of education and the desire for cheap books which now prevails precludes the possibility of prices being unduly raised by any copyright bill." Under the extended term of forty-two years, the copyright of "Waverley" and that of six or seven novels, its successors, have expired. But in 1862 those published between 1820 and 1826 still remain the exclusive property of the assignees of the copyright. It was truly prognosticated in 1842 that the interests of booksellers "would be better promoted by a low price to the multitude rather than by a high one to the few." Messrs. Black are issuing the "Waverley Novels" in a series, of which three volumes, originally published at a guinea and a half, are comprised in a single volume at one shilling. The case of Wordsworth stands thus: he died in 1850 in his eightieth year. The old law gave him protection during his life; but it was an exceptional case. He was seventy-two years of age when the act of 1842 was passed. Had he died before the passing of that act the "Excursion" would have become the property of that class of speculators whose position Lord Brougham greatly commiserated. "He could show that as much as five thou-

* "Diary of Henry Machyn"—Camden Society.

† To meet this possible consequence a clause was introduced in the bill of 1842.

‡ Alison, "History of Europe," chap xli.

* "Macaulay's Speeches," p. 255.

† Hansard, vol. lxiii. col. 812.

sand pounds had been expended in the expectation of the expiration of copyrights. A man was perfectly justified in making such preparations, and might already have filled his warehouses with the intended publications. Was it for their lordships to step in and ruin those men by a sudden change of the law?" * In the debates on the Copyright Bill the names of Coleridge and Southey were as freely used as those of Scott and Wordsworth. Sergeant Talfourd called up "Coleridge speaking as it were from the grave." It was well known that great as was the reputation of Coleridge in his latter years, "if the income-tax had continued to the day of his death, the collectors of it would have had a sorry recompense for the trouble of calling upon him for his return." † Coleridge has himself said, "I expect neither profit nor general fame by my writings; and I consider myself as having been amply repaid without income." ‡ At the time of Coleridge's death, in 1834, the copyright of many of his poems had terminated with his own life. His two tragedies, "Christabel," and a few miscellaneous poems had one or two years of legal protection left to them. His accomplished nephew, Henry Nelson Coleridge, and the poet's gifted daughter, the wife of his nephew, were engaged in producing those admirable editions of his works which acquired a new value under their hands. In these labors of affection were included a new edition of "The Friend." The protection of the existing law was thus sufficient to keep off the violating hands of literary traders from these bequests to posterity. But the new law of 1842 enabled these labors to be completed by another son, Derwent. We have thus a monument raised to the father's memory in complete editions of his works, which acquired a new commercial value when the world had arrived at a juster appreciation than during his life of that combination of the poetical and philosophical faculty which rendered him one of the most remarkable men of his time. Southey, the early associate in literary enterprise of Coleridge and Wordsworth, was in 1842 in a condition of unconsciousness as to the various modes in which his name was connected with the copyright question. His overtasked intellect had given way a few years before, and he was quite insensible to what was said in parliament by friends or foes—equally indifferent to the just eulogies of Mr. Monckton Milnes, or to the vulgar ridicule of Mr. Wakley. This gentleman—who not only held a coroner's inquest in a jocose fashion upon "mighty poets in their misery dead," but volunteered an appraiser's estimate of the market value and the proper remuneration of living authors—called upon the house not to be led away by sentimental tales. Mr. Monckton Milnes answered the member for Finsbury, that when he talked of sentimental tales he must have heard the tale of a man of the purest and highest life, who was distinguished in many walks of literature—a poet, a historian, a critic—he must have heard that this man was at present bereft of his great mind, and that his family were very dependent for their future comfort on the event of the debate of that night. §

Dismissing the individual consideration of the influence upon the fortunes of their representatives effected by the Copyright Bill of 1842, we may briefly recapitulate the names of a few eminent writers, belonging to what is called the Georgian era, who had then recently paid the debt of nature. Of poets, Crabbe had died in 1832; James Hogg in 1835. Of novelists, John Galt had died in 1839, at the age of sixty. While Scott was in the height of his reputation as a delineator of the past manners of his countrymen, Galt was noting with minute accuracy the domestic characteristics of the humbler classes of Scotland in his own day. The "Ayrshire Legatees" was published in 1820; the "Annals of the Parish," which appeared in 1821, established Galt's reputation. More interesting perhaps at the present time than either of these is his "Lawrie Todd." This is not only the true picture of a Scotchman in America, but a most graphic representation of the extraordinary process by which mighty cities have grown up in the forest and the swamp. The persevering labors of adventurers such as the "splorifying" Lawrie have, during the last half century, built miserable shanties on the bank of many a solitary river which has now its vast quays and warehouses—large constituent parts of a mighty empire, yet an empire too extensive not ultimately to be separated by conflicting interests, although long held together by the silken thread of a federal union. Theodore Hook died in 1841. He was essentially the novelist of those manners which came to an end very soon after the close of the reign of the last of the Georges. The clever youth, of whom the regent declared that "something must be done for Hook"—not for his wisdom or his virtue, but for his powers of mimicry—had five years in the Mauritius of luxurious gratification out of his enormous salary as accountant-general of the colony. He returned to England a defaulter rather from carelessness than dishonesty; and from 1824 to 1841 wrote some dozen novels, whose aggregate volumes amount to forty. These productions constitute an important item in the collection known as "Standard Novelists." If a reader unacquainted with the literature of the last generation were to open these novels, from "Sayings and Doings" to "Gilbert Gurney," and therein expect to find a "standard" of wit or humor—even of that worldly wisdom which results from a large observation and clear-sighted estimate of manners—we apprehend that, reasoning from a part to the whole, he would come to very unsound conclusions upon the literary characteristics of an age that had produced Maria Edgeworth and Jane Austen. Hook's novels are essentially artificial. He was, we trust, the last of that race of authors who, without being the hired servants of the great, found a place at their tables for the sole purpose of contributing to their amusement, like the jesters of the middle ages; the last of those who, indulging the belief that they were valued in their higher capacity as men of letters, arrogated a place in the fashionable world, and devoted all their small powers of ridicule to depict the violations of the conventionalities among the middle classes. Hook was almost the last of what was called the "silver-fork school." It was a school that flourished before reform bills and railroads, and its disciples long persisted in their ignorant endeavor to paint the domestic life of the flourishing citizen as uniformly vulgar, and in their base delineations of the struggles of honest poverty as revolting and disreputable. Every invention of industry, every social arrangement, which had a tendency to put high and low on a level of convenience and comfort, was hateful to such writers and to their fashionable admirers.

At the time when Theodore Hook flourished, in company with a host of imitators who combined the dandyism of the drawing-room with the ignorance of the servants' hall, the tone of periodical criticism was as essentially artificial as the novels and poems which it held up to popular admiration. It was characteristic of the ephemeral criticism which seized only upon the amusing portions of new books for extracts to administer to a lazy taste for the superficial and exciting, that a sort of antagonism was fomented between the class who desired to instruct and the class who sought only to amuse. It was the same dispute which Swift has so happily described in "The Battle of the Books," between the spider and the bee. The "man of genius," as he called himself—and every small critic was "a man of genius" as well as the object of his laudation—unconsciously used the reproaches of the spider to the bee in his periodical attacks upon the literary drudge—"the obscure literary drudge who has not a single idea in his head save what he filches from the British Museum." * Swift's spider was a self-producing creature like the "man of genius." The "literary drudge" had his answer in the language of the bee, who claimed to be the nobler creature of the two, in his universal range bringing home honey and wax, instead of feeding and engendering on itself and producing nothing but fly-bane and cobweb. The "compilers," as they were sneeringly called—and ignorantly called, for what great historical work, for example, is not essentially a compilation—had the best of the battle with the professors of "la littérature facile." The habit of research, which could not be sneered down, tended to produce that accuracy which gradually became necessary in journalism and even in the fashionable novel. The value of drawing from nature and realities had been tested by the example of a young writer who never looked upon society or upon "still life" without seeing peculiarities which he faithfully reproduced in his characters and scenes. Dickens at once threw his broad daylight upon the "twilight interim" of the herd of his immediate predecessors in prose fiction. "The mob of gentle-

* Hansard, vol. lxiii. col. 802.
† Anonymous Letter, attributed to "a most illustrious pen" by the "Quarterly Review," vol. lxix. p. 225.
‡ Preface to the first and second editions of his poems.
§ Hansard, vol. lxi. col. 1389.

* "New Monthly Magazine."

men who write with ease" could no longer hug themselves in the false application of a dictum of Burke's: "It is the nature of all greatness not to be exact." Instead of attempting to verify a quotation, the usual phrase of those who dabbled in history, philosophy, or criticism, was, when they misquoted, "We perfectly well remember that so-and-so said." The poets and novelists, in describing a landscape, never attempted to look upon the face of nature. Their storms and their sunshine were derived from some hazy recollection of "The Seasons;" their flowers and their trees would have puzzled the greatest master of classification to arrange even in families. They gave the apple blossom to the pear, and brought the wheat into ear before the rye. In their delineations of human character, vague generalities took the place of the nice distinctions of passions and humors found in the great dramatists of the Elizabethan age, and in the great novelists of the first half of the Georgian era. Everything, whether in nature or in art, in science or in literature, in the manners of high life or of low life, was indistinctly painted in their ephemeral manufacture for the circulating library. Their style was made up of a barbarous jargon of slip-slop English interlarded with the commonest phrases of French that had no idiomatic meaning. Occasional dashes of slang and half-profanity indicated that the old rags of the court-dress of vice were still the patches upon the easier and neater costume of the age which had succeeded that of buckles and knee-breeches. All honor to a higher criticism, and to the nobler aims of popular writers following the increase of readers, this race is extinct. Each one of its many genii has faded into vapor, and has gone into a bottle to be sealed up with the seal of Solomon.*

Little as there was of philosophy in the small criticism that prevailed in the latter time of George the Fourth, it might have had its origin in the popular expression of distaste to the doctrines of utilitarianism, which were then advocated somewhat dogmatically in many influential quarters. The utilitarian creed of morals, and the political economy creed which was associated with it, were imperfectly understood; and they thus became to common apprehensions the exponents of whatever was hard, and narrow, and selfish, in a view of human actions and motives. Some of the disciples of Bentham and Malthus in many respects did great injustice to the real benevolence that was at the root of the principle of "the greatest happiness for the greatest number," and of the principle that mankind has a tendency to increase faster than the food which is to maintain an increasing population. The extreme utilitarians could see no object in the pursuit of knowledge but the acquirement of something that would conduce to worldly success. With them the industrial arts attained their highest dignity in ministering to the satisfaction of physical wants. The beautiful was not an essential adjunct to the useful. The utilitarian teaching had many important results in legislation and jurisprudence. But it was wholly incompetent to deal with the whole realm of thought. Literature refused to submit to the dictation of a new school that soon produced its pedants in abundance. Out of the contests of thirty or forty years has grown up a school of compromise which best reflects the character of our age.

It has been expressively said, "All literature is more or less both an effect and a cause, both a product and a power. It both follows and leads. It takes an impulse from its age, and it also gives an impulse to its age."* The amount of the impulse which literature imparts to an age must, to a considerable extent, depend upon the genius of the writers. The opinions and feelings of an age are sometimes so definite and so strong, that the most original thinker is moulded by them into a participation with the prevailing modes of thought, so that at one time every form of literature is highly colored, and at another time all its tints are neutral. Gradually the prismatic colors become blended into an equable light as the political and religious contentions of a stirring period fade away into something approaching a catholicity of opinion. A period of quietude succeeds a period of excitement. After the outburst of fiery writing produced by the French revolution, English literature became for the most part conservative. After the agitation of parliamentary reform had come to an end, writers as well as statesmen became tolerant and compromising. The liberal author was not to be hunted out of society as an infidel and a democrat; the conservative was not to have the mob raised upon him as a slave of the aristocracy and the enemy of the people. One principal cause of this approach toward forbearance, if not to union, was the general spread of intelligence. Extreme opinions flourish amid popular ignorance. The passions and prejudices of sect and party, during a long period of contention such as the half century before the age of Victoria, influenced every expression of thought in philosophy, in history, in poetry, in prose fiction. It came at length to be perceived that two halves of any domain of letters are not equal to the whole; that the useful and the beautiful could not be advantageously cultivated apart like a potato-field and a flower-garden; that as the classical and the romantic schools of the French drama were gradually blending, so, in history, it was not absolutely necessary to leave the picturesque to the novelist and the literal to the chronicler; that poetry would acquire a new charm by an infusion of the real with the imaginative, as, rightly applied, pre-Raphaelism would work out a needful reform in the highest and the humblest art. It is enough for us to indicate this change, without attempting any formal illustration of the progress of all literature in the present generation toward a certain homogeneousness.

Of the historians of this period those who have exercised the greatest influence upon their age have been Henry Hallam, Thomas Babington Macaulay, and Thomas Carlyle. As the office of historian has a wider range than the description of public events, each of these writers was also essayist and critic. Their modes of treating the past and the present were as essentially different as their mental characteristics. Guizot has described with more than ordinary animation a visit to Westminster Abbey, in 1840, in which Macaulay was his *cicerone*. During three or four hours they walked together through this monumental gallery of the English nation. "At every step," says the memoir-writer, "I stopped, or Mr. Macaulay stopped me. Sometimes answering my questions, sometimes anticipating them, he explained to me an allegorical sculpture, he recalled to me a forgotten fact, he related to me an anecdote little known, he recited to me some fine passage from the poet or the orator at whose name we paused. . . . As the great dead of Italy throng around the passage of Dante, so the most illustrious personages of English history and literature came out of their tombs before me at the voice of a representative full worthy of them."* From the stores of his prodigious memory Macaulay thus improvised the learning which he elaborated in his writings. This eloquent monologue—for who that knew the illustrious *cicerone* could doubt that his ordinary monologue would in such a position almost become an oration—this monologue was uttered some seven years before the publication of the first two volumes of "The History of England from the Accession of James II." The great purpose of that history had been long seething in the mind of him who, in his earliest writings, exhibited "his tendency to concentrate his thoughts upon a single subject—the rescue of our native English liberties from the futile and wearisome tyranny of the Stuarts, and the consolidation of those liberties by the settlement of the revolution."† If the subject had been in his mind from the time when, in 1824, he wrote in "Knight's Quarterly Magazine," his "Conversation between Mr. Abraham Cowley and Mr. John Milton touching the great Civil War," the mode of treating it was also in his mind when, in 1828, he wrote in "The Edinburgh Review" his article on "The Constitutional History of England, from the Accession of Henry VII. to the Death of George II., by Henry Hallam." He therein complains that we have good historical romances and good historical essays; that the imagination and the reason have made partition of that province of literature, and hold their respective portions in severalty instead of holding the whole in common. "To make the past present," he says, "to bring the distant near, to place us in the society of a great man, or on the eminence which overlooks the field of a mighty battle, to invest with the reality of human flesh and blood beings whom we are too much inclined to consider as personified qualities in an allegory, to call up our ancestors before us with all their peculiarities of language, manners, and garb, to show us over their houses, to seat us at their tables, to rummage their old-fashioned wardrobes, to explain the uses of their ponderous furniture—these parts of the duty which properly

* G. L. Craik, "English Literature and Language," vol. ii. p. 522.

* "Mémoirs," tome v. p. 155.
† Lucas, "Secularia," p. 248.

belongs to the historian have been appropriated by the historical novelist. . . . Sir Walter Scott gives us a novel; Mr. Hallam a critical and argumentative history. Both are occupied with the same matter. But the former looks at it with the eye of a sculptor. His intention is to give an express and lively image of its external form. The latter is an anatomist. His task is to dissect the subject to its inmost recesses, and to lay before us all the springs of motion and all the causes of decay."* It was for Macaulay, by a wonderful combination of the two great attributes of history and romance, to build up a narrative that with the greatest power of charming the fancy compelled, with very few exceptions, the submission of the reason. Where he fails it is where he is carried away by the ardor of his political feelings and habits of thought, losing the historian in the partisan. But this total surrender to an overwhelming impulse in some degree insured his triumph. It required no ordinary amount of energy to turn the young men and maidens who had been nurtured upon Hume from a sickly sympathy with discrowned Stuarts and plotting Jacobites; to give them, in the place of that sugar-candy of history which sees nothing but the misfortunes of the great and forgets the wrongs and sufferings of the lowly, some more nourishing diet—some diet fitter for a great free people. His view of the revolution and of the character of William of Orange was producing its effects when Prince Albert, with the moral courage and sagacity that were his by nature and education, said in a large meeting of churchmen, on the 150th anniversary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, "This society was first chartered by that great man, William the Third—the greatest sovereign this country has to boast of." Some of the churchmen winced, and thought of Sacheverell and right divine.

If Macaulay were not always impartial himself, he was fully sensible of the value of impartiality. He characterizes Mr. Hallam's "Constitutional History" as eminently judicial—summing up with a steady impartiality, turning neither to the right nor to the left, glossing over nothing, exaggerating nothing. But Hallam in his impartiality seldom, we may perhaps say never, compromises the great cause of freedom and toleration by an indiscreet acceptance of the creeds of despotism disguised under the sentimentalism of loyalty, and the creeds of bigotry anathematizing heresy and schism. Under his somewhat cold and dry expositions there is a solid foundation of liberal and generous sentiment; a profound reverence for truth; a deep respect for popular rights, measured, however, by a natural dread of extreme democratic opinions. In the work which preceded his constitutional history—"Europe during the Middle Ages"—there is more of color filling up the clear outline; but he has a distinct perception of the task before him. Its limited extent, its character of dissertation rather than of narrative, "must necessarily preclude that circumstantial delineation of events and of characters upon which the beauty as well as usefulness of a regular history so mainly depends."†

Macaulay is well described as "having knocked out the brains of the Stuart superstition."‡ The third eminent historian of the Victorian era has done something more than aid in this salutary work of destruction—he has taught us how to appreciate one of the greatest of England's sons—warrior, statesman, patriot—and yet king-killer. Mr. Carlyle has cleared away the rubbish that two centuries had accumulated round the memory of Cromwell, and has raised for him a monument that will endure when some of the marble shall have perished among which his statue has no place. Partisan as Mr. Carlyle is, he is not the partisan of party. His reverence is for the individual. He bows before intellectual power of which it is the nature generally to obtain the mastery over fortune; and thus by some he is held in his hero-worship to be the idolator of success rather than of virtue. Unquestionably his contempt for the weak is somewhat too decided—for those who halt between two opinions—for those who compromise the right with the expedient. Shams and unveracities, that absolutism rides over, are the abominations of a balancing age which it is his business to underrate. With a style which is well suited to the original character of his mind in its forcible quaintness and occasional ruggedness, there is no writer of narrative who has a greater command of that descriptive power which combines the rush of the poet with the minuteness of the naturalist—the hawk's swoop with the hawk's vision. Among writers professedly aiming at word-pictures there can no passages be found more eminently picturesque than many which arrest the reader and hold him captive in the "French Revolution" and in the "Cromwell."

The "History of England," of Dr. Lingard, comes down to the revolution of 1688. The author, a Roman Catholic divine, could not be expected to deal with the great ecclesiastical reforms of three centuries without a leaning to the opinions of his own church. But he is worthy of all respect for his abstinence from any attempts to proselytize, and for his general fairness in commenting upon the documents upon which he claims the merit of having founded his narrative. If his professed endeavor to separate himself as much as possible from every party be not always successful, we may accept his declaration that he is not conscious to himself of any feeling which should induce him to pervert the truth.* The "History of Scotland," of Patrick Fraser Tytler, is another of those valuble works which are based upon authentic materials. The narrative is brought down to the union of the crowns in 1603. Thus dealing with events that are not only obscure in the hands of the early narrators, but surrounded in all narratives, ancient or modern, with a haze of national prejudice, Mr. Tytler has succeeded in telling a great story in a just spirit—not in an unpatriotic spirit, but with a conviction that the historian's duty may be best performed by looking at the past without surrendering his faith to legends and traditions which only represent the violence of semi-barbarous times. Over the Anglo-Saxon history new streams of light have been thrown by the learning of Sir Francis Palgrave and of John Mitchell Kemble. The "Historical Essays" of John Forster, particularly those on "the Grand Remonstrance of 1641," and "On the Civil Wars and Oliver Cromwell," form a valuable supplement to those "Lives of Eminent British Statesmen" which appeared at an earlier period of his distinguished literary career. Lord Mahon's "History of England from the Peace of Utrecht to 1783" filled up a considerable gap in our historical narratives of particular eras which require to be treated with fulness of detail. This is a work which is safe from its conscientiousness; pleasing from its equable flow rather than from its occasional brilliancy; reflecting the mind of an amiable and accomplished writer, who ordinarily avoids the dogmatism of a political instructor, and seeks to inform rather than to convince. Lord Brougham's "Historical Sketches of Statesmen who Flourished in the Time of George III." would be out of nature if they pretended to a similar calmness and reticence. Yet strong as they occasionally are in their language and tone, and therefore the cause of much controversy, it is obvious that the great orator of half a century has, with all his personal and party antipathies, a deep sympathy with honesty of purpose, a profound admiration of true eloquence, a just appreciation of the difficulties that surrounded the course of the advisers of the crown, when the functions of the constitutional sovereign were ill understood in the lingering superstitions of expiring feudalism. With the exception of Sir William Napier's grand "History of the War of the Peninsula," we prefer to leave, without any attempt to characterize them, the historical narratives of our own immediate times. The merits of Sir Archibald Alison and of Miss Martineau are abundantly recognized by readers who properly estimate the value of their information, without being disturbed by the opposite political tendencies of the one or the other.†

The field of historical writing is too wide for any extension of these imperfect notices beyond the historians of our own country. If our limits would allow we might devote a page to a contrast between the popular History of Greece (Mitford's) in the time of George III., and two great works thus described by an accomplished scholar: "Within the last fifty years more has been done by both English and foreign scholars to elucidate the history of Greece than at any former period since the revival of learning; and the results of all these labors are two English works on the history of Greece, such as no other nation can boast of." The works thus

* "Essays," vol. i. p. 113.
† "Middle Ages," Preface to First Edition, 1818.
‡ "Secularia," p. 270.

* Preface, Fourth Edition, p. ix.
† For obvious reasons we would only point out "The Pictorial History of England" as a general history that supplied a great want at the beginning of the queen's reign.

alluded to by Dr. Leonhard Schmitz are those of Bishop Thirlwall and Mr. Grote. The one was commenced in 1835 and was greatly improved in 1845; the other, commenced in 1846, was completed in 1856. Dr. Arnold's "History of Rome" was left unfinished in 1842, when England could ill afford to lose a man of the purest virtue and the highest ability, who so put his heart into what he did that, if he had been longer spared, he might by his honest zeal have reconciled some of the theological differences of his time, and have produced a nearer approach to reconcilement between democratic and aristocratic politics. He died when these contests appeared to threaten formidable convulsions in the Church and in the state.

Dr. Johnson, "speaking of the French novels, compared with Richardson's, said they might be pretty baubles, but a wren was not an eagle." * The French novels were those which Gray had a lazy delight in dreaming over as he lay upon a sofa in his college rooms, and all around him was the dull monotony of his half-monastic life. Another generation turned away from Richardson and knew nothing of Crebillon. Our own wrens of fiction were hopping about and chirruping their little notes on every side in the quarter of a century after Johnson. How were they petted in every parlor, aye and in every kitchen, in another half century! From 1816 to 1851 there were a hundred new works of prose fiction published in every year.† From 1852 to 1861 it may fairly be conjectured that their annual number had doubled. To catalogue even the names of all the writers of our own day in this department would occupy many pages. There has been a never-failing succession of new candidates for possible profit—even for the honor alone of appearing in print. In most cases born and dying like the May-fly, they were perhaps to be envied in their one day's existence. But those who have lived through many springs have given manifest proof that their long lives have not been idle. Never were novelists so numerous; never were the works of the enduring ones so voluminous. Shall we offend Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton if we record that he began writing novels in the seventh year of George the Fourth, and is still writing novels in the twenty-fifth year of Victoria—that there is not a province of fiction into which he has not made a foray, and carried off the richest spoils? Mr. James was in 1825 aspiring to be the imitator, if not the rival of Sir Walter Scott, and had scarcely given up his especial function of revivifying, in an apparently endless series,

"Great heaps of ruinous mortality,"

when his own mortal career was terminated in 1860. Captain Marryat did not begin to write till he was nearly forty, and he died when he was fifty-six; but in that period he produced a novel each year. Dickens was writing "Sketches by Boz" in 1836; he was writing "Great Expectations" in 1861. Of his voluminousness it may be sufficient to say that his eight larger serial stories, according to a typographical estimate, contain nearly double the quantity of the four great novels of Fielding and the five of Smollett. Ainsworth published "Rookwood" in 1834; he is still lingering around prisons and palaces and civic banqueting-halls. Thackeray was not a novelist proper till 1846, but what a large space has he filled in the world's eye during the sixteen years between "Vanity Fair" and the "Adventures of Philip." The idleness of authors must be classed with the false beliefs of another age.

It would be as manifestly impossible as it would be unnecessary for us to follow the flights even of the eagles. Many there are who cannot be classed among "the little birds," but whose names we can only indicate. Some have a moderate share of surviving reputation, such as the novelists of Irish life, John Banim, William Carleton, and Charles James Lever. Charlotte Brontë, who first awakened the world to an appreciation of her remarkable genius in 1847, has been too prematurely removed, before a wider experience might have mellowed her views of life without impairing their originality. A greater has succeeded to the elevated seat which she filled—the authoress of "Adam Bede." Let us proceed to a few general observations upon the increased and increasing prevalence of prose fiction, and upon its general tendencies in obedience to the character and influence of the era in which its writers are living.

Superficially considered, an age of novel-reading might be pronounced to be an idle and a frivolous age. Yet the living generation is far more hardly worked than the generation immediately preceding; its work is exhausting, its pace is killing, compared with the times before the French revolution. Yet the age is not frivolous, as in other times and other countries, for it is a home-keeping age, and its pleasures are of a domestic character. And home pursuits and habits have made the novel take the place of the comedy. We may repeat a few sentences we have written elsewhere: "It is remarkable how, within the last quarter of a century, the novel has been the principal reflector of manners—how the players have, to a great extent, foregone their function of being 'the abstracts and brief chronicles of the time.' It was not so when Fielding and Smollett held 'the mirror up to nature' in the modern form of fiction, while Goldsmith and Sheridan took the more ancient dramatic method of dealing with humors and fashions. The stage has still its sparkling writers—England is perhaps richer in the laughing satire and fun of journalism than at any period. But the novel, especially in that cheap issue which finds its entrance to thousands of households, furnishes the chief material from which the future philosophical historian will learn what were our modes of thought and living—our vices and our follies—our pretensions and our realities—in the middle of the nineteenth century." * The severe moralist of ten years ago might say, as he may now say, that the theatre was a rare indulgence for the middle classes, and was scarcely accessible to the lower; but that the circulating library was sending its seductions into every household, and that the fictions of the monthly serial and the weekly sheet were interfering with the serious thoughts and duties of life among all classes; that, even if they did not corrupt, they were diverting from useful studies. There was something of justice in this harsh estimate. The so-called mischief, which before the age of serials was confined to the circulating library, had reached the humblest ranks in the penny weekly sheets. The popular tendency had forced upon every weekly periodical the necessity for introducing fiction in some form or other. The great masters of fiction did not shrink from publishing their creations in weekly or monthly fragments. The humblest hacks, utterly devoid of knowledge and abounding in bad taste, could reproduce all the forgotten trash of the Minerva Press, in what has been called the kitchen literature. Their labors were crowned with an enormous popularity in periodicals which founded their large circulation upon a meretricious cheapness. Hence, for the most part, a deluge of stories that, to mention the least evil of them, abounded with false representations of manners, drivelling sentimentalities, and impossible incidents. The apologist for the light reading of his time could not shut his eyes to the ever-present fact that in proportion as the number of readers had increased the desire of the mass of the population had been rather for passing amusement than solid instruction. But his true apology would be founded upon another ever-present fact. The laboring people of this country were laboring harder than any other people, not only from the absolute necessity of the competition around them, but through the energy of their race. The middle classes were carried along that stream of excitement which had grown from the tranquil course of Denham's "Thames," "though gentle, yet not dull," into the rush of the "swift and arrowy Rhone." The quickened post, railways, telegraphs, had made all life go faster. The energies of all had become overtasked. It could not, therefore, in the nature of things, be expected that much of the reading of all classes should have been other than for amusement. Further, when it was considered how comparatively recent had been the training for any reading among a large proportion of those who had become readers, we could scarcely look for a great amount of serious application in their short leisure after a hard working day. The entertainment which was presented to all, whether in the shape of a shilling novel or a penny journal, was not debasing; it might enfeeble the intellect, but it did not taint it. We had got beyond the scurrilous stage—the indecent stage—the profane stage—the seditious stage, of cheap miscellanies.

Let us turn to another aspect of the prose fiction of our age, in regard to which it would be difficult for the most sturdy utilitarian to deny that it has accomplished higher ends than the supply of mere amusement.

About the beginning of the reign of William the Fourth there was

* Boswell, chap. xxiv., 1770.

† See note at the end of this chapter.

* "Half Hours with the Best Authors," vol. iv. p. 482, edit. 1848.

a lady whose zeal as a political and social teacher has been unwearied, who came suddenly upon the world as a writer of an extensive series of tales, having a more distinct purpose than other works of imagination. Her purpose was to teach political economy through fiction :

"So we, if children young diseased we find,
Anoint with sweets the vessel's foremost parts,
To make them taste the potions sharp we give." *

Miss Martineau had small encouragement in the onset of her adventure. Paternoster Row would willingly have bargained for the sugar on the edge of the cup without the physic within. Gray's Inn Square, wherein dwelt the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, believed that the sweets would impair the efficacy of the physic. At length a somewhat obscure sectarian publisher made a bidding ; and a little volume was cast upon the world entitled "Illustrations of Political Economy. No. 1. Life in the Wilds : A Tale." Without intermission for more than two years came out every month a new tale, with a short "Summary of Principles" indicated therein. The success was complete. "I take my stand upon science," said the now popular authoress. "The sciences on which I touch bear no relation to party." Without inferring that Miss Martineau did not strenuously labor to fulfil what she considered her mission as a teacher of political and social truths, we may venture to believe that her skilful development of an interesting story—her great power of assimilation, by which local images and scenes were reproduced as if they had been the result of actual observation—her skilful admixture of narrative and dialogue—her ability to conceive a character and to carry it through with a real dramatic power—that these qualities excited the admiration of thousands of readers, who rose from the perusal of her monthly volumes without the "Principles" having taken the slightest hold upon their minds. Her triumph as a novelist was the more remarkable as her purpose was a mistake in art. It was the same mistake that Joanna Baillie made in her "Plays on the Passions." As it was a mistake to make the conduct of a drama wholly rest upon the exhibition of one intense master passion, it was also a mistake to conduct a novel so as to lay aside most of the modifying social circumstances which would divert the progress of the action, and render a denouement according to scientific laws at least improbable. Nevertheless, we hold these remarkable little books to have, in a considerable degree, led the way in the growing tendency of all novel-writing to extend the area of its search for materials upon which to build a story, and to keep in view the characteristic relations of rich and poor, of educated and uneducated, of virtuous and vicious, in our complicated state of society, so as to bring all classes and conditions nearer to each other in the exposition of a common humanity prescribing a common brotherhood. This was the great benefit to his age which Charles Dickens has accomplished, without having a ground of scientific "principles" for his social pictures—indeed, sometimes too ostentatiously despising the doctrines of political economy in his search after a broader foundation for lessons to be implied by his readers rather than enforced upon them. Whatever be the political or theological opinions of the more prominent novelists of the Victorian era, no one, even twenty years ago, could get away from the fact that the one solemn and imperative duty of every man and woman in these days is to act upon the precept of "Blessed is he that considereth the poor"—to act upon it, not in the spirit of almsgiving, but in the spirit of Christian brotherhood. To understand, wherever possible, what are the habitual thoughts and feelings of the great mass of the people ; to go to the root of that isolation which separates the receiver of wages from the capitalist ; to see where the scientific laws which regulate labor and capital press unequally, and how their inevitable tendency to a segregation of classes can be modified ; to ascertain what is the true nature of the popular prejudice which requires to be enlightened on political questions ; to cast away all undue suspicion of democratic opinions and of religious dissent, and to open as wide as prudence may prescribe the doors of the senate and of the Church ; lastly, to trace crime to its dens, and finding out how much it is identified with misery and with that barbarism which sits grim and dangerous by the side of civilization ; to abate if possible the want and to remove the ignorance before the dimness of the child becomes the total darkness of the adult—such are the duties which it is the especial honor of many of the present race of our writers of prose fiction to have successfully inculcated. They have brought us to know our fellows in the great community to which we belong. It is a knowledge which promises safety to the great and to the rich ; to the landowner and the merchant ; to the lawyer and the divine ; to all who serve the state in administrative functions ; to the secular teacher, and even to the abstracted student who would "let the world slip"—"Blessed is he that considereth the poor ; the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble." All honor to those beguilers of life's dull hours who have labored to bring us all to a knowledge of each other by repeated efforts, such as those of Charles Dickens ; to the illustrious females, such as Elizabeth Gaskell, who have seen in this work an especial vocation ; to a band of manly thinkers, of whom Charles Kingsley is the type. They have their reward, though not a complete one, in seeing the great change which marks the difference between 1831 and 1861. The author of "Alton Locke," who, from his recollections of twenty years ago, drew a painful picture of the hateful severance of classes, thus describes the great change which presents itself to his view in 1862 : "Before the influence of religion, both evangelical and Anglican ; before the spread of those liberal principles, founded on common humanity and justice, the triumph of which we owe to the courage and practical good sense of the Whig party ; before the example of a court, virtuous, humane, and beneficent—the attitude of the British upper classes has undergone a noble change. There is no aristocracy in the world, and there never has been one, as far as I know, which has so honorably repented, and brought forth fruits meet for repentance ; which has so cheerfully asked what its duty was that it might do it. It is not merely enlightened statesmen, philanthropists, devotees, or the working clergy, hard and heartily as they are working, who have set themselves to do good as a duty specially required of them by creed or by station. In the generality of younger laymen, as far as I can see, a humanity (in the highest sense of the word) has been awakened, which bids fair, in another generation, to abolish the last remnants of class prejudices and class grudges." *

The novels of Mr. Thackeray are signal examples of a great change in the mode of conducting prose fiction. When Garrick played Macbeth in the court costume of the reign of Anne, the pit did not hiss the anachronism. When the bold baron of the Minerva Press talked to his ladye-love in the style of Sir Fopling Flutter, the scene of their passion might have equally fitted Alnwick Castle or Sion House. The trusting reader did not regard language, or costume, or local coloring, as in any way essential to the development of a story whether of the fifteenth or the nineteenth century. Mr. Thackeray saw the great vulgar and the little vulgar of the club or the drawing-room, when he first looked around him for his materials for satire, and he laid them bare in his "Book of Snobs." He has painted the passion for notoriety, the childish ostentation, the sacrifice of comfort for show, the pride that goes before a fall, the money worship of the scheming mothers, the flirtations of the ambitious daughters, the sycophancy, the hypocrisy, the selfishness of his own age. He has shown the same inner life in the days of "two pages and a chair," of buckles and periwigs. But he never confounds the characteristics of the past and the present. If there is often a family likeness in his portraits, he is careful to individualize them by peculiarities characteristic of the shifting fashions of a generation. "The Virginians" belong to the time when decorum sat prim and solemn by the side of George and Charlotte at Kew ; when if the high-born wanted an occasional frolic with licentiousness they were perfectly indifferent to the effects of their example upon the swinish multitude who admiringly looked on. "Vanity Fair" is of the regency—its noise and its glitter—the constable to keep order in the crowd, the profligacy going forward where justice stands hoodwinked outside the door.

If any attempt only to indicate those who have taken rank among the novelists of the Victorian age be embarrassing from the length of the roll, what shall we say of the poets, whose name is legion. The elder, such as Bowles and Robert Montgomery, will not be numbered by future critics as belonging to the same class as the ephemeral tribe of another age that Johnson's "Lives" have rescued from oblivion. Allan Cunningham and Bryan Waller Proctor, who belong to the

* Tasso, Fairfax's translation, book i. canto 3.

* "Alton Locke," Preface to edition of 1862, p. viii.

middle period, are worthy of long memory. A younger race to whom we, individually, were bound by ties of friendly intercourse —Winthrop Mackworth Praed, Sidney Walker, John Moultrie, Derwent Coleridge—may perhaps be more impartially estimated by others, but by none with a more hearty esteem for those who are living, and with a deeper regret for those who were too prematurely taken away. Ebenezer Elliott will be remembered for more enduring qualities than are displayed in his "Corn Law Rhymes." John Clare is still among us in the flesh, but his true pictures of rural life, and of, the peculiar aspects of his own Midland scenery, will never again delight by that truth and freshness which stand out amid the imitative and conventional herd. Richard Monckton Milnes has accomplished the very difficult feat of taking a really distinguished position as a poet, without impairing his usefulness as a politician. Richard Barham was equally successful in producing the most humorous *Fabliaux* of the nineteenth century, without compromising his character as a clergyman by putting on the dress of a troubadour.

Dramatic poetry had nearly reached its culminating point when Victoria came to the throne. Sheridan Knowles, Bulwer Lytton, Leigh Hunt, Thomas Noon Talfourd, James White, had attained a well-merited popularity, before the time when the scene-painter and the property-man usurped the functions of the poet. We need not enlarge upon their merits, nor contrast them with a time which has produced no drama to be acted which is likely to be known after it has dragged through a brief and inglorious life. We have dramas not for the stage; of which those of Henry Taylor may be mentioned as noble poems, and those of Robert Browning, of whom we have presently to speak in his general poetical character, as vivid dialogues without the "business" which makes a play.

The two great poets who came early in the fourth decade of the nineteenth century, to fill up the void when Byron, and Keats, and Shelley had passed away, were Alfred Tennyson and Robert Browning. Wordsworth, Rogers, Crabbe, Southey, Coleridge, Campbell, were still among us when Tennyson, an undergraduate of Trinity College, Cambridge, published, in 1830, "Poems, chiefly lyrical." Browning, educated at the University of London, in 1835 published "Paracelsus." Moving onward by different roads toward high excellence and permanent fame, each is, in his several way, a representative of our age. To Browning belongs its inquiring and sceptical spirit; to Tennyson its cultivation of the home affections, its sympathy with all natural emotions, whether belonging to the refined or the uneducated. To Browning it belongs to follow Paracelsus in his wanderings through continental Europe; to see Pippa pass in the Trevisan; to be in Sardinia with Victor Amadeus and Charles Emmanuel; to celebrate Colombe's birthday at Cleves. In his greater dramas and his dramatic lyrics nearly all his scenes are laid in foreign lands which had become accessible to Englishmen in the age of steamboats and railroads. He leaves to others to walk in English lanes and amid English trees. This is the landscape amid which Tennyson moves. Where "The Lady of Shallott" dwells,

> "On either side the river lie
> Long fields of barley and of rye."

"The Gardener's Daughter" grew amid meadows

> "Dewy fresh, browsed by deep-udder'd kine,"

and to the solitary garden comes

> "The windy clanging of the minster clock."

When the poet leaves the familiar scenes of to-day he takes us into the same English landscape of the past. We look upon "King Arthur"

> "Among the mountains by the winter sea;"

Godiva, "clothed on with chastity," rides through old Coventry, but the poet thinks of her as he is "waiting for the train." However steadily regarding the past and glancing at the future, he has still the great nineteenth century flashing upon his mind:

> "Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
> And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns."*

Tennyson looked upon the transition time of 1832, when fear of change was perplexing the old, and hopes of a bright future were leading on the young, and he thought of his country as

> "A land of settled government,
> A land of just and old renown,
> Where freedom broadens slowly down
> From precedent to precedent."

At once the poet of progress and of conservatism, he is essentially the representative of the opinions that have made our country secure, amid the war of opinion which has been raging all around us. What Shakespeare was to the age of Elizabeth as the suggestive poet of a just patriotism, Tennyson is to the age of Victoria.

We cannot close the mention of our poets without adding the name of Elizabeth Barrett, who in wedding as true a poet as herself—one who could walk with her in all the fields of learning—over whose thoughts her genius would have a perceptible influence—gave a double immortality to the name of Browning. Nor must we forget one who long stood alone in the most remarkable combination of humor and pathos, which gave him an equal command over laughter and over tears. Thomas Hood was a poet of the rarest genius; and yet he was classed by many with the laborious manufacturers of jokes who had little care for any result of their witticisms other than the passing smile. Put Hood's "Whims and Oddities" by the side of Colman's "Broad Grins," and we at once see the almost immeasurable superiority to the merely grotesque of the "infinite jest" which belongs to the "most excellent fancy." There was in Hood's table-talk a gravity, almost amounting to melancholy, which surrounded his humor with a halo which added to its charm without impairing its power. It was the same with his writings. The depth of his sympathies with sorrow and suffering burst out in his latter years in those pathetic lyrics which abided in the memories of many who were then coming into the active labors of life, and made them thoughtful about more things than money-getting. The economist might say that "Songs of the Shirt" presented a one-sided picture of human affairs. Rigid moralists might affirm that the frail self-destroyer might better be left unwept. Nature triumphed. We believe that the true relations of labor and capital, and the just limitations of Christian sympathy with sin, were better understood by looking at the exceptional cases which the poet drew in his day of sickness and poverty.

Hood occasionally illustrated his writings by his own sketches. When he died a remarkable publication was in its full vigor, in which the pen and the pencil were united to present the ludicrous aspects of human life, and not seldom the serious aspects of that sorrow which seemed to spring from legislative indifference to social evils. "Punch" has been one of the most vital emanations of this mixed quality of the ludicrous and the reflective. In this school Douglas Jerrold first took that hold of the public mind which his brilliant wit, his ready sarcasm, and his real benevolence long commanded. In this school Thackeray first won his spurs. To look over the forty volumes of the twenty years' existence of "Punch" is to trace the political and social England of the Victorian era through a medium which, if the age of the Tudors or the Stuarts could have tolerated such a mirror, would have been worth a wilderness of state papers, such as we are now rescuing out of the dust of oblivion.

We have thus hastily run through three principal classes of literature which have been "both an effect and a cause" in relation to their age. For very obvious reasons we pass by the great mass of the theology of this epoch, which the future historian will have to study as carefully as the High Church and Nonconformist polemics must be studied to understand the character of the time which produced Jeremy Taylor and Baxter. In the Episcopal Church of England and in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland there have been heresies and schisms, discords and separations, which have left little leisure for the calm pursuits of learned investigation, or the cultivation of an eloquence suited to all time. The Butlers and Barrows have had few rivals in logical profundity; the Lardners and Paleys have scarcely had adequate successors as historical or textual commentators. Those, we presume to say, who have most stood aloof from the controversies of their own day appear most certain of a durable place in the esteem of another generation. Such appreciation will, we believe, be awarded to the ecclesiastical historian, Dean Milman; to Frederick W. Robertson, the most fervent and yet the most tolerant of preachers; to those who have walked in the footsteps of

* "Locksley Hall."

Arnold, and have more enforced that religion of love which is all-comprehensive, than the worship which rests upon ceremonial, and the faith which assumes to be most Christian when it is most exclusive. But amid the controversies between the two great sections of the English Church, one great fact stands out, to mark most distinctly that the spirit of the age has made its religion more practically beneficent, and out of division has compelled union. When the clergy, whether Anglican or evangelical, discovered clearly that apathy and neglect amid surrounding ignorance and vice were not only a reproach but a danger, dissent saw that the area of proselytism was materially narrowed, and that its triumphs must henceforth be won in the generous and honest rivalry of all religionists in doing good—in schools, in hospitals, in prisons—in the pestilent alleys and the marsh-girt hovels; by weaning the drunkard from his dram by inducing a desire for knowledge; by teaching the slattern and the scold that discomfort makes the husband brutal and the child undutiful. There is other teaching than that of homilies; and all Christian teachers have learned that there is other work for them to do than that which Sunday brings.

The essential dependence of all social improvements upon accurate statistics has been signally manifested in the period about which we are writing. The political economists, of whom without disparagement of others we may mention John Stuart Mill as the most original and influential, have more than ever built their science upon statistics. Macculloch and Porter were individually leading the way in supplying theory with its only safe and durable materials. Graham and Farr directed official inquiries to more extensive uses than the correction of tables of mortality. They made the figures of the registrar-general's office subserve every amelioration of our social condition; rendering even the most careless observer sensible that health is dependent upon cleanliness and upon ventilation, and that the epidemics, which were once deemed the scourges of a wicked generation, are the visitations of a Gracious Ruler to teach man to read in the great book of nature how sharp and certain are the penalties of the social neglect of His laws.

The scientific writers, whether in natural history, or physiology, or physics, or mathematics, are so numerous, and their labors have produced such mighty results upon arts and industry, that to name the more eminent would in us be presumptuous. It is not for us to speak of the great geologists—Buckland, Sedgwick, Lyell, De la Beche, Hugh Miller—of the interpreters of primeval ages who have trod in the footsteps of Cuvier—Owen, Murchison, Forbes—of those who have compelled that alliance of science with sacred texts which can never impair the true value of revealed truth. But we may pronounce one word of respect for the teachers who, not stepping down from their lofty heights of pure science, have made its abstract wisdom lovely in the eyes of the uninitiated—of such as Brewster, as the younger Herschel, as Sabine, as Airy, as Babbage, as Arnott, as Whewell, as Faraday. Of the great discoverers and inventors—Wheatstone, of the electric telegraph—Talbot, who first showed how the sun could paint, and thus made photography the delight of the age, multiplying all remembrances of the perishing ruin or the fresh landscape, and making the familiar faces of the parent or the sister of the English home its truest memorials in the Antipodes—of these, and especially of the chemists, who have penetrated more deeply than any other philosophers into the hidden secrets of nature—of these the honors are inscribed on the imperishable column which records our victories over matter, compelling its unwilling obedience to the service of man.

The critics and essayists abound in an age when reviews and magazines abound more than ever. There are distinct works which stand out as self-contained achievements. The elder D'Israeli's "Curiosities of Literature;" Walter Savage Landor's "Imaginary Conversations;" Hallam's "Introduction to the Literature of Europe;" "Guesses at Truth," by Julius Hare and his brother; "Essays Written in the Intervals of Business," by Arthur Helps; "The Statesman" of Henry Taylor—these are works of real vitality. In art criticism Mrs. Jameson exhibited her remarkable knowledge of the religious symbolism of the middle ages, while Mr. Ruskin was startling the orthodox critics by his eloquent originality on the characteristics of "Modern Painters." Let us add a word on the impulse which was given in the first ten years of the queen's reign to Shakespearean criticism. It would be arrogant in the author of this history to dwell upon his own labors as a commentator on Shakespeare; it would be affectation in him not to mention them in association with the names of Collier, Dyce, Halliwell, and Hunter. The spirit of inquiry applied to the illustration of Shakespeare and our early dramatists was in some degree a continuation of the labors of the commentators of the previous century, but constructed upon those broader principles of criticism with which Coleridge had made us familiar. But it was a peculiar characteristic of this era that not only were the labors of eminent individuals, such as Palgrave and Kemble, directed toward a more searching investigation into all questions of our history and early literature, but that the deeper and more accurate spirit of antiquarian inquiry was followed up by the formation of archæological institutes and associations, not merely in London but in every part of the country. The same spirit gave rise to the establishment of publishing societies, such as the Camden Society, for printing old manuscripts and reprinting scarce books. These and many other peculiarities in the literary tendencies of the Victorian era afford satisfactory proof that the age of loose research and vague generalities was happily past, in whatever department of literature aspired to a permanent influence.

If we were to attempt a record of those whom an age of universal communication has sent forth to explore the uttermost ends of the earth—if we were to trace even such persevering and sagacious explorers amid the dust of ages as Layard, and such interpreters of the great fruitful past as Wilkinson—we might add to the suggestive interest of our chapters, but should usurp the functions that belong to a more special history of our age. Of travel in the time of Queen Victoria, there are no details more full of human interest than those which belong to African research, and to the Arctic expeditions, the last of which only developed how our countrymen would persevere and die in the discharge of the duty assigned to them, and how their followers in the same course would never rest till a difficult problem had been solved, whatever might be its intrinsic value.

We may conclude with a remark or two on the commerce of literature. When we look back at the various periods of English publication, and consider how amazingly the aggregate number of books published in any one period had increased, we must also regard the size and price of the works published, to form any adequate notion of the general diffusion of literature. Even with a general reduction of price during a quarter of a century, with the substitution of duodecimos for quartos, and with single volumes beyond all former precedent, there is little doubt that the annual returns of publishing in all its departments had been doubled in 1850, as compared with 1825. The book-trade was to be estimated, not by the number of the learned who once collected folios, and of the rich who rejoiced in exclusive quartos, but of the many to whom a small volume of a living author had become a necessity for instruction or for amusement, and who desired to read our established literature in editions well printed and carefully edited, though essentially cheap. This number of readers had been constantly increasing, and as constantly pressing for a reduction of price upon modern books of high reputation.

The altered tone and ability of newspapers was decidedly marked at this period. At the beginning of the present century the local newspapers "had no editorial comments whatever,"* and scarcely an original paragraph. The conductors of our five hundred provincial journals at the end of the first half of the century were watching for every particle of news in their own districts; reporting public meetings; waiting for electric telegraphs; pondering upon grave questions of social economy; and, to the best of their judgment, fairly representing the course of events. Much of this intelligent and honorable spirit they owed to the progressive improvement of the London newspaper press.

NOTE ON THE CLASSES OF BOOKS PUBLISHED, 1816 TO 1851.

In 1853 there was issued a "Classified Index to the London Catalogue of Books, 1816–1851," in which there are 34 divisions of classification. For a special object we took the pains to analyze this octavo volume of 300 pages, and were thus enabled to estimate in round numbers the sort of books which the public were buying, or reading, or neglecting, in these 36 years. We found that they were invited to purchase in the following proportion of classes:

* "Life of Edward Baines," by his son.

Works on divinity		10,300
History and geography		4,900
Fiction		3,500
Foreign languages and school-books		4,000
Drama and poetry		3,400
Juvenile books		2,900
Medical		2,500
Biography		1,850
Law		1,850
Science.—Zoology	550	
" Botany	700	
" Chemistry	170	
" Geology	280	
" Mathematics	350	
" Astronomy	150	
" Natural philosophy	300	
		2,500
Arts, etc.—Antiquities	350	
" Architecture	500	
" Fine arts	450	
" Games and sports	300	
" Illustrated works	500	
" Music	220	
" Genealogy and heraldry	140	
		2,460
Industry.—Mechanics, etc	500	
" Agriculture	250	
" Trade and commerce	600	
" Political economy, statistics	700	
" Military	300	
		2,350
Moral Sciences.—Philology, etc	350	
" Education	300	
" Moral philosophy	300	
" Morals	450	
" Domestic economy	200	
		1,600
Miscellaneous (so classed)		1,400
		45,510

Upon calculations based upon the London catalogues of books from 1828, we learn that after the lapse of a quarter of a century there were three times as many books published as in 1828 ; that the comparative increase in the number of volumes was not so great, showing that of the new books more single volumes were published ; that the average price of each new work had been reduced nearly one half ; and that the average price per volume had fallen about five shillings below the price of 1828.

CHAPTER CCXXXV.

Sir Robert Peel prime minister—Commercial distress—Birth of the Prince of Wales—Agitation against the corn laws—Sir Robert Peel's bill for a sliding scale—Lord John Russell's proposal of a fixed duty—Income tax renewed—Reduction of the tariff—Petition for the people's charter—Assaults on the queen—Parliament prorogued—Relations with France—Treaty of Washington settling the boundary question—Disturbances in the manufacturing districts—Opening of parliament, 1843—Debate on the depression of manufactures—Mr. Cobden and Sir Robert Peel—Corn law debate—Mr. Charles Buller's speech on systematic colonization—Monster meetings for repeal of the union—Arrest of O'Connell—The Scotch Church—Secession of ministers to constitute the free church—New district churches in England—The Rebecca riots—Suppression of the disturbances in Wales.

The ministerial arrangements of Sir Robert Peel were completed ; the members of the House of Commons who had accepted office were all re-elected. On the 16th of September, 1841, the prime minister made a declaration of his policy in the most explicit terms, which policy amounted to this, that not a word would he utter of what he intended to do. He asked for the confidence of the house, while he considered the mode in which the great financial evil of the previous seven years could be removed. Being pressed upon the subject of the corn laws, he said, in a subsequent debate, he should have thought it reasonable that, on returning to power after a lapse of ten years, he should not been called upon within a month to propose an alteration of the law in respect to the trade in corn. If he were to be responsible for not instantly proposing a measure on the corn laws, what must be thought of that government that had held office for five years, and never until the month of May, 1841, had intimated an united opinion on that subject? During the remainder of the session, from all the manufacturing districts came the most afflicting statements of the depression of trade and of the sufferings of the operative classes. Again and again it was said that the corn laws were the principal cause of this commercial distress ; and Sir Robert Peel was urged not to let parliament separate without making some disclosure of the measures which he contemplated for the settlement of this question. The prorogation took place on the 7th of October. During these three weeks of continued debate not a syllable could be extracted in either house of parliament from any member of the government, as to the course to be pursued, by which hope might be afforded to those who suffered, and discontent might be deprived of some of its power of stirring up a starving population into madness. The royal speech, delivered by commission, was as vague and mysterious as the individual declarations of members of the cabinet. The difficulties of Sir Robert Peel arose, as we have already seen, not only from the distrust of his political opponents, but from the almost impossibility of reconciling some members of his own administration to any large change of financial and commercial policy opposed to their own class interests, and to the principles which had so long held them together as a great party.

On Tuesday, the 9th of November, the "London Gazette Extraordinary" announced the birth that morning of a prince. By letters patent of the 8th of December the queen created "our most dear son, the Prince of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland (Duke of Saxony, Duke of Cornwall and Rothsay, Earl of Carrick, Baron of Renfrew, Lord of the Isles, and Great Steward of Scotland), Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester." On the following 25th of January the baptism of the Prince of Wales was performed in the royal chapel of St. George at Windsor, the King of Prussia, who had visited England for this especial occasion, being one of the sponsors.

After four months of anxious speculation on the part of the public as to the course that the ministry would pursue upon the two great questions of finance and trade, the queen opened the session of parliament on the 3d of February, 1842. The King of Prussia accompanied the queen to witness this ceremonial. A great personal interest was given to the speech by its opening sentence : "I cannot meet you in parliament assembled without making a public acknowledgment of my gratitude to Almighty God on account of the birth of the prince, my son ; an event which has completed the measure of my domestic happiness." The state of the finances and of the expenditure of the country was recommended to the immediate attention of parliament ; and so also was recommended "the state of the laws which affect the importation of corn and of other articles the produce of foreign countries." There was no amendment to the address. It was announced on the 3d by Sir Robert Peel that on the 9th he should move for a committee of the whole house for the purpose of considering the laws which affected the import of foreign corn. When the day arrived great was the excitement in and around the House of Commons. Six hundred anti-corn-law delegates had gone in procession to Palace Yard, and had there taken their station, crying out from time to time as members passed them, "Total repeal," "Fixed duty," "No sliding scale." The plan which Sir Robert Peel developed in his speech was in no degree calculated to allay the commercial discontent with regard to the trade in corn. He maintained the existing principle of the sliding scale of duties on the importation of foreign corn, but he lowered the protection afforded, and introduced a more liberal method of fixing the averages. To no party was the minister's scheme satisfactory. The Whigs, by Lord John Russell, proposed, instead of the sliding scale, a fixed duty of eight shillings per quarter. Mr. Villiers and Mr. Cobden insisted upon that total repeal of all duties on corn which they had long so strenuously and consistently advocated. The ultra-protectionists demanded that a higher rate of duties should be adopted at every move in the sliding scale. The debates upon each and all of these various principles were carried on without intermission till the bill introduced by Sir Robert Peel passed the House of Commons on the 7th of April. For four nights Lord John Russell's proposition of a fixed duty was debated, and it was rejected by a majority of a hundred and twenty-three. During five nights the motion of Mr. Villiers for the abolition of all duties on corn was discussed, and it was rejected by a majority of three hundred and ninety-three. The higher protectionist scale proposed by Mr. Christopher was rejected by a majority of three hundred and six. In defending his proposal Sir Robert Peel maintained that it was of the utmost importance to the interests of the country that we should be as far as possible independent of foreign supply ; that the main sources of the supply of corn should be derived from domestic agriculture ; but that all foreign supplies should be for the purpose of making up deficiencies, rather than as the chief sources of subsistence. There was a tone, however, in the speech of Sir Robert Peel which indicated to some of the protectionists that the minister was not the man to carry out their extreme views. "I

should not consider myself," he said, "a friend to the agriculturist if I asked for a protection with a view of propping up rents, or for the purpose of defending his interest or the interest of any particular class." Lord Palmerston, in a speech at the close of the session, in which he reviewed the measures of the late and present ministers, congratulated the government upon having come into office fully imbued with those sound principles, "the enunciation of which has excited so much admiration on this side of the house, and has created so much surprise and alarm on the other."* Sir Robert Peel retorted—in allusion to Lord Palmerston's support of the Reform Bill after his opposition to all reform in the time of Mr. Canning—that harsh and intolerant criticisms on the versatile opinions of others proceeded with a very bad grace from the noble lord. It was insinuated that he had deluded his supporters by the extent and importance of the alterations he had made in the corn laws. There might have been shades of difference—there might have been occasional dissatisfaction and complaint—but he had the firm belief that the conduct of himself and his colleagues in office had not abated one jot of that confidence on the part of their friends which cheered and encouraged them in the blank regions of opposition. Subsequent revelations have shown how materially Sir Robert Peel was hampered by the suspicions of his party. In his own memoirs, published by the trustees of his papers, he says, "During the discussions in parliament on the corn law of 1842, I was more than once pressed to give a guarantee (so far as a minister could give it) that the amount of protection established by that law should be permanently adhered to; but although I did not then contemplate the necessity for further change, I uniformly refused to fetter the discretion of the government by any such assurances as those that were required from me."†

The measure propounded by Sir Robert Peel upon the corn laws was that halting between two opinions which it was evident he himself could not regard as a final settlement of the question: "I did not *then* contemplate the necessity for further change." This measure, like most compromises, required something like a tone of apology both to his friends and his opponents. But the minister was on far safer ground when he came forward with his great financial measure. When he proposed the renewal of the property tax for the purpose of sweeping away a host of vexatious and embarrassing duties upon foreign commerce, he had not to defy the opposition of a great class interest such as that of the landed proprietors and the agriculturists. He would make many of the tax-payers indignant, especially those who saw indirect taxation according to their means, the closing of that door of escape from the general burden of the community of which many of the rich could avail themselves by parsimony or absenteeism. The ministerial proposition was a tax upon all incomes above 150*l.* a year, not to exceed sevenpence in the pound, for the limited period of three years. The tax, he said, would not only supply the deficit occasioned by the excess of expenditure over revenue, but would justify such a large reduction of commercial taxation as would, in regard to the expenditure of most individuals, indirectly make up the difference that was taken from them by direct taxation. Out of a tariff of twelve hundred articles Sir Robert proposed to reduce the duty on seven hundred and fifty. "We have sought," he declared, "to remove all absolute prohibitions upon the import of foreign articles, and we have endeavored to reduce duties which are so high as to be prohibitory to such a scale as may admit of fair competition with domestic produce. In cases where that principle has been departed from, and prohibitory duties maintained, we justify our departure from the rule by the special circumstances of the case. With respect to raw materials, which constitute the elements of our manufactures, our object, speaking generally, has been to reduce the duties on them to almost a nominal amount. In half-manufactured articles, which enter almost as much as the raw material into our domestic manufacture, we have reduced the duty to a moderate amount. And with regard to completely manufactured articles, our design has been to remove prohibition, and to reduce prohibitory duties, so that the manufactures of foreign countries may enter into a fair competition with our own." That part of the financial measure which revived the obnoxious war tax upon income, with all its original inquisitorial character and its unequal operation, upon permanent and upon uncertain revenues, was strenuously opposed in both houses. But the necessity for some bold measure for putting the finances of the country upon a solid foundation bore down all opposition, whether in or out of parliament. The commercial and manufacturing interests could not regard the new tariff with any feeling but that of satisfaction. The actual amount of the seven hundred and fifty reductions would not much exceed a quarter of a million sterling, but an immense number of vexatious custom-house restrictions were at once swept away, and an example was held up to foreign nations which Sir Robert Peel believed would ultimately prevail. The agriculturists were in a fearful state of alarm. Salted and fresh meat, oxen, sheep, and cows, were to be admitted at reduced rates of duty. There was a widespread panic, raised upon prophecies that it would be impossible to compete with the foreign grazier, that meat would be reduced to threepence per pound, and that all who had stock had better sell it as fast as possible. This senseless alarm, which we can laugh at in 1862, was only a foretaste of the terror which would prevail when a bolder approach should be made to those principles of free trade which, during the twenty years before Sir Robert Peel's opening administration, had been slowly advancing, and which in the succeeding twenty years have changed the whole character of English industry, giving an impulse to every employment of capital and labor beyond what the most sanguine of economists could have contemplated as so immediate and so permanent a result of legislation. After many debates in both houses, the financial propositions of Sir Robert Peel were carried with little alteration. The government had done something in its advance toward a sound commercial policy; it had done nothing, as some had expected, to go back to antiquated principles, or to halt altogether on the road of improvement.

While the House of Commons was in committee on the Income Tax Bill, its attention was diverted from the minute details involved in its numerous clauses by the presentation of a very remarkable petition. On the 2d of May a long procession of workingmen, escorting sixteen of their number bearing a heavy burden, entered the lobby of the House of Commons. The load which required for its support this aggregate amount of human strength was a petition, signed, it was alleged, by three millions of people. The document was too large to pass through the folding doors of the House of Commons, and it was necessary to unroll it to carry it into the house. When unrolled it spread over a great part of the floor, and rose above the level of the table. The petition set forth many evils of which the petitioners complained, and they demanded that the House of Commons "do immediately, without alteration, deduction, or addition, pass into a law the document entitled 'The People's Charter.'" Mr. Thomas Duncombe presented the petition, and the next day he moved that the petitioners should be heard at the bar of the house in support of their allegations. The debate on this occasion was interesting. Probably its greatest interest was a speech of Mr. Macaulay. Of the six points of the charter, he said, there was one for which he had voted—the ballot—and he saw no reason to change his opinion on that subject. There was another point of which he decidedly approved—the abolition of the pecuniary qualification for members of that house. He differed from the Chartists in their demand for annual parliaments, as he differed also as to the expediency of paying representatives of the people, and of dividing the country into electoral districts. He did not consider these matters as vital. They were subordinate questions when compared with that one question which still remained to be considered. "The essence of the charter is universal suffrage. If you withhold that, it matters not very much what else you grant. If you grant that, it matters not at all what else you withhold. If you grant that the country is lost. . . . My firm conviction is, that in our country universal suffrage is incompatible, not with this or that form of government, but with all forms of government, and with everything for the sake of which forms of government exist; that it is incompatible with property, and that it is consequently incompatible with civilization."* The motion of Mr. Duncombe was rejected by two hundred and eighty-seven votes to forty-nine.

It was in this session that, after considerable debate in both houses, Lord Ashley's bill for restraining the employment of women and

* Hansard, vol. lxv. col. 1237.

† "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. ii. p. 101.

* "Macaulay's Speeches," p. 256.

children in mines and collieries was passed.* In this session important alterations were made in the constitution of courts of bankruptcy. The court of review was formed of one judge instead of three judges; and district courts of bankruptcy were established. This amendment of the bankruptcy law was introduced by the chancellor, Lord Lyndhurst. While parliament was sitting, two infamous assaults were made upon the person of the sovereign. On the 30th of May John Francis, a young man under twenty years of age, fired a pistol at the queen as she was returning to Buckingham Palace down Constitution Hill in a barouche and four, accompanied by Prince Albert. Some rumor of the intended attempt upon the queen's life had previously reached the palace. Her majesty, thinking of others rather than of herself, desired that none of the ladies in waiting should accompany her in her ride, which she would not forego for ambiguous threats that had reached the ears of the police. Francis, who had been immediately seized, was found guilty of high treason, and received the usual capital sentence, which on the 2d of July was commuted into transportation for life. On the 3d of July a deformed youth, named John William Bean, presented a pistol at her majesty, but being seized by a bystander was prevented firing it. The mode in which the legislature dealt with offences of this nature was completely successful in putting an end to attempts which were odious and contemptible, having their origin in no feelings of public or private grievance, but were the results most probably, in each of the three cases which had shocked the public feeling, of a distempered imagination producing a morbid desire for notoriety. On the 12th of July Sir Robert Peel brought in a bill for the better protection of the queen's person. He proposed that any party not actually designing to take away the queen's life, but intending to hurt her or alarm her, should be subject to transportation for a term not exceeding seven years; but that there should also be another punishment, more suitable to the offence and more calculated to repress it—a discretionary power of imprisonment with authority to inflict personal chastisement. What we have to guard against, said Sir Robert Peel, is not any traitorous attempt against the peace of the nation by conspiring to take away the life of the sovereign, but it is the folly or malignity of wretches who are guilty of acts prompted by motives which are scarcely assignable. The bill was rapidly passed through all its stages in both houses.

On the 12th of August her majesty prorogued parliament in person. The queen's speech necessarily adverted to the great financial and commercial measures of the session, and expressed a trust that there were indications of a recovery from that depression which had affected many branches of manufacturing industry.

In the debate at the conclusion of the session—a debate which was truly a passage-at-arms between Lord Palmerston and Sir Robert Peel—the prime minister said that the non-ratification of treaties by France and her delay in admitting our just claims had been the consequences of that alienation, that irritable feeling, which either through the fault or the misfortune of the noble Lord (Palmerston) had been the result of his foreign policy. "This country," said Sir Robert Peel, "has no feeling of hostility toward France. It was but the other day that we heard of the lamentable death of the Duke of Orleans, the heir to the throne of France, with deep and universal regret and sympathy."† The Duke of Orleans was thrown from his carriage and killed on the 13th of July. Twenty years ago, so different was the mode of transmitting intelligence from one country to the other, that the news of this event reached London by pigeon-carriers on the morning of the 14th.‡ The foreign policy of the British government was chiefly intrusted by Sir Robert Peel to Lord Aberdeen. M. Guizot has said of this able and honest member of the cabinet: "Like Peel, he desired that peace and justice should prevail in the mutual relations of states: better than any one else, he knew how to discern and accept their conditions, and to employ only those means and that language which were calculated to secure their predominance, and by inspiring the men with whom he treated with confidence in his moderation and equity, he disposed them to deal with him in the same spirit."§ In the debate of the 14th of August Sir Robert Peel said, "We have no hostile, no irritable feeling toward France, neither have we any fear; we are too proud, too conscious of our own strength, to regard the power of France with apprehension; but we deprecate, for the interests of humanity, the interruption of friendly relations with that country."* The Count de Jarnac, who succeeded M. Guizot in his embassy to England, had an interview with Sir Robert Peel at this period, at which, "in spite of his habitual reserve and laconicism," the prime minister strongly expressed his opinion upon the temper of the French government: "The recent policy of France has entirely alienated from you the party which sustains me. No one more often than myself has testified from its origin my respect and confidence for the actual government of France. I have supported it from the beginning with all my power against the convictions and antipathies of a great number of my partisans. I have never endeavored to impede its march or augment its difficulties. But never have I foreseen that our relations would be placed in such a situation as I find them in to-day." Who, says Count Jarnac, shall fathom the depth of popular credulity? At this epoch Louis Philippe and his government were seriously accused of excessive condescension toward England, and Sir Robert Peel and Lord Aberdeen escaped not the reproach of extreme complaisance toward France.†

It was in this year that Lord Ashburton, having proceeded to the United States as a special commissioner, concluded a treaty which settled the question as to the boundary between Canada and the State of Maine. Sir Robert Peel, at the commencement of the session of 1843, declared that the treaty which Lord Ashburton had concluded at Washington in August, 1842, established such a division of the disputed district as secured our British possessions in North America, and at the same time preserved our military communication intact. Subsequent circumstances have manifested that these results were not altogether obtained by what Lord Palmerston called "the Ashburton Capitulation."‡

On the day after the prorogation of parliament a proclamation by the queen was issued, setting forth that in divers parts of Great Britain multitudes of lawless and disorderly persons had assembled and with force and violence had entered into mines, mills, and manufactories, and by threats and intimidation had prevented those employed from following their usual occupation. The distress in the manufacturing districts had been most severe for a considerable time. Many employers had failed; mills were shut up; the poor rates were enormously increased; and government was called upon to supply that aid for the relief of the distress which was beyond the management of local administrators of the poor law. The working people upon the whole bore their privations with patience and fortitude; but in many places the Chartists were busy stirring them up to demand higher wages than the capitalists could afford out of their reduced means, although the workmen perfectly well knew that their employers were fast sinking into ruin. Strikes were unavailing, and then came riots. Sir James Graham, the home secretary, encountered the crisis with decision and firmness. The system of railroads had enabled him to send troops rapidly to any scene of outrage, and their appearance was sufficient in any case to effect the restoration of tranquillity without a repetition of such sanguinary collisions as those of Manchester and Bristol at a past time. Some of the more dangerous Chartists, among whom was Feargus O'Connor, were held to bail, and during the first fortnight of October special commissions sat at Stafford, at Chester, and at Liverpool, for the trial of persons accused of riots and political offences, a great number of whom were convicted and sentenced either to transportation or to various terms of imprisonment.

When parliament met on the 2d of February, 1843, the government had few subjects for exultation, which were not more than counterbalanced by circumstances calculated to weaken the confidence of the country, if not to inspire distrust and alarm. The treaty with the United States, the conclusion of the war with China, the final success of military operations in Afghanistan, were the favorable topics of the royal speech delivered by commission. The diminished receipt from some of the ordinary sources of revenue, which it was acknowledged must be attributed to reduced consumption caused

* See *ante*, p. 1226. † Hansard, vol. lxv. col. 1281.
‡ See Raikes's "Memoirs," vol. iv. p. 208.
§ "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 145.

* Hansard, vol. lxv. col. 1281.
† "Revue des Deux Mondes," 15th July, 1861, p. 443.
‡ The boundary as finally agreed upon by the treaty of 1842 is fully stated in the "English Cyclopædia," art. Canada, col. 276.

by depression of the manufacturing industry of the country, was a most significant index of the continuance of that depression which a few months before had produced serious violations of the public peace. There was no amendment proposed to the address. But very little time was suffered to elapse before the one great cause assigned for the stagnation of commerce, for the languor of manufacturing industry, for men working at half time or wholly unemployed, was rung into the ears of the minister in parliament. That cause had been most effectually proclaimed throughout the country by a body of agitators more powerful in their wealth, their social position, their talents, and their perseverance, than had ever before been banded together to force upon an unwilling legislature a great measure of reform. Against this dreaded reform was arrayed a no less powerful combination of the noble and the exclusive classes, hounded on by orators and writers who took their stand upon the wisdom of their forefathers, and despised all opinions founded upon increasing knowledge. On the 13th of February Lord Howick moved for a committee to consider so much of her majesty's speech as referred to that depression of the manufacturing interest of the country which had so long prevailed. The debate was continued for five nights. It was on the fifth night that Mr. Cobden uttered one of those harangues which, making no pretensions to be eloquent, extorted conviction from a few, and respect from many, by their strong common-sense, their logical array of facts, and their utter contempt for the conventionalities of party. It is time, he said, to give up bandying the terms Whig and Tory about from one side of the house to the other, and engage in a serious inquiry into the condition of the country. . . . "I tell the right honorable baronet that I, for one, care nothing for Whigs or Tories; I have said that I never will help to bring back the Whigs; but I tell him that the whole responsibility of the lamentable and dangerous state of the country rests with him." At the close of Mr. Cobden's speech Sir Robert Peel rose with manifest emotion, and said, "The honorable gentleman has stated here very emphatically, what he has more than once stated at the conferences of the Anti-Corn-Law League, that he holds me individually—individually responsible for the distress and suffering of the country; that he holds me personally responsible; but be the consequences of those insinuations what they may, never will I be influenced by menaces, either in this house or out of of this house, to adopt a course which I consider—" The minister was unable to complete his sentence. Mr. Cobden denied that he had said that he held Sir Robert Peel personally responsible. "You did!" was the cry from the ministerial benches. "You did!" said Sir Robert Peel. It was some time before the orator, usually so calm and unimpassioned, could shake off this sensitiveness, to which the term extraordinary might be applied, if it had not been associated with a lamentable event that had occurred on the previous 21st of January. On that day Mr. Drummond, private secretary of the minister, was shot by a Scotchman of the name of MacNaughten, who had come to London brooding over some supposed official injury, and had mistaken Mr. Drummond for Sir Robert Peel. There was no political motive in this act; the man upon his subsequent trial was shown to be a maniac. But it produced a deep impression on the mind of Sir Robert Peel; and when Mr. Cobden held him individually responsible for the state of the country, he considered that the words were an incentive to assassination. This extraordinary scene was concluded by Mr. Cobden disclaiming, amid repeated interruptions, the meaning which had been ascribed to his words. He declared that in what he stated he intended to throw the responsibility of his measures upon the right honorable baronet as the head of the government, and in using the word individually he used it as the minister himself used the first pronoun when he said, "I passed the tariff, and you supported me." The construction which Mr. Cobden had put upon the language he employed was accepted by Sir Robert Peel. But, says his biographer, "he accepted the explanation coldly, and still maintained an air of reserved distrust." M. Guizot adds, "Who can tell how much fatal poison may be contained in words uttered without any evil design?" He repeats a sentiment which was expressed in a speech by Mr. Roebuck: "I ask the honorable member if he did not see the danger of such language? Passion does sometimes destroy people's judgment." The motion of Lord Howick was finally rejected by a majority of a hundred and fifteen.

If the corn laws were not on the point of being repealed, it was not for the want of perseverance in their parliamentary opposers. The general subject was directly and indirectly brought forward again and again; but on each occasion a large majority asserted the principle of protection. At the close of one debate, which had lasted five nights upon a motion by Mr. Villiers, Mr. Cobden declared that whatever might be the fate of the motion it would not have the slightest effect upon the progress of public opinion on this subject. The league would go on as it had hitherto done, and if there were any force in truth and justice, it would go on to an ultimate and not distant triumph. The landed and agricultural interests were so much alarmed by what they considered the coquettings of the government with free-trade, that when Lord Stanley, as secretary for the colonies, proposed to impose a duty only of three shillings per quarter upon wheat imported from Canada, the more sensitive of the party shrieked out their horror of the Canadian Corn Bill as a free-trade measure. They were not soothed when they were told by Mr. T. Duncombe that "between their pledges to their constituents, their attachment to the government, and their antipathy to the Whigs, they were in a most unpleasant predicament. They smelt a rat; it was in the Canadian Corn Bill."* Skirmishes such as these occupied much of the time of the house during this session. The Canadian Corn Bill passed—the one practical move toward a great change of policy, although its supporters did not clearly see where their steps were tending.

Important as was the question of the repeal of the corn laws with reference to the condition of the great bulk of the people, there were legislators who could take a wider view of the circumstances of the country than was implied in the one prevailing cry of cheap bread. On the 6th of April Mr. Charles Buller moved an address to the queen on the subject of systematic colonization. His speech was a most able and comprehensive exposition of his belief that there was a permanent cause of the depression of industry, and the suffering of the people, in the constant accumulation of capital and the constant increase of population within the same restricted field of employment. He proposed colonization as a means of remedying the competition both of capital and labor in this restricted field. He stated that emigration had promised to be of little service until Mr. Wakefield propounded the theory of colonization that goes by his name. The great principles of that theory were, the sale of colonial land, and the expenditure of the proceeds in carrying out laborers. The government opposed Mr. Buller's motion, upon the plea that it would raise false hopes in the public mind. Mr. Buller withdrew his proposal, but it was clear that, with or without an official inquiry, new principles of colonization would gradually take root and finally produce, in concurrence with the rapid development of the resources of a vast colonial empire, that refuge for a surplus population which has been attended with such beneficial results upon our domestic condition in the present generation.

At the beginning of May the agitation in Ireland for the repeal of the union had become sufficiently formidable to make a declaration of the intentions of the government a matter of imperative necessity. In the House of Lords the Duke of Wellington and in the House of Commons Sir Robert Peel expressed a determination to abide by the principle of the joint address of both houses in 1834—"to maintain unimpaired and undisturbed the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland." Sir Robert Peel said that the executive government would rely as long as possible on the ordinary powers which the law and constitution gave them; but that if the necessity for increased authority should arise, they would not hesitate for a moment to appeal to parliament for additional powers. He added, "I am also prepared to make, in my place here, the declaration which was made, and nobly made, by Lord Althorp, that deprecating as I do all war, but above all civil war, yet there is no alternative which I do not think preferable to the dismemberment of this empire."† It was certainly time that the government should speak out. In January, at the weekly meeting of the Repeal Association, Mr. O'Connell announced that "1843 is and shall be the great repeal year." He abstained from attendance in parliament to devote himself to that system of political agitation which continued to arrest the removal of social evils till their overwhelming magnitude was fully manifested in the great collapse of the existing relations of landlord and tenant.

* Hansard, vol. lxix. col. 945.

† Ibid., col. 25.

The abuse of the right of property in land had long rendered the condition of the Irish peasantry inferior to that of any other peasantry in Europe. The organization for repeal which Mr. O'Connell had accomplished was to be supported and extended by the means of a universal subscription. The members of the repeal association were to subscribe twenty shillings a year, but throughout the country there were to be associate subscribers of a shilling each, with a machinery of inspectors, wardens, and collectors. This great sinew of war thus compelled from a starving population was known as the "rent." With most Englishmen there was not an utter forgetfulness of some benefits for his countrymen which O'Connell had worked out by his eloquence and his perseverance. But much of their respect had passed into a profound contempt for the unscrupulous agitator, which those who could pretty accurately read the public sentiment embodied in such graphic representations as that of "The Irish Ogre fattening on the finest pisantry."* Vast assemblies of the people were exultingly called by the great demagogue "monster meetings." He addressed thirty thousand people at Trim on the 16th of March, and referred to the physical force by which he was surrounded as something much more effectual than idle petitioning of parliament. Through the summer meetings of this nature were held in various parts of Ireland, where the same inflammatory language was repeated by laymen and priests with increasing vehemence. Father Mathew had been working a vast change in the habits of many of the Irish by the great temperance movement, of which he was an honest and zealous leader. But O'Connell adroitly adopted the teetotalers as the repealers upon whom rested the hope of sweeping away Saxon domination. On the 15th of August there was an assembly of which the lowest estimate of the number was half a million of people. During the previous night, and from the break of day, the people had been marching from all points to the Hill of Tara, where the ancient kings of Ireland had been elected. A sort of crown was prepared which the liberator was there to put on, and to declare to his people that the day was come when they should no longer be slaves—when the land should overflow with plenty, and every one should hold his half-acre with fixity of tenure, and out of its produce maintain his portion of a constantly increasing population. When the parliament was prorogued on the 24th of August, the queen in her speech noticed these persevering efforts to stir up discontent and disaffection, and expressed her earnest desire to administer the government of Ireland in a spirit of strict justice and impartiality, and to effect such amendments in the existing laws as might improve the social condition and develop the resources of that country. But she also expressed her firm determination to maintain the legislative union. Relying on the good sense and patriotism of the people, the queen called upon those who had influence and authority in Ireland to discourage a system of pernicious agitation. This moderate declaration of the government was pronounced by O'Connell to be "an excess of impudence and stupidity combined." His dangerous career was coming to an end. A meeting had been announced for the 8th of October at Clontarf, near Dublin. On the 7th a proclamation was agreed to by the privy council at Dublin, which, referring to the seditious language used at the monster meetings, declared the proposed assembly to be illegal. The demagogue was at once tamed. He called the Repeal Association together, and it was agreed that no meeting at Clontarf should take place. On the 14th Mr. O'Connell and his principal associates were arrested on charges of conspiracy, sedition, and unlawful assembling. The accused were admitted to bail; and after various pretexts for legal delays of which they availed themselves, it was finally determined that their trial should take place on the 15th of January, 1844.

At the prorogation of parliament the speaker addressed these words to her majesty, upon a subject of great and permanent interest: "We have witnessed with deep concern the unhappy divisions which have occurred in the Church of Scotland, and which have led to the secession of many of her most valued ministers. We have endeavored, we trust successfully, to heal those divisions, and to restore peace to an establishment which is fraught with such inestimable blessings to the inhabitants of that part of the United Kingdom." The "unhappy divisions" of the Scotch Church had been maturing for nine years, till, in 1843, the event occurred which is known as "the disruption." In 1834 the differences which had existed for more than a century between the supporters of lay patronage, long known as the "Moderates," and the opposers of lay patronage, then recently termed "Non-Intrusionists," assumed a more important character than that of a war of pamphlets, by the anti-patronage party obtaining a majority in the general assembly, and passing a measure known as the Veto Act. The object of this act was to make it a law of the Church that no presentee to a benefice was to be held fit to be ordained as minister of a parish unless he were acceptable to a majority of the parishioners. The mode of collecting the opinions of a congregation was this: The Presbytery, when a presentee laid his presentation before them, appointed him to preach twice in the church, and they also appointed a day for "moderating in a call," or, in other words, for receiving dissents. If a majority of the male heads of families in communion with the Church dissented, the presentee was rejected as an unfit person. In 1839 the question of a presentation to the parish of Auchterarder, in Perthshire, which had been agitated in the ecclesiastical courts, where the decision of the Presbytery against the presentation was confirmed, was finally decided on appeal in the House of Lords against the Presbytery. There was another case, that of Strathbogie, in which this important question was agitated under somewhat different circumstances, but in which the decisions of the ecclesiastical and civil courts were also at variance. The formal disruption of the Scotch Church took place at the meeting of the General Assembly on the 18th of May, 1843, when, before the roll of members was made up, Dr. Welsh, who had been moderator of the preceding assembly, read a protest against the constitution of the assembly signed by 120 ministers and 73 lay elders. Those who had signed the protest and their adherents then left the assembly in a body, and constituted in another place "The General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland." Of this assembly Dr. Chalmers was chosen as moderator. On the 23d of May the disruption was completed by the seceders and many other clergymen who were members of the assembly signing "an act of separation and deed of demission," which completely cut them off from the benefits as well as burdens of the Establishment. "Whatever previous differences of opinion existed, and whatever objections there were to a body such as the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, entitled to legislate and adjudicate for its own interest and according to its own feelings, being exempt from the control of the courts of law, the sacrifice of emolument and station thus made elicited general respect and sympathy, and was creditable to the sincerity of those who made it."* The intervention of the legislature by passing "an act to remove doubts respecting the admission of ministers to benefices" presents one of many examples of the difficulty of legislating for unity in ecclesiastical establishments when conscientious scruples lead to separation. The Free Church pursued its course perfectly indifferent to the operation of a measure which was expected "to restore religious peace in Scotland." That peace was best promoted by leaving a people keenly alive to all questions of religious liberty to follow the impulses of their own feelings, in making an adequate provision throughout the land for a zealous and able body of ministers chosen and supported upon the voluntary principle. It may be mentioned that there was a secession from the Church of Scotland a century before the great difference which resulted in the veto of 1834. This seceding body was called the "United Secession Church." There was a smaller body of seceders in the middle of the last century who formed the "Relief Church." In 1847 these two bodies coalesced and became the "United Presbyterian Church." They now constitute a most extensive organization, comprising nearly a fourth of the congregations of Scotland.

An important statute affecting the Church of England was passed in the session of 1843. It was an act for increasing the means of spiritual instruction in populous parishes, by making a portion of the revenues of the Church available for the endowment of additional ministers. The ecclesiastical commissioners for England were empowered to borrow 600,000*l.* from the governors of Queen Anne's Bounty for the purpose of forming districts for spiritual purposes in populous parishes with the consent of the bishop of the diocese, each such district to be permanently endowed and to become a new parish

* "Punch," vol. v. p. 15.

* English Cyclopædia, article, "Free Church of Scotland."

upon a new church being consecrated. The patronage of such new districts or parishes might be conferred, either in perpetuity or for one or more nominations, on any person or persons contributing to the permanent endowment of the minister or toward providing a church or chapel for the use of the inhabitants. The vast extension of church building in this country, beyond the precedent of any former time, may to a considerable extent be attributed to this brief but important enactment.

The annalist of 1843 says that his narrative of public events would be very imperfect if he did not include some particular notice of three popular movements in three different quarters of the United Kingdom. In one chapter of the "Annual Register" we find, therefore, the history of the repeal agitation in Ireland, of the secession from the Church of Scotland, and of the Rebecca riots in South Wales. There is no parity of interest in the abortive efforts to destroy the legislative union of two nations, in the great schism in an established church, and in what is dignified by the name of an insurrection for the removal of turnpike-gates. Yet if the historian were to consult only his own fancy in recording what is picturesque, the riots in Wales would furnish a much more spirit-stirring record than the most elaborate description of the popular ceremonials of the Hill of Tara, or of the procession of seceding ministers from St. Andrew's Church through the streets of Edinburgh to Canonmills Hall, four abreast. We must tell the story of Rebecca and her daughters as briefly as we can under the temptation it affords for graphic details. It is recorded that when the first turnpike upon "the ancient highway and post-road leading from London to York and so into Scotland" was established in 1663, the toll was so unpopular that "the mob" broke the toll-gates. "The mob" is rather a loose term to apply to the drovers, swineherds, pack-horse carriers, and wagoners of the days of Charles II., who would rather have floundered through roads described in the first Turnpike Act as "almost impassable and very dangerous to his majesty's liege people," than pay the somewhat heavy toll which the act prescribed. But even in those very insecure times, when the parish constable was the chief instrument for preserving the peace of the realm, we hear of no general insurrection in Middlesex, or Hertford, or Cambridge, or Huntingdon, to pull down the toll-gates and injure the toll-keepers. At the beginning of 1843, in the counties of Pembroke and Caermarthen, there suddenly appeared at nightfall a body of horsemen under the command of a leader who wore a female dress, and who was generally surrounded with a body-guard in similar costume. These were Rebecca and her daughters, and their commission was derived from the following verse in the twenty-fourth chapter of Genesis: "And they blessed Rebecca, and said unto her, Thou art our sister, be thou the mother of thousands of millions, and let thy seed possess the *gate* of those which hate them." Rebecca was ubiquitous; for wherever there was a gathering for the purpose of a nocturnal assemblage, there was a Rebecca. Amid the blowing of horns and the firing of guns such a body of men would arrive at a turnpike gate, and immediately proceed to break the gate into fragments, saw off the posts close to the ground, and pull down the toll-house. This remarkable combination soon extended to all the South Welsh counties, with the exception of Brecknockshire. The disturbances were not confined to any peculiarly obnoxious locality. There was one indiscriminate onslaught upon the turnpike system, and so successful were these operations during the spring and summer that nearly all the roads in the autumn were practically toll free. When bodies of ignorant and lawless men feel their physical strength, they are easily induced to believe that this power is sufficient to bid defiance to the law, for the removal of every supposed grievance. The local magistrates were unable to contend with Rebecca; and Rebecca was very soon set up as an authority to provide summary redress against poor laws, and tithes, and heavy rents, and all other evils which small occupiers of land, little elevated above the condition of common laborers, believed themselves peculiarly subjected to. On the 10th of June a large body marched into Caermarthen, consisting of some thousands on foot and three hundred on horseback. Their purpose was to pull down the workhouse. Their excesses were stopped in the middle of their career of destruction by the arrival of a troop of cavalry who had ridden thirty miles without drawing bit. The whole province was gradually falling into the condition of the worst parts of Ireland. Intimidation by threatening letters had become general; landowners, clergymen, and magistrates were kept in terror of the vengeance of Rebecca; the law was so utterly suspended that when an old woman who kept a turnpike gate was deliberately shot by one of the rioters, and the fact of her murder was distinctly made out to a coroner's jury, they returned a verdict that she died from suffusion of blood which produced suffocation. The government at last sent down a large body of troops into Wales, and, what was equally serviceable, they also sent a detachment of that active and intelligent body, the London police, who were everywhere engaged in tracing the secret agencies by which this extraordinary conspiracy had been conducted. A special commission was appointed for the trial of the offenders, and three of the leaders were sentenced to transportation. The Turnpike Acts in force in Wales were in many instances oppressive and unequal. A government commission of inquiry was appointed to examine into the operation of these laws, and into the other causes of disturbance. Ignorance and poverty were at the root of the matter; but the especial object of the Rebecca organization ceased to be a cause of complaint and agitation after the passing of an act in the next session of parliament for the consolidation and amendment of the laws relating to turnpike trusts in South Wales.

CHAPTER CCXXXVI.

General Sir Charles Napier—War in Scinde—Destruction of Emaun-Ghur—Battle of Meanee—Annexation of Scinde—Napier the beneficent administrator—Gwalior—Recall of Lord Ellenborough—Trial of O'Connell—Debates on corn laws in the session of 1844—Position of Sir Robert Peel—Renewal of the bank charter—Regulation of labor in factories—Lord Ashley's ten-hours clause rejected—Debates on sugar duties—Opening letters by the secretary of state—Reports of committees—Lady Hewlet's bequest—O'Connell's sentence reversed by the House of Lords—Difference with France on the treatment of the British consul at Tahiti—Visit of King Louis Philippe to the queen—Prince de Joinville's pamphlet on the naval forces of France.

In Trafalgar Square, under the shadow of the Nelson Column, is a statue of "Charles James Napier, General." The inscription bears that it was "erected by public subscription, the most numerous contributors being private soldiers." This renowned warrior is ordinarily termed "Conqueror of Scinde." By the side of this figure was erected, also by public subscription, a statue of one of the scientific benefactors of the human race, Edward Jenner. That statue has been removed to Kensington Gardens. An objection was raised that one whose science had so materially conduced to the prolongation of life, and to the consequent increase of the population of the world, was somewhat out of place in his close proximity to a great soldier—especially great in the estimation of the "private soldiers" whom he had led to triumph—whose vocation was, according to the belief of an ancient poet, "to ease the earth of her too numerous sons." But the "Conqueror of Scinde," taking a broad and just view of his career, was a promoter of civilization, by which alone the earth is adequately peopled; and thus he had also a claim to be recorded as a benefactor of mankind in his successful endeavor to make his conquest a source of good to the conquered people. He was the just and beneficent administrator of Scinde. His "victories of peace" are "not less renowned than those of war." He was the warlike instrument of injustice; but the aggression, which resulted in triumphs as brilliant and as decisive as any other of the wonderful events of the career of the British in India, may be received as a remarkable addition to the many instances of dangers and difficulties overcome, as if for some special working out of the decrees of a superintending Providence, which does not permit the supremacy of a dominant nation for the gratification of its own ambition, but through that agency carries forward the great law of progress.

Scinde, a country capable of an almost boundless increase of agricultural and commercial wealth, having the river which bears its name (as well as that of Indus) flowing through its whole extent, was, in 1842, under the rule of a body of despotic nobles, the ameers, who about seventy years before had dispossessed the legitimate sovereigns. The original inhabitants, who groaned beneath the yoke of these conquerors, cultivated the fields less for themselves than for their tyrannous masters, to whom the land was little better than a hunting ground, while their idea of government was simply that of

exacting tribute by their fierce military retainers, the Beloochees. Whatever were the relations of these rulers to the people whom they misgoverned, the British authorities in India had repeatedly entered into treaties with them, and in the treaty of 1820 these words were used: "The two contracting parties mutually bind themselves from generation to generation never to look with the eye of covetousness on the possessions of each other." But the passage of troops through Scinde was necessary for carrying on the war with Afghanistan. The ameers remonstrated, but were compelled to yield. Something more was required by a subsequent treaty. Kurrachee and Tatta were ceded to the British, with power to station troops there, and the free navigation of the Indus was stipulated as another condition of our friendship! At an earlier period some of the ameers had expressed their fears that Scinde was gone—"the English have seen the river." After we had withdrawn from Ghuznee, and when the terror of the British name was no longer sufficient to command a compliance with enforced engagements, the ameers began to manifest hostile designs. Sir Charles Napier, having learned that they had assembled an army of twenty-five thousand men, resolved upon a direct and immediate act of hostility, instead of allowing them to gain time by delays and negotiations. He "had permission," he has said, "from the governor-general to assemble an immense force to impose his final treaty;" he told the governor-general it could be done with the troops he, Napier, already commanded. Boldness and promptitude in this short war effected more than unlimited reinforcements. Emaun-Ghur, in the desert of Beloochistan, was a stronghold where the mercenaries of the ameers could gather together, safe from pursuit. Napier resolved to attack this fortress, whither upon his approach a large body of troops were marching. But having ascertained that the Beloochees had mutinied and turned back upon reaching the wilderness where there was no water, he saw that a march of eight days from the Indus was impossible for a numerous army. On the night of the 5th of January, 1843, he commenced a perilous adventure. With three hundred and sixty of the 22d queen's regiment on camels, with two hundred of the irregular cavalry, with ten camels laden with provisions, and with eighty carrying water, he set forth to traverse the arid waste, defying the armed bands on every side. After a few days the camels which drew the howitzers were unable to drag them over the sand-hills, and the unshrinking Irish soldiers took their place. When the fortress, which no European eye had before seen, was reached, it was found deserted. The governor had fled with his treasure, but he had left immense stores of ammunition behind. Napier resolved to destroy Emaun-Ghur; and having mined it in twenty-four places, by a simultaneous explosion all the mighty walls of the square tower, which stood as it were the monarch of the vast solitude, crumbled into atoms, and the wild bands who went forth to plunder and harass the populous Scinde had to retire still further into the desert. Napier and his hardy companions, after undergoing great privations on their march back by a different route, rejoined the main army on the 23d near Hyderabad. In the House of Lords in 1844, upon a motion for the thanks of parliament to Sir Charles Napier and his army, the Duke of Wellington said that the march to Emaun-Ghur was one of the most curious military feats which he had ever known to be performed, or had ever perused an account of.

The British resident at Hyderabad was Major Outram. On the 12th of February the ameers, with one exception, the Ameer of Khyrpore, signed the treaty which in the previous December had been tendered to them, and which, as was to have been expected from its hard conditions, they had evaded signing. This was Lord Ellenborough's "final treaty," which Napier was to have imposed upon them by an immense force. The day after the signature Major Outram was attacked in the Residency by eight thousand Beloochees. He had only a hundred foot-soldiers with him. In the river, however, there were two war steamers. To these he effected his retreat, by presenting a bold front to his assailants, while the guns of the steamers swept the flanks of the pursuers. With the loss only of three men killed and two wounded the gallant officer joined the main army. The force which Napier commanded could scarcely, however, be termed an army, if that name is to be applied only to a large body of soldiers. It consisted of four hundred British of the 22d, and two thousand two hundred sepoys and other native troops. The 22d were under the command of Colonel Pennefather, a name of renown in the Crimean War. The artillery consisted of twelve guns. With this force the battle of Meanee was fought on the 17th of February. On this day Napier wrote in his journal, "It is my first battle as a commander: it may be my last. At sixty, that makes little difference; but my feelings are, it shall be *do or die*." Whatever deeds have been done by heroic Englishmen under the inspiration of duty, never was there a greater deed of warfare than the victory of Meanee, which was won by two thousand six hundred men against twenty-two thousand. The Beloochees were posted on a slope behind the bed of the river Fulailee, which was for the most part dry. The half mile between the two armies was rapidly passed; the bed of the river was crossed; up the slope ran the intrepid 22d, and from the ridge looked down upon the Beloochees "thick as standing corn." The Beloochees, covering their heads with their large dark shields and waving their bright swords in the sun, rushed with frantic gestures upon the front of the 22d. The Irish soldiers, with shouts as loud and shrieks as wild and fierce as theirs, met them with the bayonet and "sent their foremost masses rolling back in blood."* The native infantry came up; the artillery took a commanding position, and mowed down the Beloochees with round-shot and canister. Upon the slope went on the deadly conflict for three hours, the assailants rushing upward against an enemy who resolutely held his ground, the gaps in his ranks being closed up as fast as they were made. The result was at one time uncertain. The greater number of the European officers were killed or wounded. Napier was in the thick of the fight, and though surrounded by enemies was unharmed. Had he fallen there would have been a tale to be told of rashness courting destruction. Like Nelson, his daring was his safety; but then it was under the direction of his genius. He saw, what the eye only of a great commander can see, the opportunity for closing a doubtful struggle by one decisive blow. He ordered a charge of cavalry. Defying the guns on the top of the ridge, the chosen band of horsemen charged right into the enemy's camp. Those who had so long stood firm on the hill fell into confusion. The 22d and the sepoys gained the ridge and drove the Beloochees over. The mighty host of the ameers was thus beaten by a handful of troops led on to victory by one who had gained his experience in the great battles of the Peninsula; by one who knew that large masses of men, however brave and strong, are comparatively weak unless their movements are directed by some master-mind, bold in the conception of his plans, cool in their execution, and having all the resources of strategy at his command at the instant when all would be lost by ignorance or incertitude.

Sir Charles Napier followed up his victory the next day by a message sent into Hyderabad that he would storm the city unless it surrendered. Six of the ameers came out and laid their swords at his feet. He returned their jewelled weapons to the humbled chiefs. He refused to intrude upon their privacy by occupying their splendid palaces, heroically abiding in his humble tent. There was another enemy yet unsubdued—Shere Mahomed of Meerpoor. On the 24th of March Napier, who had been reinforced and had now five thousand troops, attacked this chief, who had come with twenty thousand Beloochees before the walls of Hyderabad to recover the city. It was a hard-earned victory, which was followed up by the British occupation of Meerpoor. The spirit of the Beloochees was so broken that after two slight actions in June, when Shere Mahomed was routed and fled into the desert, the war was at an end. Scinde was annexed to the British possessions, and Sir Charles Napier was appointed its governor. He ruled the country for four years. He saw the great natural resources of Scinde, and he led the way in rendering them available for commercial purposes by costly public works. The great branch of the Indus was opened to restore the fertility of Cutch. A gigantic pier was constructed at Kurrachee, by which a secure harbor was formed; and now the port is connected with the Indus by a railway. He made the revenue of the province sufficient to support the expenditure for its civil and political administration. But above all, he made the native population prosperous and contented under the British rule. The state of the people under his wise government is thus described by the historian of the Scinde war: "The laborer cultivates in security his land; the handicraftsman, no longer dreading mutilation of his nose or ears for demand-

* Sir W. Napier.

ing remuneration for his work, is returning from the countries to which he had fled, allured back by good wages and employment. Young girls are no longer torn from their families to fill the zenanas of the great, or sold into distant slavery. The Hindoo merchant and Parsee trafficker pursue their vocation with safety and confidence, and even the proud Beloochee warrior, not incapable of noble sentiments, though harsh and savage, remains content with a government which has not meddled with his right of subsistence, but only changed his feudal ties into a peaceful and warlike dependence. He has, moreover, become personally attached to a conqueror whose prowess he has felt in battle, and whose justice and generosity he has experienced in peace." * The best proof that this high praise is not exaggerated is furnished by the fact that during the great period of danger through which we have passed, when so many enemies of the British power raised their heads in revolt, Scinde was faithful.

The close of the year 1843 was marked by another great military success in India. The state of Gwalior was in 1804 placed under the protection of the British government. The successor of the rajah who died in 1843 was a minor, and a regent was appointed, with the approbation of the governor-general. The regent was expelled by the Mahrattas, and the British resident was insulted. Lord Ellenborough, to whom war appeared a noble pastime in which an amateur might laudably indulge, immediately sent Sir Hugh Gough from Agra with fourteen thousand troops, and on the 29th of December he fought the battle of Maharajpoor, when the Mahrattas were defeated with great loss. On the same day Major-General Grey also defeated the Mahrattas at Punniar. The usurping government immediately submitted, and the strong fortress of Gwalior was occupied by a British governor. These warlike proceedings, however brilliant and successful, were not acceptable to the majority in the direction of the East India Company. In parliament, on the 21st of April, 1844, Sir Robert Peel, in answer to a question put to him by Mr. Macaulay, said, "I beg to state that on Wednesday last her majesty's government received a communication from the court of directors that they had exercised the power which the law gives them to recall at their will and pleasure the governor-general of India." There were loud cheers from the opposition benches. Mr. Macaulay then stated that he should not now bring forward a motion of which he had given notice respecting the occupation of Gwalior. In the House of Lords the Duke of Wellington declared that the government had not concurred in the measure adopted. There was a prevailing opinion in parliament and in the country that the recall of a governor-general upon their sole authority was a dangerous power to be intrusted to the court of directors; nevertheless there was a feeling that India would be safer under Sir Henry Hardinge, who had seen too much of war to be inflated by its "pride, pomp, and circumstance."

When the session of parliament was opened by the queen, on the 1st of February, 1844, there was a state trial proceeding in Ireland which excited more attention throughout the country even than the royal speech. This speech could not avoid an indirect reference to the circumstances which had placed Daniel O'Connell and seven others at the bar of their country. It was the fifteenth day of this trial in the Court of Queen's Bench in Dublin. At this remarkable juncture her majesty said to the Lords and Commons—and she uttered these words with a marked emphasis—"At the close of the last session of parliament I declared to you my firm determination to maintain inviolate the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland. I expressed at the same time my earnest desire to co-operate with parliament in the adoption of all such measures as might tend to improve the social condition of Ireland, and to develop the natural resources of that part of the United Kingdom. I am resolved to act in strict conformity with that declaration." It was the 12th of February, the twenty-fourth day of the trial, when O'Connell and the other traversers were, under various counts of the indictment, found guilty of conspiracy. As the queen's speech could not offer "observations on events in Ireland in respect to which proceedings are pending before the proper legal tribunal," so the attack upon the policy of the government, which was inevitable, could not be opened with propriety while the great legal issue was in suspense. But on the 13th of February the question was raised in both houses. The Marquess of Normanby moved a resolution pledging the House of Lords to examine into the causes of the discontent prevalent in Ireland, and to carry into effect the true principles of union by securing to that country equal rights. After two nights' debate the resolution was rejected by 175 votes against 78. In the House of Commons Lord John Russell moved for a committee of the whole house on the state of Ireland. The debate was continued for nine nights, Mr. O'Connell himself taking a part in it. It would be wearisome to attempt to follow its course, even in the barest outline. Perhaps the most impressive as well as the most truthful sentiment uttered was contained in the conclusion of Sir Robert Peel's speech: "I do earnestly trust that the influence of public opinion, as well as that of the laws, may control this agitation —may convince those who are concerned in it that they are prejudicing the best interests of Ireland—impeding its improvement, preventing the application of capital, and hindering the redress of those grievances which can, I think, be better redressed by the application of individual enterprise than by almost any legislative interference. I have the firmest conviction that if there were calmness and tranquillity in Ireland there is no part of the British dominions which would make such rapid progress as that country; for I know that there are facilities for improvement, opportunities for improvement, which would make that advance more rapid than that of any other part of our empire. I do hope—and I will conclude by expressing that earnest hope—that this agitation and all its evil consequences may be permitted to cease." * On the division on the 23d of February the numbers for Lord John Russell's motion were 225; against it 324. The sentence against Mr. O'Connell was not pronounced till the 30th of May, when he was adjudged to be imprisoned for twelve months, to be fined 2000*l.*, and to be bound in his own recognizances and by two sureties to keep the peace for seven years. The other persons convicted, with the exception of one not brought up for judgment, were sentenced to nine months' imprisonment and to a fine of 50*l.*, with smaller sums for their own recognizances, with sureties to keep the peace for the like terms of seven years.

When Sir Robert Peel met the House of Commons in the session of 1844 he was enabled with justice to take a favorable view of the condition of the country as the best justification of his financial policy of 1842. There had been a disposition, he said, to draw too hasty a conclusion as to the operation of the great change in the customs' duties. The government had asked for time properly to judge what would be the effect of that alteration. It was now admitted that there was a material improvement in some branches of manufacture. With regard to revenue he was enabled to state that the course of deficiency had been suspended, and that the revenue of the current year would be amply sufficient to meet the existing charges. He explicitly declared that he had not contemplated, and did not contemplate, an alteration in the present corn laws. Neither on account of the price of corn nor on account of variations in that price was he led to form a more unfavorable opinion with respect to the operations of the existing law than he entertained at the time when he proposed it.

The improvement in the condition of the people was attributed by members of the opposition less to the measures of the government than to the effects of a plentiful harvest. To this cause may be ascribed the diminished agitation for the repeal of the corn laws. But the league held firmly together, and continued its salutary course of endeavoring to enlighten the public upon the permanent results of those laws. During the session there were two formal discussions on the subject of protection to agriculture. Mr. Cobden, on the 12th of March, moved for a committee to inquire into the effects of protective duties on agricultural tenants and laborers. The motion was negatived by a majority of 91. On the 25th of June Mr. Villiers proposed resolutions which contemplated the total repeal of the corn law. These resolutions, after a debate of two nights, were rejected by a majority of 204. In this debate, as at the beginning of the session, Sir Robert Peel maintained his determination to stand by the existing law. He avowed himself an advocate for protection to agriculture, not for the sake of the landlords but from a conviction of the evils which the sudden removal of protection would inflict upon general interests, domestic and colonial. He looked to those general

* Sir W. Napier.

* Hansard, vol. lxxiii. col. 254.

nterests; he looked especially to Ireland, of which agriculture was he great staple.

The principles avowed and the measures proposed by Sir Robert Peel in his legislative career must be viewed under two aspects. He is the minister of expediency, holding a party together by deference to the opinions of the majority that placed him in power, and in this capacity we may always trace in his speeches some evasion of the logical points of a controversy—some inclination to skirmish on the outside of the field of debate instead of encountering the risks of a general conflict of principles. Thus he always deals with the question of protection, and especially of protection to agriculture. His adversaries tell him again and again that he is speaking against his own convictions. Mr. Villiers closed the debate of the 25th of June by saying that Sir Robert Peel had just made a speech with which the agriculturists were well pleased; but he had made the same sort of speech for them in 1839, and had thrown them overboard afterward, because the state of the season and the distress of the people had made it indispensable to give some relief to the country: the same thing would happen again. Mr. Milner Gibson averred that Sir Robert Peel would not say that he meant to make protection permanent, but his will must give law to his party, for they could not make a ministry without him. As a party leader we must therefore regard the first lord of the treasury when he deals with questions upon which the majority appeared to be irrevocably committed. Now and then, indeed, there was a slight indication that the powerful minister, under some pressure of circumstances, might think for himself, and risk the consequences of an independent judgment. The extreme protectionists were occasionally restless and suspicious under his reserved and cautious demeanor. There were men among them quite ready to become their leaders in the character of advocates; but the doubt always arose, Could they govern as statesmen? The nation forbade the experiment in its support of the temperate conservatism of Sir Robert Peel. Those who suspected more than ever that he was losing the "undoubting mind" of a party leader could not affirm that he was acting against a secret conscientious belief that should have urged him forward with or without his following. For him the abandonment of protection was not a purely scientific question. Representative government imposed upon him, for a time at least, the inevitable distinction between speculation and action. Essentially different was the course of the minister when some great policy could be safely treated without reference to the chances of a division. When such an occasion arose the timid partisan threw off his trammels and became the confident legislator.

The question of the renewal of the bank charter furnished such an opportunity, which real statesmanship knew how to seize. He was now consistently acting upon principles which he had tardily adopted upon conviction a quarter of a century before. Considering, he said, the part which he took in 1819 in terminating the system of inconvertible paper-currency and in re-establishing the ancient standard of value, it would be to him a source of great personal satisfaction if he should obtain the assent of parliament to proposals which were in fact the complement of these measures—which were calculated to guarantee their permanence and to facilitate their practical operation. He chiefly looked forward as the result of these proposals to the mitigation or termination of evils such as had at various times afflicted the country, in consequence of rapid fluctuation in the amount and value of the medium of exchange. The leading proposals which he submitted to the House of Commons on the 6th of May were, briefly, as follows: To continue for a limited time, under certain conditions, the privileges of the Bank of England; to provide by law that the bank should be divided into two departments, one confined to the issue and circulation of notes, the other to the conduct of banking business; to limit the amount of securities upon which it should be lawful for the bank to issue promissory notes payable upon demand; to provide that a weekly publication should be made by the bank of the state both of the circulation and the banking departments. With regard to other banks, the issue of promissory notes payable to bearer on demand was prohibited to any bank not then issuing such notes, or to any bank hereafter to be established; and the banks of issue that were to continue were to be subject to limitations of the extent of issue, and to various regulations, including the weekly publication of the amount of notes issued. The bill founded on Sir Robert Peel's resolutions was carried, with very slight opposition, through both houses. M. Guizot says "he keenly enjoyed that success, and delighted to speak of his Bank Act as one of the most important achievements of his public life. Perhaps because it was one of those in which he most fully succeeded in obtaining the object which was ever present to his mind—the union of scientific truth with practical efficiency." * Eighteen years have gone by since the passing of this measure, and unquestionably its "practical efficiency" has often been tested in times of improvident speculation. On the other hand, while the advocates for unlimited paper currency maintained that the "scientific truth" shackled all the operations of industry, which would have flourished with less risk under a perfectly free system of banking, more sober economists could not suppress their belief that in a season of commercial collapse the Bank Act increased the difficulties of the crisis, and made a season of pressure become a season of ruin to a far wider class than that of rash speculators.

In the session of 1843 the ministry had brought forward a measure for the regulation of labor in factories, which embraced a comprehensive plan for the education of the children employed in the large and increasing establishments where the cotton, flax, wool, and silk manufactures were carried on. These education clauses produced an outcry throughout the kingdom equally strong from churchmen and from dissenters, so that the government was compelled by the hostility of sects and parties to make no provision at all for the proper training of a class of children who, with a very few exceptions in the case of some enlightened mill-owners, were left in their ignorance and evil habits to grow up into brutalized and dangerous men and women. Sir James Graham, who had assiduously labored in the construction of an efficient plan of factory education, was thus compelled, after his measure had been four months under discussion in parliament, to announce that he would not in that session press the education clauses in the Factories Bill. He had made alterations, he said, which had not abated the hostility of the dissenters; the Church had not given him any very cordial support, and without general concord and co-operation the bill would be inoperative, and would engender religious strife and animosity. Early in the session of 1844 Sir James Graham again introduced a bill for the regulation of labor in factories; but the education clauses of the former bill were now dropped; and without any provision whatever for education the sole object aimed at was a proper limitation of the hours of employment for women and children. The house was in committee on this bill on the 15th of March when upon the discussion of the interpretation clause which defined the word "night" and the word "meal-time," Lord Ashley proposed an amendment, "that the word 'night' shall be taken to mean from six o'clock in the evening to six o'clock in the following morning, and that the word 'meal-time' shall be taken to mean an interval of cessation from work, for the purpose of rest and refreshment, at the rate of two hours a day, with a view to effect a limitation of the hours of labor to ten in the day." Sir James Graham opposed this amendment, which he asserted would seriously affect the commercial prosperity of the country, reducing the returns on capital, and involving a diminution of wages to the amount of twenty-five per cent. The government bill proposed to retain the existing term of twelve hours of factory labor, extending protection to females and young persons. Sir Robert Peel maintained that the opposite suggestion for the limitation of labor to ten hours for females and young persons would produce a limitation to ten hours for male adults also. The most urgent argument that Sir Robert Peel used was founded upon statistical facts. The exports of the cotton, linen, silk, and woollen manufactures of the country amounted to thirty-five millions sterling out of forty-four millions of all British manufactures exported, so that five sixths of the exported manufactures of this country would be subjected to a new law, which was to provide that it would not be legal to labor at them for more than fifty-nine hours instead of sixty-nine hours a week, the Saturday being proposed by Lord Ashley to remain without alteration. There would thus be two hundred and fifty days in a year, of which the working hours being reduced from twelve to ten, there would be five hundred hours less labor during fifty-two weeks, which would be equivalent to a loss of seven weeks' working time. Singu-

* "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 191.

lar were some of the arguments by which Lord Ashley's proposal was supported. Lord John Russell, for example, would vote for it in the hope that a limitation in the hours of labor would compel us to resort to additional supplies of foreign corn to counteract the effect of falling wages. The government were defeated, Lord Ashley carrying his amendment by one hundred and seventy-nine votes against one hundred and seventy. Sir James Graham said that the proposed alteration, when the eighth clause came to be discussed, could be considered in a more substantive form. The next night Lord Ashley stated that he should so word his clause that for two years the limitation should be for eleven hours, and that after that period the ten hours' restriction should take effect. On the 22d, when the government strongly opposed the amendment of their bill in this modified shape, the debate was terminated by two divisions, one of which was contradictory of the other. Upon the proposal to fill up the blank in the clause with the word "twelve," one hundred and eighty-three voted in favor of the motion, and one hundred and eighty-six against it. The house again dividing on the motion that the blank be filled up with the word "ten," for the motion there were one hundred and eighty-one votes, against it one hundred and eighty-eight. In various and complicated shapes this question continued to be discussed for two months, till, on the 13th of May, Sir Robert Peel, having declared that, estimating that a ten hours' bill would strike off thirty-six thousand pounds a week from the wages of those employed, and believing it was the duty of the government to take a comprehensive view of all the great interests, commercial, political, social, and moral, of all classes, he would resist the wishes of the factory operatives in order to promote their welfare. "I protest," he said, "against the doctrine that we are to concede because it is the popular will. If we are satisfied that it is not for the popular interests, then it is our painful but necessary duty to resist. If this house be of a different opinion—if you are satisfied that you must make this great experiment on labor—or if you think concession is inevitable, and that you must give way to the wishes and feelings of the people—be it so! But if you take that course, and if you resolve (as you cannot but do in consistency) to pursue it, you must—I say it with all respect—you must do so under other auspices, and under guides who can trace a clearer and a better way than can the present administration." This very plain intimation, which the biographer of Sir Robert Peel describes as "using his right with a somewhat ungentle haughtiness," produced its natural effect. The house rejected the ten hours' clause by a majority of one hundred and thirty-eight, and the government bill was passed.

The question of the sugar duties, which was formerly debated less on financial grounds than on moral and religious, has now lost, in the equalization of duties between colonial and foreign sugar, the interest which once attached to the strong repugnance of a great party to admit slave-grown sugar. Upon commercial grounds there were also two parties, whose interests and principles were strongly opposed. The West India interest resisted that enlargement of the area of supply which would result from the admission of any other than colonial sugar. With them went the formidable anti-slavery party. The free-traders, constantly protesting against the preference of colonial over foreign sugar, had against them the great band of enthusiasts who regarded slave-grown sugar as the abomination which every good housewife ought to resist, by supporting that monopoly of the West India proprietors which was quite insufficient to supply the demand in this country, and therefore kept all sugar dear. The government in 1844 still held to the principle of a differential duty; but the chancellor of the exchequer, on the 3d of June, proposed an abatement of the duty on foreign sugar, provided it was the produce of free labor. Upon a proposition of Mr. Miles, a conservative member, for reducing the duty upon British plantation sugar to 20*s*. per cwt. instead of 24*s*., and foreign free-grown sugar to 30*s*., the government were defeated by a majority of two hundred and forty-one against two hundred and twenty-one. This division was a great crisis for the ministry. The division took place on a Saturday morning. On the Sunday a cabinet council was held, and on the Monday Sir Robert Peel, amid intense excitement, called upon the house to reconsider its decision, of which important consequences might be the result. This was to declare, in words that could not be mistaken, that if he were to continue in office he must have the full and untrammelled support of the party he represented. The house did reconsider, reversing its decision by a majority of two hundred and fifty-five against two hundred and thirty-three. It was on the occasion of this debate that Mr. Disraeli, with a more marked hostility toward Sir Robert Peel than he had before displayed, adverted to the former opinions of the prime minister, when he said that he had never entered into the anti-slavery cry, and would never enter into the cry of "cheap sugar." "Now the right honorable gentleman had adopted certain opinions of a very decided character with respect to slavery, and he told the house cheap sugar was of such importance that the existence of his ministry depended upon it, and that the character of his supporters must be sacrificed to secure his ministry. Twenty-four months had only elapsed, and the right honorable gentleman came forward with a detestation of slavery in every place—except in the benches behind him. If the anti-slavery repugnance were only a little more prevalent—if the right honorable gentleman did not expect upon every division and at every crisis that his gang should appear, and the whip should sound with that alacrity which he understood was now prevalent—it would be a little more consistent with the tone which he assumed with respect to the slave-trade, and with that which was now the principal subject of discussion."

The great questions, financial and social, whose decision was to have a permanent influence upon the progress of improvement, produced little excitement beyond the walls of parliament compared with one ministerial act which startled the nation for a while and then quickly passed into oblivion. The British people are, as they ought to be, excessively jealous of any secret and apparently despotic exercise of power by the executive government. The power of issuing a warrant from the secretary of state for the opening of letters at the post-office had been exercised, under the sanction of the law, from the very first formation of that institution. It was the express condition in the preamble to the early acts of parliament relating to the post that the government should have this power. In subsequent statutes the power had been confirmed, with certain modifications, even as recently as at the accession of Queen Victoria. There could be no question about the law of the case, and the power had been exercised by secretaries of state of all parties, without any apprehension that in a discreet use of this right they had violated the great principles of English liberty; from Mr. Fox to Lord John Russell they believed that such a power was necessary to the safety of the state. On the 14th of June Mr. Thomas Duncombe presented a petition to the House of Commons from Serafino Calderara, Joseph Mazzini, W. J. Linton, and William Lovett, complaining that their letters had been opened at the post-office. Sir James Graham stated that, under the power of the act of 1837, which consolidated previous laws, he had given a warrant, no longer in existence, to open the letters of one of the petitioners, whom he did not wish to name. On the 24th of June Mr. Duncombe moved for a committee of inquiry, which was refused by a majority of forty-four. For some weeks the country became agitated with a prevailing belief that no letters were safe; that there was an extensive spy system conducted within an inner chamber of the post-office. There were few who did not to some extent adopt the declaration of the four petitioners, "that they considered such a practice, introducing as it did the spy system of foreign states, as repugnant to every principle of the British constitution, and subversive of the public confidence which was so essential to a commercial country." This was indeed a fertile theme for journalists and caricaturists. Continental nations looked on with astonishment at the ebullition of popular rage at an act which appeared to them the simplest and most natural course of a government to pursue. They were accustomed to much stronger displays of bureaucratic power. Sir James Graham, it soon became understood, had thus endeavored to trace the intrigues of one distinguished foreign enthusiast, whose designs he was powerless to repress in a country where aliens were subjected to no stringent supervision. Wisely did the ministers resolve at last that the disclosures of all the facts in a full inquiry was the best mode of setting themselves right in public opinion. On the 2d of July Sir James Graham expressed his anxiety for inquiry; and when Mr. Duncombe moved again for a committee, the suspected secretary of state, while proposing that the committee should be secret, moved that it should consist of nine persons, none of whom should be connected with office, and five of whom should be selected from the opposition. This fairness went

far to disarm the public hostility. In August the committee made their report. It is a most interesting and elaborate review of the history of the practice, from the time of the statute of Anne in 1711 to that of its exercise in 1844. The committee reported that the general average of the warrants during the present century did not much exceed eight a year. A similar committee was formed in the House of Lords. Their report showed that since 1822 one hundred and eighty-two warrants had been issued, averaging about eight per annum, two thirds of which had been for the purpose of tracing persons accused of offences, or of tracing property embezzled by suspected offenders. The warrants for detention of letters, at periods when the circumstances of the country seemed to threaten public tranquillity, had scarcely, upon an average of twenty-one years, exceeded two warrants annually in Great Britain. After the publication of these reports the people were effectually tranquillized; the advertisers of secure envelopes and anti-Graham wafers ceased to find customers; the law remained unaltered. There was a generous motive for the indignation expressed at the opening of the letters of Señor Mazzini, for it was understood that he was the one petitioner to whom the warrant of Sir James Graham applied. It was said that this warrant was issued at the instance of the Sardinian minister. The Duke of Wellington, in the House of Lords, declared that he was enabled to state that there was no foundation whatever for such a rumor. The report of the committee of the House of Commons related that the warrant to open and detain letters addressed to Mazzini was issued on the 1st of March and was cancelled on the 3d of June; that representations had been made to the government that plots, of which he was the centre, were carrying on upon British territory to excite an insurrection in Italy; that the information calculated to frustrate this attempt, which was deduced from the letters so opened, was communicated to a foreign power; but the information so communicated was not of a nature to compromise, and did not compromise, the safety of any individual within the reach of that foreign power, nor was it made known to that power by what means or from what source such information had been obtained.

An act of this session for the "regulation of suits relating to meeting-houses and other property held for religious purposes by persons dissenting from the United Church of England and Ireland," was a measure of justice promoted and carried through by the government. In the time of Charles the Second there was a bequest of certain manors in York in trust to support "godly preachers of Christ's holy gospel." The Lady Hewlet, who made this bequest, was a dissenter, and the terms "godly preachers" was sufficient to indicate that the bequest was not intended for the benefit of the Church of England; neither could the sect of Unitarians which afterward arose have been held as "godly preachers" in the seventeenth century. But after the lapse of many years the Trinitarian sectaries to which Lady Hewlet belonged gradually became Unitarians. Other dissenters, however, held that those in possession had no legal right to the benefit of the bequest, having forfeited it when they abandoned the doctrine which she considered that of "Christ's holy gospel." After a suit of fourteen years and an appeal to the House of Lords, the judgment of the Court of Chancery was confirmed, that the Unitarians were excluded from the bequest, and that the Trinitarian Protestant dissenters ought to be the possessors of the property. To put an end to the recurrence of similar disputes, Lord Lyndhurst brought in a bill, which, however, was strenuously opposed in and out of parliament. The principal object of the bill was to confirm in the full possession of their establishments any society of Protestant dissenters which had been in possession of them for twenty years. The Bishop of London opposed the bill, on the ground that it legalized the use of chapels for purposes entirely contrary to that for which they were founded. But there was another object in the bill which provoked a wider opposition. Previous to a statute of 1813 the exceptions to the act of toleration which exclusively affected Unitarians had continued in force; in repealing these exceptions the legislature had not made the act retrospective. It was the intention of the present bill to give Unitarians as firm a possession of their ancient property as of that which they had acquired since the statute of 1813. This measure generally was denounced by certain portions of what is called the religious world as being solely for the benefit of a sect; which other sects, suspending their own differences to unite against a community—rich and intelligent indeed, but a mere fraction as to its numbers—denounced as standing outside the pale of Christianity. Nevertheless in both houses the bill, with an alteration of the term of occupancy from twenty to twenty-five years, was passed by large majorities.

The actual prorogation of parliament was deferred for a month later than was required by the exigencies of public business. On the 9th of August Lord John Russell took a survey of the general condition of the country, his speech being remarkable for the absence of party spirit. Sir Robert Peel recapitulated the measures of the session, which he said was distinguished for important and efficient legislation. The House of Commons then adjourned to the 5th of September. The House of Lords was engaged in one of the most important functions of that body, that of being a court of law in the last resort. Mr. O'Connell and the other prisoners had appealed for a reversal of their sentence upon a writ of error. The judges of the English courts were referred to by the Lords for their opinions. Six of the eleven counts were decided by all of nine judges to be bad or informal; seven of the judges held that the judgment must stand, as the Irish judges alone could know upon how much of the verdict they had grounded their sentence. The Peers were now to decide. The people both of Ireland and England were waiting their decision with intense interest, the Irish repealers anticipating that the servile and despotic peers of England would eagerly embrace the opportunity of condemning their great agitator to a prolonged incarceration, and the people of England for the most part being afraid that, through the high sense of honor and the impartial justice of these peers, he would be let loose for further mischief. It was a question of legal construction which could only be properly settled by the law lords. On the 5th of September, when the judgment was to be delivered, some lay peers contended that they had a right to vote. The ministry, speaking with a voice of moderation by Lord Wharncliffe, one of their supporters, left the decision of the question with the four law lords, although it was pretty well known what their decision would be. It was voted by Lord Denman, Lord Cottenham, and Lord Campbell that the judgment of the court below should be reversed; Lord Brougham voted that it should be maintained. O'Connell on the 6th of September left his prison in a triumphal car, wearing the green and gold repeal cap, and, escorted by thousands of people, paraded the streets of Dublin for four hours. He then addressed the multitude from his own house in Merrion Square. He told them that on the next Monday, at Conciliation Hall, he would put forth his plans for the future. His triumph was celebrated throughout Ireland by the most enthusiastic demonstrations. But his power was gone. His "plans for the future" were altogether abortive. He again had his monster meetings, but they ceased to furnish a subject of apprehension to the government. From his balcony, on the 6th of September, he had told the people, "This is the great day for Ireland—a day of justice." By the justice he was extinguished.

During the month of August the governments of Great Britain and France had been nearly on the point of a serious rupture. In September, 1843, the Queen of Tahiti (Otaheite), named Pomaré, who was a follower of the English missionaries, and had professed her desire that her subjects should be converted to Christianity, was induced—probably under the threats of the admiral of a French squadron off her shores—to place herself under the protectorate of France. The natives were angry at this, and showed marked hostility to the French among them. In November Admiral Dupetit Thouars landed troops on the island, set up the French flag, removing Queen Pomaré's ensign, and issued a proclamation that Tahiti belonged to France. The French government disavowed this act; but, says M. Guizot, "The French flag had just been planted in the islands of Polynesia, and we could not consent that, at the very moment of its appearance, it should be withdrawn."* French honor would be wounded, said a party in the chambers, if the national flag which the admiral had set up should be removed. The office of British consul at Tahiti was filled by a missionary named Pritchard. When Queen Pomaré was deposed he hauled down his flag, declaring his functions as consul were at an end, as he was not accredited by the English government to a French colony in that capacity. Four months afterward the French authorities, believing that he had instigated the

* "Memoirs of Sir R. Peel," p. 168.

hostility of the natives to their rule, seized him, and required as a condition of his release from imprisonment that he should immediately leave the Pacific. Mr. Pritchard arrived in England on the 26th of July, and there was immediately an outburst of national indignation which the government did not attempt to repress. On the contrary, Sir Robert Peel said in parliament on the 31st of July, "We have received accounts from Tahiti, and presuming on the accuracy of these accounts, which I have no reason whatever to call in question, I do not hesitate to say that a gross outrage, accompanied with gross indignity, has been committed upon the British consul in that island." M. Guizot, in his account of this affair, says the words which Sir Robert Peel had used were "unseasonable and inaccurate;" but he adds that Sir Robert Peel, in his communication with the French government, stated that he did not admit the correctness of the newspaper versions of his speech. Nevertheless the parliamentary language of Lord Aberdeen might have been equally termed "unseasonable;" for on the 1st of August he said, "The late outrage of the French at Tahiti was of so flagrant a character as to be almost incredible." M. Guizot says, in his memoirs of Sir R. Peel, that he could not with propriety relate the delicate negotiations to which this affair gave rise between Lord Aberdeen and himself, which "ended in results, just in themselves, honorable to the two cabinets, and salutary to the two countries."* The French government, while maintaining that it had good reason for sending Mr. Pritchard away from the island, acknowledged that useless and vexations proceedings had been taken respecting him, of which they disapproved, and offered to award him compensation for his losses and sufferings.

Upon the prorogation of parliament it was stated in the queen's speech that the danger of an interruption to the good understanding and friendly relations between this country and France had been happily averted by the spirit of justice and moderation which had animated the two governments. The *entente cordiale* was to be confirmed by a visit of the king of the French to her majesty. On the 7th of October he arrived at Windsor Castle, where he remained for a week, being installed a Knight of the Garter, and entertained with sumptuous banquets. It will perhaps be for the historian at some future day to relate whether Louis Philippe, during this friendly visit, forbore altogether to approach the delicate subject of matrimonial alliances of his own family with Spain. His far-reaching projects presented, a year or two later, a question of far greater danger to the good understanding and friendly relations between the two countries than the arbitrary acts perpetrated upon a poor missionary at Tahiti.

It was in this year that the Prince de Joinville published his celebrated "Note on the State of the Naval Forces of France." With the general public a document like this passes into oblivion, after the lapse of eighteen or twenty years, unless it be revived for the purpose of maintaining some exclusive opinions either of a war party or a peace party. We have alluded to this production in Chapter CCIX. of Vol. VII.,† and there we should have left the subject had not a politician of no ordinary mark recently called attention to it as a point of history—of course with his own gloss. "The principal contribution to the first panic," says Mr. Cobden, "previous to the publication of the Duke of Wellington's letter, was the pamphlet of Prince Joinville. It is difficult now, after a calm perusal of this tract, to understand how it could have been pressed into the service of the alarmists. It is filled throughout with complaints of the inferiority of the French navy, and offers not a few probably unmerited compliments to the superior management of England." Mr. Cobden then quotes the concluding passage of the pamphlet: "'I have been obliged to expose the secret of our weakness compared to the greatness of British power; but I should think myself happy if, by the sincere avowal of those sorrowful truths, I were able to dissipate the illusion, in which are so many clever persons, as to the real condition of the navy of France, and to decide them to ask with me those salutary reforms which alone can give our navy a new era of power and glory.'"‡

The Prince de Joinville quotes a passage from a speech in the House of Commons on the 29th of February, 1844, in which it was said that if steam-vessels had been employed as at present Napoleon might easily have landed even fifteen or twenty thousand men on our shores; and that although such a debarkation would not have had much success, the effect would have been "to destroy that confidence which our insular situation now inspires." The speaker, says the royal pamphleteer, adjured the legislature to take into consideration the great use that might be made of steam navigation in the event of a new war.* This is the text which the prince takes for his exhortation. Let us build steam vessels of war as quickly as possible, to maintain some approach to equality with the hundred and twenty-five steam vessels of war of Great Britain, of which number seventy-seven are armed. No suggestion could have been more proper. But what are the definite objects he proposes for a large addition to the French steam navy, beyond the defence of the ports and arsenals of France, in the event of a war? "Our successes would not be brilliant, because we should take care at first to avoid compromising all our resources in decisive encounters. But we should carry on war with certainty because we should attack two things equally vulnerable—the confidence of the English people in the insular position of their country and its maritime commerce. Who can doubt that, with a steam navy strongly organized, we should have the means of inflicting upon the enemy's coasts losses and sufferings unknown to a nation which has never felt all the miseries which war brings in its train? As the complement of these sufferings would come the evil, equally new for that nation—that of confidence lost. The wealth accumulated on its coasts and in its ports would cease to remain in security."

We have given "a calm perusal to this tract," and we do *not* find it "difficult to understand how it could have been pressed into the service of the alarmists." Mr. Cobden quotes a remonstrance by Sir William Molesworth to the "Spectator" in January, 1848, in which the philosophical statesman asks "the editor of that staid and philosophical print" whether he considered the French to be ruffians, Pindarees, freebooters, so that "you believe it necessary to keep constant watch and ward against them, as our Saxon forefathers did against the Danes and the Nordmen, lest they should burn our towns, plunder our coasts, and put our queen to ransom." The year 1847—when Louis Philippe and his ministers were full of ambitious projects not very different from those which Louis the Fourteenth had cherished—was not so far removed from 1844 that the people of England had forgotten that a son of the king of the French had published a pamphlet which, to use Mr. Cobden's words, "had sounded like a tocsin in our ears;" that a prince of the blood royal had proposed to "burn our towns and plunder our coasts;" had, to repeat the honest language of our great soldier which we have before quoted, issued "an invitation and provocative to war, to be carried on in a manner such as had been disclaimed by the civilized portions of mankind."†

CHAPTER CCXXXVII.

Parliament opened—Improved state of the kingdom—Sir Robert Peel's new tariff—Opposition of the country party—Mr. Cobden's motion for inquiring into agricultural distress—Grant to Maynooth College—Queen's Colleges in Ireland—Jews admitted to municipal offices—Prorogation—Apprehended failure of the potato crop in Ireland—Proposal of Sir Robert Peel to the cabinet—Lord John Russell's letter to the electors of London—Dissensions in the cabinet—Sir R. Peel resigns—Failure of Lord John Russell to form a ministry—Sir R. Peel resumes power—Parliament opened by the queen—Sir R. Peel asserts his determination to be unshackled as minister—The new tariff and the corn law bills introduced by Sir R. Peel—Debate of twelve nights in the Commons—The bills passed in both houses—Bill for the protection of life in Ireland rejected by a majority against the government—Resignation of Sir R. Peel—The Russell administration—The Oregon question settled—British Columbia—India—War with the Sikhs—Battle of Moodkee—Sir Henry Hardinge and Sir Hugh Gough—Battle of Feroze-

* "Memoirs of Sir R. Peel," p. 178.
† *Ante*, Note, p. 1099.
‡ "The Three Panics," p. 7.

* The speaker was Mr. Spring Rice, on the subject of Harbors of Refuge. See Hansard, vol. lxxiii. col. 400.
† The pamphlet of the Prince de Joinville, with its accompanying tables, is given in full in "Annuaire Historique," 1844, Appendice, p. 372.

shah—Battles of Alliwall and Sobraon—Treaty of peace—List of the Russell ministry.

When parliament was opened by the queen on the 4th of February, 1845, "the improved condition of the country" was a fertile subject of her majesty's congratulation. "Increased activity pervades almost every branch of manufacture; trade and commerce have been extended at home and abroad." At this period the income tax was about to expire. Why, then, with a certainty of improved revenue from imports, which had risen from sixty-five millions in 1842 to eighty-five millions in 1845, was it necessary for her majesty to say, with reference to the income tax, that it might be expedient to continue its operation for a further period? The reason alleged for this recommendation was, "thus to obtain the means of adequately providing for the public service, and at the same time making a reduction in other taxation." Simple as were these words they were full of significance. The one object in 1842 of imposing an income tax was to repair the financial disorder of the country. That object had been accomplished. On the 5th of January, 1845, there had been an excess of income over expenditure of nearly three millions and a half. The income tax had produced something above five millions. It was in many respects an objectionable tax, and if not to be wholly abolished there was ample room to reduce the amount of the impost by one half. But the minister had a great policy to carry into effect. His partial experiment on free-trade had prepared him to make a bolder experiment, upon the doctrine that the surest way to improve the condition of the great body of the people was to remove those taxes upon large branches of industry which not only interfered with their extension, but placed many of the comforts and conveniences of life beyond the reach of the humbler classes. M. Guizot has truly as well as eloquently said, "The greatest happiness of the greatest number of human beings as the supreme object of society and of government, was the superior power of which Sir Robert Peel had made himself the minister, and which swayed all his opponents; some of them governed like himself, others intimidated or paralyzed by this great idea, which was clearly or dimly present to their minds, either as an incontestable right or as an irresistible fact." *

The financial statement of Sir Robert Peel was made on the 14th of February. Continuing the income tax, he estimated there would be a surplus of 3,400,000*l*. He said—laying down general principles which ought ever to be kept in mind by a British financial minister—"In the first place you have to consider the claims which may be urged in favor of a reduction of taxation on account of the heaviness with which certain imposts press on articles of general consumption. You are bound also to consider what taxes press on the raw materials which constitute the staple of the manufactures of the country. You are also bound to consider what taxes cause a great increase in the establishments necessary for their collection, and what are those taxes the remission of which will enable us to diminish those establishments so as to reduce the expense of collection. You are bound also to consider what are those taxes the removal of which will give more scope to commercial enterprise, and occasion an increased demand for labor." † Broadly to state the minister's plans for obtaining such results as these, he proposed to abolish all duties on exports, including the duty on coal; he would abolish the import duties on four hundred and thirty raw materials used in manufactures, which, although yielding to the treasury only 320,000*l*., would still be a real and efficient relief; he would altogether remove the duties on cotton-wool, which yielded 680,000*l*., the reduction to be effected on the sugar duties would amount to 1,300,000*l*. More important, perhaps, than any of the imposts to be abolished or reduced was the repeal of the duty upon glass. That duty, upon the value of the manufactured article, was not less than from 200 to 300 per cent; there was no duty which required such a system of perpetual and vexatious interference with the manufacturer. In France, in Belgium, and in Bohemia, there was no excise duty on glass. In Bohemia, in particular, the manufacture had been brought to a state of admirable perfection. We had peculiar facilities for obtaining the same results, and yet we could not compete with foreigners in the manufacture of glass. "If you permit," said Sir Robert, "this article to be free of duty, it is difficult to foresee, in the first place, to what perfection this beautiful fabric may not be brought, and, secondly, it is impossible to say to what new purposes glass, manufactured by our own skill and capital, may not be applied." Seven years only had elapsed after the sagacious minister had made this confident anticipation, when we saw a wondrous fabric arise constructed almost wholly of glass, in which the British manufacturer was not ashamed to exhibit his glass wares by the side of his foreign rivals, not perhaps reaching the perfection of some glass fabrics, but very nearly approaching their beauty of form and color. Eleven more years elapsed, and then, in the more extended competition of a second International Exhibition, the British manufacture of glass for domestic use stood at the head of every European production. But, more than all this, it is only necessary to look with a rapid glance at the architecture of our public buildings, of our shops, of our mansions and villas, and even of our humblest cottages, to see how, in conjunction with the subsequent repeal of the window tax, the removal of the duty on glass had enabled every building to be erected with a regard to convenience and comfort, to health and cleanliness, which the existence of those imposts to a great extent prevented. It was the merit of Sir Robert Peel rarely to forget the effect of taxation upon the condition of the poor. He had in view the quarry of the cottage window, rarely mended when broken, but patched with paper or stuffed with rag, when he said, "If the house sanction the removal of the duty upon glass, you will thereby confer on the poorer classes a most extensive benefit." It is unnecessary now to follow the discussion upon Sir Robert Peel's financial measures, beyond noticing a few points in which the jealousy of free-trade principles occasionally broke out in objections almost ludicrous. One member complained of the removal of the duty on grease, as he judged it would lead to a great importation of foreign butter; another moved the omission of lard from the list of articles to be admitted free of duty. Mr. Cobden, upon such objections, besought the landed interest not to make a pitiable exhibition of themselves; Lord John Russell advised them either to surrender the principle of protection to native industry altogether, or resolutely to stand by it in and out of parliament. Bolder than the parliamentary free-traders was Mr. W. J. Fox, who, at one of the meetings of the League in Covent Garden Theatre, said of those who were horrified at the notion of repealing the duties on butter, bacon, and cheese, "they keep a great chandler's shop, and they look to every minute article in their store, how they can pervert the power of legislation to make the community pay more for the benefit of the aristocracy. There was a time when trading at all was thought inconsistent with the possession of that dignity. Your feudal baron did not mind robbing by the strong hand, but he turned away with contempt from robbing by the short weight of a protective duty." The time was approaching when as strong things would be said in and out of parliament against the minister who had sufficiently manifested his indisposition to support the chandler's shop. The course which Sir Robert Peel was pursuing, of asserting the principles of free-trade cautiously and yet successfully, by enlisting the opposition, for their support against the imperfectly concealed hostility or indifference of his own supporters, was gradually preparing for him an amount of rebellion and insubordination of which he was too experienced a party leader not accurately to contemplate the final result—his own deposition.

Upon the opening of parliament Lord John Russell endeavored to produce some ministerial declaration on the subject of the corn laws, by affirming that protection was the bane of agriculture. He obtained no contradiction from Sir Robert Peel; but he was asked by Mr. Miles, one of the most sturdy of the protectionists, whether he had found it convenient to make a compact alliance with the Corn Law League? Protectionists and free-traders equally sought support for their arguments at this time in the distress which was said to exist among the agriculturists. On the 13th of March Mr. Cobden moved for a select committee to inquire into the causes and extent of this alleged agricultural distress, and into "the effects of legislative protection upon the interests of land-owners, tenant-farmers, and farm laborers." His motion was rejected by a majority of ninety-two. But his speech produced a great impression upon the country; and it has been said that upon the prime minister himself it had a marked influence. On this occasion Mr. Cobden came forth with a spirit-stirring and impassioned eloquence which few had con-

* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 232.
† Hansard, vol. lxvii. col. 473.

sidered within the range of his oratorical powers. To the country party he said, "You live in a mercantile age, when the whole wealth of the world is poured into your lap. You cannot have the advantages of commercial rents and feudal privileges, but you may be what you always have been, if you will identify yourselves with the spirit of the age. The English people look to the gentry and the aristocracy of this country as their leaders. I, who am not one of you, have no hesitation in telling you that there is a deep-rooted, an hereditary prejudice, if I may so call it, in your favor in this country. But you never got it, and you will not keep it, by obstructing the spirit of the age. If you are indifferent to enlightened means of finding employment for your own peasantry; if you are found obstructing that advance which is calculated to knit nations more together in the bonds of peace, by means of commercial intercourse; if you are found fighting against the discoveries which have almost given breath and life to material nature, and setting up yourselves as obstructives of that which destiny has decreed shall go on—why, then, you will be the gentry of England no longer, and others will be found to take your place."

The speech of Mr. Cobden on his motion for a committee was replied to by Mr. Sidney Herbert; but that reply was more damaging to the cause of agricultural protection than the arguments of Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright or the agitation of the League. It was the incaution of a young man of remarkable candor and somewhat inexperienced in parliamentary tactics, when he said, as the representative of an agricultural constituency, that it would be distasteful to the agriculturists to come whining to parliament at every period of temporary distress. Parliament had awarded to the agriculturists a certain amount of protection; with that they were content; and in adverse circumstances, such as failure of crop, they would meet them manfully and put their shoulders to the wheel.* Agriculturists were indignant at being represented as content with the protection they enjoyed; the assumption (which was meant for advice) that they would put their shoulders to the wheel instead of crying out for help to Hercules, was something different from the zealous friendship upon which they had calculated so long and reposed so confidingly. The rejection of Mr. Cobden's motion did not calm their anger. On the 17th of March Mr. W. Miles moved that in the reduction of taxation "due regard should be had to the necessity of affording relief to the agricultural interest." It was then that Mr. Disraeli pronounced unmistakably that sentence of open war against Sir Robert Peel which, whether in its skirmishes or pitched battles, for a year or two was admired by many as the daring of a noble courage in its insults to the first statesman of his time. Sir Robert Peel sometimes winced at these attacks, but in most cases he shook off the reckless words "like dewdrops from the lion's mane." "I remember," said Mr. Disraeli, "to have heard the right honorable baronet at the head of the government say he would sooner be the leader of the gentlemen of England than possess the confidence of sovereigns. . . . They were the right honorable baronet's first love, and though he may not kneel to them now as in the hour of passion, still they can recall the past. He does what he can to keep them quiet; sometimes he takes refuge in arrogant silence, and sometimes he treats them with haughty frigidity; and if they knew anything of human nature they would take the hint and shut their mouths. But they won't. And what then happens? The right honorable baronet, being compelled to interfere, sends down his valet, who says in the genteelest manner, We can have no whining here." Describing Sir Robert Peel as one who, by skilful parliamentary manœuvres, had tampered with the generous confidence of a great people, he addressed these words to the treasury bench: "Dissolve, if you please, the parliament you have betrayed, and appeal to the people who I believe mistrust you; for me there remains this at least—the opportunity of expressing thus publicly my belief that a conservative government is an organized hypocrisy."

In this speech of Mr. Disraeli there was a skilful allusion to that former desertion of the principle of ultra-Toryism which many yet remembered with the bitterness of intolerance: "Protection appears to be in about the same condition that Protestantism was in 1828. The country will draw its moral." Protestantism was now to have a new cause of offence. On the 3d of April Sir Robert Peel brought forward the plans of the government respecting the improvement of the College of Maynooth, proposing a grant of 30,000*l.* a year, to be secured by act of parliament. On the 11th, when the bill was to be read a second time, the table of the house was covered with petitions. There had been meetings throughout the country, in which churchmen and dissenters had been equally conspicuous in denouncing the measure as a renunciation of the Protestantism under which the empire had flourished. An annual vote had been taken for many years for the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth. It was the object of the government, to use the words of Sir Robert Peel, "to adopt in a friendly and generous spirit the institution provided for the education of the Roman Catholic priesthood—to extend the parliamentary provision for that purpose, and to attempt, not by interference with the doctrine or discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, but by a more liberal provision, to improve the system of education, and to elevate the tone and character of that institution." During six nights of debate in the Commons there was not a shaft in the quiver of bigotry, still replenished, however scantily, which was not then discharged against the government, and especially against Sir Robert Peel. Sir Robert Inglis, the most moderate and rational of his theological opponents, declared that, although shattered and torn, the flag of Protestantism still remained at the mast-head, and he would fight for it as unflinchingly as when in better days it waved untorn and unbent over our empire. Mr. Plumptre would not say that the religion of Rome was exclusively that of Antichrist, but he believed that it was so, completely and prominently; and he was further of opinion that it would be a fearful and national sin to endow such a religion. Mr. Ferrand solemnly believed that if the government could induce her majesty to attach her signature to this bill she would sign away her title to the British crown. Colonel Sibthorp was the loudest in the chorus: "Really, if I had not seen the first lord of the treasury take the oaths at the table of this house, I should have doubted whether he were a Protestant, a Roman Catholic, or a Mahometan; nor should I be surprised if the time should yet come when we shall see him sitting cross-legged as a Mahometan, or embracing a pope. I must say that I have lost all confidence in that man." Leaving the question of Maynooth untouched, Mr. Disraeli embraced the occasion for another personal assault upon the prime minister: "There is now no longer any constitutional opposition, because there is no government formed on definite principles. Something has risen up in this country as fatal in the political world as it has been in the landed world in Ireland; we have a great parliamentary middleman. It is well known what a middleman is: he is a man who bamboozles one party and plunders the other, till, having obtained a position to which he is not entitled, he cries out, 'Let us have no party questions, but fixity of tenure.'" In spite of the unmitigated opposition in both houses the Maynooth Bill was carried by considerable majorities. So also was the ministerial measure introduced by Sir James Graham for establishing three purely secular colleges in Ireland, wholly independent of religious tests or creeds, for the education of the middle classes. On the first debate on the measure Sir Robert Inglis termed it a great scheme "of godless education." The measure was carried by a large majority in the Commons upon the third reading, and was passed without a division in the Lords. But the faint cry of "godless education" raised by Sir Robert Inglis was echoed with far greater vehemence by the Roman Catholic clergy, whose prelates declared, through Mr. O'Connell, in the House of Commons, that this was a bad scheme of education, and the bill a penal and revolting measure. The "godless colleges" of Cork, Galway, and Belfast, nevertheless have flourished, unharmed under the constant attempts of a bigoted priesthood to oppose in this case, as well as in the national schools of Ireland, that system of instruction without religious teaching which the soundest statesmen have constantly regarded as one of the best means of softening the religious animosities and abating the injurious jealousies between Catholic and Protestant. There was another measure carried this session, in the spirit of religious liberality—that of the admission of Jews to municipal offices.

The session of parliament was terminated by the prorogation by the queen on the 9th of August. In the usual address to her majesty the speaker, in addition to his notice of the great financial measures of the session—the endowment of Maynooth, and the provision of the means of academical instruction in Ireland—adverted to two

* Hansard, vol. lxxviii. col. 818.

other labors in which the Commons had been engaged. The session had been rendered unusually laborious by the rapid development of private enterprise in extending the railway communications of the kingdom; anticipating the most beneficial results from the facilities thus afforded to the internal trade of the country, they had devoted much time and labor to the legislation requisite for the construction and regulation of those important works. The condition of the destitute poor of Scotland was the other subject of general legislation which the speaker recapitulated: "Assisted by the information which your majesty has directed to be laid before us, we have made such amendments in the law as will provide for the more effectual relief of the poor, and for a better system of parochial management, under the control of a general board of supervision."

Parliamentary warfare was for a season at an end. The queen and Prince Albert, on the day of prorogation, embarked at Woolwich on a visit to Germany. The prime minister gladly sought the retreat of Drayton Manor, where the murmurs of his once devoted partisans could scarcely reach him. An observer of London fashionable life at this time has written, "The language of the Tory party is more bitter and violent against him [Sir R. Peel] than ever I heard in society of the olden time from disappointed Whigs against Mr. Pitt. But I do not imagine this to be traced to a no-popery cry. If Sir Robert had left the corn laws untouched he would have carried the Maynooth question by a triumphant majority without a schism. His inattention to what the landed interest call their agricultural distress, their apprehensions that he will ultimately repeal those laws, and also his notorious neglect of those who, in good report and ill report, had stuck to his skirts till they had brought him through the battle, and then found that his patronage was lavished on their opponents—all these things have so embittered their minds that they have seized with readiness the first opportunity to stick their teeth in his flanks, and have rallied all the sectarian interests to take part in the *curée*." *

On the 31st of October the cabinet having been called together by Sir Robert Peel, a meeting took place at his house, and on the following day the cabinet again assembled. The "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," which were published by his executors in 1857, enable us now to trace with a distinctness which could not previously be derived from other sources the beginning of that train of events which led to the repeal of the corn laws. The documents which these memoirs contain relate to the information received by Sir Robert Peel on the probable failure of the potato crop, and exhibit his correspondence on the subject with other members of the government. With something like an apology for giving these documents at length, he describes them as "the materials from which the future historian will extract that which is worthy of permanent record, and from which, with the aid of other contemporary evidence, he will pronounce his judgment on the motives and conduct of public men." †

There were three members of the government who, from their official station, were chiefly responsible at this time for instituting inquiries into the probability of a sudden and extensive defalcation in the ordinary supply of food, with a view to the adoption of measures calculated to mitigate the evil consequences of such a defalcation. These ministers were the first lord of the treasury, the secretary of state for the home department, and the lord lieutenant of Ireland. The correspondence between Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham goes on from the 12th of August to the 15th of October amid alternations of hope and alarm. On the 15th, the official reports having assumed a very serious aspect, Sir Robert writes: "My letter on the awful state of the potato crop in Ireland crossed yours to me. . . . Interference with the due course of the laws respecting the supply of food is so momentous and so lasting in its consequences that we must not act without the most accurate information. I fear the worst." To obtain the most accurate information the prime minister dispatched to Ireland two men eminent in their respective departments of science—Professor Lindley and Dr. Lyon Playfair. The reports of the botanist and the chemist were not calculated to mitigate the apprehensions of official and other observers in Ireland. The secretary of the Irish Agricultural Improvement Society had obtained proofs that the entire potato crop was more or less affected in every part of the country, and he says that a panic had seized all parties to a greater extent than he ever remembered since the cholera. The alarm in Scotland was also great and rapidly increasing. Sir James Graham clearly sees what is at hand. "The anti-corn law pressure is about to commence, and it will be the most formidable movement in modern times."

Such was the information which Sir Robert Peel had to lay before the cabinet on the 31st of October. He told his colleagues in a cabinet memorandum that "inaction—the letting things take their own course—seems to me impossible. . . . Inaction and indifference might involve the country in serious danger, and the government in the heaviest responsibility." It is unnecessary here to go through the various suggestions of the memorandum. The prime minister found few inclined to deal boldly with the danger: "It became evident that very serious differences of opinion existed as to the necessity of adopting any extraordinary measures and as to the character of the measures which it might be advisable to adopt." * The cabinet separated, fixing another meeting for the 6th of November. The accounts received in the interim were not of a nature to allay the apprehensions of the week before. At that cabinet Sir Robert Peel proposed to issue immediately an order in council remitting the duty on grain in bond to one shilling, opening the ports to the temporary admission of all grain at a smaller rate of duty. He further proposed to call parliament together on the 27th to ask for indemnity, and to declare an intention of submitting immediately after the recess a modification of the existing corn laws. Three only of his colleagues gave their support to the first lord of the treasury—the Earl of Aberdeen, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Sidney Herbert. On the 2d of November Lord Stanley wrote to Sir Robert Peel to express the regret with which he saw how widely he differed in opinion with Sir James Graham and himself as to the necessity of proposing to parliament a repeal of the corn laws. Sir Robert Peel replied that he had not proposed to the cabinet that they should recommend to parliament a repeal of the corn laws, still less that they should offer their advice to the queen that the corn laws ought to be abandoned.

On the 22d of November Lord John Russell addressed a public letter to the electors of the city of London, which began with stating precisely the same truth which Sir Robert Peel had endeavored to impress upon his cabinet. "The present state of the country in regard to its supply of food cannot be viewed without apprehension. Forethought and bold precautions may avert any serious evils—indecision and procrastination may produce a state of suffering which it is frightful to contemplate." He complains that the queen's ministers had met and separated without affording any promise of seasonable relief. He points out that the duties on the importations of corn were so contrived that "the corn barometer points to fair while the ship is bending under a storm." Then comes a declaration from the leader of the Whig party which forbids all further advocacy of "fixed duty" in opposition to "sliding scale." "I confess that on the general subject my views have in the course of twenty years undergone a great alteration. I used to be of opinion that corn was an exception to the general rules of political economy; but observation and experience have convinced me that we ought to abstain from all interference with the supply of food. Neither a government nor a legislature can ever regulate the corn market with the beneficial effects which the entire freedom of sale and purchase are sure of themselves to produce." It was no longer worth while, he said, to contend for a fixed duty; the imposition at present of any duty, without a provision for its speedy extinction, would only prolong a contest already sufficiently fruitful of animosity and discontent. "Let us then unite to put an end to a system which has been proved to be the blight of commerce, the bane of agriculture, the source of bitter division among classes, the cause of penury, fever, mortality, and crime among the people." Sir Robert Peel prints this letter in his Memoirs with this observation: "It was asserted by many who were careless about the foundation of their assertions that I had been influenced in the advice which I offered to the cabinet by the appearance of this letter. A simple reference to dates will prove that this could not have been the case." †

On the 25th and 26th of November the cabinet was occupied in the discussion of instructions to be given to the commission which had been

* Raikes's "Diary," vol. iv. pp. 423, 424.
† "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," p. 107.

* "Memoirs," p. 148.
† Ibid., p. 179.

appointed, for the consideration and adoption of such measures as might tend to mitigate the evil consequences of the apprehended scarcity. These instructions were unanimously approved of by the cabinet. Sir Robert Peel felt that the danger to be apprehended was so fully admitted and was set forth in such strong terms in the letter of the secretary of state to the lord lieutenant that it was "difficult to reconcile the issue of this letter with passiveness and inaction in respect to the means of increasing the supply of food." Before the instructions, therefore, contained in the letter were finally assented to by the cabinet, he read to them a memorandum, of which the opening sentence was quite sufficient to indicate the final tendency of his opinions: "I cannot consent to the issue of these instructions, and undertake at the same time to maintain the existing corn laws." On the 29th of November he put in circulation among his colleagues a memorandum, addressed in the first instance to the Duke of Wellington, in which "are contained the reasons which induce me to advise the suspension of the existing corn laws for a limited period." The answer of the Duke of Wellington is very characteristic. He was of opinion that the government should avoid to break down the corn laws till that measure should appear to be absolutely necessary. "But of this I do not entertain a doubt: if it is necessary to suspend the corn laws to avoid real evils resulting from scarcity of food, we ought not to hesitate." The duke then comes to the party view of the question which Sir Robert Peel had not discussed, Could he carry on a government for the queen, supposing that the support of the landed interest were withdrawn from him? The duke was afraid that Sir Robert Peel must reckon upon its being withdrawn from him, unless he should be able to show clearly the necessity of the measure in question. "In respect to my own course, my only object in public life is to support Sir Robert Peel's administration of the government for the queen." The duke, if Sir Robert Peel thought that his position in parliament and in the public view required that the course should be taken which he recommended, had no hesitation in saying, "I earnestly recommend that the cabinet should support him, and I for one declare that I will do so." Others of the cabinet took a very different view. Mr. Goulburn writes to Sir Robert Peel, "An abandonment of your former opinions now would I think, prejudice your and our characters as public men, and would be fraught with fatal results to the country's best interests. . . . In my opinion the party of which you are the head is the only barrier which remains against the revolutionary effects of the Reform Bill." Lord Wharncliffe was of opinion "that the queen's speech, if it should ultimately be decided to recommend any modification or a tempotary suspension of the corn law, should do so in terms which would show our decided intention to uphold the principle of protection in some way or other."

The discussions in the cabinet continued till the 2d of December, when Sir Robert Peel brought before his colleagues a specific measure for the proposal of a new law which would be "founded upon the principle of the present law, while it continues in operation, but will in the course of that operation insure the ultimate and not remote extinction of protective duties." He believed that some such measure as he had suggested might receive the assent of all his colleagues. Lord Stanley and the Duke of Buccleugh, however, each signified his inability to support a measure involving the ultimate repeal of the corn laws. Sir Robert Peel, thinking that the public interest would be very injuriously affected by the failure of an attempt made by a government to adjust the question of corn laws, repaired to Osborne on the 5th of December, and humbly solicited the queen to relieve him from duties which he could no longer discharge with advantage to her majesty's service. The queen then informed Sir Robert Peel that it was her intention to propose to Lord John Russell to undertake the formation of a government. In a letter to the queen, written after the audience, Sir Robert Peel stated that if the opinions of his colleagues had been in concurrence with his own, he had been fully prepared to take the responsibility of suspending the corn laws, and of entering upon a comprehensive review of restrictions on the import of foreign grain and other articles of food, with a view to their gradual diminution and ultimate removal. With reference to the proposed new administration he adds, "Sir Robert Peel is prepared to support, in a private capacity, measures which may be in general conformity with those which he advised as a minister."

Lord John Russell was at Edinburgh when a summons reached him to attend the queen. He went to her majesty with the conviction that he could not accept the great trust now offered to him. He felt that his party, being in a large minority in the Commons, he could not properly undertake the formation of a government. But the offer of Sir Robert Peel, to give his assistance in a private capacity toward the settlement of the corn-law question, determined Lord John Russell to depart from this resolution. There was a week of negotiation as to the specific nature of this limited offer. Sir Robert Peel was "convinced that previous concert, or a previous pledge on his part, to support a particular measure of adjustment would be distasteful to the House of Commons, and embarrassing to all parties." With this view Lord John Russell expressed his concurrence, but required at the same time that Sir Robert Peel should give assurances, that would have amounted substantially to a pledge, that he would support the immediate and total repeal of the corn laws. The ex-minister did not feel it to be consistent with his duty to enter upon the consideration of this important question in parliament, being fettered by a previous engagement of the nature of that required from him. Nevertheless Lord John Russell, in the afternoon of the 18th of December, stated to her majesty at Windsor Castle that he was ready to undertake the formation of a government. In consequence Sir Robert Peel was invited by her majesty to a parting interview on his relinquishment of office. On entering the room at Windsor, on the 20th of December, her majesty said to him very graciously, "So far from taking leave of you, Sir Robert, I must require you to withdraw your resignation, and to remain in my service." Lord John Russell had written to the queen on the morning of that day that he had found it impossible to form an administration. He had informed the queen that he had had olely in view the settlement of the question of corn laws; he admitted that Sir Robert Peel had been willing, from the commencement to the end, to diminish the difficulties of a new government in attempting that settlement, although Sir Robert Peel could not of course rely upon the support of his political friends. It was therefore necessary, he wrote, that all those who were prominent in the political party to which Lord John Russell was attached should give their zealous aid, and act in concert in the new administration. "Lord John Russell had in one instance been unable to obtain this concert, and he must now consider that task as hopeless which has been from the beginning hazardous." The one instance was that of Lord Grey; he had objected to one proposed appointment, and Lord John Russell had been unwilling to admit the force of the objection. We can easily understand how the self-asserting inheritor of a great name should have failed in substantiating his objection to a statesman with the reputation of Lord Palmerston. Lord John Russell having absolutely relinquished the formation of a government, Sir Robert Peel at once decided, if such were her majesty's pleasure, on the resumption of his office. He wished, he said, to be able to announce to his late colleagues that he had not hesitated to reaccept the appointment of first minister. The cabinet met at Downing Street in the evening of the 20th, and he told them that, whether supported or not, he was firmly resolved to meet parliament as her majesty's minister, and to propose such measures as the public exigencies required. Lord Stanley declared that he must persevere in resigning. He thought the corn laws ought to be adhered to, and might have been maintained. The Duke of Buccleugh would not at once decide upon resigning. The other members of the cabinet declared their determination to support Sir Robert Peel in the course he had announced to them. The Duke of Wellington was the man to admire courage, whether civil or military. He told the House of Lords, on the ministerial explanations, "I applauded the conduct of my right honorable friend; I was delighted with it. It was exactly the course which I should have followed myself under similar circumstances, and I therefore determined to stand by him." The new cabinet enlisted an able coadjutor in Lord Dalhousie; and Mr. Gladstone, who had retired from office some time previous, succeeded Lord Stanley as secretary of state for the colonial department. Lord Wharncliffe, the president of the council, had died, during this great crisis, on the 19th of December.

The biographer of Sir Robert Peel has described his hesitation, in the session of 1845, to apply the strict principles of commercial freedom to the trade in corn, as the "touching perplexity of a sincere and conscientious mind, carried forward in the direction of its own

inclination by a great flood of public opinion and passion, and struggling painfully against its adversaries, its friends, and itself."* The "perplexity" was now over. The struggle of the "sincere and conscientious mind" against itself was passed. Six days after Sir Robert Peel had declared to the cabinet that he was again her majesty's minister, he wrote to the Princess Lieven at Paris a short note, in which he casts off the reserve of the statesman to give unrestrained expression to his natural feelings: "However unexpected is the turn which affairs have taken, it is for the best. I resume power with greater means of rendering public service than I should have had if I had not relinquished it. But it is a strange dream."†

It was the 22d of January, 1846, when the queen opened the parliament in person. The royal speech necessarily alluded to the failure of the potato crops in Ireland, and to the means that had been adopted for alleviating the sufferings caused by this calamity. Her majesty had had great satisfaction in giving her consent to the measures for the repeal of prohibitory and the relaxation of protective duties. The prosperous state of the revenue, the increased demand for labor, and the general improvement which had taken place in the internal condition of the country, were strong testimonies in favor of the course that had been pursued. "I recommend you," said the queen, "to take into your early consideration whether the principles on which you have acted may not with advantage be yet more extensively applied, and whether it may not be in your power, after a careful review of the existing duties upon many articles, the produce or manufacture of other countries, to make such further reductions and remissions as may tend to insure the continuance of the great benefits to which I have adverted." There might have been some doubt as to the interpretation of the words "further reductions and remissions;" but the ministerial explanations of Sir Robert Peel and of Lord John Russell, in which the details of the negotiations for the formation of a government were fully stated, left no doubt whatever that a free trade in corn, however gradually to be accomplished, was now the great object of Sir Robert Peel's administration. After the mover and seconder of the addresses in the House of Commons had delivered their speeches, Sir Robert Peel immediately rose. Having gone through the explanatory details expected from the head of the government after a ministerial crisis, he did not wait for the attacks of those adversaries who were once his submissive friends. He boldly proclaimed his determination to stand free from the trammels of party. "Sir, believe me, to conduct the government of this country is a most arduous duty; I may say it without irreverence, that these ancient institutions, like our physical frames, are 'fearfully and wonderfully made.' It is no easy task to insure the united action of an ancient monarchy, a proud aristocracy, and a reformed constituency. I have done everything I could do, and have thought it consistent with true conservative policy, to reconcile these three branches of the state. I have thought it consistent with true conservative policy to promote so much of happiness among the people that the voice of disaffection should be no longer heard, and that thoughts of the dissolution of our institutions should be forgotten in the midst of physical enjoyment. These were my attempts, and I thought them not inconsistent with true and enlarged conservative policy. These were my objects in accepting office—it is a burden too great for my physical and far beyond my intellectual structure; and to be relieved from it with perfect honor would be the greatest favor that could be conferred on me. But as a feeling of honor and a strong sense of duty require me to undertake those responsible functions, I declare, sir, that I am ready to incur these risks, to bear these burdens, and to front all these honorable dangers. But, sir, I will not take the step with mutilated power and shackled authority. I will not stand at the helm during such tempestuous nights as I have seen, if the vessel be not allowed fairly to pursue the course which I think she ought to take. I will not, sir, undertake to direct the course of the vessel by the observations taken in 1842. I will reserve to myself the marking out of that course; and I must, for the public interest, claim for myself the unfettered power of judging of those measures which I conceive will be better for the country to propose. Sir, I do not wish to be the minister of England; but while I have the high honor of holding that office, I am determined to hold it by no servile tenure. I will only hold that office upon the condition of being unshackled by any other obligations than those of consulting the public interests and of providing for the public safety."*

This speech was of course accepted as a declaration of war by all those who interpreted conservative policy as one almost exclusively directed to the upholding of class interests and class prejudices. Mr. Disraeli, in declaring his intention of adhering to the principles of protection which had sent him into that house, did not attempt to defend those principles, but confined himself, as he did for the greater part of the session, to the bitterest attacks on the minister who was about to give them their final and irrevocable blow. Sir Robert Peel's conduct, he said, was that of the captain, who having received the command of a fleet from the sultan to attack Mehemet Ali, steered that fleet at once into the enemy's port. Sir Robert Peel, a great statesman, who was always marching after the events of his age! He was just as much a great statesman as he who got up behind a carriage was a great whip. There could be no mistake as to the intentions of the so-called conservative party, whether they spoke in the "wild and hurling words" of the brilliant orator, or in the bucolic accents of the lords of many acres. By the mouth of Mr. Miles they gave notice that the "strongest constitutional opposition would be given to the minister's plan, and that every impediment would be made use of to prevent its passing into law." The plan was not yet developed, but its scope and objects were pretty correctly anticipated.

On the 27th of January the avenues of the House of Commons were filled with eager crowds; the seats below the bar were thronged with listeners, among whom were Prince Albert and the Duke of Cambridge; the strangers' gallery was crammed to excess, while hundreds who had obtained tickets were unable to get admission. His whole plan of financial and commercial policy was developed by Sir Robert Peel in a speech of four hours. He said, in the onset, that he was not about to apply the principle of relaxation of protective duties to any one particular class: "I am not about to select that great interest connected with the agriculture of the country, and call upon the landowners to relinquish protection, unprepared at the same time to call upon other protected classes to relinquish protection also. In the confidence that the principle for which I contend is a just and a wise one, I ask all protected interests to make the sacrifice, if it be a sacrifice, which the application of that principle will render necessary."† The duties on tallow and timber were to be extensively reduced; these were the only raw materials still subject to duty. The duties on foreign manufactured goods were to be abolished or reduced. As the silk manufacture had increased in the ratio of the removal of duties, there was now to be a further reduction. On cotton and woollen fabrics duties were to be removed or lessened by one half. Articles of food were relieved from taxation, either wholly or partially. The differential duties on free-labor sugar were abated about fifty per cent. Animal food and vegetables were admitted duty free. One half of the existing duties on butter, cheese, hops, and cured fish were removed. Live animals were no longer to be subject to any import duty. Here was a tariff which a few years before would have shaken the isle from its propriety; but what a clamor would have gone through the land, echoed at every county meeting and every market table, if a minister had proposed, as Sir Robert Peel now proposed, to admit buckwheat and Indian corn duty free; to submit colonial grain to a merely nominal duty; and altogether to remove protection from every other species of grain at the end of three years. In the interval the duties on grain were to be as follows: When wheat was under 48*s.* per quarter the duty was to be 10*s.*; at every rise of a shilling per quarter in the market price the duty was to be a shilling lower, till wheat should be at 54*s.* and the duty at 4*s.*, after which the duty should not further change. The existing price of wheat being 54*s.*, the duty would be at once reduced from 16*s.* to 4*s.* Some relief of the burdens upon agriculture, involved in an alteration of the law of settlement, a consolidation of highway boards, the removal of the cost of prisoners from the county rates—these and other minor concessions, which were real benefits, were received only with ridicule, in the face of the startling fact that the staff of protection, which had so long been leaned upon, would be utterly broken and cast away. The philosophical

* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 250.
† "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," p. 251.

* Hansard, vol. lxxxiii. col. 94.
† Ibid., col. 241.

reasoners knew well that the hale man would then be able to walk without his crutch ; but the country party were not greatly addicted to philosophical politics. Sir Robert Peel concluded the speech, in which he offered, on the part of the government, these proposals "for the ultimate adjustment of this question by affirming that there had been a great change in the opinion of the great mass of the community with respect to the corn laws." He recommended his plan as a whole to their calm and dispassionate consideration, with no other feeling or interest in its ultimate issue than that it might, to use the words of her majesty's speech, conduce to promote "friendly feelings between different classes of my subjects, to provide additional security for the continuance of peace, and to maintain contentment and happiness at home by increasing the comfort and bettering the condition of the great body of my people."

On the 9th of February a debate was begun, which continued twelve nights, on the motion that the speaker should leave the chair to go into committee on the Customs and Corn Importation Act. Mr. Miles had proposed as an amendment, "that this house will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said committee." On the fifth night of the discussion, the 16th of February, Sir Robert Peel, with even more than his ordinary debating ability, reviewed every species of objection, whether from agriculturists or shipowners or manufacturers, that had been raised to the various details of his measure. Toward the conclusion of his speech he warmed into an eloquence such as had been rarely equalled since the days of the great orators of former generations.

"This night is to decide between the policy of continued relaxation of restriction or the return to restraint and prohibition. This night you will select the motto which is to indicate the commercial policy of England. Shall it be 'advance' or 'recede'? Which is the fitter motto for this great empire? Survey our position ; consider the advantage which God and nature have given us, and the destiny for which we are intended. We stand on the confines of Western Europe, the chief connecting link between the old world and the new. The discoveries of science, the improvement of navigation have brought us within ten days of St. Petersburg, and will soon bring us within ten days of New York. We have an extent of coast greater in proportion to our population and the area of our land than any other great nation, securing to us maritime strength and superiority. Iron and coal, the sinews of manufacture, give us advantages over every rival in the great competition of industry. Our capital far exceeds that which they can command. In ingenuity, in skill, in energy, we are inferior to none. Our national character, the free institutions under which we live, the liberty of thought and action, an unshackled press spreading the knowledge of every discovery and of every advance in science, combine with our natural and physical advantages to place us at the head of those nations which profit by the free interchange of their products. And is this the country to shrink from competition? Is this the country to adopt a retrograde policy? Is this the country which can only flourish in the sickly, artificial atmosphere of prohibition? Is this the country to stand shivering on the brink of exposure to the healthful breezes of competition?" *

Turning then from commercial freedom in manufactures to commercial freedom in agriculture, he asked if in some future season, when "the years of plenteousness shall have ended," and "the years of dearth may have come," would it be no satisfaction to you to reflect that by your own act you have been relieved from the grievous responsibility of regulating the supply of food? "When you are again exhorting a suffering people to fortitude under their privations ; when you are telling them 'these are the chastenings of an all-wise and merciful Providence, sent for some inscrutable but just and beneficent purpose—it may be to humble our pride or to punish our unfaithfulness or to impress us with a sense of our nothingness and dependence on His mercy ;' when you are thus addressing your suffering fellow-subjects, and encouraging them to bear without repining the dispensations of Providence, may God grant that by your decision of this night you may have laid in store for yourselves the consolation of reflecting that such calamities are, in truth, the dispensations of Providence—that they have not been caused, they have not been aggravated by the laws of man, restricting in the hour of scarcity the supply of food!" *

On the 27th of February the debate on Mr. Miles's amendment on the motion for going into committee on the Customs and Corn Importation Act was brought to a conclusion. During the twelve nights of debate forty-eight members spoke in favor of free trade and fifty-five on the side of protection. To attempt the briefest analysis of the general arguments for the removal of protection, and of the anticipations of commercial and agricultural ruin if protection were abolished —arguments now so perfectly understood, and fears now so thoroughly exploded—would be as wearisome as useless. Upon a division the numbers were, for Mr. Miles's amendment, 240 ; against it, 337, being a majority for the government of 97. The House of Commons went into committee on the 2d of March. The various clauses of the proposed bill were debated with the same earnestness for four nights, when the second reading was carried by a majority of 88. On the third reading there was a debate of three nights. On the 15th of May, at four in the morning, 327 members voted for the third reading, and for an amendment of the Marquess of Granby, that the bill be read that day six months, 229 voted, giving a majority for the third reading of 98. In the House of Lords the bill was passed with less difficulty than might have been anticipated. The Duke of Wellington on the 18th moved the first reading of the Corn Importation Bill, and on the 19th the Duke of Buccleugh moved the first reading of the Customs Duties Bill. It is as unnecessary to follow the course of debate in the Lords as in the Commons. The second reading of the Corn Bill was carried by a majority of 47—211 being for the second reading, against it 164. The second reading of the Customs Duties Bill was carried without a division. The various clauses of the Corn Bill having been debated in committee, the bill on the 19th of June was reported without amendments. On the 25th of June both bills were read a third time and passed, to which on the 26th the royal assent was given by commission. By the Corn Importation Act, that scale of duties as proposed by the government on the 27th of January was to continue until the 1st of February, 1849, after which day a duty upon grain of one shilling per quarter, and of fourpence-halfpenny per cwt. upon flour and meal, was to be levied, for purely statistical purposes. A revolution, scarcely second in importance to the Reform Bill, was thus accomplished. England entered on a new course of commercial policy, of whose beneficial results the experience of the succeeding sixteen years has left too strong an evidence to allow any but a few devotees of an obsolete creed to abide in "their temples dim."

During the progress through the House of Commons of the measures of commercial freedom, a bill entitled, "For the protection of life in Ireland," which had passed in the House of Lords, was brought under discussion in the House of Commons. It was opposed with the utmost vehemence by the protectionists, who in the rejection of the measure hailed the prospect of being revenged on Sir Robert Peel ; and by the majority of the Whigs, who, consistently adhering to their often declared principles upon coercion bills in Ireland, nevertheless saw in the defeat of the government the door opened for their return to power after it had been closed against them for five years. On the 21st of June Sir Robert Peel accurately calculated upon the double event—the passing of the Corn Law Repeal Bill unmutilated in the House of Lords, and the rejection of the bill for the protection of life in Ireland by the House of Commons. He took a decision at once dignified and patriotic. He addressed a memorandum on the position of the government to the cabinet, in which he suggested to the deliberate and dispassionate consideration of his colleagues, "to determine whether, after the passing of the Corn and Customs Bills, it would be for the interest of the crown, of the country, and for the honor and character of the government, that they should remain in office." He said, with an honesty worthy of all imitation, "a government ought to have a *natural* support ; a conservative government should be supported by a conservative party ; support from the compassion of its enemies, or even from the personally friendly feelings of those who *ought* on public principle to oppose a government, is a hollow and not a creditable support. Depend upon it that we shall not pass the Irish Bill into a law." He was decidedly, he told them, of opinion "that we should not fall

* Hansard, vol. lxxxiii. col. 1041.

* Hansard, vol. lxxxiii. col. 1044.

into the errors of the last Whig government—retain office after we have lost power, or advise a dissolution with little prospect of securing a majority of members, honestly and cordially concurring with us on great political principles." * The memorandum being communicated to the other members of the government, there was not the slightest difference of opinion as to the course to be pursued.

There were six nights of debate upon the Irish Bill. On the 25th of June Lord George Bentinck, who had for some time filled the office of the aristocratic leader of the protectionists, expressed himself with a violence toward the prime minister that more than rivalled the attacks of his untitled coadjutor. Mr. Cobden answered Lord George Bentinck: "I have to say, in contradiction to the noble lord, that if the right honorable baronet chooses to retire from office in consequence of this vote, he carries with him the esteem and gratitude of a larger number of the population of this empire than ever followed any minister that was ever hurled from power." After Mr. Cobden had spoken the division took place: for the second reading, 219; against it, 292; majority against the government, 73. On the 29th of June the resignation of ministers was announced by Sir Robert Peel. He cast a retrospect over the reasons which had influenced his conduct, and the results which had been obtained. "The name," he said, "which ought to be associated with the success of those measures, is not the name of the noble lord, the organ of the party of which he is the leader, nor is it mine. The name which ought to be and will be associated with the success of those measures is the name of one who, acting, as I believe, from pure and disinterested motives, has, with untiring energy, made appeals to our reason, and has enforced those appeals with an eloquence the more to be admired because it was unaffected and unadorned: it is the name of Richard Cobden." He concluded his speech with those emphatic words which have been inscribed upon the pedestal of more than one monumental tribute of a nation's gratitude: "It may be that I shall leave a name sometimes remembered with expressions of good-will in the abodes of those whose lot it is to labor and to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow, when they shall recruit their exhausted strength with abundant and untaxed food, the sweeter because it is no longer leavened with a sense of injustice."

The House of Commons adjourned to the 3d of July. On the 6th Lord John Russell, as first lord of the treasury, and the other members of the administration were sworn into office.

From the 16th of July, when, after the change of government, the House of Commons met again for the dispatch of business, to the 28th of August, when parliament was prorogued by commission, the measures passed were various and important. The impending distress in Ireland occupied much of the attention of the legislature. Two measures of permanent social interest became law. One enactment has worked a most material and salutary change in the power of the people to obtain cheap justice—the establishment of county courts for the recovery of small debts. The other, directed to important sanitary objects, which received the royal assent on the 26th of August, declares that "it is desirable for the health, comfort, and welfare of the inhabitants of towns and populous districts, to encourage the establishment therein of public baths and wash-houses and open bathing-places." To town councils and parish vestries is given the power to establish such public conveniences, the expenses of which, beyond the receipts, are to be paid as part of the poor's-rate.

On the 4th of July Sir Robert Peel wrote to Lord Hardinge, "There is nothing I would not have done to insure the carrying of the measures I had proposed this session. I pique myself on never having proposed anything which I have not carried; but the moment their success was insured, and I had the satisfaction of seeing two drowsy masters in chancery mumble out at the table of the House of Commons that the Lords had passed the Corn and Customs Bills I was satisfied. Two hours after this intelligence was brought we were ejected from power; and, by another coincidence as marvellous, on the day on which I had to announce in the House of Commons the dissolution of the government, the news arrived that we had settled the Oregon question, and that our proposals had been accepted by the United States without the alteration of a word." *

The settlement of the Oregon question was announced to the House of Lords on the 29th by the Earl of Aberdeen. He made a brief statement of what had occurred since the President of the United States, Mr. Polk, had sent his message to the Senate with a direct refusal of the repeated proposals of the British government to submit the whole question to arbitration. When Lord Aberdeen afterward saw that the Senate and House of Representatives had adopted resolutions of a conciliatory and friendly description, he at once put aside all idea of diplomatic etiquette, and sent over to the British minister the draft of a convention to be proposed for the acceptance of the United States Government. The president having submitted this draft for the opinion of the Senate, that body, by a majority of thirty-eight votes to twelve, adopted a resolution advising the president to accept the terms proposed. Mr. Buchanan, the American Secretary of State, accordingly informed our minister that the conditions offered were accepted, "without the addition or alteration of a single word." *

This settlement of the Oregon question relieved the British nation and the government from a long-continued cause of anxiety. In 1845 Mr. Polk, in his inaugural address, affirmed that it was his duty "to assert and maintain by all constitutional means the right of the United States to that portion of our territory which lies beyond the Rocky Mountains. Our title to the country of the Oregon is clear and unquestionable; and already are our people preparing to perfect their title by occupying it with their wives and children." † The value of the Oregon territory was so little understood when the treaty of peace was concluded, in 1783, that no provision whatever was made for its occupation. Forty years later the claims of the British government and that of the United States to this region had become so opposed that Lord Castlereagh said to Mr. Rush, the American minister, that by holding up a finger a war regarding Oregon might be produced between the two countries. During the foreign secretaryship of Mr. Canning the apprehension of hostilities became greater. In 1818 a convention had been entered into, by which the whole territory was to be open to the settlers of both countries for a period of ten years; but the agreement was not to be construed to the prejudice of any claim which either of the contracting parties might have to any part of the country. In 1844 Mr. Calhoun, Secretary of State at Washington, explained his reasons for declining proposals made by the British government, in a state paper, in which he contended that time so far from impairing the American claims had greatly strengthened them, by the rapid advance of the population of the United States toward that territory. An emigration, estimated at not less than a thousand in 1843 and fifteen hundred in 1844, had flowed into it, and that the current thus commenced would continue to flow with increased volume hereafter. "There can, then, be no doubt now that the operation of the same cause which impelled our population westward from the shores of the Atlantic across the Alleghany to the valley of the Mississippi will impel them onward with accumulating force across the Rocky Mountains into the valley of the Columbia, and that the whole region drained by it is destined to be peopled by us." ‡ In 1845 the president, in a public address, while negotiations were pending, referred, contrary to all usage, to other contingencies than a friendly and satisfactory termination of the differences between the two governments. Upon this declaration Sir Robert Peel expressed himself with deep regret that such a reference should be made in a tone and temper which was not likely to lead to an amicable and equitable settlement of the differences. We have rights, he said, respecting this territory of Oregon clear and unquestionable. "We trust still to arrive at an amicable adjustment—we desire to effect an amicable adjustment of our claim—but having exhausted every effort to effect that settlement, if our rights should be invaded we are resolved—and we are prepared—to maintain them." §

We have thus briefly traced the course of those differences which were happily concluded before the administration of affairs was handed over by the Peel government to that of Lord John Russell The territory in dispute has now became the rising colony of British Columbia. In looking to the probable extensive emigration in a few years to this vast territory—in many parts fertile, abundantly

* "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," pp. 288, 297. † Ibid., p. 309.

* Hansard, vol. lxxxvii. col. 1038.
† "Annual Register for 1845," p. 279. ‡ Ibid., p. 288.
§ Hansard, vol. lxxxi. col. 199.

watered by numerous streams, and most attractive in adding one more to our gold-productive colonies—we are struck by an eloquent prediction of the great modern orator of the United States, which was made at Boston three months after the speech of Sir Robert Peel on the Oregon question. The anticipation of Mr. Webster carries us forward to the consideration of a future of far greater significance than the disputes of the past. "I believe that it is in the course of Providence and of human destiny that a great state is to arise, of English and American descent, whose power will be established over the country on the shores of the Pacific; and that all those rights of natural and political liberty, all those great principles that both nations have inherited from their fathers, will be transmitted through us to them, so that there will exist at the mouth of the Columbia, or more probably farther south, a great Pacific republic, a nation where our children may go for a residence, separating themselves from this government, and forming an integral part of a new government, halfway between England and China; in the most healthful, fertile, and desirable portion of the globe, and quite too far remote from Europe and from this side of the American continent to be under the governmental influence of either country. This state of things is by no means so far off as we may imagine—by no means so remote from the present time as may be supposed; and, looking to this state of things, this question becomes one upon which intelligent and well-disposed men might very readily come to an agreement." *

In writing to Lord Hardinge on the 4th of July, Sir Robert Peel mentions "our reception in England of your closing exploits on the Sutlej." In the royal speech, on the prorogation, the queen congratulated her parliament on the victorious course and happy conclusion of the war in India, and announced that perfect tranquillity prevailed throughout the whole of the British possessions in that quarter of the world. It was in December, 1845, when the British occupied most of the southern bank of the Sutlej, that the Sikh army began to cross the river for the purpose of making an attack on the British frontier. Runjeet Sing, the ruler of the Sikhs and the Punjaub, had, up to the time of his death in 1839, always continued on terms of amity with the British government. His son, Kurruck Sing, who died in 1840, was the ruler of the country, his elder brother being imbecile. An illegitimate son of Runjeet Sing, who succeeded to the government, was assassinated in 1843. His son, being very young, the mother assumed the power, giving her favorite, Lall Sing, the appointment of Vizier. There was no strong hand, as in the days of Runjeet Sing, to restrain the army, and thus, having crossed to the southern bank of the Sutlej, they took up an intrenched position at the village of Ferozeshah. In this camp the Sikhs had a force of more than 50,000 men, with 108 pieces of cannon. The British force, under the commander-in-chief, Sir Hugh Gough, was advancing from Umballah in order to relieve Ferozepoor, held by Sir J. Littler, which had been partially invested. On the 18th of December the British army reached Moodkee, and that evening repulsed an attack of the Sikhs. In this battle Sir Robert Sale received a wound, of which he died two months afterward. The British army, consisting of 16,700 men, and 69 guns, then marched toward Ferozepoor. Sir Henry Hardinge accompanied the army. Up to the time of the Sikhs crossing the Sutlej he had carefully avoided every demonstration which could be construed into an act of hostility. It was now his clear duty to repel aggression, and he put into the performance of that duty all that energy of a chivalrous nature which had so illustrated his career in the Peninsular War. Waiving the claims of his rank as governor-general, he offered to Sir Hugh Gough to serve under him as second in command. On the 21st and 22d of December was fought the great battle of Ferozeshah. The British attacked the intrenched camp on the evening of the 21st. The resistance of the Sikhs was most obstinate. Night closed before the British had become masters of a part of the intrenched quadrangle. Their situation was one of considerable peril. The British reserves had been engaged to the last man; the troops had fought a desperate battle after a long march; they were wearied, and had little food. A writer, who had access to special information, has given an animated description of the night which followed the attack on the intrenched camp. "Side by side, with the dying and the dead, the living lay down. They strove to sleep; some of them did sleep in spite of cold, hunger, thirst, and, worse than all, the cries and groans of their wounded comrades. And all around them and above, the horizon was illuminated with the flames of burning huts, exploding shells, tumbrils, ammunition carts, and occasionally a mine. Moreover, they suffered, even then, from a constant fire of artillery, which became at one time so annoying, where the governor-general was in person, that he was forced to order two regiments, the 80th and 1st Bengal Europeans, to charge with the bayonet. But Sir Henry Hardinge and Sir Hugh Gough knew no rest at all; they went about from corps to corps, animating the men, and cheerfully demonstrating to the officers that there was no alternative but victory or death." *

"The long night wore away," wrote Sir Hugh Gough, "and dawned the morning of the 22d." The line was again formed. All the artillery of the British was brought up to the attack, but this arm of war was overmatched by the heavy cannon of the Sikh batteries. Relying upon the unfailing British weapon, the bayonet, the line advanced. The two commanders rode in front. The inner works were carried; the troops entered the village. But the day was not yet gained. The Sikh army of reserve had marched from the camp above Ferozepoor early in the morning, and their advanced guard became engaged with our cavalry. They, however, drew off, but soon again appeared in tremendous force. Very touching are the words in which the veteran commander-in-chief described his feelings: "The only time I felt a doubt was toward the evening of the 22d, when the fresh enemy advanced with heavy columns of infantry, cavalry, and guns; and our cavalry horses were so thoroughly done up that they would not command even a trot. For a moment then I felt regret (and I deeply deplore my want of confidence in Him who never failed me nor forsook me) as each passing shot left me on horseback: but it was only for a moment." The cavalry movement, with jaded horses and exhausted men, decided the struggle. A panic seized the Sikhs, who believed the British were going to fall on their flank in force. They abandoned their guns, and retreated across the Sutlej. The British in that terrible struggle, almost unmatched in Indian warfare, lost 2415 men, with many distinguished officers. The European regiments were fearfully thinned. Of these the 62d left half its numbers on the field.

Having crossed the Sutlej the Sikhs again took up a fortified position. The British army were so destitute of ammunition that they were unable to prevent the Sikhs again establishing a portion of their army on the left bank of the river. They intrenched themselves near the village of Alliwall to prevent Sir Harry Smith's communication with the main army. With 12,000 men and thirty-two guns he attacked them, carried their camp by storm, captured the whole of their cannon and munitions of war, and drove the entire force precipitately across the Sutlej.

On the 10th of February was fought the great battle of Sobraon. The Sikhs had here intrenched themselves on the southern bank, having constructed a bridge of boats across the river. The victory of Alliwall had enabled Sir Harry Smith to unite with the main army. A siege train had arrived from Delhi. Sir Hugh Gough was strong enough to attack the Sikhs at some moment when the accidents of climate would permit him fairly to engage the enemy. He waited for a fall of rain to swell the ford, or a thaw of snow upon the hills, which would deprive them of any means of crossing except by their bridge of boats. A fall of rain came; the ford was impracticable. The Sikhs, dislodged from their intrenchments, retreated across the bridge, which broke down with the weight of the masses, having lost 13,000 men and sixty-seven guns. The British loss was about 2000 killed and wounded. On the 20th of February Lahore, the capital, was occupied; Dhuleep Sing, the young Maharajah, was reinstated in the city; and a treaty was signed by which he was continued in the relation of a friendly sovereign with the British government.

THE MINISTRY AS FORMED BY LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

Cabinet.

Marquess of Lansdowne.....Lord President of the Council.
Lord Cottenham.....Lord High Chancellor.
Earl of Minto.....Lord Privy Seal.
Right Hon. Lord John Russell..First Lord of the Treasury.
Right Hon. Charles Wood.....Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Earl of Auckland.....First Lord of the Admiralty.

* "Annual Register for 1845," p. 301.

* "Quarterly Review," vol. lxxviii. p. 203.

Right Hon. Sir George Grey....	Secretary of State for the Home Department.
Right Hon. Viscount Palmerston.	Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Earl Grey.....	Secretary of State for the Colonies.
Right Hon. Sir John Cam Hobhouse.....	President of the Board of Control.
Earl of Clarendon.....	President of the Board of Trade.
Right Hon. T. B. Macaulay.....	Paymaster of the Forces.
Marquess of Clanricarde.....	Postmaster-General.
Lord Campbell.....	Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.
Right Hon. Viscount Morpeth...	Woods and Forests.
Right Hon. H. Labouchere.....	Chief Secretary for Ireland.

Not of the Cabinet.

Duke of Wellington.....	Commander-in-Chief.
Marquess of Anglesey.....	Master-General of the Ordnance.
Right Hon. Fox Maule.....	Secretary at War.
Right Hon. T. M. Gibson.....	Vice-President of the Board of Trade.
H. G. Ward, Esq.....	Secretary of the Admiralty.
Right Hon. R. L. Shiel.....	Master of the Mint.
J. Jervis, Esq.....	Attorney-General.
David Dundas, Esq.....	Solicitor-General.

Great Officers of State.

Earl Fortescue.....	Lord Steward.
Earl Spencer.....	Lord Chamberlain.
Duke of Norfolk.....	Master of the Horse.

Ireland.

Earl of Bessborough.....	Lord-Lieutenant.
Right Hon. Maziere Brady.....	Lord High Chancellor.

Scotland.

Right Hon. Andrew Rutherford..	Lord Advocate.
Thomas Maitland, Esq.....	Solicitor-General.

CHAPTER CCXXXVIII.

The great Irish famine—The potato-rot of 1845 and 1846—Modes of relief adopted by the government—Mr. O'Connell's call upon England for help—His death—Munificent subscriptions—Irish landlords and cottier tenants—Navigation laws suspended—Ten Hours Factory Bill—Abundant harvest in England—Monetary pressure and panic—Excitement on the subject of national defences—The Duke of Wellington's letter—Proposed increase of the income tax—The House of Commons on the night of the 24th of February—News of the abdication of Louis Philippe—Real causes of the overthrow of the French monarchy—The revolution of 1848—Provisional government appointed—Chartism in England revived by the Socialist revolution—The Tenth of April—Preparations of the government—Physical-force Chartism at an end—The attempt at insurrection in Ireland—The French Republic established in bloodshed—Paris in a state of siege—Prince Louis Napoleon president—Convulsions of the continent—Progress of improvement in England—The Public Health Bill—The impulse to social amelioration given by Prince Albert—Free-trade banquet at Manchester to celebrate the final extinction of the corn laws—Meeting of parliament the next day—Tranquillity and loyalty of England contrasted in the royal speech with the condition of the continental kingdoms.

Postscript.

Tables—Sovereigns—Population—Occupations of the people—Census of education—Census of religious worship—Revenue and expenditure—Commerce.

One of the most intelligent and experienced of the official men attached to the Whig government thus wrote in the beginning of 1848: "The time has not yet arrived at which any man can with confidence say that he fully appreciates the nature and the bearings of that great event which will long be inseparably associated with the year just departed." That event was "the great Irish famine." This thoughtful writer adds, "Unless we are much deceived, posterity will trace up to that famine the commencement of a salutary revolution in the habits of a nation long singularly unfortunate, and will acknowledge that on this as on many other occasions supreme wisdom has educed permanent good out of transient evil." *

We have seen how the first appearances of the potato-rot, which was to deprive the population of Ireland of their too-exclusive article of subsistence, induced that alarm in 1845 which was the turning-point in the memorable change of the policy of Sir Robert Peel as to the supply of food for the population of all this kingdom. The disease in the crop of 1845 was not so universal as to prevent a considerable portion being saved; but the quantity that was found unfit for food when the store-pits were opened in 1846 fully testified to the wisdom of the step which Sir Robert Peel took upon his own responsibility before he quitted office, of giving a commission to a great mercantile house to purchase a hundred thousand pounds' worth of Indian corn in the American markets. That supply was intrusted to Irish commissariat officers in the spring of 1846, to sell from various depôts, at a moderate price, wherever the ordinary supplies of food were found to be deficient. The necessity for something more effectual than even such a timely but partial supply was soon apparent. In 1846 the fatal potato blight took place earlier and was much more destructive than in 1845. Father Mathew, the great temperance apostle of Ireland, has described how, on the 27th of July, he saw in a journey from Cork to Dublin the doomed plant blooming in all the luxuriance of an abundant harvest; but how, on his return on the 3d of August, he beheld one wide waste of putrefying vegetation: "In many places the wretched people were seated on the fences of their decaying gardens, wringing their hands, and wailing bitterly the destruction that had left them foodless." The experience of the partial failure of 1845 had not taught the people that it was dangerous to depend upon one species of food alone. The great proportion of the early culture of 1846 was that of potatoes. Toward the end of July the potatoes began to show symptoms of the disease of the previous year. There was first a little brown spot on the leaf; the spots gradually increased in number and size until the foliage withered and the stem became brittle. Then, although the stalks remained green, the leaves suddenly blackened; the growth of the root was arrested; the staple food of a nation had perished. No potatoes were that year pitted. Those that were of any value when dug up were immediately sold or consumed, in the natural apprehension that they would rot. The autumn came, and it was now found that the potato-crop had, with very few local exceptions, universally and entirely failed.

Before the distress in Ireland had reached its height—before the word "famine" was the only term which could express the real state of human beings who would die for want of food if help were not bestowed upon them—the government of Lord John Russell had devised various modes for the relief of sufferings and privations which were, even in their early stage, far more extensive than those which had been caused by the failure of the potato crop in various years during the previous quarter of a century.

On the 28th of August, 1846, the roaly assent was given to three acts, especially directed to meet the inevitable failure of the great Irish esculent. They were acts for the employment of the poor in the distressed districts for a limited period, for providing additional funds for provisional loans and grants for public works, and for authorizing a further issue of money in aid of public works. The application of these measures was a tentative process. The Labor Rate Act at the beginning of September was directed to be applied to twenty-four districts, proclaimed to be in a state of distress. At the beginning of October this measure was found ineffectual, and the lord lieutenant issued a circular authorizing the undertaking of works of permanent utility. In the House of Commons, on the 20th of January, 1847, Lord John Russell described how the Labor Rate Act and other acts of the last session had worked. An immense staff of servants, upward of eleven thousand, had been employed to furnish labor to half a million of adults, representing two millions of souls, at an expense estimated for January of 800,000*l*. It was difficult to find trustworthy servants, and to prevent the improper employment upon the works of persons by no means destitute. It was desirable for the government to adopt new measures; to form relief committees empowered to receive subscriptions and levy rates, and to be intrusted with donations from the state. Out of the sums thus raised they were to purchase food, and deliver rations to the famishing inhabitants. The system of affording relief through public works had utterly broken down; the payment of money was evidently liable to gross abuse; and undressed food, such as meal, might be exchanged for less needful articles by the improvident. Rations of cooked food

* "Edinburgh Review," vol. lxxxvii. p. 229. Article "On the Irish Crisis," by Sir Charles Trevelyan.

offered the most effectual mode of relieving the helpless and prostrate people. Then began that beneficial system which was limited by the act to the 1st of October, and which reached its highest point in July, 1847, when upward of three millions of persons received separate rations. The famine was stayed. The harvest was approaching in which the staple food was not affected by the disease. Impressively has it been said by Sir Charles Trevelyan, "This enterprise was in truth the grandest attempt ever made to grapple with famine over a whole country. Organized armies, amounting altogether to some hundreds of thousands, had been rationed before; but neither ancient nor modern history can furnish a parallel to the fact that upward of three millions of persons were fed every day in the neighborhood of their own homes, by administrative arrangements emanating from and controlled by one central office." *

The last time that the voice of Daniel O'Connell was heard in parliament was on the 8th of February, 1847. He called upon the House of Commons to do something speedy and efficacious—some great act of national generosity, calculated upon a broad and liberal scale. "Ireland is in your hands—in your power. If you do not save her, she cannot save herself." The great demagogue was dying. The wretched parodists of his system of agitation, which was as powerful for good as for evil—the ranting and swaggering young Irelanders, who, as Charles Lamb said of the early dramatists, used blood as they would "the paint of the property-man in the theatre"—had separated from him when he declared against the employment of physical force to obtain the repeal of the union. In the famine he perhaps clearly saw how social evils had been neglected for the advocacy of purely political objects very uncertain in their possible benefits for the future, and deeply injurious in their present tendency to put aside all real improvement. He died at Genoa, on the 15th of May. Had he lived he would have seen and acknowledged how England had answered, not merely his call upon her generosity, but had yielded at once and wholly to the cry that had gone up to heaven from the afflicted land, and had stretched forth her hand to succor and to save. Distressing as it must be, even at this distance of time, to look back upon the amount of human misery produced by this national calamity, there were circumstances connected with its relief that we can regard with pride and admiration. The noble exertions of public officers and private individuals, the unstinting employment of the pecuniary resources of the government, the munificence of the subscriptions sent to Ireland from the sister kingdom, the tender sympathy with the sufferers of every true English heart—these might be considered by a captious few as the mere payment of a debt from the happier island; but if so the payment was large and liberal, and such as could scarcely have been anticipated, even by those who best understood the English character. Captain Mann, an officer of the Coast Guard, who had seen the whole course of this great affliction, and who, when the worst was over, said, "I frequently look back upon it as a fearful and horrid dream," was of opinion that "such sufferings and such help cannot be easily forgotten." The government in 1846 and 1847 advanced more than seven millions of money. The British Association for the Relief of the Distress in Ireland and Scotland applied to Ireland half a million sterling of the subscriptions raised. The Society of Friends collected in addition 168,000*l.*; and many persons in England contributed largely, independently of any association. Sir Robert Peel, in his cabinet memorandum of November 1st, 1845, thought there would be no hope of contributions here for Irish relief. He apprehended that the charitable would have monster meetings and repeal rent too present to their minds to make any great exertions.† All such feelings quickly passed away. England did her duty. "In the hour of her utmost need, Ireland became sensible of an union of feeling and interest with the rest of the empire, which would have moved hearts less susceptible of every generous and grateful emotion than those of her sons and daughters."‡ It was during the eventful years from 1846 to 1850 that the vast amount of emigration took place which has been called the Irish Exodus. Before the gold discoveries in Australia, the emigrants from England and Scotland were comparatively few. "It is to Ireland that we must chiefly ascribe the departure, during those five years, of a million and a quarter of emigrants from the ports of the United Kingdom, three fourths of whom went to the United States." *

Sir James Graham wrote to Sir Robert Peel at the commencement of the alarm with respect to the potato crop, "A great national risk is always incurred when a population so dense as that of Ireland subsists on the potato; for it is the cheapest and the lowest food, and if it fail no substitute can be found for starving multitudes."† Why was the population of Ireland driven to subsist on the cheapest and the lowest food? Why was the agriculture of the south and west in a neglected state, little wheat being grown, with oats inferior for milling purposes, and green crops almost unknown? Why was the sole foundation for a sufficiency of food the renting of a bit of land on which a family could be located in a miserable cabin; the population rapidly increasing, inasmuch as land used for raising potatoes will support three times the number as the same land laid down to corn will support? These small tenures paid the landlord a higher rent than could have been obtained by letting to cultivators on a large scale. The rent of the cottier tenantry was always forthcoming, either in money or in kind. This certain payment, however delayed, was the absolute condition of their precarious existence upon the cheapest and the lowest food. Too often, even in the best times, they were standing on the margin of absolute want, especially when they were waiting for the ingathering of their crop. It was as truly as boldly said, by a great political economist, soon after the Irish crisis, "With individual exceptions (some of them very honorable ones), the owners of Irish estates do nothing for the land but drain it of its produce." He had previously said, "In no sound theory of private property was it ever contemplated that the proprietor of land should be merely a sinecurist quartered on it."‡ Mr. O'Connell, in the speech we have quoted, replied to some such inference: "It is asserted that the Irish landlords do not do their duty. Several of them have done their duty; others have not. . . . But recollect how incumbered is the property of Ireland, how many of her estates are in chancery, how many in the hands of trustees." The legislature did recollect this, and in 1849 passed the act by which a commission for the sale of incumbered estates was established. From the beneficial operations of this commission, and through a better spirit infused into the proprietors of unincumbered estates, much of the land has come into the hands of skilful cultivators; and that race of cottier tenantry, of whose family one or more of its members was supported by beggary, has in great part vanished. Religiously and wisely did the Society of Friends in Ireland regard the mysterious dispensation with which their country had been visited in the blight of the potato, "as a means permitted by an all-wise Providence to exhibit more strikingly the unsound state of its social condition."

The question of a probable scarcity of food, not only in Ireland and in the Highlands and isles of Scotland, but in the kingdom generally, was very early in the session brought before parliament, upon a proposal of the government for the total suspension of all import duties upon corn, and of the navigation laws through which importation was restricted. There was very little opposition to this measure. The Protectionists were paralyzed by the fearful presence of the Irish famine, which forbade the consideration of class interests while three millions of people were crying out for food. Sir Robert Peel has justly said, that if subsequent events could fairly be taken into account, the various measures taken by parliament to mitigate the sufferings of 1846 and 1847, and "the hurried suspension of the navigation laws and of the remaining duties on articles of subsistence, would exercise no unfavorable influence on the opinion which might be formed on the precautionary measures of 1846." Unanimously as these measures were passed, as an absolute and uncontrollable necessity, there was scarcely a debate during the session in which the repeal of the corn laws and the abolition or reduction of protective duties were not denounced as causes of present injury and of future mischief. When the budget was brought forward Lord George Bentinck denied that free-trade had caused any in-

* "Edinburgh Review," vol. lxxxvii. p. 269.
† "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," p. 143.
‡ Sir Charles Trevelyan, "Edinburgh Review," vol. lxxxvii. p. 316.

* See the twenty-second report of the emigration commissioners, 1862. Table, p. 65.
† "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," p. 114.
‡ John Stuart Mill, "Principles of Political Economy," book ii. chap. ii. sect. 6.

creased consumption, as affirmed by the chancellor of the exchequer, except in slave-grown sugar and in foreign silks; and he read an address from the Spitalfields weavers to himself, which thus concluded: 'We entertain the idea that had your lordship possessed the reins of government, the people of Ireland would not have perished to the extent they have, because we conceive that your lordship would not have regarded the fashionable principles of political economy, whereby the people might have been saved." His lordship with great complacency affirmed that he agreed with them.

It was during this session that the Ten Hours' Factory Bill was carried upon the motion of Mr. Fielden; the members of the government being divided in opinion, not only upon the general question of this interference with labor, but as to the probable benefit, or rather injury, of limiting factory labor to ten hours or to eleven hours. Sir Robert Peel was strongly opposed to restrictions of labor which might lessen the power of the operatives to command the material necessaries and comforts of life. It had been said that a diminution of the hours of labor would tend to the moral and intellectual improvement of the great laboring class. "I firmly believe," said Sir Robert Peel, "that the source of the future peace, happiness, and prosperity of this country lies in the improvement, religious as well as moral, of the different classes of society; but it is in thus advocating the elevation of the people that I oppose these restrictions. I do not deny the advantage of leisure; but of this I am perfectly convinced, that the real way to improve the condition of the laborer, and to elevate the character of the working classes of this country, is to give them a command over the necessaries of life." When the bill went to the House of Lords, Lord Brougham laughed at the idea of passing the bill for the sake of mental improvement. After ten hours' work a man was too tired for the task of self-cultivation. He had been trying to educate the peasantry for these twenty-five years, and his constant competitor and antagonist, by which he had always been defeated, was—sleep.

On the 23d of July parliament was prorogued by the queen. Her majesty, after announcing her intention immediately to dissolve the present parliament, said, "I rely with confidence on the loyalty to the throne, and attachment to the free institutions of this country, which animate the great body of my people. I join with them in supplications to Almighty God that the dearth by which we have been afflicted may, by the divine blessing, be converted into cheapness and plenty."

The prayer was heard. On the 17th of October thanksgivings were offered up in all the churches of England for the abundant harvest. But in a country of such large and complicated commercial relations as Great Britain, the transition from dearth to plenty cannot produce that universal gladness which is felt in simpler communities, when the garners are newly filled, and the privations of the summer and the dread of the winter are removed in a bounteous autumn. In September and October there had been such a pressure upon the merchants and traders as had not been experienced since the great panic of 1825. Mercantile houses in London of the highest eminence suspended their payments. Corresponding disasters occurred at Manchester, Liverpool, and Glasgow. All the usual accommodation in the money market was at an end. In October the alarm swelled into a general panic; the crash of eminent houses went on in London; in the country, not only mercantile firms but banks were failing; the funds fell rapidly; exchequer bills were at a high rate of discount. On the 19th of October a deputation from the bankers, merchants, and shipowners of Liverpool addressed the first lord of the treasury on the necessity for some remedial measures. On the 23d a deputation of London bankers urged upon the government to grant relief by a suspension of the Bank Charter Act of 1844. On the 25th of October a letter was addressed, signed by Lord John Russell and the chancellor of the exchequer, to the governor and deputy-governor of the Bank of England, in which it was announced that "her majesty's government have come to the conclusion that a time has arrived when they ought to attempt, by some extraordinary and temporary measure, to restore confidence to the mercantile and manufacturing community." They recommended, therefore, the directors of the Bank of England to enlarge the amount of their discounts and advances upon approved security, charging a high rate of interest. The letter added, "If this course should lead to any infringement of the existing law, her majesty's government will be prepared to propose to parliament on its meeting a bill of indemnity." The recommendation was immediately acceded to by the Bank of England. There was a partial restoration of confidence; but the ruin had been too widely spread not to make its effects long felt by the mercantile and manufacturing classes, and thus by abridging the capital engaged in the employment of labor, extending the suffering to the class least able to endure it.

The new parliament was opened on the 18th of November. Mr. Charles Shaw Lefevre was re-elected speaker. On the 23d the royal speech was delivered by commission. It announced that although the course recommended by ministers to the Bank of England might have led to an infringement of the law, the law had not been infringed. It went on to say that the alarm had subsided; that the pressure on the banking and commercial interests had been mitigated; and that the abundant harvest with which the country had been blessed had alleviated the evils which always accompany a want of employment in the manufacturing districts. On the 30th of November the chancellor of the exchequer, in a speech in which he defended the government interference with the Bank Act of 1844, ascribed the recent pressure to the continued drain of available capital for the purchase of foreign corn and for the construction of railways. He moved the appointment of a select committee "to inquire into the causes of the recent commercial distress, and how far it has been affected by the laws for regulating the issue of bank-notes payable on demand." After three nights of debate the motion was agreed to. It is unnecessary to follow the course of that debate. A law was passed for the prevention of crime and outrage in Ireland; and a bill to remove the civil disabilities of the Jews was read a first time, the second reading being deferred to the 7th of February. The measure proposed by Lord John Russell was occasioned by the return at the general election of the Baron Rothschild as one of the members for the city of London. It was first presented in the shape of a resolution, affirming the eligibility of Jews to all functions and offices to which Roman Catholics were admissible by law. The prime minister, who was the colleague of Baron Rothschild, vindicated his measure in a speech of great eloquence and historical research. He was opposed by Sir Robert Inglis and Lord Ashley; he was supported by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli.

On the 20th of December it was moved and carried in both houses that parliament should be adjourned to the 3d of February.

When parliament met after the recess, there was existing in the country an unusual excitement on the subject of our national defences. Many may remember how the enjoyment of the great domestic festival of Christmas was somewhat marred that season, by a letter of the Earl of Ellesmere which appeared in the "Times" of the 25th of December, 1847. From the 10th of October, 1846, when the king of the French and M. Guizot, his minister, by a stroke of policy intended to circumvent the supposed designs of the British government, secretly prepared and hastily accomplished the double marriage of the Queen of Spain with the Infanta of Spain, the Duke of Cadiz, and of the Infanta with the Duke de Montpensier, the son of Louis Philippe, it was evident that between the two courts of France and England there would no longer be friendship. There had been too much bad faith on the part of the king to permit the old relations to continue, which had existed during the days of the *entente cordiale* at Windsor Castle and at the Château d'Eu. M. Guizot exaggerated the importance to France of the Spanish alliance. He has said that he had openly laid down the principle that the throne of Spain should not pass from the House of Bourbon, and that he secured its triumph when it was on the point of defeat.* The British government perhaps took an equally exaggerated view of a new family compact, in being, as M. Guizot infers, more influenced by memory and imagination than enlightened by observation; the past casting its mighty shadows over their minds, and leading them to waste their strength in the pursuit or avoidance of phantoms.† Whether the apprehension of the mischief that was especially provided against by the allied powers in 1814 were well-founded or unreasonable, the correspondence between the two governments became altered in its character; and the English people, with a natural hatred of trickery,

* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 336.
† Ibid., p. 330.

and with peculiar feelings of disgust at some circumstances connected with the marriage of Queen Isabella to the Infanta, from that time forth ceased to regard Louis Philippe with the sentiments of respect and confidence which once prevailed. When Lord John Russell, therefore, in making his financial statement for the year, exhibited a probable excess of expenditure beyond revenue, occasioned by the Irish famine and by the commercial panic, he said it was obvious that the deficiency must be met by taxation, or by great reductions in the army and navy. He adverted to a letter of the Duke of Wellington on our national defences, which had been described by a foreign writer,* animated by the most friendly feelings toward England, as a pamphleteering reply to the Prince de Joinville. Nothing, he continued, could be more foreign to the intentions of the Duke of Wellington, or could have given him greater pain, than the publication of sentiments which he had confidentially expressed to a brother officer. The duke had communicated to the government what he considered to be a deficiency in our defences; but it was far from his wish to make any public appeal, or to exasperate relations between England and other countries. It was clear from the statements of Lord John Russell that France was the country from which danger was apprehended. "Under a king," he said, "who was a sincere lover of peace, since 1833 the active preparations and increase of the naval force of France had been very extensive." The proposition of the government was to increase the military, naval, and ordnance estimates by 358,000*l.*, to lay the foundation of a militia by a grant of 150,000*l.*, and to meet the probable deficiency of revenue by increasing the income tax to five per cent. The proposed armament was moderate, compared with the public alarm on the subject of invasion; but it was evident that a reduction of expenditure would be strenuously demanded by the union of two very opposite parties—the free-traders and the country gentlemen. The House of Commons was debating these subjects, when the question whether we could look to the professed friendship of Louis Philippe as our security for peace, or prepare for a rupture arising out of his bitter remembrance of our dissatisfaction with his schemes for the aggrandizement of his house, suddenly received a solution most unexpected—pregnant with far higher consequences than the success or the failure of an obsolete policy, totally out of character with the altered condition of society in which a king could no longer say, "I am the state."

Mr. Cobden, in his "Historical Episode," which, however decided may be the bias of his opinions, exhibits many of the qualifications of the historian, has preserved the recollection of a scene of singular interest. "On the evening of the 24th of February, 1848, while the House of Commons was in session, a murmur of conversation suddenly arose at the door, and spread throughout the house, when was witnessed—what never occurred before or since, in the writer's experience—a suspension for a few minutes of all attention to the business of the house, while every member was engaged in close and earnest conversation with his neighbor. The intelligence had arrived of the abdication and flight of Louis Philippe, and of the proclamation of the republic." Mr. Cobden relates a curious anecdote of the impression which this startling intelligence produced upon Sir Robert Peel. Mr. Cobden and Mr. Hume were sitting together when the news reached their bench. Mr. Hume stepped across the floor to tell it to the ex-minister; and on returning to his place, repeated the following remarkable words as Sir Robert's commentary: "This comes of trying to carry on a government by means of a mere majority of a chamber, without regard to the opinion out of doors."†

Before we proceed to narrate, with necessary brevity, the portentous event which shook Europe to its centre, "with fear of change perplexing monarchs," we feel it due to M. Guizot, who has been accused of precipitating the fall of his sovereign by his conduct in the Spanish marriages, to exhibit his opinion upon this debatable matter: "It has sometimes been said that the Spanish marriages, and the ill-humor which the English government had felt on their account, were not without their influence in this catastrophe. This is a frivolous mistake wth regard to its nature and causes; they were altogether internal. It was a social and moral crisis—an earthquake, French at first, and afterward European, but with which the external relations of states and their governments had nothing to do."*

The real causes of the "social and moral crisis," by which the government of France was overthrown, were too deeply imbedded in the feelings and opinions of that large portion of the French people who were shut out from an active participation in public affairs, to be at first seen and understood by political observers in England. The proximate causes were on the surface. A very short time sufficed to reveal, what might have been conjectured from the tendency of much of the current literature of the time, that the employers of labor and the receivers of wages had no bond of union or sympathy; were suspicious of each other; were regarding each other as natural enemies—the one accustomed to view their almost exclusive possession of political power as their exclusive and inalienable right; the other, debarred from civil privileges, hating the government much, but hating the middle class more, upon whose affections the government was founded. The opposition in the chambers were ready to excite this uneasiness in the masses. They wielded the double weapons of the tribune and the press; dangerous as orators, they were more dangerous as journalists. Seeking for the attainment of power while they strove to accomplish an electoral reform, they did not hesitate to ally themselves with men of more extreme opinions, whose democratic principles were directed rather toward the maintenance of the doctrine of "Equality" under a new form than to the assertion of "Liberty," as understood by the founders of the revolution which had overthrown the ancient monarchy; which was the cry of the indignant citizens who destroyed the monarchy of the restoration, to place upon the throne one who was proud to call himself a citizen king. The constitutional opposers of the government of Louis Philippe in 1848 were ready enough to propitiate the assertors of equality, without perceiving that it had taken a practical shape, in which was involved the modification or destruction of all the conditions of society which rested on the basis of individual property exchanging capital for labor, and which, carrying out the principle of competition, regarded the consumer more than the producer. A profound thinker has said, "The passion for equality has never ceased to occupy that deep-seated place in the hearts of the French people which it was the first to seize: it clings to the feelings they cherish most fondly."† In 1848 the principle of co-operation was regarded by the workmen of France less as a means of benefiting their condition than as placing all men upon a level. Vain attempt to war against nature, who, in making men unequal in bodily and mental vigor, has decreed that the most skilful, the wisest, and the strongest shall be foremost in the race.

It is not compatible with the limits of our work to enter into any minute detail of the revolution of February. The legislative session had opened on the 28th of December, 1847. The king's speech contained an allusion to the agitation for "electoral and parliamentary reform"—which words had become a toast at several provincial banquets. Petitions for reform had been presented to the Chamber of Deputies. On the opening of the session there had been discussions in the chamber on the legality of peaceful and unarmed political meetings. On the 22d of February there was to have been a reform banquet in the twelfth *arrondissement* of Paris—a quarter where the materials for disorder were abundant. The minister of the interior forbade the meeting, as the committee for the banquet had proposed a procession of national guard in uniform, and of students. The uniform of the national guard had almost disappeared from public view. They were no longer favored and flattered by the government. The principal leaders of the parliamentary opposition now announced that the banquet was adjourned, in consequence of the declaration of the minister of the interior. This postponement was loudly murmured at by the democratic journalists. On the morning of the 22d the streets were crowded at an early hour. About noon a crowd surrounded the Chamber of Deputies, and a cry was raised of "Down with Guizot;" but in the evening the city was quiet. Not so during the night. The government was collecting troops, and the people were raising barricades. The *rappel* was again heard calling out the national guard at seven in the

* M. Chevallier.
† "The Three Panics," p. 12.

* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 337.
† De Tocqueville, "France before the Revolution of 1789," Mr. Reeve's translation, p. 383.

morning of the 23d. Some firing soon took place between the populace and the municipal guard. But the national guard had come to an agreement among themselves to act the part of conciliators rather than that of the opposers of the people; and their presence in consequence prevented any attempt of the regular troops to disperse the multitudes assembled in various quarters. Soon the cry of *Vive la Réforme* was heard among groups of the citizen soldiers. The royal occupants of the Tuileries began to be seriously alarmed. A council was hastily summoned, when M. Guizot, finding that the cabinet could not rely upon the firmness of the king, expressed his determination to retire. He himself announced his resignation to the Chamber of Deputies. There was joy that night in Paris, for it was thought that the cause of reform had gained a victory. Houses were illuminated as if the crisis were passed. But a band of republicans bearing a red flag had come forth, and gathering together before the Hotel of Foreign Affairs, occupied by M. Guizot, where a battalion of infantry were stationed, a shot fired from the mob was answered by a volley from the soldiery, and fifty fell, killed or wounded. A procession was immediately formed. The bodies of the dead were carried by torchlight through the streets, amid the frantic cries of excited crowds demanding vengeance. The opportunity of restoring tranquillity by the exercise of force had passed away. During the night the king had reluctantly decided for concession. He had sent for M. Thiers and offered him the formation of a ministry. As the condition of his acceptance M. Thiers stipulated that M. Odillon Barrot should be a member of the cabinet. This was entirely to yield upon the question of reform, and wholly to change the policy of the government. But there was no alternative for the perplexed king. The change of administration was announced by placards in the morning. The command of the troops had been given to Marshal Bugeaud during the night, and it is probable that he would have adopted no half measures to support the crown. His command was superseded by the new ministers, who judged that the danger of insurrection was passed. They were deceived. About noon the populace attacked the Palais Royal, and sacked the apartments. The Tuileries was next to be assailed. The king left the palace with his queen. The mob broke in. The throne was carried along the boulevards and was burned at the foot of the column of July.

The Chamber of Deputies met at half-past twelve, when M. Dupin announced the abdication of Louis Philippe. M. Dupin also announced that the king had abdicated in favor of his grandson, the Comte de Paris, appointing the Duchess of Orleans regent. The duchess, leading her two sons by the hand, entered the chamber accompanied by the Duke de Nemours. She said, "I have come here with all I have dear in the world." Some repugnance was manifested at the presence of the royal strangers, but the duchess appearing unwilling to retire, a stormy discussion began. By a law of 1842 it was declared that during the minority of the Comte de Paris, in the event of the demise of the king, the Duke de Nemours should be regent. The debate turned upon this difficulty. It was soon interrupted by the rush of a crowd that filled all the passages of the chambers and swarmed into the hall. The mother and her children were surrounded by armed men; but still she resolved to remain. She heard the demand for a provisional government; she heard the assertion that a regency could not be created. Amid clamors and threats she was forced by her attendants out of the hall. The deputies were scarcely free agents, as, with the applauses or the hisses of the fierce republicans who were now in command of the situation, the members of a provisional government were nominated. Seven deputies were finally appointed to this responsibility. In the mean time another provisional government had been formed at the Hôtel de Ville. The members chosen by the chamber were Lamartine, Marie, Ledru-Rollin, Crèmieux, Dupont de l'Eure, Arago, and Garnier Pagès. The provisional government of the Hôtel de Ville consisted of Marrast, Flocon, Louis Blanc, and Albert. The seven proceeded to the Hôtel de Ville, and there, after violent altercation, came to a compromise with the four. Liberty and equality shook hands. There was to be a republic; but a republic in which the principles of Socialism should be the paramount element. At the top of the stairs of the Hôtel de Ville Lamartine proclaimed the republic to the populace below. The provisional government of eleven declared that the Chamber of Deputies was dissolved; that a national assembly should be convoked, the members of the "ex-chamber of peers" being forbidden to assemble. On the 25th "a proclamation," signed by Garnier Pagès and Louis Blanc, declared that the provisional government undertook to secure the existence of the workman by labor; to guarantee labor to all citizens. On the 26th the members presented themselves to the people assembled before the Hôtel de Ville, and there Lamartine proclaimed the abolition of royalty and the establishment of the republic, with the exercise of their political rights by the people. The prospect of universal suffrage was made still more agreeable by the announcement of the opening of national workshops for the unemployed workmen.

Chartism had slumbered in England since the monster petition of 1839.* The principles of Socialism, which had been diligently propagated in France during the ten years which preceded the revolution of 1848, gradually made their way to a small extent in this country. Enthusiasts multiplied, who believed that the evils of competition were to be swept away by one broad recognition of the blessings of co-operation. While Robert Owen, the most benevolent of fanatics, still continued to predict that grass would soon grow in the streets of London at the time when happy communities should produce every necessary and every luxury of life for themselves in capacious parallelograms, there were less harmless regenerators of society who asserted that universal felicity could not exist without the complete establishment of democratic principles which should know no distinctions of rank and wealth. "Liberty and property," wrote Voltaire, "is the cry of England. It is of far higher worth than St. George and my right—than Saint Denis and Mount Joy. It is the cry of nature." The social regenerators of England in 1848, when they had taken the government of the country into their own hands, "would divide the land into small farms, and give every man an opportunity of getting his living by the sweat of his brow." Such was one of the doctrines propounded at "the convention" held in the week which preceded the great demonstration of the 10th of April. The organ of Chartism was the "Northern Star," of Mr. Feargus O'Connor, one of the members for Nottingham, a brawling ignorant demagogue, who, not without an eye to his own profit, had contrived to induce many hard-working people to subscribe their money to his schemes for establishing "The National Land Company." This association was, in truth, founded upon those rights of property which his disciples, with some inconsistency, were inclined to abolish for all landowners except themselves. In the mean time, while the higher mysteries of Chartism only now and then peeped out, the great business of the Chartists, was to get up a petition to parliament for their five points, which being completed, and alleged to have received 5,706,000 signatures, was to be presented to the House of Commons by Mr. Feargus O'Connor on the 10th of April.

The preparations for this day would have been calculated to alarm any other than an energetic government. A great convulsion might have shaken all our institutions into temporary disorder had not the avowed designs of the physical-force Chartists been promptly met by such an organization as would have crushed mob-violence into annihilation at the moment of its display. The ministry took the advice of the Duke of Wellington. He so judiciously arranged a plan for the presence of the military power at every point where a contest might by possibility occur, that without the display of a single soldier effectual resistance was impossible. "You have left one point unprotected—one way in which they could escape," said a member of the cabinet to the great captain. "That was precisely what I intended to do," replied the duke.† But, more than all the combinations of military science was a display of strength which proclaimed to the Chartists—some of whom were young enthusiasts who had brooded over the evils of society hopelessly and passionately; many, desperate men, such as the *prolétaires* of France; all, without any definite plan, at the command of ignorant and presumptuous leaders—that they alone were not the people. On that morning a hundred and seventy thousand special constables stood shoulder to shoulder in the streets of London, each armed only with a staff which represented the strength of the law—a band where a real equality of rights and duties placed the peer side by side with the shopkeeper; where the merchant stood amid his clerks, and the

* *Ante*, p. 1236. † We state this from private information.

manufacturer with his workmen ; where the humblest and the highest exchanged the resolves of good subjects, that, come what might, the generation which had seen so many ameliorations of the state of society peacefully accomplished, should not be disgraced by an attempt to redress grievances by physical force, under the direction of empty-headed demagogues. The display of the national will—the unostentatious preparations of the government, and their bold resolve not to prevent the proposed meeting of the Chartists on Kennington Common, but steadily to oppose their return over either of the bridges in procession—was enough for present safety and future peace. This resistance to their return in multitudes at nightfall was accomplished, not by the soldiery, who continued unseen to the last, but by the police alone. The great petition was ignobly carried to the House of Commons in a cart, to be presented by Mr. Feargus O'Connor without his legions. Physical-force Chartism was really at an end, although its revival was several times attempted, to be put down by the same firmness.

Contemporaneous with the abortive proceedings of disaffection in London, in Glasgow, and in a few provincial towns, was what at first appeared to be a serious renewal of insurrection in Ireland. An association was in 1847 formed in Dublin, called "The Irish Confederation." Of this confederation Mr. Smith O'Brien, with several others who attained to distinction as the utterers of the boldest sedition, and the announcers of the bloodiest resolves, were leading authorities. The French Revolution gave a new impulse to their exertions. "Up with the barricades and invoke the God of battles," cried Mr. Meagher, at a meeting held to congratulate the provisional government of France. The uttering of seditious speeches was, up to April, an offence which the law regarded as a misdemeanor ; but an act was then passed which rendered it felony to compass or imagine the deposition of the queen, or to give expression to any such intention. Under this act Mr. Mitchell was tried and convicted, and Mr. Duffy was about to be prosecuted. It was determined by Mr. O'Brien and his bold associates in an act of treason to rise in August to rescue Mr. Mitchell, and to prevent the trial of Mr. Duffy. A war directory was appointed by the confederation, and a mighty warrior, Mr. O'Brien, was to take the field in person and lead his forces to the overthrow of the despotic government. On the 28th of July the great rebel was in arms. He engaged the police in a pitched battle near Ballingarry, where he had seven of his army killed and several wounded. On the 5th of August he was arrested at Thurles. The adventure of "the cabbage-garden" will be long remembered, in connection with the wise mercy of the government, which, after a few years, permitted his return to Ireland, to warn political fanaticism of the probable danger of that public contempt which awaits the anarchist who is too silly to be mischievous. The insurrection had soon come to an end. There were trials for high treason, of which the ridicule attached to the traitors could not prevent the people acknowledging that their capital sentence was deserved ; rejoicing equally when, in the next year, after the demand of a writ of error, the sentence was commuted to transportation. Ireland was now free to apply herself to the amelioration of her social evils, instead of continuing a vain struggle for a separation from a country which had saved her in the direst hour of her calamity, and which was now ready to devote her capital and her skill, in a hearty endeavor to improve the material resources of the neglected land.

The essential differences between the institutions of England and of France, and the no less remarkable diversity in the political aspirations of the people of each, may in some degree account for the contrast between the two countries which 1848 presented. The insurrectionary movements in the one were suppressed without bloodshed. In the other, within four months after the proclamation of the republic, sixteen thousand persons were killed or wounded in the streets of Paris. The short career of the provisional government of France had been upheld by military force, amid the increasing animosities of the Socialists. When the national assembly was opened, and had appointed an executive commission of five members, there was an attempt to form another provisional government of those who had now come to be designated as Red Republicans. This attempt was put down. The election of Prince Louis Napoleon to a seat in the national assembly was met by the proposition of a decree for his banishment. He was admitted to take his seat by the vote of a great majority. Close upon this event came the terrible crisis which, after four days' fighting, ended in the total rout of the insurgents, the appointment of General Cavaignac as dictator, and the declaration that Paris was in a state of siege—that is, under martial law. This state endured from the 24th of June till the 20th of October. On the 21st of December Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte took the oath as president of the French Republic, to continue in office till May, 1852.

The year 1848 will be memorable, not only for the revolution of France, and its great example of extreme democratic opinions terminating, after a sanguinary struggle, in military despotism, but for the universal upheaving of the continental kingdoms in an earthquake of which the tremblings have not yet subsided. To trace these events beyond this general reference to them would be beyond the scope of our history. We could not attempt to narrate the convulsions of Italy ; the war between Austria and Sardinia ; the insurrection of Hungary and the Hungarian war ; the violated promises of sovereigns to their peoples ; the dead calm, which was not peace, that ensued when absolutism had triumphed ; without going into a view of cause and effect, of the merit of contending principles, of the balance of good and evil, in the absence of which a meagre narrative of occurrences would be wholly unsatisfactory.*

Amid the general disquiet of Europe, the session of parliament came to a close on the 5th of September. It was in no boastful spirit that the queen said, that, surrounded by convulsions and wars between neighboring states, she had had the satisfaction of being able to preserve peace for her own dominions, and to maintain our domestic tranquillity. "The strength of our institutions has been tried, and has not been found wanting." In these troublous times the social improvement of the country steadily went forward. The great measure of establishing a general board of health and to create local boards was the timely work of this session. It is unnecessary to point out how the condition of the cities and towns of this kingdom has been essentially changed—how the amount of human suffering has been lessened, and the moral improvement and contentment of the inhabitants in dense and populous districts promoted, by the Public Health Act. The awakening had succeeded to a lethargic sleep. No one was more strenuous in proclaiming how individual energy was to make legislative provisions effectual than Prince Albert. At a meeting of the "Society for Improving the Condition of the Laboring Classes," he uttered words which sank deep into the national mind : "Depend upon it, the interests of classes too often contrasted are identical, and it is only ignorance which prevents their uniting for each other's advantage. To dispel that ignorance, to show how man can help man notwithstanding the complicated state of civilized society, ought to be the aim of every philanthropic person ; but it is more peculiarly the duty of those who, under the blessing of Divine Providence, enjoy station, wealth, and education."

On the 31st of January, 1849, there was a public banquet in the Free-trade Hall at Manchester, to celebrate this triumph of that principle which had so often been advocated in that vast room. Two thousand persons were assembled. The renowned leaders of the league were the chief speakers. Their special vocation was now at an end, but they were ready again to do battle for political truth if a defeated party should attain power and attempt to undo the great work of seven years. The hand of the clock was approaching the hour which was to begin another day, when the band struck up the inspiriting air of "A good time coming, boys." A chorus very solemn in its joyfulness burst from those two thousand voices. As the clock struck twelve the chairman called for silence. "THE GOOD TIME HAS COME," he shouted. Then that multitude stood up, and with the British huzza, which has struck terror into many an enemy, proclaimed that one foe to the well-being of the people was at last laid low. The 1st of February, so hopefully expected, so patiently waited for, had arrived. The millions who earned their daily bread by the sweat of their brow might at last eat "untaxed food."

When the session of parliament was opened by the queen on the 1st of February, the same newspaper contained the speech of her majesty and the report of the great banquet at Manchester. The

* In the *Appendix* we do not profess to present the occurrences there briefly noticed in their chronological succession with any attempt to digest them historically. We offer those imperfect annals of nineteen years as some aid to the reader, if he should desire to trace the course of very marked events from the close of this history.

royal speech contrasted the tranquillity and loyalty of England with the condition of the continent, convulsed by anarchy or trodden down by absolutism. Who, with any pretence to political philosophy, can now fail to trace this peace and contentment, in a very material degree, to the extinction of that injustice which had been so long perpetrated by delusive legislation, for the supposed interests of an exclusive class? The great statesman who accomplished this work points, with an honest exultation, to those who had been loudest in condemnation of the measures of 1846, who on the 10th of April, 1848, openly rejoiced that provision had been made for the total repeal of the corn laws. Yet, he says, these admissions were retracted, on the removal of all danger from popular disaffection. 'They were retracted without due reflection on the causes which had interfered in the hour of danger to promote loyalty to the throne and confidence in the justice of parliament." *

All these inconsistencies of party feeling have long since passed away. We have no pleasure in recalling the wearisome period of controversy that preceded the common agreement of all, except a few who still pored over their obsolete statistics to enter upon a new era of manly exertion, unimpeded by class prejudices and unembittered by class animosities. We were becoming an united people, even in that dawning of a brighter day when the queen met her parliament on the 1st of February, 1849, and said, "I observe with satisfaction that this portion of the United Kingdom has remained tranquil amid the convulsions which have disturbed so many parts of Europe. . . . It is with pride and thankfulness that I advert to the loyal spirit of my people, and that attachment to our institutions which has animated them during a period of commercial difficulty, deficient production of food, and political revolution. I look to the protection of Almighty God for favor in our continued progress, and I trust you will assist me in upholding the fabric of the constitution, founded as it is upon the principles of freedom and of justice."

END OF THE HISTORY.

POSTSCRIPT.

I HAVE thus completed a labor of seven years in writing the history of my country from the Roman period to a remarkable epoch of the reign of Queen Victoria. With a reverent heart I thank the Supreme Controller of all human designs that he has permitted me, in reaching a prolonged term of the life of man, to carry forward my purpose to its close.

In referring from time to time to the irrevocable results of this long-continued occupation—irrevocable, because this history of four thousand pages has been produced at periodical intervals, thus precluding the power of revising it as a whole—I am conscious of errors that might have been corrected under other circumstances. But I am not conscious of any material want of harmony between the earlier and the later portions—certainly of no essential discordance of principles and feelings. Whatever may be the defects of this narration—stretching over nineteen hundred years of recorded time, and comprehending a vast body of facts, of whose quantity and varied character the indexes, full as they are, will give an inadequate conception—I am warranted in saying that it is the only complete history of England—a library history and not a school history—which is the production of one writer. With the exception of three chapters, the "Popular History" has been wholly written by myself.† This unity of thought, whatever may be the knowledge and ability of a historian, must have a certain value beyond what may be attained by a division of labor. Being the production of one mind, the due proportions of the narrative from the first chapter to the last have, I trust, been maintained.

Having undertaken, perhaps somewhat rashly, to write a history of England that, regarding only its chronological extent, involved a large range of research—more especially so as it was intended from the first to embrace the social as well as the political history of many ages—it is scarcely necessary for me to apologize for not having plunged into the great ocean of unpublished State Papers, which have, in very recent days, afforded most valuable materials for the authors of special histories of particular eras. Such an employment would have rendered it impossible for me to have completed my undertaking in double or treble the years during which it has been my continued occupation. At the same time I may conscientiously state that I have not taken upon trust the facts or opinions of any previous writers of the general history of our country or of the history of any detached regnal periods. I have consulted no inconsiderable number of books that are the essential foundations of the English historical library; and for modern times I have not neglected that vast field of memoirs and letters, English and foreign, in which there are always fruits to be gathered by the writer who will diligently seek for them.

Of the spirit which has animated me during the progress of this work, and has sustained me through the difficulties of my task, I will venture to say a few words. I had a fixed purpose in view when I commenced it. I addressed myself, not exclusively, but with a steady regard, to those of either sex who were entering upon the serious duties of life. Passing from the elementary works that had been used in the course of ordinary education, there were hundreds to whom a fuller history—not dry, not didactic, not written with the prejudices of party or sect—would be an acquisition. Feeling my responsibilities to be increased by the fact that my duty was to impart knowledge and not to battle for opinions, my desire has been to cherish that love of liberty which is best founded upon a sufficient acquaintance with its gradual development and final establishment among us; to look with a tolerant judgment even upon those who have sought to govern securely by governing absolutely; to trace with calmness the efforts of those who have imperilled our national independence by foreign assault or domestic treason, but never to forget that a just love of country is consistent with historical truth; to carry forward, as far as within the power of one who has watched joyfully and hopefully the great changes of a generation, that spirit of improvement which has been more extensively and permanently called forth in the times of which this concluding volume treats, than in the whole previous period from the revolution of 1688. I doubtless have failed in many cases in the accomplishment of my leading purposes; but the wish to effect these objects has been always present.

In the introduction to my first volume I have stated the circumstances which led me to entertain the idea of writing a book that might be recommended for purposes of instruction, "when a young man of eighteen asks for a history of England." With a pardonable pride, I may presume to mention that my desire to produce such a book has been welcomed in a manner far beyond my hope—I fear beyond my desert. While the Prince of Wales was pursuing his studies at the University of Cambridge, my history was used as a text-book, and was quoted and recommended by the Reverend Charles Kingsley, the professor of modern history, in the course of lectures which his royal highness attended. The exalted rank of the student—the literary eminence of the professor—combine to render this compliment most grateful to me. It affords me the consolation of believing that, whatever may be the errors and deficiencies of my undertaking, it has been recognized by one whose opinion is of no ordinary value, as a well-meant endeavor to write the history of the kingdom and of the people with a due sense of my responsibility to be just and truthful, and with a catholicity of mind that may be preserved without the suppression of honestly-formed opinions.

I am writing the concluding sentences of this postscript in my birthplace—in Windsor. In solitary walks of my boyhood—by the windings of the Thames, or looking from the gentle hills of the forest—the "proud keep" seldom rose to my view but I connected it with some historical memory. To me those majestic towers were interpreters of heaven's o'erpast decrees. They formed my mind to look upon the history of my country as the most interesting of studies; to endeavor to draw from that study a just guide to the public duties of a youth who had the happiness to be born a Briton. If what I have written in these volumes should inspire similar feelings;

* "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," p. 319.

† Those three chapters are chap. clxvi. of vol. v., chap. clxxx. of vol. vii., and chap. ccxvi. of vol. viii. Being confined to the subject of the fine arts, I felt that they required technical knowledge and a peculiar judgment to which I could not pretend. I therefore confided them to Mr. James Thorne, who has for some years contributed many articles on art to works in which I have been engaged.

if this history should be found more calculated for truthful instruction that the histories which were accessible to me in my early days, I have not written in vain.

In the "Faery Queen"—passages of which present themselves to my memory as I ramble among the scenes where I first read that noble poem—a man "of ripe and perfect age" unrolls the ancient book of "Briton Moniments" to two youthful champions, who burn with fervent fire to attain a knowledge of "their country's ancestry." As the old man of Spenser unfolded the "records from ancient times derived," to induce that feeling of patriotism which would make his chivalrous visitors brave and courteous maintainers of England's honor, I would point to the earliest and to the latest of our annals, to exhort the rising generation to a grateful sense of the blessings of which they are the heirs. To the young man who is passing into active life at a season in which his country has attained a position of greatness unprecedented, and of security not easily to be shaken, while I look back to early days of national danger and difficulty, but nevertheless days in which the true Englishman rarely lost heart or hope—to him especially I would say, in the words of the poet who now wears the laurel which Spenser wore,

"Love thou thy land, with love far-brought
From out the storied past, and used
Within the present, but transfused
Thro' future time by power of thought."

CHARLES KNIGHT.

APPENDIX.

ANNALS, 1849-1867.

1849.

INDIA.—At the opening of parliament on the 1st of February the royal speech announced the beginning of a war of a very serious nature: "A rebellion of a formidable character has broken out in the Punjaub, and the Governor-General of India has been compelled, for the preservation of the peace of the country, to assemble a considerable force, which is now engaged in military operations against the insurgents."

[To make the narrative of Indian affairs in 1849 intelligible, we must trace the origin and progress of the war during 1848.]

On April 18th, 1848, Mr. Van Agnew and Lieutenant Anderson, in company with Khan Singh, the newly appointed governor of Mooltan, had reached the town of Mooltan, and had been killed in a quarrel with the troops of the old governor, Dewan Moolraj, who immediately broke out into open rebellion. On June 18th Lieutenant Edwardes, with a small British force, having joined the forces of the Rajah of Bhawalpoor, engaged and defeated the army of Moolraj, who retreated to the town. General Whish undertook to besiege it, but was compelled, by the desertion of Shere Singh with his troops, to raise the siege on Sept. 22. He fell back a few miles, while Lord Gough with a relieving army assembled at Ferozepoor, and another large force was concentrating at Roree. On Oct. 9 Shere Singh separated himself from Moolraj, and skilfully led his army to the country north-west of Lahore and south-west of Wuzeerabad. Here he was joined by Chuttur Singh. On Nov. 21 Lord Gough found them intrenched on the left bank of the Chenab, behind Ramnuggur, with nearly 40,000 men and 28 guns, and attacked them. On the 23d the Sikhs withdrew; on Dec. 3 Major-General Thackwell crossed the Chenab at Wuzeerabad, a fight took place, and on the 4th the rebels retreated to Jailam, a little beyond which place they strongly intrenched themselves. Lord Gough had also crossed the Chenab, but stopped all further fighting till Mooltan should have been taken, which place was then being besieged by General Whish. On Dec. 21 the British troops with their Indian allies advanced to the attack, they cleared the suburbs, and established themselves within 500 yards of the walls. The place was heavily cannonaded till the 29th, when several breaches were made, a granary was set on fire, and several small magazines exploded. On the 30th the principal magazine, containing nearly 800,000 lbs. of powder, blew up, killing the Dewan's mother, many of his principal officers, and destroying a great number of houses, mosques, and other public buildings. On the 31st the garrison made a sortie, but the attack was repulsed with great loss to the assailants.

[To connect the notices of foreign affairs in 1849, we give the following very brief abstract of events in 1848.]

ITALY.—Insurrection in Sicily. January 12. Provisional government proclaimed in Palermo. March 18. Insurrection in Milan against the Austrians. March 19. The Italian flag hoisted in all towns of north Italy. March 23. The King of Sardinia espouses the cause of Italian regeneration against Austria. May 15. Fighting at Naples between the royal troops and the national guard; the city given up to pillage and massacre upon the defeat of the people. May 29. The Austrians defeated at Goito by the Sardinian army under King Charles Albert. June 12. The whole of the Venetian territory, except the city of Venice, was in the hands of the Austrians. July 27. Retreat of the Sardinian army, after six days' fighting with the Austrians. August 4. They capitulated to the Austrian Field-Marshal Radetsky. Sept. 21. Armistice between Sardinia and Austria.

GERMANY.—March 13. Revolution at Vienna—Prince Metternich flies from the city—Constitutional government to be established. March 18. A week of commotion and fighting at Berlin—A new ministry appointed—An amnesty proclaimed. June 16. Renewed conflicts in Berlin. July 12. The Archduke Johann of Austria installed at Frankfort as Lieutenant-General of Germany. Oct. 6. Insurrection in Vienna—Count Latour, the minister of war, assassinated. Oct. 16. The Emperor of Austria issues a proclamation appointing Prince Windischgrätz commander-in-chief, and announces his determination to put down by force the party in rebellion. Oct. 28. Windischgrätz attacks Vienna with 75,000 men. Nov. 7. The imperial troops in possession of the city—Hungarian troops sent to assist the insurgents are defeated. Dec. 2. Ferdinand II., Emperor of Austria, abdicates in favor of his nephew. To the end of the year continued fighting between the Hungarians and Austrians.

Jan. 5. Buda-Pesth taken by the Austrians, and Kossuth, the Hungarian president, retires to Debreczin.

Feb. 1. Parliament opened by the queen in person. She said in her speech that she hoped the joint intervention of England and France would produce a permanent settlement of the troubles in Sicily, and stop any further effusion of blood. Feb. 6. The ministers brought in a bill to continue the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland for six months, which was opposed by Mr. J. O'Connell and some other Irish members, but carried through all its stages by large majorities, and received the royal assent on the 27th. Feb. 7. The chancellor of the exchequer proposed a grant of 50,000*l.* for the relief of the distress in Ireland, which met with some opposition, but ultimately passed the House of Lords on March 6.

Feb. 8. The Roman national assembly adopts a republican form of government, and divests the pope of all temporal power; against these decrees the pope published a protest on the 14th, and on the 18th appeals to the Roman Catholic powers for protection.

March 6. The Emperor of Austria issues the charter of a new constitution for the whole empire. It contained many improvements, but was only accepted by some of the states.

March 8. The Sardinian government recommences hostilities against Austria, and on the 23d the Sardinian army was utterly routed at Novara. On the 25th Carlo Alberto resigned his crown in favor of his son Victor Emmanuel.

March 12. The second reading of the Navigation Bill was carried in the House of Commons by 266 against 210; it passed the House of Lords with little opposition, and received the royal assent on June 26.

March 30. Haynau, the Austrian commander, takes Brescia, in Italy, with great slaughter of the inhabitants, and nearly the total destruction of the city.

April 2. Trial of the Paris insurgents. Barbes, Albert, Blanqui, Sobrier, and Raspail transported for various periods.

April 18. Prince Albert laid the first stone of the Great Grimsby docks.

April 24. The Austrians defeated at Gran by the Hungarians, who likewise reoccupy Pesth.

April 26. Civita Vecchia occupied by French troops under General Oudinot.

April 29. The King of Prussia, who had been elected hereditary Emperor of Germany by the national assembly at Frankfort, on this

day declined by his plenipotentiary the proffered dignity, and rejected the Frankfort framed constitution.

May 1. Meeting of protectionists held in the Hall of Commerce, Threadneedle Street, London, under the presidency of the Duke of Richmond, to form an association for the purpose of "arresting the progress of free-trade, of opposing the repeal of the navigation laws, and of re-establishing protection.

May 7. The second reading of the Parliamentary Oaths Bill, relieving Jews and other dissenters from certain parts of the existing oath, was carried by 278 to 185. After passing the Commons, the bill was thrown out by the Lords on June 26, by a majority of 95 to 70.

May 7. An insurrection having broken out in Dresden on the 3d, the city was on this day bombarded by Prussian and Saxon troops, and the insurgents were driven out of the town.

May 11. On the appeal by writ of error to the House of Lords by W. Smith O'Brien and three others, the judgment was confirmed, and they were all sentenced to transportation.

May 16. Prince Albert addressed a public meeting of the Servants' Provident and Benevolent Society, pointing out and recommending the advantages of vesting savings in government annuities. He told them that their society was founded on the correct principle, "which requires every man by personal exertions, and at his own choice, to work out his own happiness."

May 19. A large meeting held at Cape Town, to express the indignation of the whole colony against the attempt of the Colonial Office to make the Cape a penal colony. The same feeling had been expressed at previous meetings. Subsequently the inhabitants combined to refuse supplies to the public departments, and at length the intention was abandoned.

May 27. The legislative assembly of the French Republic holds its first sitting.

June 3. The French army, commanded by General Oudinot, commences its attack on Rome. After a brave defence it was surrendered on July 3.

June 4. The Incumbered Estates, Ireland, Bill, passed the House of Commons after a slight opposition; it received the royal assent on July 28.

June 13. A red republican procession visit the national assembly in Paris, ostensibly to present a petition, but in a threatening attitude. They were dispersed by the troops without violence; but Paris is thereupon declared in a state of siege by the assembly, and on the 14th several of the newspapers were ordered to be suppressed, and Ledru-Rollin and others to be prosecuted for conspiracy, and endeavoring to excite a civil war. Several of the leaders in the movement succeeded in making their escape.

June 21. The Russians, who had entered Hungary in aid of the Austrians, take Kronstadt, and having joined the Austrian army under General Wohlgemuth, defeat the Hungarians at Szered, and on the 23d defeat them again at Eperies. On August 2 the Russians captured Debreczin.

June 27. A public meeting held at the London Tavern, London, to receive a deputation from Ireland, on the subject of the distress in that country.

July 6. The German army, which had been sent to the aid of the Schleswig-Holstein insurgents, and was besieging Fredericia, defeated by the Danes, who took 1800 prisoners. An armistice for six months between Denmark and Prussia was concluded on the 10th.

July 12. Serious affray between the Orangemen and the Roman Catholics at Dolly's Brae, near Castlewellan, in Ireland. Several of the Roman Catholics were killed, and some of their houses wrecked and burned. On Sept. 13 a majority of the magistrates in petty sessions, by their chairman, the Earl of Roden, refused to take informations against the Orangemen accused of the offence. The refusal was repeated on Oct. 9, for which the Earl of Roden and two other justices were discharged from the magistracy.

July 27. An insurrection broke out in Cephalonia and Corfu, which was suppressed, and the instigators punished.

Aug. 9. The Hungarians, after various alternations of success and defeats, were utterly routed at Temeswar; and on the 13th the remains of the army and Görgey surrendered to the Russians at Grosswardein.

Aug. 22. Venice surrendered to the Austrians, after an energetic defence.

Sept. 8. Louis Napoleon, President of the French Republic, publishes a letter to Colonel Ney, insisting on a general amnesty, a secular administration, and other improvements for the subjects of the pope.

Sept. 16. Prayers offered up in all the churches for the removal of the cholera, which was raging with great intensity. It continued to prevail during the autumn, till, on Nov. 15, thanksgivings were offered on its cessation.

Oct. 30. The President of the French Republic dismisses his ministry.

Nov. 3. Sir James Ross returns from an unsuccessful search after Sir John Franklin.

Nov. 5. Russia and Austria require Turkey to withdraw her protection from the Hungarian refugees who had fled into her territory; this is refused. Turkey appeals to England, and on this day the British fleet entered the Dardanelles, where, however, it returned on the 13th to Besika Bay.

Nov. 7. The inauguration of the Queen's College at Cork took place on this day.

Dec. 1. The Queen-Dowager Adelaide died at Bentley Priory, Stanmore, Middlesex, aged 57.

Dec. 16. At Mullinahone, in Tipperary, a vast assemblage of tenant farmers and cottiers met to petition in favor of tenant-right, which included lower rents determined by a valuation, compensation on quitting for permanent improvements, and a lease. This meeting was followed by many others with the same object.

Dec. 28. Letter appeared from Sir Robert Peel to his tenantry on "the present state and prospects of agriculture."

INDIA.—On Jan. 2, 1849, a breach was made near the Delhi gate, but the entrance was not found practicable; but the Bombay column had forced an entrance on the opposite side of the town, which was ultimately taken possession of by the British troops; the fort having been captured on the following day, while the citadel still remained in possession of Moolraj. On Jan. 13 Lord Gough, having advanced toward the Jhelum with 22,000 men and 130 guns, found himself in front of the Sikh army, which, under the command of Shere Singh, occupied a long line from Moong to Russool. Here the British troops were halted, in order to give them a day's rest before attacking the enemy. The Sikh batteries, however, some of which were within range, commenced firing on the British position, some of the shot falling close to the commander-in-chief. This occasioned him to change his plan, and a cannonade was ordered on the enemy's centre, which was kept up on both sides for an hour or two. Lord Gough ordered a flank movement of infantry to be made on the left, but it was met by a concealed battery. The repulse occasioned some confusion. A regiment of light dragoons retreated in consequence of a misunderstanding of orders, and one cavalry regiment turned and fled. Night put an end to the combat; the British bivouacked near the field of battle, and the Sikhs withdrew. This was the battle of Chillianwallah, in which the British loss was 731 men killed and 1446 wounded. That of the Sikhs was far greater. On the 22d, Moolraj, the citadel of Mooltan having become untenable, surrendered himself and his garrison unconditionally.

On Feb. 15, Lord Gough having discovered that Shere Singh, with the main body of his army, instead of leaving, crossed the Jhelum, was on his march to Lahore, advanced in pursuit. General Whish had in the mean time arrived at Ramnuggur with a brigade of his force, and learning that Shere Singh was approaching Wuzeerabad dispatched Col. Byrne with a detachment of men and guns to prevent or delay his crossing the Chenab. This was effected, and the Sikh army encamped itself near Goojerat. The British forces under General Whish and brigadiers Markham and Hervey were then enabled to cross the Chenab and co-operate with Lord Gough, who continued to advance. On Feb. 21 took place the battle of Goojerat. Lord Gough, with 25,000 men and 100 guns, attacked the strongly posted Sikh army of 60,000 men and 59 guns. After nine hours of obstinate fighting the Sikhs were totally routed, and Shere Singh escaped to the Salt Range Hills with only 8000 men. On March 8 he came to the British camp to propose a capitulation, but was told that nothing but an unconditional surrender would be accepted. On the 14th this was made, and the Sikh forces laid down their arms.

The Afghans under Dost Mahomed had taken a hostile part against the British during this contest. They had taken the fort of Attock and captured several British officers. Sir William Gibert was sent against them, and, after some other successes, on March 21 Dost Mahomed and the remnant of his army reached the Khyber Pass, through which they were able to retreat unmolested. On March 29 the Governor-General of India issued a proclamation that the Punjaub was annexed to the British dominions. In July Moolraj was tried and found guilty of the murder of Mr. Agnew and Lieutenant Anderson, but was recommended to mercy, and in September he was sentenced to be transported for life.

LEGISLATION. SESSION 12 & 13 VICTORIÆ.

Cap. 29. *An Act to amend the Laws in force for the Encouragement of British Shipping and Navigation.*

Cap. 77. *Further to facilitate the State and Transfer of Incumbered Estates in Ireland.*

Cap. 106. *To amend and consolidate the Laws relating to Bankruptcy.*

Cap. 111. *To amend the Nuisances Removal and Diseases Prevention Act*, 1848.

Revenue, 52,951,749*l.*; expenditure—army and ordnance, 8,881,-141*l.*; navy, 6,942,397*l.*; for all objects, 50,853,623*l.*; debt, 790,-927,017*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce and manufactures, 63,596,025*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 41,367; to the United States, 219,450; to the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 32,191; to all other places, 6490: total, 299,498.

Railway traffic: miles open, 6031; number of passengers, 63,841,-539; traffic receipts, 11,806,498*l.*

Number of paupers in England and Ireland on Jan. 1, 1,555,166.

1850.

Jan. 3. A proclamation issued by the queen, appointing a commission for the promotion of the works of industry of all nations, to be holden in 1851, of which Prince Albert became the acting chief. In

pursuance of this object a numerous meeting was held at the Mansion House, London, on the 25th.

Jan. 10. The Enterprise and Investigator leave Woolwich in search of Sir John Franklin.

Jan. 17. A meeting of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce took place, in order to consider the important question of how best to insure a more certain and steady supply of cotton. Several suggestions were offered, but no important mode of action was decided on.

Jan. 31. Parliament opened by commission. The speech announced the happy continuance of peace and amity with foreign powers; that the differences which had arisen between Austria and Turkey respecting the reception of the Hungarian refugees was peacefully terminated; that the United States and Sweden had granted reciprocity to British ships; the speech then referred to the cholera, and to the loyal reception of her majesty in Ireland; it congratulated the houses on the improved condition of commerce and manufactures, and upon the freedom of the kingdom from the wars and convulsions which had prevailed during the last two years on the continent of Europe.

Feb. 4. Social riots in Paris occasioned by the orders for the police to cut down the trees of liberty; this continued for two days, but the mobs were dispersed by the troops.

Feb. 6. The King of Prussia takes the oaths to the new constitution agreed upon for that kingdom.

March 15. The chancellor of the exchequer made his financial statement. He showed that there would be a surplus of revenue, with which he proposed to remove the duty on bricks, and to make loans for purposes of drainage and agricultural improvement to England, Scotland, and Ireland.

March 15. The King of Würtemberg opens his states assembly with a speech attacking the insidious ambition of Russia, and announcing the formation of a league, under the sanction of Austria, between Würtemberg, Bavaria, and Saxony.

March 21. A grand banquet was given at the Mansion House by the Lord Mayor of London to the mayors of 188 towns, to the foreign ambassadors, the ministers, and Prince Albert, to promote and forward the project of the great international exhibition. In his speech to the meeting Prince Albert said, "It must indeed be most gratifying to me to find that a suggestion which I had thrown out, as appearing to me of importance at this time, should have met with such universal concurrence and approbation."

June 17. In the House of Lords a resolution was moved by Lord Stanley condemnatory of the foreign policy of ministers in relation to the affairs of Greece, which was carried, after some debate, by a majority of 37 against ministers. On the 20th Mr. Roebuck gave notice in the House of Commons of his intention to move a resolution approving the whole foreign policy of the government. The debate on this resolution commenced on the 24th, and was continued on the 25th and the 28th, when the house divided—for the resolution, 310; against it, 264; majority in favor of ministers, 46.

July 2. Sir Robert Peel died in consequence of a fall from his horse on June 29, aged 62. On July 4 Lord John Russell pronounced a panegyric on the deceased statesman, and suggested a public funeral, which was declined, on the ground of his own expressed wish, "to be interred without ostentation or parade of any kind." On July 22 a numerous meeting was held at Willis's Rooms to consider of means to perpetuate his memory. On the 10th a meeting had been held at Bury to promote the erection of a monument to his memory at his native place; and, on the 15th, one in the city of London for a national testimonial.

July 4. A protocol, signed in London, on the part of Great Britain, France, Prussia, and Sweden, guaranteeing the integrity of the territories of Denmark. A peace had been concluded between Denmark and Prussia on the 2d respecting the duchies, but the Schleswig-Holsteiners refused to submit. On the 25th the Danish army totally defeated the insurgents at Idsted, and entered the town of Schleswig.

July 22. Lord John Russell withdrew in the House of Commons the Jews' Oath of Abjuration Bill. On the 26th the Baron de Rothschild presented himself at the table of the house to take the oaths as member for the city of London, but, on saying that he desired to be sworn on the Old Testament, a stormy debate arose, which was adjourned. It was resumed on the 29th, and on the motion of Mr. Hume, that the clerk be directed to swear the baron on the Old Testament, the house divided after a debate—for the motion 113, against it 59.

Aug. 18. The parliament was prorogued by her majesty in person.

Aug. 28. The submarine telegraph wire was sunk between Dover and Cape Grisnez, near Calais.

Aug. 30. Prince Albert laid the foundation-stone of the National Gallery at Edinburgh. In his address on the occasion he said: "Let us hope that the impulse given to the culture of the fine arts in this country, and the daily increasing attention bestowed upon it by the people at large, will not only tend to refine and elevate the national tastes, but will also tend to the production of works which, if left behind us as the memorials of the age, will give to after generations an adequate idea of our advanced state of civilization."

Sept. 1. The Elector of Hesse Cassel declares his dominions in a state of siege in consequence of the chamber requiring to have a regular budget laid before them, in concordance with the constitution of 1831. An insurrection takes place, and on the 13th the elector fled to Hanover. He is restored by Austrian and Bavarian troops, although Prussia declared her intention of supporting the constitution against the elector, advanced troops, and even took possession of Cassel, but ultimately withdrew them on December 5th; and on December 10th an order was issued by the prime minister of Hesse for the immediate payment of the taxes refused by the chamber, under pain of fine and imprisonment.

Sept. 10. The Roman Catholic Synod, which had met at Thurles in Ireland on August 22d, closed its labors by condemning the establishment of the Queen's colleges, and proposing a Roman Catholic university.

Oct. 25. A return banquet for the purpose of promoting the great International Exhibition of 1851 was given by the Lord Mayor of York to the Lord Mayor of London and the mayors of the principal cities and boroughs of the United Kingdom, at which Prince Albert was present. On his health being drunk, he pronounced a warm eulogium on the late Sir Robert Peel. In the course of it he said: "If he has had so great an influence over this country, it was from the nation recognizing in his qualities the true type of the English character, which is essentially practical. Warmly attached to his institutions, and revering the bequests left to him by the industry, wisdom, and piety of his forefathers, the Englishman attaches little value to any theoretical scheme. It will attract his attention only after having been for some time placed before him; it must have been thoroughly investigated and discussed before he will entertain it. Should it be an empty theory, it will fall to the ground during this time of probation; should it survive this trial, it will be on account of the practical qualities contained in it; but its adoption in the end will entirely depend upon its harmonizing with the national feeling, the historical development of the country, and the peculiar nature of its institutions."

Dec. 6. Cardinal Wiseman was enthroned as an archbishop. The act caused an extreme agitation throughout the country. On the 10th various addresses were presented to her majesty on the subject of this aggression.

LEGISLATION. Session 13 & 14 Victoriæ.

Cap. 2. *An Act to restrain Party Processions in Ireland.*

Cap. 33. *To make more effectual Provision for regulating the Police of Towns and populous Places in Scotland, and for paving, draining, cleansing, lighting, and improving the same.* This is the first general and comprehensive act for the management of towns in Scotland.

Cap. 52. *To make better Provision for the Interment of the Dead in and near the Metropolis.* This gives power for the formation of extramural cemeteries, and forbids, after certain orders have been issued, the burial in any of the parish churches or churchyards within the metropolitan district.

Cap. 59. *For the better Government of her Majesty's Australian Colonies,* forming the colony of Victoria, giving a representative constitution, and empowering the legislative body to levy customs, duties, and other taxes.

Cap. 65. *For enabling Town Councils to establish Public Libraries and Museums.*

Cap. 93. *For improving the Conditions of Masters, Mates, and Seamen, and maintaining Discipline in the Merchant Service.*

Cap. 99. *For the better assessing and collecting the Poor Rates and Highway Rates in respect of small Tenements.* The act gives power to vestries to determine whether tenements of a ratable value of not more than 6*l.* shall be rated to the owners or the occupiers.

Revenue, 52,810,680*l.*; expenditure—army and ordnance, 8,955,-061*l.*; navy, 6,437,883*l.*; for all objects, 50,231,874*l.*; debt, 787,029,-162*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce and manufactures, 71,367,-885*l.*; total of exports, 73,300,951*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 32,961; to the United States, 223,078; to the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 16,037; to all other places, 8773: total, 280,849.

Railway traffic: miles open, 6221; number of passengers, 72,-854,422; traffic receipts, 13,204,668*l.*

Number of paupers in England and Ireland, 1,228,513.

1851.

Jan. 2. The French ministry resigned; on the 10th the "Moniteur" contained the official list of the new ministry appointed by the prince president. The new ministers were on the evening of the 10th defeated in the Legislative Assembly on a point of minor importance by 330 to 258. On the 18th the assembly passed a vote of want of confidence in the ministry, by 417 to 278. On the 24th a message from the prince president was received, communicating the formation of a cabinet composed of persons not members of the assembly.

Jan. 10. General Changarnier deprived of his offices as commander of the national guard and of a division of the army.

Jan. 27. Earl Grey, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in a dispatch to the Governor of Canada, relinquished to the provincial legislature the right of disposing absolutely of the clergy reserves in Canada.

Feb. 4. Parliament opened by the queen in person, who in the royal speech initmated that a bill in reference to ecclesiastical titles would be introduced to parliament in consequence of the bull recently issued by the Pope, appointing certain dioceses in England.

Feb. 20. Mr. Locke King obtained leave to bring in a bill to extend the 10*l.* franchise to counties. This was carried against the govern-

ment by a majority of 100 to 52, which circumstance coupled with the smallness of the majority (281 to 267) in favor of government against a protectionist motion of Mr. Disraeli on the 13th, led to the resignation of the ministry on the 22d. Lord Stanley and the Earl of Aberdeen were each requested to form a government, but neither being able to do so, the former ministers were, by the advice of the Duke of Wellington, reinstated in office, and resumed their places on the 3d of March.

March 10. Public meetings of English Roman Catholics held in Freemasons' Hall, London, to petition parliament against the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. A meeting of Irish Roman Catholics for the same object was held in Dublin on the 30th of April.

March 13. Opening of Owen's College, Manchester, an educational institution founded in accordance with the will of Mr. John Owen, who bequeathed 100,000*l.* for the purpose, with the condition that no religious test should be applied in the admission of students.

March 31. The decennial census of Great Britain and Ireland taken this day.

May 1. The great exhibition of the industry of all nations opened in Hyde Park by the queen. On the 9th of July a grand entertainment was given at the Guildhall in celebration of the great exhibition, when the queen and Prince Albert attended. The exhibition was closed to the public on the 11th of October. On the 15th the awards of the juries were announced, and the closing ceremony took place. The total number of admissions to the exhibition was 6,007,944, being a daily average of upward of 43,500. The largest attendance was on Tuesday, the 7th of October, when 109,915 persons were admitted. The gross receipts were about 506,000*l.*; the expenses about 330,000*l.* The number of exhibitors was about 15,000.

May 3. Prince Albert, at the Royal Academy dinner on this day, in responding to the toast proposed by the president, remarked that "We have now on the one hand the eager competition of a vast array of artists of every degree of talent and skill, and on the other as judge, a great public, for the greater part wholly uneducated in art, and thus led by professional writers, who often strive to impress the public with a great idea of their own artistic knowledge by the merciless manner in which they treat works, which cost those who produced them the highest efforts of mind and feeling."

May 22. Proclamation issued by the government of New South Wales, claiming the royalty of the newly-discovered gold-fields for the crown. The amount of gold exported from New South Wales to the end of 1851 was 468,336*l.*

June 17. Mr. Cobden moved an address to the crown, praying her majesty to direct the foreign secretary to enter into communication with the French government to promote a mutual reduction of armaments. Lord Palmerston objected to the adoption of the address, while he expressed the general concurrence of the government in its principle and object. The motion was withdrawn.

Aug. 1. The Lord Mayor of London, the commissioners of the great exhibition, and many other distinguished persons, visited Paris by invitation, and were entertained for several days by the municipality.

Aug. 18. Death of the King of Hanover in his 81st year. He was succeeded by his son, George V.

Aug. 27. Submersion of the great cable telegraph between England and France. It was opened for public use on the 13th of November.

Nov. 4. Opening of the session of the French Legislative Assembly, when the prince president in his message recommended the restoration of universal suffrage. On the 13th the assembly (by 353 votes against 347) threw out the bill, which had been proposed by the ministry in accordance with the president's message, for the repeal of the existing electoral law and the substitution of universal suffrage.

Dec. 2. The prince president of the French Republic issued a decree dissolving the Legislative Assembly, establishing universal suffrage, proposing the election of a president for ten years and the establishment of a second chamber; also declaring Paris in a state of siege. MM. Thiers, Changarnier, Bedeau, Cavaignac, Lamoricière, and Charras were arrested, and placed in confinement in the Castle of Vincennes. About 180 members who attempted to constitute a meeting of the assembly, with M. Berryer at their head, were likewise arrested.

Dec. 18. At this date thirty-four departments of France were under martial law.

Dec. 21. On this and the preceding day the votes of the people were taken, on the principle of universal suffrage, on the question of the election of a president of the republic for ten years.

Dec. 22. Viscount Palmerston quitted office. [See parliamentary explanation, February 3d, 1852.]

LEGISLATION. Session 14 & 15 Victoriæ.

Cap. 19. *An Act for the better Prevention of Offences*, inflicting punishments for attempts at crime, and authorizing the apprehension of persons found in possession of house-breaking instruments at night, and of suspected persons.

Cap. 28. *For the well-ordering of Common Lodging-houses*, regulating the number of lodgers, and all other matters conducing to cleanliness and health.

Cap. 61. *For providing a Metropolitan Market and Conveniences connected therewith in lieu of the Cattle Market at Smithfield.* The market is now held in the Caledonian Road, Islington.

Cap. 79. *To consolidate and amend the Laws relating to the Regulation of Steam Navigation, and to Boats and Lights to be carried by Sea-going Vessels.*

Cap. 83. *To improve the Administration of Justice in the Court of Chancery, and in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.* This is the act by which the Court of Appeal in Chancery was established.

Cap. 99. *To Amend the Law of Evidence.* Parties to a suit enabled to give testimony, and documents to be produced in courts of common law.

Cap. 100. *For further improving the Administration of Criminal Justice.* Enabling the judges to correct errors in the indictment not material to the merits of the cause; removing certain minute details from indictments, and giving juries the power of convicting for a crime though not precisely the one proved, as in case of a charge for misdemeanor or embezzlement which may turn out to be a larceny, the criminal may be found guilty in the form charged.

Revenue, 52,233,006*l.*; expenditure—army and ordnance, 8,723,-940*l.*; navy, 5,849,917*l.*; for all objects, 49,506,610*l.*; debt, 782,869,-382*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce, 74,448,722*l.*: total of exports, 115,821,092*l.*; imports, 152,889,053*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 42,605; to the United States, 267,357; to the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 21,532; to all other places, 4472: total, 335,966.

Railway traffic: miles open, 6890; number of passengers, 85,391,-095; traffic receipts, 14,997,459*l.*

Number of paupers in England and Ireland, 1,070,080.

1852.

Jan. 1. Installation of Prince Louis Napoleon as President of the French Republic for ten years. On the 10th eighty-three members of the late Legislative Assembly were banished from France, and 575 persons, arrested for resistance to the *coup d'état* of December 2d, were conveyed to Havre to be transported to the penal settlement of Cayenne, in Guiana.

Jan. 9. The principal engineering firms of London and Lancashire discharged their workmen, and closed their works, rather than submit to the demands of the Amalgamated Society of Operative Engineers for the abolition of piece-work and overtime. This unhappy dispute lasted several months, at great cost both to masters and operatives, and occasioned much distress among the families of the workmen.

Feb. 3. Parliament opened by the queen. The royal speech recommended the reconsideration of the Reform Act of the late reign, with a view to its amendment on some points. In the House of Commons, in the debate on the address, Lord John Russell, in answer to a question, explained the circumstances under which Lord Palmerston had quitted office. Lord Palmerston, as foreign secretary, had sent a dispatch of importance, in which his colleague had not concurred, and he had hastily expressed his approbation of the proceedings of the prince president of the French Republic in the *coup d'état* of December 2d.

Feb. 9. New Reform Bill introduced into the House of Commons by Lord John Russell, by which the franchise was proposed to be 5*l.* rated yearly value in boroughs, and 20*l.* occupation, or 10*l.* copyhold rated yearly value in counties.

Feb. 20. Defeat of government on the Local Militia Bill, an amendment by Lord Palmerston that the force should be *general* instead of *local* being carried by 136 votes to 125. In consequence of this vote Lord John Russell's ministry resigned on the 21st.

Feb. 27. The Earl of Derby, having accepted the premiership, explained in the House of Lords the intended policy of his cabinet. He said that the question of protection to agriculture was one to be solved only by a reference to the well-understood and clearly-expressed opinion of the people. The members of Lord Derby's cabinet were as follows: Earl of Derby, first lord of the treasury; Earl of Lonsdale, president of the council; Lord St. Leonards, lord high chancellor; Marquess of Salisbury, lord privy seal; Rt. Hon. B. Disraeli, chancellor of the exchequer; Rt. Hon. S. H. Walpole, secretary of state for home affairs; Earl of Malmesbury, foreign secretary; Rt. Hon. Sir J. S. Pakington, colonial secretary; Duke of Northumberland, first lord of the admiralty; Rt. Hon. J. C. Herries, president of the board of control; Rt. Hon. J. W. Henley, president of the board of trade; Lord J. J. R. Manners, commissioner of woods and forests.

March 2. Reorganization of the Anti-Corn League in consequence of the accession to power of a protectionist ministry.

June 1. Electric telegraph opened throughout from London to Dublin.

July 1. Parliament closed by the queen in person, and dissolved by proclamation. A new parliament called.

July 14. Death of the Duke of Wellington at Walmer Castle, Dover, in his 84th year, after a slight illness. His death took place as if he had fallen asleep in his chair. On the 18th of November his remains were interred in St. Paul's Cathedral near those of Nelson, being conveyed thither by military procession along the streets of London. On the 6th of December the House of Commons voted 80,000*l.* for the expenses of the funeral.

Oct. 7. At a public dinner at Bordeaux the prince president of the

French Republic delivered a speech, in which he made the declaration that "The empire is peace."

Nov. 4. The French Senate received a message from the prince president recommending the re-establishment of the empire.

Nov. 11. The queen opened parliament in person. The Earl of Derby stated that he was prepared to bow to the decision of the country in favor of free-trade, as indicated by the result of the elections for the present parliament.

Dec. 1. The French Corps Législatif proclaimed the definitive result of the voting on the *plebiscite* respecting the re-establishment of the empire, as follows: Ayes 7,864,189; noes, 253,145; null, 63,326. The prince president, in accepting the imperial dignity, took the title of Napoleon III.

Dec. 6. Ministers announced in both Houses of Parliament that the government had recognized the re-establishment of the empire in France, and Napoleon III. as emperor.

Dec. 16. On the debate on the ministerial budget, which continued through four sittings of the House of Commons, the government was left in a minority of 19—the votes in favor of ministers being 286; against, 305. In consequence of this vote, the Earl of Derby's ministry resigned office on the 17th, and the Earl of Aberdeen accepted the premiership. The new cabinet was composed as follows: Earl of Aberdeen, first lord of the treasury; Earl Granville, president of the council; Lord Cranworth, lord high chancellor; Duke of Argyll, lord privy seal; Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, chancellor of the exchequer; Viscount Palmerston, secretary of state for home affairs; Earl of Clarendon, foreign secretary; Duke of Newcastle, colonial secretary; Sir James Graham, first lord of the admiralty; Sir Charles Wood, president of the board of control; Rt. Hon. Sidney Herbert, secretary at war; Sir W. Molesworth, commissioner of parks and public buildings; Marquess of Lansdowne, and Lord John Russell, without office.

Dec. 20. Proclamation issued by the Governor-General of India, annexing Pegu as a province to the British territory in India.

Dec. 31. The amount of gold exported from the colony of New South Wales during 1852 was 2,660,946*l.*

LEGISLATION. Session 15 & 16 Victoriæ.

Cap. 12. *Copyright Amendment Act*, for carrying into effect a convention with France on the subject of copyright, by which the right of translation is mutually reserved on publishing a notice to that effect with the work.

Cap. 31. *To legalize the formation of Industrial and Provident Societies*, enabling them to pay officers, sue for subscriptions, to carry on trades, etc., on being registered. This is the act under which co-operative societies are formed.

Cap. 51. *Enfranchisement of Copyholds.* By this act any lord of the manor or tenant may compel or require enfranchisement on certain defined terms.

Cap. 56. *For regulating the Qualifications of Pharmaceutical Chemists*, enabling examiners appointed by the Pharmaceutical Society to grant certificates to persons who have satisfactorily passed an examination, who may then assume the title of pharmaceutical chemists; a penalty of 5*l.* is imposed on any one assuming the title without having a certificate.

Cap. 76. *To amend the Process, Practice, and Mode of Pleading in the Superior Courts of Common Law at Westminster, and in the Superior Courts of the Counties Palatine of Lancaster and Durham.* An important act, making great alterations in and simplifying the proceedings in the common law courts.

Cap. 83. *For amending the Law for granting Patents for Inventions.* Reducing the payment of fees on the first grant of a patent, and regulating the periods of payment for lengthened terms of years.

Revenue, gross receipts, 56,576,840*l.*; expenditure—army and ordnance, 9,023,940*l.*; navy, 5,849,917*l.*; for all objects, 53,850,445*l.*; debt, 780,869,382*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce, 78,076,854*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 32,873; to the United States, 244,261; to the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 87,881: to all other places, 3749: total, 368,764.

Railway traffic: miles open, 7336; number of passengers, 89,135,729; traffic receipts, 15,710,554*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,080,953.

1853.

Jan. 30. The Emperor Napoleon III. married to Mdlle. de Montijo, Duchess of Teba.

Feb. 17. The Duke of Newcastle stated in the House of Lords that the transportation of convicts to the Australian Colonies would no longer be resorted to, except in the case of Western Australia. Termination of the Kafir war by the submission of the chiefs Macomo, Sandilli, and Kreili.

March 4. Inauguration of General Pierce as President of the United States of North America.

March 22. A treasury minute issued authorizing the establishment of mints in Australia.

April 1. Manchester constituted a city by royal charter.

April 8. The chancellor of the exchequer brought forward his plans for a modification of the form of the national debt, the object being to lay the foundation of a permanent irredeemable 2½ per cent stock. The resolutions embodying this plan were adopted by the House of Commons.

April 18. The chancellor of the exchequer introduced his budget, in which he proposed to repeal the duties leviable on 105 articles, of which the principal item was soap; and to make important reductions in the duties leviable on 126 articles, including the stamp duties on receipts and life assurance policies, and the duties on advertisements and on tea. He proposed also to extend the income-tax to Ireland, and to widen its range, so as to include incomes between 100*l.* and 150*l.*, and to bring real property within the operation of the legacy duty.

May 12. The great exhibition of industry of Ireland opened in Dublin by the lord lieutenant.

June 20. Peace with Birmah proclaimed by the Governor-General of India.

Nov. 7. Thirty-three persons tried at Paris for plotting to assassinate the Emperor Napoleon. Ten received sentence of transportation for life; the others were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment.

Nov. 15. Death of Donna Maria II., Queen of Portugal. She was succeeded by her eldest son, Don Pedro VIII.

Dec. 31. The amount of gold exported from New South Wales in 1853 was 1,781,172*l.*

The following events are preliminary to the war with Russia in 1854–55:

On the 3d of May Prince Menzikoff, the Russian Ambassador to the Porte, presented the *ultimatum* of the Russian government on certain matters in dispute between the Czar and the Sultan. On the 22d Prince Menzikoff left Constantinople. On the 4th of June orders were transmitted by the English and French governments to the commanders of their Mediterranean fleets to approach the Dardanelles without delay. On the 16th of June the Porte finally rejected the Russian *ultimatum*. On the 26th the Emperor of Russia issued a manifesto against the Porte, in which he announced the marching of Russian armies upon the Danubian provinces of Turkey. On the 2d of July the Russian army crossed the Pruth, thus invading the Turkish territory. On the 27th of September the Porte declared war against Russia; and on the 1st of October appealed to France and England for material aid in the war. The English and French fleets entered the Bosphorus on the 22d of October. On the 3d of November the Russians placed Moldavia and Wallachia under martial law. On the 4th the Turks were attacked at Oltenitza by General Dannenberg, with 9000 Russians, when the Russians were repulsed with a loss of 1200 men. On the 30th the Turkish fleet lying in the harbor of Sinope, with the citadel and town of Sinope, were destroyed by the Russian admiral, Nachimoff. On the 3d of December the combined fleets of England and France entered the Black Sea, on the demand of the Porte, on which the Russian fleet retired within the harbor of Sebastopol. On the 5th a protocol was signed at Vienna by the representatives of France, England, Austria, and Prussia, for the re-establishment of peace between Russia and Turkey, and for the maintenance of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire as an essential condition of the balance of European power.

LEGISLATION. Session 16 & 17 Victoriæ.

Cap. 15. *An Act to limit the time of taking the Poll in Counties at contested Elections for Knights of the Shire to serve in Parliament in England and Wales to one day.*

Cap. 51. *For granting to her Majesty Duties on Succession to Property, and for altering certain Provisions of the Acts charging Duties on Legacies and Shares of Personal Estates.* Succession duties are laid on real estates by this act, the rate varying according to the nearness of consanguinity.

Cap. 73. *For the Establishment of a Body of Naval Coast Volunteers, and for the temporary transfer to the Navy, in case of need, of seafaring Men employed in other Services.* Enables volunteers to enter for a period of five years, during which period they are to be trained to the navy for a time not exceeding 28 days in each year, and in case of imminent danger to be called into actual service, but not to be sent more than 100 leagues from the coast during exercise and actual service. They are to receive the same allowances as able seamen. While volunteers they are exempt from serving in the navy or militia, and a regulated bounty is given, which is not to exceed 6*l.*

Cap. 99. *To substitute, in certain Cases, other Punishment in lieu of Transportation.* Penal imprisonment is substituted by this act.

Cap. 137. *For the better Administration of Charitable Trusts.* Commissioners are appointed, with powers to investigate the affairs of any charitable trusts, and authorize legal proceedings to enforce the proper fulfilment of the trust if it should be necessary.

Revenue, 57,535,215*l.*; expenditure—army and ordnance, 9,876,962*l.*; navy, 6,625,944*l.*; for all objects, 51,044,986*l.*; debt, 770,923,001*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce, 98,933,781*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 34,522; to the United States, 230,885; to Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 61,401; to all other places, 3129: total, 829,937.

Railway traffic: miles open, 7686; number of passengers, 102,286,660; traffic receipts, 18,035,879*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,016,081.

1854.

[The principal events of the war with Russia, which will fill so large a space in the history of the years 1854 and 1855, will be given separately from other events in our annals of those two years.]

Jan. 31. In opening parliament Queen Victoria, in the speech from the throne, expressed her regret that the endeavors made by her in conjunction with the Emperor of the French had failed to procure an amicable settlement of the differences which had arisen between Russia and Turkey. On the 6th of February the Russian ambassador withdrew from Paris, and on the 8th Baron Brunnow, the Russian ambassador at the British court, left England. On the 20th the Grenadier and Coldstream Guards embarked at Southampton for Turkey. Other troops followed in rapid succession. On the 11th of March the queen reviewed at Spithead the fleet under the command of Admiral Sir Charles Napier, previous to its sailing for the Baltic. On the 12th a treaty of alliance between France, England, and Turkey was signed at Constantinople. March 25. England and France, having sent an *ultimatum* to the Russian emperor, received an answer to the effect that the czar had no answer to send. War against Russia declared on the 27th by France, and on the 28th by Great Britain. On the 21st of April Odessa was bombarded by the French and English fleets. On the 10th of May the Tiger war-steamer ran ashore near Odessa in a dense fog; in this position she was attacked by the Russians, who disabled her and took her crew of two hundred men prisoners. On the 17th Silistria was invested by the Russians, who, after a siege of forty days, abandoned their operations against the place. Two British officers, Captain Butler and Lieutenant Nasmyth, encouraged and directed the Turks in their heroic defence. On the 29th of May the allied troops disembarked at Varna, where, during the period of their encampment, they suffered greatly from disease and insufficient accommodation. On the 29th of June the Russian batteries at the Sulina mouth of the Danube were destroyed by two British steamers. In the Baltic the fortress of Gustafsvaern was bombarded by the British fleet on the 22d of May. The British force was reinforced by ten thousand French troops, who left Boulogne on the 15th of July in British ships of war. On the 16th of August the fort of Bomarsund, with a garrison of 2000 men, surrendered to the allied fleet, after three days' bombardment. On the 15th of September the Russians evacuated Moldavia, after which the Danubian provinces were garrisoned by the Austrians. On the 14th of September the allied forces landed in the Crimea, on the western shore, near 45° N. lat., without opposition. The army included 23,000 French, 25,000 British, and 8000 Turks. On the 20th the first conflict with the Russians in the Crimea took place in the battle of the Alma, in which the Russians were completely worsted. On the 26th, after a forced march of fourteen hours, the allied forces occupied Balaklava, and subsequently encamped before Sebastopol. On the 29th Marshal St. Arnaud, the commander-in-chief of the French forces, fell a victim to disease, after having transferred his command to General Canrobert. On the 17th of October the bombardment of Sebastopol by the allied armies and fleets commenced. On the 25th the Russians attacked the allies at Balaklava, but were repulsed with loss. By an unhappy misreading of an order of Lord Raglan, the Earl of Lucan directed the light cavalry to charge the overwhelming Russian force. Of 607 men who went into the action, only 198 returned. On the 5th of November the battle of Inkerman was fought, in which the Russians, in immense numbers, attempted a surprise before daybreak, but were obliged to retire with a loss of about 10,000 killed and wounded. The struggle lasted the entire day. On the 14th a violent storm occurred in the Black Sea, which destroyed many store-ships and caused great calamities on shore. This was followed by a season of intense suffering among the troops; the roads were impassable; the weather was bitterly cold; men and horses, ill supplied with food and shelter, perished in large numbers, while medical attention and hospital accommodation were woefully deficient. This being known at home from the reports of the correspondents of the newspapers, gave rise to great dissatisfaction with the management of affairs, and private subscriptions to a large amount were speedily raised to mitigate the distress. Miss Nightingale organized a numerous staff of nurses, and proceeded with them to Constantinople to superintend the hospitals, which were principally at Scutari, and to attend the sick and wounded, by which attention the lives of many hundreds were saved.

June 10. Crystal Palace at Sydenham opened by Queen Victoria.

Sept. 1. The Emperor Napoleon entertained at Boulogne the King of the Belgians, the King of Portugal, and the Prince Consort of England.

Sept. 9. The deaths from cholera in London for the week ending this day were 2050. In three months, August, September, and October, 10,500 persons died of cholera in London.

LEGISLATION. Session 17 & 18 Victoriæ.

Cap. 5. *An Act to admit Foreign Ships to the Coasting Trade.* Foreign vessels are admitted on paying the same duties as British ships.

Cap. 38. *For the suppression of Gaming Houses.*

Cap. 74. *To render Reformatory and Industrial Schools in Scotland more available for the benefit of Vagrant Children.* Young persons under fourteen found begging, and without visible means of subsistence, may be sent to these schools without being charged with crime.

Cap. 114. *To extend the Rights enjoyed by the Graduates of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, in respect to the Practice of Physic, to the Graduates of the University of London.* Bachelors and doctors of medicine are privileged to practise as physicians in the same manner as graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, but this privilege does not extend to surgery, pharmacy, or midwifery.

Revenue, 58,903,495*l.*; expenditure—army and ordnance, 9,685,079*l.*; navy, 6,640,596*l.*; for all purposes, 55,647,991*l.*; debt, 771,335,801*l.**

Exports of British and Irish produce, 97,184,726*l.*: total exports, 115,821,092*l.*; imports, 152,389,053*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 43,761; to the United States, 193,065; to Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 83,237; to other places, 3366: total, 323,429.

Railway traffic: miles open, 8054; number of passengers, 111,206,707; traffic receipts, 20,215,724*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,004,068.

1855.

Jan. 25. Lord John Russell retired from office in consequence of an approaching discussion in the House of Commons, on a motion of which Mr. Roebuck gave notice on the 23d for a select committee to inquire into the condition of our army before Sebastopol, and into the conduct of the commissariat and medical departments of the army.

Jan. 31. Resignation of Lord Aberdeen's cabinet, in consequence of the defeat of the government on the 29th, in the division on Mr. Roebuck's motion; the votes being 305 against ministers and 148 in their favor. The Earl of Derby was invited by the queen to undertake the formation of a government, but declined; Lord Palmerston accepted the responsibility, and the members of his cabinet were sworn into office on the 8th of February. The ministry stood thus: Viscount Palmerston, first lord of the treasury; Earl Granville, president of the council; Lord Cranworth, lord high chancellor; Duke of Argyll, lord privy seal; Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, chancellor of the exchequer; Sir George Grey, secretary of state for home affairs; Earl of Clarendon, foreign secretary; Right Hon. Sidney Herbert, colonial secretary; Lord Panmure, war secretary; Right Hon. Sir James Graham, first lord of the admiralty; Right Hon. Vernon Smith, president of the board of control; Sir B. Hall, commissioner of works and public buildings; Earl of Harrowby, chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster; Marquess of Lansdowne, without office.

Feb. 20. Lord John Russell left London to attend the conferences of the representatives of the great powers, on the terms of peace between Russia and Turkey, as the British plenipotentiary.

Feb. 22. Withdrawal from office of Mr. Gladstone, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Sidney Herbert, on account of the House of Commons insisting upon the appointment of a select committee in terms of Mr. Roebuck's motion. Their places in the cabinet were filled up by the appointment of Sir G. C. Lewis, Sir Charles Wood, and Lord John Russell.

April 17. Arrival of the Emperor and Empress of the French at Windsor on a visit to the queen. On the 19th they were entertained by the lord mayor at a splendid fête in the Guildhall of London. They took leave on their return home on the 21st.

April 20. The chancellor of the exchequer made his financial statement, in which he intimated that the deficiency occasioned by the Russian war was about twenty-three millions, of which he proposed to raise sixteen millions by loan, and the rest by a readjustment involving an increase of taxation.

June 13. The new Metropolitan Cattle Market opened. Prince Albert attended the opening, and, in replying to the address read to him by the recorder, after remarking on the enormous growth of London, said that this growth "imperatively requires that those establishments which are to minister to the common wants of the whole should keep pace with its growth and magnitude. This can only be undertaken by public bodies, they can only be carried out by public spirit. . . . I hail the spirit which is rising among us."

July 13. Lord John Russell resigned his office of colonial secretary, in consequence of discussions in the House of Commons in reference to the part taken by him in the Vienna conferences. He was succeeded by Sir William Molesworth.

Aug. 1. Viscount Canning was entertained at a public banquet by the East India Company, previous to his departure to assume the functions of Governor-General of India.

Aug. 18. Queen Victoria and Prince Albert visited the Emperor of the French in Paris, remaining till the 27th, when they embarked at Boulogne on their return to England.

Nov. 22. The first stone of the Birmingham and Midland Institute laid by Prince Albert. At the banquet afterward, in the Town Hall of Birmingham, in replying to the toast of his health, he dwelt on the advantages to be derived from the higher branches of education; he remarked on the error of considering scientific knowledge as antagonistic; and said, "Far be it from me to undervalue the creative power of genius, or to treat shrewd common-sense as worthless without knowledge. But nobody will tell me that the same genius would not take an incomparably higher flight, if supplied with all the means

* Up to this date the financial year ended on January 4th; all after end on March 31st.

which knowledge can impart, or that common-sense does not become, in fact, only truly powerful when in possession of the materials upon which judgment is to be exercised."

Nov. 30. The King of Sardinia arrived at Windsor on a visit to the queen.

RUSSIAN WAR.—On the 6th of January conferences were opened at Vienna between the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain, France, Austria, and Russia, with a view to the restoration of peace. These conferences continued till the 21st of April, when they were suspended without any practical result. On the 10th of January Victor Emmanuel, King of Sardinia, joined the allies, and undertook to send 15,000 men to the Crimea to aid in the war against Russia. On the 12th of February an imperial ukase ordered the organization and arming of the entire militia of the Russian empire for the defence of the "orthodox faith." On the 17th the Russians attacked Eupatoria, but were repulsed by the Turks who formed the garrison of the place. On the 2d of March Nicholas, Emperor of Russia, died, and was succeeded by his son, Alexander II. The event was announced to the British houses of parliament within five hours of the emperor's decease, the intelligence being transmitted by telegraph. On the 4th of April the British fleet, under Rear-Admiral Dundas, sailed for the Baltic. The Baltic coast was blockaded from the 19th of April. The French fleet in the Baltic was under the command of Admiral Pénaud. On the 9th of April the second bombardment of Sebastopol commenced, and was continued, with little effect, till the 28th. On the 16th of May General Canrobert resigned the chief command of the French army in the Crimea to General Pelissier, but continued to serve as a general of division. On the 24th of May Kertch was occupied by the allies, whose fleets swept the sea of Azoff, captured and garrisoned Yenikali, and bombarded Taganrog, Mariapol, Gheisk, and other towns, destroying public buildings, government magazines, and provision stores. On the 7th of June, at Sebastopol, the French troops captured the Mamelon, two redoubts, and 62 guns, and took 130 officers and 400 men prisoners. On the 18th the French attacked the Malakhoff and the English the Redan, but were repulsed by the Russians with considerable loss. On the 28th Lord Raglan, the British commander-in-chief in the Crimea, died of cholera, in his sixty-eighth year; he was succeeded by General Simpson, as next in command. On the 11th of July, in the Baltic, the fortifications of Sweaborg were bombarded by the allied fleets of England and France. On the 16th of August the battle of the Tchernaya, near Sebastopol, took place, in which the Russians were defeated by the French and the Sardinians. On the 5th of September the third bombardment of Sebastopol commenced, and on the 8th the French took the Malakhoff; the English who attempted to take the Redan were repulsed. The Russians, who had suffered to a frightful extent from the effects of the shot and shells which had been poured upon the city and its defences—about 17,000 officers and privates having been killed, wounded, and missing in three days—evacuated the south side of Sebastopol at night, after sinking their ships and blowing up the defences. On the 9th the allies took possession of the place, which they found in a ruinous condition. On the 17th of October Kinburn, at the mouth of the Dnieper, surrendered to the allies. On the 18th the Russians blew up the fortress of Oczakoff. On the 10th of November the Emperor Alexander visited his army near Sebastopol. On the 11th of November General Sir William Codrington assumed the command of the British army in the Crimea. On the 26th the fortress of Kars surrendered to the Russians, after a protracted and gallant defence, continued for several months amid severe privations; General Williams and the other English officers, his companions, who became prisoners of war, were treated with great kindness by the Russian general. On the 16th of December Austria sent proposals for peace, the terms of which had been sanctioned by the allies, to the Emperor Alexander at St. Petersburg. On the 19th the United Kingdom of Sweden and Norway joined the alliance of the Western powers.

LEGISLATION. SESSION 18 & 19 VICTORIÆ.

Cap. 27. *An Act to amend the Laws relating to the Stamp Duties on Newspapers, and to provide for the transmission by Post of printed Periodicals and Publications.* By this act the stamp duty was removed except for purposes of transmission by post.

Cap. 88. *To facilitate the erection of Dwelling-Houses for the Working Classes in Scotland.* Granting powers under supervision for small associations to hold land and build houses suitable for the working classes.

Cap. 116. *For the better Prevention of Diseases.* In case of any endemic, epidemic, or contagious disease occurring in any part of England, the privy council and the general board of health are empowered to issue rules and directions for the removal of nuisances, the speedy interment of the dead, for house to house visitation, the dispensing of medicines, etc., the expenses to be paid out of the rates or funds administered by the local authorities.

Cap. 120. *For the better Local Management of the Metropolis.* By this act the construction of sewers, and such matters as cannot be effected by parishes singly, are confided to a board, the members of which are elected by the various parishes contained in the metropolitan district.

Cap. 126. *For diminishing Expense and Delay in the Administration of Criminal Justice in certain cases.* Offenders charged with simple felony where the thing stolen does not exceed 5*s.* in value, may be dealt with summarily by a police magistrate, if they consent; and if the value exceeds 5*s.* it may be so dealt with on the offender pleading guilty; if he does not, the case must go for trial.

Cap. 132. *For facilitating the Erection of Dwelling-houses for the Working Classes.* This, with some variation in detail, is for a similar purpose to that for Scotland, stated above.

Cap. 133. *For limiting the Liability of Members of certain Joint-Stock Companies.* Enables joint-stock companies to be formed, of which the individual liabilities are limited, but they must be registered, and the word "limited" must form the last word of the name of the company, and must always appear where the title is given.

Revenue, 62,815,952*l.*; expenditure—army and ordnance, 15,631,-602*l.*; navy, 14,490,105*l.*; for all purposes, 65,721,755*l.*; debt, 801,-978,763*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce, 95,688,085*l.*: total exports, 116,691,300*l.*; imports, 142,542,850*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 17,966; to the United States, 103,414; to Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 52,309; to all other places, 3118: total, 176,807.

Railway traffic: miles open, 8280; number of passengers, 118,595,-135; traffic receipts, 21,507,599*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,018,075.

1856.

Jan. 31. The queen, in opening parliament, announced that Russia had accepted as a basis for negotiation the proposals for a general peace put forth by Austria, with the sanction of the other allied powers.

Feb. 1. Protocol signed at Vienna by the representatives of Russia, France, Great Britain, Austria, and Turkey, accepting the Austrian propositions as a basis for peace.

Feb. 1. Dispatch from General Codrington announcing that the destruction of the Sebastopol docks had been completely effected.

Feb. 5. A new order of merit, "The Victoria Cross," instituted, the decoration of which is to be conferred upon inferior officers and privates in the army and navy for distinguished gallantry.

Feb. 7. The Governor-General of India announced by a proclamation the deposition of the King of Oude, and the annexation of his territory to the British possessions in India. The king was allowed a pension of 120,000*l.* a year.

Feb. 25. The peace conferences opened at Paris, attended by the representatives of France, Austria, Great Britain, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey. Prussia was subsequently admitted.

Feb. 29. Suspension of hostilities in the Crimea.

March 16. Birth of the Prince Imperial of France. On this occasion the emperor issued an amnesty in favor of upward of a thousand political exiles.

April 25. The queen reviewed a fleet of more than 300 men-of-war at Portsmouth. At the commencement of the review the fleet extended in an unbroken line of anchorage for about five miles.

April 29. Peace with Russia officially proclaimed by a herald in the streets of London.

May 3. An amnesty granted to political exiles, in virtue of which Frost, Williams, Jones, and Smith O'Brien were permitted to return to England. On the 11th of November a free pardon was granted by the queen to these political offenders.

May 29. Public celebration of the conclusion of peace. Magnificent fireworks in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin. A general illumination took place.

June 1. Disastrous inundations in France. For the relief of the sufferers subscriptions were raised in England to the amount of more than 40,000*l.*

July 12. Evacuation of the Crimea by the allied troops.

Oct. 8. Seizure by the Chinese authorities of a lorcha, or small trading vessel, which bore the British flag. This led to hostilities between Great Britain and China.

Oct. 13. Surrender of the city of Herat to the Persians, when the governor and his family were put to death. The Persians having thus violated a treaty to which Great Britain was a party, war was proclaimed against Persia at Calcutta on the 1st of November.

Oct. 24. Canton attacked by the British, who bombarded it on the 3d of November.

Oct. 27. Railway opened between Montreal and Toronto.

Nov. 22. An insurrection in Sicily suppressed by the military.

Dec. 9. Bushire, in the Persian Gulf, taken by the British expedition.

Dec. 10. Mr. Sheepshanks presented to the nation his collection of drawings and paintings. The collection has been placed in the South Kensington Museum.

Dec. 16. The queen went to Spithead to receive from the representative of the United States government the Arctic discovery ship Resolute, which having been abandoned in the ice by its crew, was recovered by an American ship, and having been completely repaired by the American government, was now restored to Great Britain.

LEGISLATION. SESSION 19 & 20 VICTORIÆ.

Cap. 47. *An Act for the Incorporation and Regulation of Joint-Stock Companies and other Associations.* One of the most important parts of this act is that relating to the winding-up of companies.

Cap. 64. *To Repeal certain Statutes not in use.* One hundred and

welve statutes, most of them obsolete, but hitherto unrepealed, are once swept away.

Cap. 65. *To Encourage the Providing of Improved Dwellings for the aboring Classes in Ireland.*

Cap. 69. *To render more effectual the Police in Counties and Boroughs England and Wales.* This empowers the justices assembled in uarter sessions to adopt and enforce a more general system than had therto taken place; the divisional police of a county was to be consolidated, unless the secretary of state authorizes a division; and unty constables are empowered to act in any borough within the unty; and boroughs may be consolidated with the county for the rposes of police.

Cap. 83. *To Provide for the better Defence of the Coasts of the Realm, d the more ready Manning of the Navy, and to transfer to the Admilty the management of the Coast Guard.* The coast-guard men are to ve the privilege of making allotments of wages, and of pensions, seamen in the navy, and the officers are to have the training of the oyal Naval Coast Volunteers.

Cap. 98. *To amend the Laws relating to the Burial of the Dead in eland.* This establishes burial boards in Ireland as in England.

Revenue, 70,262,882*l.*; expenditure—army, including ordnance, 0,006,603*l.*; navy, 19,654,585*l.*; for all purposes, 88,453,385*l.*; debt, 9,579,798*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce, 115,826,948*l.*: total exports, 9,220,353*l.*; imports, 172,544,154*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 16,378; to the United tates, 111,837; to Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 44,584; to l other places, 3755: total, 176,554.

Railway traffic: miles open, 8707; number of passengers, 129,347,- 2; traffic receipts, 23,165,491*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,030,823.

1857.

[This year was remarkable for the mutiny of the native army in ritish India, which was not finally subdued till 1858. It may be nvenient to give the events connected with this alarming outbreak nder a separate head in each of these years, after the general chrology.]

Feb. 3. Parliament opened by commission.

March 3. A motion proposed by Mr. Cobden censuring the governent for the war with China, was carried, after four nights' discuson in the House of Commons, by 263 to 247 votes.

March 3. Treaty of peace between Great Britain and Persia, signed Paris by Lord Cowley and Ferukh-Khan.

March 3. Election of Mr. Buchanan as President of the United tates of North America.

March 13. The chancellor of the exchequer brought forward his udget, which contained proposals for the remission of taxation to ne extent of eleven millions.

March 14. Treaty signed at Copenhagen for the abolition of the ound dues. The share of indemnity money payable by Great ritain was 1,125,206*l.*

March 19. Prince Albert, accompanied by the Prince of Wales, pened new schools in Golden Lane, Barbican. In the course of his nswer to the address presented to him, he said, "You have not been ontent with the bare attempt to force, perhaps upon unwilling recients, a boon, the value of which might not be appreciated, but you ave wisely sought to work upon the convictions of the parents of ne children you wish to benefit, by extending your assistance only those who, by a small contribution out of their hardly-won earngs, have proved that they are awake to a sense of the vast imporance it is to their offspring that the means of being fitted to pass succssfully through life, and, by honest industry, to better their conition, should be brought within their reach."

March 21. Parliament dissolved, and a new parliament summoned.

April 21. Departure of the Earl of Elgin on a special embassy to ne Emperor of China at Pekin.

May 5. Prince Albert opened the Exhibition of Art Treasures at Manchester. In addressing the committee, he remarked on the generous feeling of mutual confidence and good-will between the ifferent classes of society, of which it [the exhibition] affords so ratifying a proof."

May 7. Parliament opened by commission. Mr. J. Evelyn Denison lected Speaker of the House of Commons.

May 21. The House of Commons agreed to grant to the princess oyal an annuity of 8000*l.* per annum, and a dower of 40,000*l.*, on ccasion of her marriage with Prince Frederick William of Prussia.

June 1. A number of war junks taken from the Chinese in the anton River.

June 22. Educational conference in London, at which Prince Albert resided. In his speech he detailed some of the statistics of the state f education, but he said, "You will probably trace the cause of ur social condition to a state of ignorance and lethargic indifference n the subject among parents generally; but the root of the evil will, suspect, be found to extend into that field on which the political conomist exercises his activity—I mean the labor market—demand nd supply." He pointed out how this acted. Of the laborer he aid, "His children are not only his offspring, to be reared for a uture independent position, but they constitute part of his produc ive power, and work with him for the staff of life." He therefore xhorted the meeting to work "upon the minds and hearts of parents, to place before them the irreparable mischief which they inflict," by keeping their children from the "right of knowledge."

June 25. An order in council conferred the title of Prince Consort on Prince Albert.

July 11. Failure of the Atlantic telegraph cable, the cable having snapped after 335 miles length had been given out.

July 25. Public meeting at the Mansion House, London, in aid of the sufferers from the Indian mutiny. In the course of three months upward of 260,000*l.* was raised for this purpose.

Nov. 12. In consequence of a severe commercial panic, the government authorized the Bank of England to extend its issues, which had the effect of mitigating the pressure upon the money market, and restoring confidence. An estimate was made to the effect that the aggregate liabilities of commercial houses, which had fallen during the panic, amounted to about forty-five millions sterling. At this time there was great distress in the manufacturing districts.

Nov. 18. Ambassadors from the two kings of Siam received by Queen Victoria at a court held at Windsor.

Nov. 18. Great distress in Kafirland. About 30,000 destitute Kafirs brought in as servants to the Cape Colonists.

Dec. 3. Parliament opened by the queen in person, having met at this season chiefly for the purpose of passing a bill of indemnity, exonerating the government in regard to the permission given to the Bank of England to extend its issues for the purpose of mitigating the pressure of the recent commercial panic. On the 12th the royal assent was given to the bill of indemnity, and the houses adjourned.

Dec. 29. Canton taken by the British forces, and Commissioner Yeh made prisoner.

India.—Jan. 24. A mutinous spirit began to manifest itself among the Sepoys of the East India Company's army at Barrackpoor, Berhampoor, Lucknow, Meerut, and elsewhere. The origin of the disaffection was said to be the use of cartridges made up in paper which had been greased with a mixture of cow's fat and hog's lard—a composition offensive to the Hindoo, who regards the cow with religious veneration, and also to the Mohammedan, who looks upon the hog with abhorrence. On the 10th of May the mutiny broke out at Meerut, from which place the insurgents marched to Delhi, where, on the 11th, being joined by several native regiments, they proclaimed the King of Delhi as emperor, and massacred many of the English residents. Lieutenant Willoughby blew up the magazine, and made his escape. On the 20th General Anson arrived before Delhi with a small force of British and native troops. On the 27th General Anson died of cholera, which also struck down his successor, Sir H. Barnard. General Reed, who took the command on July 5th, was obliged, from ill health, to transfer it to General Wilson on the 22d. General Nicholson having arrived with reinforcements, Delhi was taken by assault on the 14th of September, the fight being continued in the city till the 20th. The British lost about 1200 killed and wounded. General Nicholson died on the 23d. The native troops, at Lucknow, broke out in mutiny on the 31st of May. They were dispersed by the troops under Sir Henry Lawrence. On the 5th of June the Europeans at Allahabad were besieged in the fort by the mutineers. The small British force in Cawnpore were in like manner hemmed in, and were compelled to surrender to Nana Sahib on the 26th of June, General Wheeler having died on the 21st from a wound received in making a sally on the previous day. The English were embarked in boats on the Ganges, to be conveyed to Allahabad, in accordance with the terms of surrender. They were fired upon with cannon, many boats were sunk, and those persons who got on shore were cut down. Colonel Havelock, who had arrived at Calcutta from the Persian Gulf on the 17th of June, was immediately dispatched, with the rank of brigadier-general, in command of the troops intended for the relief of Cawnpore. On the 1st of July General Havelock left Allahabad with a force of 2000 Europeans, on the 16th he defeated Nana Sahib before Cawnpore, and on the 17th entered the town. On the 19th he again defeated Nana Sahib at Bithoor. At Lucknow, in a sortie against the Sepoy besiegers, on the 2d of July, Sir Henry Lawrence was wounded, and died on the 4th—Major Banks took the command, and held possession of the Residency and fort. On the 15th General Neill defeated the mutineers at the Pundoo Nuddee, south of Cawnpore. On the 16th Nana Sahib murdered the women and children who were in his custody at Cawnpore, and flung their bodies into a wide and deep well. On the same day General Havelock gained his ninth victory between Cawnpore and Lucknow. On the 25th of September he reached Lucknow with 2500 troops, and relieved the Europeans besieged in the Residency. On the 26th he forced the mutineers to abandon their intrenchments. On the 3d of November Sir Colin Campbell, who had been appointed commander-in-chief of the army in India on the 11th of July, and left London for Calcutta on the 12th, arrived at Cawnpore. On the 17th of November he delivered the Europeans from their confinement in the Residency, which was evacuated by the 23d. On the 25th of November Sir Henry Havelock died, eight days after he received the tidings of his having been created a Knight Commander of the Bath. On the 6th of December Sir Colin Campbell defeated the Gwalior contingent, and on the 8th Sir Hope Grant also defeated them higher up the Ganges.

LEGISLATION. Session 20 & 21 Victoriæ.

Cap. 3. *An Act to Amend the Act of the* 16 *&* 17 *Victoria, cap.* 95, *to substitute in certain Cases other Punishment in lieu of Transportation.*

No offender in future to be sentenced to transportation, but persons under sentence of penal servitude may be sent to places beyond sea, the privy council appointing the places; and magistrates may commit convicts whose licenses are revoked to penal servitude in any convict prison.

Cap. 14. *An Act to Amend the Joint-Stock Companies Act*, 1856. Much of this act relates to the duties of officials, but it also enacts that where more than 20 persons are engaged in partnership, and are not registered, each is declared separately liable for the debts of the firm. When a winding-up order has been obtained against any company, the liquidator may obtain a warrant for the arrest of any shareholder whom he may have reason to suspect of being about to abscond or to conceal his property, and his books, papers, moneys, and other property may be seized.

Cap. 48. *To make better Provision for the Care and Education of Vagrant, Destitute and Disorderly Children, and for the Extension of Industrial Schools.* Parents may be compelled to pay toward the support of their child a sum of not more than 3*s.* per week.

Cap. 54. *To make better Provision for the Punishment of Frauds committed by Trustees, Bankers, and other Persons intrusted with Property.* After detailing the various frauds enacted against—as appropriating property, making false statements with intent to deceive; keeping fraudulent accounts, etc.—the offender is declared liable to penal imprisonment for three, or by imprisonment with or without hard labor for two, years, or by fine as the court shall direct.

Cap. 71. *For the Regulation of the Care and Treatment of Lunatics, and for the Provision, Maintenance, and Regulation of Lunatic Asylums in Scotland.* Private asylums are to be licensed; district asylums are to be provided in the large towns, and commissioners to be appointed who are to inspect and make an annual report.

Cap. 72. *To render more effectual the Police in Counties and Burghs in Scotland.* This act in effect is for organizing a general police in Scotland, which had previously been only local.

Cap. 77. *To Amend the Laws relating to Probate and Letters of Administration in England.* This important act removes the jurisdiction in all such matters, from the ecclesiastical courts to a special court instituted by this act; cap. 79 was a similar act for Ireland.

Cap. 83. *An Act for more effectually Preventing the Sale of Obscene Books, Pictures, Prints, and other Articles.* On information given upon oath, magistrates may issue search warrants, authorizing the use of force in the day-time, in order to search the suspected premises.

Cap. 85. *To Amend the Law relating to Divorce and Matrimonial Causes in England.* This, like cap. 77, removes all such matters from the ecclesiastical courts to a court especially appointed, of which the judge holds the same office in the Probate Court; the lord chancellor, the chief judges, and the senior puisne judges of the law courts may sit with him; and in suits for annulling marriage, applications for new trials, etc., they must be heard by three or more judges, the judge of the probate court being always one.

Revenue, 72,334,062*l.*; expenditure—army, 20,811,242*l.*; navy, 13,459,012*l.*; for all objects, 71,371,533*l.*; debt, 834,722,963*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce, 122,066,107*l.*: total of exports, 146,174,301*l.*; imports, 187,844,441*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 21,001; to the United States, 126,905; to Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 61,248; to all other places, 3721: total, 212,875.

Railway traffic: miles open, 9094; number of passengers, 139,008,888; traffic receipts, 24,174,610*l.*

Number of paupers, 979,117.

1858.

Jan. 14. An attempt was made to assassinate the Emperor and Empress of the French by an explosion of hand grenades. The emperor and empress escaped unhurt, but five persons were killed and about sixty wounded. For this attempt five persons were tried and convicted, of whom two, Orsini and Pieri, were guillotined at Paris.

Jan. 25. Marriage of the Princess Royal of England with Prince Frederick William of Prussia, in the chapel of St. James's Palace.

Jan. 31. Completion of the launch of the Great Eastern steamship, the commencement having been made about three months previously.

Feb. 10. The blockade of Canton raised.

Feb. 22. Lord Palmerston's cabinet resigned, in consequence of an adverse vote (234 to 215) of the House of Commons, proposed by Mr. Milner Gibson, expressing regret that her majesty's government, previously to inviting the house to amend the law of conspiracy, had not made some reply to the dispatch received from the French government dated January 20th, 1858. On the retirement of Viscount Palmerston the Earl of Derby was intrusted with the formation of a ministry. The new cabinet was constituted as follows: Earl of Derby, first lord of the treasury; Marquess of Salisbury, president of the council; Lord Chelmsford, lord high chancellor; Earl of Hardwicke, lord privy seal; Rt. Hon. B. Disraeli, chancellor of the exchequer; Rt. Hon. Spencer Walpole, secretary of state for home affairs; Earl of Malmesbury, foreign secretary; Rt. Hon. Sir E. B. Lytton, colonial secretary; Major-General Peel, secretary for war; Earl of Ellenborough, president of the board of control; Rt. Hon. Sir J. S. Pakington, first lord of the admiralty; Rt. Hon. J. W. Henley, president of the board of trade; Lord John Manners, president of the board of works.

March 14. A proclamation was issued by the Governor-General of India to the people of Oude, threatening confiscation of the lands of such talookdhars as do not submit to the government. This proclamation was disapproved by Lord Ellenborough, the president of the board of control, and the publication in this country of his dispatch to the governor-general upon the subject led to Lord Ellenborough's withdrawal from the cabinet.

March 15. Lord Malmesbury, the foreign secretary, laid on the table of the House of Lords the correspondence that had taken place between her majesty's government since its accession to office and the French government, and said that the correspondence had concluded in all honor and good feeling on both sides.

March 30. Conference at Shanghai of the representatives of Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States. The reply of the Chinese government to the communications of the ambassadors being considered unsatisfactory, it was resolved to proceed to Tien-tsin.

May 15. Massacre of the English and French consuls, and about 20 other Europeans, at Jeddah, the port of Mecca.

May 20. Arrival of the British and French expedition at Tien-tsin, after having captured the Pei-ho forts.

May 26. Treaty of Tien-tsin concluded between the Chinese government and Great Britain, represented by the Earl of Elgin. Separate treaties with the Chinese were made by France, Russia, and America.

July 23. Jeddah bombarded by the British ship Cyclops, and again on the 5th of August.

Aug. 5. The queen and prince consort visited the Emperor Napoleon at Cherbourg on occasion of the opening of the Napoleon Docks.

Aug. 12. The Earl of Elgin landed at Jeddo, the capital of Japan, and negotiated a favorable treaty with the emperor, which was signed on the 26th.

Aug. 22. Congratulatory message sent by Queen Victoria to President Buchanan by the Atlantic Telegraph and responded to in a friendly manner by the president. The telegraph soon ceased to transmit messages, and the efforts made to effect a communication by telegraph between the opposite shores of the Atlantic have been unsuccessful.

Sept. 1. The East India Company's government transferred to the crown by act of parliament, which was announced throughout India by a royal proclamation on the 1st of November.

India.—On the 2d of January Sir Colin Campbell defeated the rebels at Futtehghur, and established an artillery depot there. On the 9th the first party of ladies and children, and of sick and wounded officers from Lucknow, arrived at Calcutta. They landed under a royal salute, amid the cheering of several hundreds of Europeans. On the 29th Saugor, in Central India, which had been invested by the rebels for upward of six months, was relieved by Sir Hugh Rose. March 2. Sir Colin Campbell commenced the siege of Lucknow, taking possession of the Dilkoosha Palace and park. On the 19th Lucknow fell into the hands of the British, the rebels, to the number of 50,000, seeking safety in flight. On the 13th of April the garrison of Azinghur was relieved by Sir E. Lugard. On the 13th of May Sir Hope Grant defeated the rebels at Nawabgunge, near Lucknow, and on the 23d the strong fortress of Calpee was taken by Sir Hugh Rose. On the 19th of June Sir Hugh Rose retook Gwalior from the rebels, and reinstated the Maharaja Sindia in his capital and possessions.

LEGISLATION. Session 21 & 22 Victoriæ.

Cap. 26. *An Act to abolish the Property Qualifications of Members of Parliament.* Repealing all the acts requiring a property qualification for a member of parliament.

Cap. 48. *To substitute one Oath for the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration, and for the relief of her Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish Religion.* Preserves the form of oath, allows Quakers to "affirm" instead of "swear," and Jews to omit the words, "on the faith of a Christian."

Cap. 49. *To provide for the Relief of her Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish Religion.* This act admits Jews to sit in parliament, but they are restricted from presenting to any ecclesiastical benefice, and from holding the offices of lord chancellor, lord lieutenant of Ireland, or high commissioner of the general assembly of the Church of Scotland.

Cap. 90. *To regulate the Qualifications of Practitioners in Medicine and Surgery.* Councils are appointed to examine applicants as to qualifications, and on approval they receive certificates entitling them to practise. The act also regulates the Royal College of Physicians, and the College of Surgeons in London, and other medical colleges.

Cap. 91. *To enable Joint-Stock Banking Companies to be formed on the Principle of Limited Liability.* Repeals so much of a former act as prevented the formation of such companies; but only on condition of not issuing notes in the United Kingdom.

Cap. 99. *To provide for the Government of British Columbia.* By this act British Columbia was constituted a distinct colony.

Cap. 106. *For the better Government of India.* This act transferred the government of India from the board of directors to her majesty, with a new secretary of state for its management.

Revenue, 67,881,513*l.*; expenditure—army, 14,405,850*l.*; navy, 10,590,000*l.*; for all objects, 68,128,859*l.*; debt, 826,134,640*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce, 116,608,756*l.* : total exports, 139,782,779*l.* ; imports, 164,588,832*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 9704 ; to the United States, 59,716 ; to Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 39,295 , to all other places, 5257 : total, 113,972.

Amount of gold imported from Australia, 9,064,763*l.* ; total imported, 22,793,126*l.**

Railway traffic : miles open, 9542 ; number of passengers, 139,-193,699 ; traffic receipts, 23,956,749*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,037,967.

1859.

Jan. 9. The Governor-General of India published decrees constituting the Punjaub a lieutenant-governorship and ordering the general disarming of Upper India.

Jan. 25. At this date the entire pacification of Oude was reported.

Jan. 30. Prince Napoleon, cousin of the emperor, married at Turin to Princess Clothilde, daughter of the King of Sardinia.

Feb. 3. Parliament opened by the queen in person.

March 1. Mr. Walpole and Mr. Henley stated to the House of Commons their reasons for withdrawing from Lord Derby's government on account of some of the provisions of the Reform Bill proposed by the government.

March 31. The debate in the House of Commons on the Government Reform Bill, which had continued for several days, terminated in the defeat of ministers by a majority of 330 against 291 votes.

April 18. Tantia Topee, one of the leaders of the Indian Mutiny, executed at Seepree by sentence of a court-martial.

April 19. Parliament dissolved.

June 7. Queen Victoria opened parliament in person. On the address in answer to the queen's speech the ministers were left in a minority of 13—the votes being 323 to 310—and in consequence resigned the office. Viscount Palmerston was intrusted with the formation of a new cabinet. The ministry, as arranged by him, was as follows : Viscount Palmerston, first lord of the treasury ; Earl Granville, president of the council ; Lord Campbell, lord high chancellor ; Duke of Argyll, lord privy seal ; Rt. Hon. W. E Gladstone, chancellor of the exchequer ; Rt. Hon. Sir G. C. Lewis, secretary of state for home affairs ; Lord John Russell, foreign secretary ; Duke of Newcastle, colonial secretary ; Rt. Hon. Sidney Herbert, secretary for war ; Rt. Hon. Sir C. Wood, secretary for India ; Duke of Somerset, first lord of the admiralty ; Rt. Hon. E. Cardwell, chief secretary for Ireland ; Earl of Elgin, postmaster-general ; Rt. Hon. T. M. Gibson, president of board of trade ; Rt. Hon. C. P. Villiers, president of poor-law board ; Rt. Hon. Sir George Grey, chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

June 25. The allied forces accompanying the English and French ambassadors to the Chinese court, being obstructed in their passage up the Pei-ho River, on their way to Pekin, attempted to force their way, but were repulsed with the loss of about 450 men.

Aug. 13. Parliament prorogued by commission.

Oct. 30. For several months a large proportion of the workmen employed in the building trades of the metropolis continued on strike, their demand being chiefly for the establishment of nine hours as the time of a working day : much distress prevailed in the families of the workmen. Many of the employers having adopted the rule of payment by the hour, the men gradually returned to work.

Italy.—On the 1st of January the emperor of the French, at his new year's day reception of the foreign ambassadors, said to M. de Hubner, the Austrian representative : "I regret that our relations with your government are not so good as they were, but I request you to tell the emperor that my personal feelings for him have not changed." These words reported in the newspapers caused a great sensation throughout Europe. On the 10th the King of Sardinia, in opening the Piedmontese Chambers in Turin, said : "The horizon in which the new year rises is not perfectly serene. . . . While we respect treaties, we are not insensible to the cry of grief which reaches us from so many parts of Italy." On the 11th of February Count Cavour, the Piedmontese prime minister, in a speech to the Turin Chamber of Deputies, charged Austria with assuming an offensive attitude toward Sardinia by placing large bodies of troops along the frontier. On the 27th Lord Cowley arrived at Vienna, as an envoy from the British government, with a view to mediate between the Austrian government on the one hand and France and Sardinia on the other. This mission was unsuccessful. On the 1st of April the French government decided to send an army of 60,000 men to the Sardinian frontier. On the 19th the Austrian government sent an *ultimatum* to the Court of Turin, requiring Sardinia to disarm immediately, and to disband the Italian volunteers. Three days were allowed for an answer. Sardinia rejected this *ultimatum*, and Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia protested against the conduct of Austria. France proceeded to prepare for war. Peaceful revolutions took place on the 27th in Tuscany, and on the 31st at Parma, provisional governments being formed in both cases. On the 29th the Austrian army crossed the Ticino. On the 20th of May the French and Piedmontese, under the command of the Emperor Napoleon and Victor Emmanuel, defeated the Austrians at Montebello. On the 27th Garibaldi, at the head of the Italian Volunteers, took possession of the city of Como, after defeating the Austrians in several engagements. On the 30th the Emperor of Austria put himself at the head of his army at Verona. On the 31st the Austrian army was defeated by the Sardinians at Palestro. On the 1st of June the French troops occupied Novara. On the 4th was fought the battle of Magenta, in which the Emperor of the French commanded the Imperial Guard and the zouaves. The Austrians were defeated with immense loss in killed, wounded, and prisoners. On the 5th Milan and on the 7th Pavia were evacuated by the Austrians. On the 8th the Emperor Napoleon and Victor Emmanuel entered Milan in triumph. On the 22d the Austrian army retreated across the Mincio. On the 24th the battle of Solferino took place, in which the Austrians, 170,000 in number, were commanded by the Emperor Francis Joseph, and the allied French and Sardinians, numbering about 150,-000, by the Emperor Napoleon. The battle, which lasted from five o'clock in the morning till eight at night, was attended with enormous slaughter. An armistice was agreed to on the 8th of July, and on the 11th a personal interview took place at Villafranca, between the emperors of France and Austria, who came to an agreement as to the terms of peace. The treaty of peace was signed at Zurich, on the 11th of November, by the representatives of Austria, France, and Sardinia. On the 18th of November General Garibaldi published a proclamation to the Italians, intimating his withdrawal from the service in consequence of the obstacles placed in his path by the demands of a crafty policy, but exhorting the Italians to rally round Victor Emmanuel.

LEGISLATION. Session 22 & 23 Victoriæ.

Cap. 27. *An Act to facilitate Grants of Land to be made near Populous Places for the Use of Regulated Recreation for Adults, and as Play-grounds for Children.* Enabling lands given for such purposes to be held by trustees, empowering corporations and parishes to grant lands, for the purchase or maintenance of which personal property of not more than 1000*l.* in value may be bequeathed.

Cap. 34. *To amend and explain the Act of the 6 Geo. IV. cap. 129, to repeal the Laws relating to the Combination of Workmen, and to make other Provisions in lieu thereof.* Allows workmen to unite for the purpose of regulating their wages or other matters, peaceably and in a reasonable manner, and without threat or intimidation, direct or indirect, but not to break or to induce another to break any contract.

Cap. 56. *To amend the Act 5 and 6 Wm. IV. cap. 63, relating to Weights and Measures.* Imperial standards are to be furnished, and inspectors appointed in counties and towns who are to examine beams, scales, weights, and measures ; false ones being subject to forfeiture and fine. Owners of markets are to provide such articles for general use, and to have their accuracy tested at least twice a year.

Cap. 66. *For regulating Measures used in the Sale of Gas.* A general act by which inspectors are appointed, and meters are to be examined and stamped, and no meter to be considered legal unless stamped.

Revenue, 65,477,284*l.* ; expenditure—army, 13,294,814*l.* ; navy, 9,215,487*l.* ; for all objects, 60,147,914*l.* ; debt, 823,934,880*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce, 130,411,529*l.* : total exports, 155,692,795*l.* ; imports, 179,182,355*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 6689 ; to United States, 70,303 ; to Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 31,013 ; to all other places, 12,427 : total, 120,432.

Amount of gold imported from Australia, 8,624,566*l.* : total imported, 22,297,698*l.* ; exported, 18,081,139*l.*

Railway traffic : miles open, 10,002 ; number of passengers, 149,-807,148 ; traffic receipts, 25,743,502*l.*

Number of paupers, 983,837.

1860.

Jan. 24. Parliament opened by the queen in person. The speech stated that a conference of the great powers of Europe had been proposed with reference to the affairs of Italy, but the conference had been postponed—whether in congress or in separate negotiation, her majesty would "endeavor to obtain for the people of Italy freedom from foreign interference by force of arms in their internal concerns."

Feb. 10. The chancellor of the exchequer brought forward his budget, which included, among other measures, an extension of the license system to refreshment houses for the sale of wines, the abolition of the duties on paper and numerous other articles, with the income-tax at sevenpence in the pound on incomes between 100*l.* and 150*l.*, and tenpence in the pound on incomes above 150*l.* a year.

March 1. Lord John Russell introduced a bill to amend the representation of the people of England and Wales. Similar reform bills were introduced for Scotland and Ireland.

Feb. 12. By votes recorded on the 11th and 12th, the people of Tuscany and the Romagna decided on annexation to Sardinia.

Feb. 15. General rising of the people of Sicily against the Neapolitan government.

Feb. 24. Treaty between France and Sardinia signed at Turin, by which Savoy and Nice were annexed to France.

May 1. War between the Maoris of New Zealand and the British, in consequence of a dispute about the sale of some lands.

May 3. Lord John Russell's Reform Bill was read a second time in the House of Commons, after being debated for four nights.

* The imports of bullion were not registered at the Custom House until November, 1857.

May 16. Garibaldi's troops defeated those of the King of Naples at Lioppo. On the 17th Garibaldi issued a proclamation announcing that he had assumed the responsibility of the dictatorship of Sicily.

May 21. In the House of Lords, on the motion of Lord Monteagle, the Paper Duties Repeal Bill was thrown out by 193 votes to 104.

May 22. Garibaldi defeated the Neapolitan forces, and on the 27th entered Palermo. On the 29th the ministers of the King of Naples resigned their functions.

June 1. Armistice agreed to between Garibaldi and the Neapolitan troops in Sicily.

June 11. Lord John Russell stated in the House of Commons that, in consequence of the large number of amendments on the proposed Reform Bill of which notice had been given, and the lateness of the session, the government had resolved to withdraw the bill.

June 23. The queen reviewed 18,000 volunteers in Hyde Park.

July 5. The House of Commons, on the motion of Lord Palmerston, passed three resolutions in vindication of the privileges of the house against the recent aggression of the Lords, in throwing out the Paper Duties Repeal Bill, the rejecting of which, being a money bill, was not within the province of the Lords.

July 9. The Prince of Wales, accompanied by the Duke of Newcastle, secretary of state for the colonies, embarked at Plymouth on a visit to Canada and the United States. On the 18th of August the prince was at Quebec. On the 20th of September he entered the United States on his way to Washington to visit the president, travelling under the title of Baron Renfrew. On the 15th of November he landed at Plymouth on his return home.

July 16. Opening of the fourth annual congress of the International Statistical Congress in London, when the prince consort, as president, delivered an address.

July 21. England, France, and other European powers united in sending an expedition to Syria to protect the life and property of Europeans, and arrest the effusion of blood, in the conflicts which might occur and were still threatened between the Druses and the Maronites.

Aug. 7. The queen reviewed about 20,000 volunteers in the Queen's Park, Edinburgh.

Aug. 20. Fuad Pasha, the commissioner sent to Syria by the sultan, caused 167 persons implicated in the massacres in Syria to be executed in Damascus, and many others to be sent to Constantinople to be imprisoned and put to hard labor.

Aug. 21. The Taku forts at the mouth of the Pei-ho River taken by the British and French troops, after a determined resistance by the Tartars forming the garrison. The allies proceeded to occupy Tien-tsin, the ambassadors and the main body of the army going on toward Pekin.

Aug. 28. Parliament closed by commission.

Sept. 7. The King of Naples left his capital in a Spanish ship for Gaeta. Garibaldi entered Naples on the 8th, accompanied only by his staff, and immediately organized a government. On the 9th he proclaimed Victor Emmanuel King of Italy, and on the 11th handed over the Neapolitan fleet to the Sardinian admiral.

Sept. 29. Ancona capitulated to the Sardinians. The papal army, with their commander, General Lamoricière, surrendered themselves prisoners of war.

Oct. 1. Garibaldi defeated the Neapolitans in the battle of the Volturno.

Oct. 24. Peace concluded between Great Britain and France on the one hand and China on the other. The allies were represented by the Earl of Elgin and Baron Gros ; China was represented by Prince Kung, brother of the emperor. On the 5th of November the allied forces left Pekin.

Nov. 7. The King of Sardinia entered Naples, and was received with general enthusiasm. On the 9th Garibaldi retired to his small property on the little island of Caprera.

Dec. 13. Death of the Earl of Aberdeen, aged 77.

Dec. 14. Message of President Buchanan to the United States Congress, deprecating the threatened secession of the Southern States.

Dec. 20. Secession of South Carolina from the United States of North America.

LEGISLATION. Session 23 & 24 Victoriæ.

Cap. 8. *An Act to amend the Law relating to the unlawful Administering of Poisons.* Administering poisons or noxious substances with intent to injure, aggrieve, or annoy, is made punishable as a misdemeanor for three years, with or without hard labor ; if endangering life or causing bodily harm, by penal servitude for not more than ten nor less than three years. Persons indicted for the felony may be convicted of the misdemeanor.

Cap. 11. *To amend the Law relating to Endowed Schools.* Provides for the admission of children of parents not in communion with the Church of England, were not expressly required by the endowment.

Cap. 27. *For granting to Her Majesty certain Duties on Wine Licenses and Refreshment Houses, and for regulating the licensing of Refreshment Houses, and the granting of Wine Licenses.* Licenses for the retailing of foreign wine to be drunk on the premises to be granted by the commissioners of inland revenue, within certain limited hours, and under certain regulations.

Cap. 78. *To place the Employment of Women, young Persons, and Children in Bleaching Works and Dyeing Works, under the Regulations of the Factory Acts.*

Cap. 84. *For preventing the Adulteration of Articles of Food or Drink.* Articles of food adulterated with anything prejudicial to health subjects the seller, if aware of it, to a penalty of 5*l*. Chemical analyzers are to be appointed, and purchasers may have a suspected article analyzed on payment of a fee varying from 2*s*. 6*d*. to 10*s*. 6*d*.

Cap. 151. *For the Regulation and Inspection of Mines.* Forbids the employment of boys under the age of twelve, or not under ten, with a certificate of having attended school for a certain period. Penalties are imposed for giving false certificates, and inspectors are appointed.

Cap. 154. *To consolidate and amend the Law of Landlord and Tenant in Ireland.* Several acts are repealed, and fixtures of trade and agriculture erected by a tenant at his own expense are made removable, if not injuring the freehold. Compensation is to be made for the crops or manuring the land on the removal of the tenant.

Revenue, 71,089,669*l*. ; expenditure—army, 14,915,243*l*. ; navy, 11,823,859*l*. ; for all objects, 69,502,289*l*. ; debt, 819,079,310*l*.

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 9786 ; to United States, 87,500 ; to Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 24,302 ; to all other places, 6881 : total, 128,469.

Amount of gold imported from Australia, 6,719,000*l*. : total imported, 12,584,684*l*. ; exported, 10,393,512*l*.

Railway traffic : miles open, 10,433 ; number of passengers, 163,483,572 ; traffic receipts, 27,766,622*l*.

Number of paupers, 973,255.

1861.

Jan. 1. The French government abolished the passport system in respect of British subjects travelling in France.

Jan. 3. President Buchanan received commissioners from South Carolina, who requested that the troops should be removed from the forts of the United States in Charleston Harbor. The president, in accordance with the views of the majority of his cabinet, refused to withdraw the troops.

Jan. 12. Famine in North-western India, owing to want of rain. Besides money granted by the government, and raised by subscription in Calcutta, upward of 100,000*l*. was transmitted from London and Liverpool, the contributions of the people of Great Britain for the relief of the starving millions of the Indian rice country.

Feb. 4. The Emperor Napoleon, in opening the French legislative chambers, invited free discussion on the topics submitted to their consideration, and intimated that the newspapers would now be permitted to publish the debates.

Feb. 5. Parliament opened by the queen in person, who in the royal speech expressed her concern at the unhappy differences which had arisen between the States composing the North American Union, and her heartfelt wish that these differences might be susceptible of a satisfactory adjustment.

Feb. 14. Gaeta surrendered to the Piedmontese general, Cialdini, after suffering severely from the prolonged siege and bombardment. The ex-King and Queen of Naples left the harbor on board the French ship Mouette.

Feb. 26. Mr. Bruce took up his residence at Pekin as British plenipotentiary at the Chinese court.

April 8. The decennial census of Great Britain and Ireland taken this day.

1.	England and Wales	20,061,725
2.	Scotland	3,061,329
3.	Ireland	5,764,543
4.	Islands in the British Seas	143,779
5.	Army, navy and merchant seamen	303,412
	Total	29,334,788

The males and females numbered in each case as follows : (1) 9,758,852 males and 10,302,873 females ; (2) 1,447,015 m. and 1,614,314 f. ; (3) 2,804,961 m. and 2,959,582 f. ; and (4) 66,394 m. and 77,385 f. ; the total consists of 14,380,634 of the one sex, and 14,954,154 of the other.

April 8. Disturbances in Warsaw, in which in a few days about a thousand persons were killed and wounded by the Russian troops.

April 15. The chancellor of the exchequer brought forward his budget, in which he proposed to reduce the rate of income-tax from 10*d*. to 9*d*. in the pound, to abolish the paper duties, and to re-enact the existing duties on tea and sugar for one year.

April 15. Proclamation of Mr. Lincoln, the new President of the United States, calling out the militia of the several States, and summoning an early session of Congress, to meet on July 4th.

April 18. At Harper's Ferry the commissioners of the Federal government, being pressed by a superior force, destroyed the armory, the arsenal, and 15,000 stand of arms, and retired to Pennsylvania.

April 29. In the House of Lords it was stated by Lord Wodehouse that her majesty's government had decided not to intrude advice or counsel on the government of the United States, but that Lord Lyons, the British ambassador at Washington, had been instructed to express on every fitting occasion the earnest desire of her majesty's government that the differences between the North and the South might be amicably arranged.

April 29. Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States, sent a message to the Confederate Congress respecting the war with

the Federal States. In this message he announced that a permanent constitution of the Confederate States had been ratified.

May 8. Messages from the queen to both Houses of Parliament intimated her majesty's sanction to a marriage between the Princess Alice and Prince Louis of Hesse. On the 6th parliament voted to the Princess Alice a dower of 30,000*l.* and an annuity of 6000*l.*

June 1. Death of Count Cavour, Prime Minister of Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy.

June 10. Repulse of the Federal American troops by the Confederates at Great Bethel, between James River and York River.

July 4. The Federal American Congress, in extraordinary session, authorized the employment of 500,000 volunteers, and voted a supply of 500 million dollars to carry on the war.

July 21. The Federal army beaten by the Confederates at Bull Run, near Manassas Junction, after nine hours' severe fighting.

Aug. 6. Parliament prorogued.

Oct. 25. Death of Sir James R. G. Graham, Bart., aged 69.

Nov. 8. The Trent, West-India mail steamer, which left Havana on the 7th, was boarded by the San Jacinto, United States man-of-war, commanded by Captain Wilkes, and four passengers—Messrs. Slidell and Mason, Confederate commissioners to London and Paris, with their secretaries—were forcibly abducted, the commander of the Trent, and the admiralty agent in charge of the mail energetically protesting against the outrage, which they had no power to prevent.

Nov. 30. Earl Russell, secretary of state for foreign affairs—having received information on the 27th of the seizure of the confederate commissioners on board the Trent—dispatched instructions to Lord Lyons to demand the restoration of the four passengers taken from the Trent by Captain Wilkes. On the 13th of December the first draft of troops was sent off from this country for Canada, followed by several detachments in the next ten days. On the 27th of December, Mr. Seward, the American secretary of state, informed Lord Lyons that the four prisoners would be cheerfully given up by the United States government, which had not authorized or sanctioned the act of Captain Wilkes in capturing them. They were accordingly given up to Lord Lyons on the 2d of January, 1862, and sent by him immediately to England.

Dec. 14. Death of the prince consort at Windsor Castle, in his 43d year.

LEGISLATION. Session 24 & 25 Victoriæ.

Cap. 14. *An Act to grant additional Facilities for depositing Small Savings at Interest with the Security of the Government for the due Repayment thereof.* This act enables a depositor of any amount not less than a shilling to deposit his savings in any money-order office which he may withdraw from any other office, and which, while it remains, receives an interest of 2½ per cent per annum.

Cap. 47. *To facilitate the Construction and Improvement of Harbors, by authorizing Loans to Harbor Authorities, to abolish Passing Tolls, and for other purposes.* The chief purposes are to abolish tolls, unless facilities are afforded to equalize the dues on foreign ships with those of British, and to abolish passing tolls.

Cap. 55. *To amend the Laws regarding the Removal of the Poor, and the Contribution of Parishes to the common Funds in Unions.* Reduces the power of removing poor persons to a residence of three years without receiving parish relief. The contribution of parishes to the common fund is to be computed on the rental, and not on the payment to its own poor. A similar act was passed for Ireland. (Cap. 76.)

Cap. 109. *To amend the Laws relating to Fisheries of Salmon in England.* This insures the preservation of salmon in English rivers by many detailed precautions.

Cap. 117. *To place the Employment of Women, young Persons, Youths, and Children in Lace Factories under the Regulation of the Factory Acts.*

Cap. 133. *To amend the Law relating to Agricultural Drainage.* Enables parties to join in effecting drainage that could not be accomplished by individuals.

Cap. 134. *To amend the Law relating to Bankruptcy and Insolvency.* Abolishes the courts of the commissioners of bankruptcy and the court of insolvency, and enacts the course of procedure before new judicatures.

Revenue, 70,283,674*l.*; expenditure—army, 18,013,896*l.*; navy, 13,331,668*l.*; for all objects, 72,792,059*l.*; debt, 818,048,896*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce, 125,102,814*l.*; total exports, 159,632,498*l.*; imports, 217,485,024*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 12,707; to United States, 49,764; to Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 28,738; to all other places, 5561: total, 91,770.

Amount of gold imported from Australia, 6,331,225*l.*: total imported, 12,163,937*l.*; exported, 11,238,372*l.*

Railway traffic: miles open, 10,869; number of passengers, 173,773,218; traffic receipts, 28,565,355*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,019,539.

1862.

Jan. 5. Garibaldi accepted the presidency of the Rifle Association of Genoa, and advised the members, in a letter, "to hasten to prepare themselves to take up arms, for the moment was approaching when they would have to give fresh proofs of their valor."

Feb. 23. The Greek insurgents, who had for some time held possession of Nauplia, capitulated to the Greek government.

March 1. The Earl of Elgin arrived at Calcutta to succeed Earl Canning as Governor-General of India.

March 4. President Lincoln, in a message to the Federal Congress, proposed a plan for co-operation with the Slave States for the gradual emancipation of slaves by means of pecuniary compensation. It was approved of by the House of Representatives on March 10, by 88 votes to 31, and by the Senate, on April 3, by 32 votes to 10.

March 8. The Merrimac, Confederate iron-clad war-steamer, attacked the Federal fleet at Newport News, and disabled and sunk several vessels. The Monitor, Federal iron-clad steamer, arrived in the evening, and on the following day maintained a close fight with the Merrimac for several hours, the contest ending in a drawn battle.

March 9. A meeting of 300 Italian delegates held at Genoa, at which Garibaldi presided. On the 12th the provisional committee received a warning from the government to be calmer in tone, or the authorities might find it necessary to suppress the association.

March 21. Garibaldi received at Milan with enthusiastic cries of "Rome and Venice."

March 25. The pope pronounced an allocution in favor of the temporal power of the papacy. At the same time the canonization commenced of twenty-three martyrs, who had been put to death in the Philippine Islands in the sixteenth century. It lasted till June 8th, and was attended by upward of 200 prelates and about 6000 other ecclesiastics.

March 25. The Italian government ordered the amalgamation of the southern army, consisting principally of Garibaldi's volunteers, with the regular troops.

March 27. The Prince of Wales arrived at Cairo. He subsequently visited Jerusalem and other places in the Holy Land.

April 6. Battle between the Federals and Confederates at Pittsburg Landing.

May 3. The Tae-ping rebels in China defeated with great loss. On the 21st Ningpo was taken by the Imperialists.

May 25. The Federal American troops, under General Banks, defeated at Winchester by the Confederates, who, however, had to abandon Corinth on the 29th.

June 19. The Federal House of Representatives passed a bill confiscating the slaves of rebels.

July 1. Marriage of the Princess Alice to Prince Louis of Hesse-Darmstadt.

July 10. Freedom of the city of London presented to Mr. Peabody, for his munificent gift of £150,000 for the benefit of the poor of London.

Aug. 3. A proclamation issued by Garibaldi, addressed to the young men in his army, exhorted them to be ready for an approaching combat against "arrogant foreign oppressors." A proclamation from Victor Emmanuel followed, warning the young men of Italy against being led into a dangerous and disloyal course of action by illusions, "forgetful of the duty of gratitude due to our best allies."

Aug. 20. Garibaldi took possession of the town of Catania, in Sicily. On the 21st the Italian government proclaimed Sicily in a state of siege.

Aug. 25. Garibaldi landed in Calabria. The royal troops were marched against him, and on the 29th, after a skirmish at Aspromonte, in which he and his son Menotti were wounded, both were taken prisoners and conveyed to Spezia.

Aug. 30. The Federal American army under General Pope defeated a second time at Bull Run by the Confederates. General Pope retired, and took up a position on Arlington Heights, near Washington.

Sept. 8. At this date, in 24 poor-law unions in the cotton districts, there were 140,165 persons receiving out-door relief, at a cost of 7922*l.* per week. The pauperism in these districts amounted to 7.3 per cent of the entire population.

Sept. 17. The Confederate army defeated by General McClellan at Antietam, after several previous encounters in which it had been worsted, and forced to evacuate Maryland, into which it had advanced.

Sept. 22. President Lincoln issued a proclamation declaring all slaves to be free after Jan. 1, 1863, whose owners may be in insurrection against the Federal government at that date.

Oct. 5. Riot in Hyde Park between the adherents of the pope and the sympathizers with Garibaldi. Several persons were severely injured.

Oct. 6. The King of Italy publishes a decree of amnesty for Garibaldi and his associates in the recent rising, except such as had deserted from the royal army.

Oct. 13. The Prussian representative chamber closed by the king in consequence of its refusal to vote a large estimate for military expenditure proposed by the military

Oct. 23. The Tae-pings, in China, driven out of Kah-sing by the imperialists.

Oct. 24. Peaceful revolution in Greece. King Otho had to quit the kingdom, and a provisional government was appointed.

Nov. 7. The financial estimates of Austria for 1863 were laid before the Chamber of Deputies, thus practically acknowledging the right of the representatives of the people to control the finances of the empire.

Nov. 9. An address sent to the pope, signed by 8943 members of the Italian clergy, praying him to give up Rome as the capital of the new kingdom, and to restore peace to Italy.

Nov. 23. Prince Alfred proclaimed King of Greece at Athens, but the choice declined by the British government, as all the protecting powers had agreed that none of their families should accept the crown. He received 230,000 votes on Feb. 3, 1863.

Dec. 20. From this date the distress in the cotton districts began slowly to decrease. Up to this time 407,830*l.* had been raised for its relief by the Central Relief Fund, and 236,926*l.* by the London Mansion House Fund. The number of persons on the relief books was 275,000 at the time.

LEGISLATION. Session 25 & 26 Victoriæ.

Cap. 8. *To prevent the Employment of Women and Children during the Night in certain Operations connected with bleaching by the open-air Process.* They are not to be employed in any of the operations of dyeing, bleaching, or finishing, between eight in the evening and six in the morning, of yarn or cotton cloth, silk, wool, or flax, or any mixture of them, in any building where steam, water, or other mechanical power is used.

Cap. 18. *To amend the Law as to Whipping of Juvenile or other Offenders.* The number of strokes is to be specified, and if the offender be not more than fourteen years old, they are not to exceed twelve, to be inflicted with a birch rod. In Scotland no one above sixteen is to be whipped for theft or offences against property.

Cap. 40. *To carry into effect the Treaty between her Majesty and the United States of America for the Suppression of the African Slave Trade.* A mutual right of search is given within certain limits, the slaves captured are to be freed, mixed courts of justice are to be appointed, the captains and crews of condemned vessels are to be given up to the government to which they belong, as also any other subjects found on board.

Cap. 43. *To provide for the Education and Maintenance of Paupers' Children in certain Schools and Institutions.* Guardians are empowered to send children from the union to any properly certified school, and to pay for them; but no child to be sent without the consent of its parent, unless it has been deserted or is an orphan, and no child to be kept against its will beyond the age of fourteen.

Cap. 53. *To facilitate the Proof of Title to and the Conveyance of Real Estate.* This act is almost entirely professional, but it establishes a registry, and the registration is a warranty of the title, except in cases of fraud.

Cap. 61. *For the better Management of Highways in England.* This long act gives permission to districts to form a board for the management of the road, and to levy a rate on the occupiers.

Cap. 66. *For the safe-keeping of Petroleum.* Not more than forty gallons may be kept within fifty yards of a dwelling-house without a license. The penalty for transgressing the law is 20*l.* a day.

Cap. 68. *For amending the Law relating to Copyright in Works of the Fine Arts, and for repressing the commission of Fraud in the Production and Sale of such Works.* The act mainly aims at repressing the reproduction of such works by means of photography, in the violation of the rights of the possessors of the originals.

Cap. 79. *To amend the Laws relating to Coal Mines.* No new mine is to be opened from the passing of this act, and no existing mine to be worked after Jan. 1, 1865, with less than two shafts, well separated by natural strata.

Cap. 86. *To amend the Law relating to Fraudulent Marking of Merchandise.* Every person selling merchandise with forged trade-marks is liable to a penalty not exceeding 5*l.* or less than 10*s.* on each article so sold, beside the value of the article itself.

Cap. 93. *For Embanking the North Side of the river Thames from Westminster Bridge to Blackfriars Bridge, and for making new Streets in and near thereto.* This marks the commencement of the great improvements that have been made and are making on the banks of the Thames.

Cap. 114. *For the Prevention of Poaching.* Constables or police officers are empowered to search any person suspected of coming from any land where he may have been in quest of game, or of having game in his possession, or of having a gun or nets for the taking of game. If any such are found, the offender to be taken before justices, where he may be fined 5*l.*, with the forfeiture of the game or such instruments for procuring game as may be found in his possession.

Revenue, 69,674,479*l.*; expenditure—army (including ordnance), 16,854,290*l.*; navy, 12,598,042*l.*; for all purposes, 72,792,059*l.* In this year commenced an expenditure for fortifications which is not included, as it was provided for by the creation of terminable annuities.

Exports of British and Irish produce, 123,992,264*l.*; total of exports, 166,168,134*l.*

Imports, 225,716,976*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 15,522; to the United States, 58,706; to the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 41,843; to other places, 5146: total, 121,214.

Gold imported from Australia, 6,704,753*l.*; total imported, 19,903,704*l.*; exported, 16,011,963*l.*

Railway traffic: miles open, 11,551; number of passengers, 180,485,727; traffic receipts, 29,128,558*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,084,651.

1863.

Jan. 9. The British legation at Rio Janeiro having demanded in vain an indemnity for the plunder of a British vessel wrecked on the coast of Brazil, and also an apology for the imprisonment of some naval officers who were taken not in uniform, and accused of a riot, caused five Brazilian merchant vessels to be seized. They were given up on an undertaking to pay the indemnity to be settled in London; the other question was referred to the arbitration of the King of the Belgians.

Jan. 14. The Prussian Chambers opened their session at Berlin. The king's message stated that their sanction would be asked for expenses incurred without their previous sanction, and hoped that a mutual good understanding might be arrived at. On the 22d an address was prepared and carried after several days' debate, complaining that "the ministers had carried on the administration against the constitution, and without a legal budget." During the debate the prime minister, Count von Bismarck, said, "The Prussian ministry is quite different from the English. The latter, call it what you will, is only the ministry of the parliament, but we are the ministers of the king."

Jan. 22. The insurrection in Poland commenced, in consequence, it is said, of its being discovered that the conscription taking place in Warsaw, instead of being carried out on the usual plan, was used to remove all the young men of education suspected of liberal tendencies. The young men withdrew to the woods, provided themselves with arms, and prepared for resistance. The insurrection rapidly spread: detached parties of Russian soldiers were killed; the railways were broken up, the telegraph wires cut; and dividing themselves into small parties, the insurgents were frequently successful in defeating detachments of Russian troops sent against them.

Feb. 3. The King of Prussia replied to the address of the lower chamber, refusing to acknowledge the right of the people to control the financial expenditure through their representatives.

March 7. The Princess Alexandra landed at Gravesend, and was married to the Prince of Wales on the 10th.

March 18. Langiewicz, the principal leader of the Polish insurgents, who had been proclaimed dictator on the 10th, after two successful encounters with the Russians on the 16th and 17th, was attacked by them at Zagoscie, and defeated after a desperate contest. The insurgent force was dispersed, but Langiewicz and some of his adherents escaped across the Austrian frontier into Galicia. They were there disarmed and imprisoned at Cracow.

March 18. Prince William George of Denmark was elected King of Greece by the national assembly, and proclaimed under the title of George the First, France and England approving of the choice.

March 31. The French entered Puebla after a bombardment of four days. The citadel, with the whole town, surrendered on May 17.

April 3. The Sultan of Turkey left Constantinople on a visit to Egypt. He arrived at Alexandria on the 8th, when he declared that he came but as a guest, but he had previously declared his disapproval at the large grant of land to the Suez Canal Company, and had forbidden forced labor.

April 7. Great Britain, France, and Austria sent separate notes to St. Petersburg, remonstrating against the cruelties practised by Russia in Poland. On the 14th Prince Gortschakoff replied, ascribing the revolt to the revolutionary principles with which Europe was infested, and that in England was organized the conspiracy which was armed abroad to keep up disorder in the empire.

April 16. The German Federal Diet debated on the ordinance of the King of Denmark of March 30, by which he gave a constitution to all his European dominions exclusive of the members of the confederation, and by which Holstein was to have an independent army, and to share with the rest of the kingdom in the general burdens. The diet would not recognize it, and protested against the assumption of the king that the diet had no right to interfere in the question of the duchies.

April 22. Prince Christian of Denmark announced that he accepted the crown of Greece for his son George; and the King of Denmark informed the Rigsraad that the ordinance of March 30 had been opposed by the great powers of Germany, but that he should persist in his adoption of it.

April 22. An earthquake at Rhodes by which 2000 houses were destroyed, killing and injuring some thousands of its inhabitants.

May 12. Radama, King of Madagascar, assassinated, and his widow proclaimed queen.

May 26. Herat captured by Dost Mohammed Khan of Afghanistan, who died on June 9, after which the succession was contested by his sons.

June 10. General Forey with the French army entered the city of Mexico; they were received, as was stated, with great enthusiasm. The president, Juarez, retired to San Juan Potosi.

June 18. The King of the Belgians, by his award in the case of the imprisonment of the British naval officers, declared that there was no intentional offence given by the Brazilians.

June 24. After a trial in the court of exchequer lasting three days, the case of the Alexandria, seized on behalf of the United States for an infringement of the Foreign Enlistment Acts, was decided in favor of the defendants and against the seizure.

July 1, 2, and 3. Battle of Gettysburg, in which the Confederates failed to defeat the Federals, and were forced to retire on the 4th. On the same day Fort Hudson, on the Mississippi, after a long siege, was surrendered to the Federals.

July 15. An insurrection broke out in New Zealand, near Auckland. On the 17th, General Cameron had an action with a large

force of the natives, who, availing themselves of rifle-pits, fought desperately, but were defeated with great loss. On the 22d the native settlement of Kiri-Kiri was attacked, and taken after a vigorous defence. From this time the natives would not meet the British in the field, but through July and August continued to ravage the province. The colonists rose in their own defence, and within a few weeks had 4000 volunteers and militia under arms.

July 20. Mexico proclaimed as an empire by an assembly of notables, with the Archduke Maximilian as emperor. A deputation was appointed to wait on him and tender the crown.

Aug. 15. In September, 1862, Mr. Richardson had been murdered in Japan by the attendants of the Prince of Satsuma, and as no satisfaction could be obtained from any of the Japanese authorities, Admiral Kuper had been sent with a British squadron to reduce the prince's fortified port of Kagosima. On this day the bombardment commenced, which was vigorously replied to; but in two days the fort, the palace, the arsenal, and a great part of the town, were reduced to ruins, and three steam-vessels destroyed. The British loss was two captains and eleven seamen killed, and thirty-nine wounded.

Aug. 17. The Frankfort Congress of Princes assembled at the desire of the Emperor of Austria to consider of a plan for the reformation of the Federal Constitution of Germany. Prussia declined to appear. On Sept. 1 it was terminated without any result, although the emperor hoped that a second congress would be more satisfactory.

Sept. 3. A body of 700 Poles under Lelewel attacked a much superior force of the Russian army, who were compelled to retreat, although the Poles had 100 men killed. On the 6th another battle was fought, Lelewel was killed, and the insurgents, after a gallant defence, had to fly for refuge into Galicia.

Sept. 7. Prince Gortschakoff rejected the proposal of France for a conference respecting Poland, the welfare of which, he said, was, in common with all his other dominions, the object of the czar's devoted solicitude.

Sept. 23. The Ionian Assembly voted in favor ofuniting themselves to Greece, thanked Queen Victoria for surrendering the protectorship and for the benefits conferred, and the other powers also for their ready concurrence in the surrender, but declined the pecuniary stipulations.

Oct. 30. The King of Greece, after having visited France and England, arrived at Athens, where he was enthusiastically received.

Nov. 4. The Emperor of the French addressed the sovereigns of Europe, proposing a general congress for the purpose of regulating the questions now agitating their peoples, and thus avoiding war. It was declined on the part of England by Earl Russell as leading to no practically good result; and by Austria, unless with a stipulation that there should be no territorial alterations adopted. The project was then abandoned. On the 5th the French chambers were opened by the emperor, who announced the sending of the proposal for a congress, congratulated them on the prosperity of the country, and on the success of the armies in Mexico and Cochin China, and alluded to the distressing position of Poland.

Nov. 6. Czaschkowski, who had maintained a desultory war against the Russians in the government of Radom in Poland, was defeated on this day, his force dispersed, and himself taken prisoner; but he died of his wounds within a few days.

Nov. 15. Frederick VI., King of Denmark, died, aged 55, and was succeeded by Christian IX., the father of the Princess of Wales and of the King of Greece, in virtue of a treaty signed in May, 1852, by which the Princess Christiana and the Prince of Holstein-Augustenburg resigned their claims in his favor for a pecuniary consideration, in order to avoid a separation of the kingdom. The treaty was signed on behalf of Great Britain, France, Prussia, Austria, and Russia. On the 17th the young Duke of Holstein-Augustenburg claimed the duchy, announcing that his father, who was still alive, could not sell his rights, and his claim was admitted by the Frankfort Diet, but his representative was not admitted to sit.

Dec. 8. At Santiago, in Chili, on the last evening of a long festival, in honor of the Immaculate Conception, in the Church de la Compania (a Jesuit church), some of the muslin drapery of the image of the virgin caught fire. The interior of the church, with the roof, was chiefly of wood; there was but one available exit, and this was at once rendered impassable by the rushing crowd who choked the passage, and in fifteen minutes 2000 corpses, mostly females, were all that remained of the congregation inclosed within that fiery furnace. Some of the priests subsequently preached that all who there died were martyrs, but the government forbade any building to be erected on the site.

Dec 24. The Saxon and Hanoverian troops, acting under the orders of the Frankfort Diet, marched into Altona, and took possession of it, "without prejudice to the only temporarily suspended rights of the sovereign." The Danish forces withdrew without offering any opposition.

LEGISLATION. Session 26 & 27 Victoriæ.

Cap. 13. *For the Protection of certain Gardens in Ornamental Grounds in Cities and Boroughs.* Where land has been set apart for the use of the public, and where trustees or other authorities neglect to keep it in proper order, this act enables the governing corporations of the place to take possession, and a rate may be imposed for its due maintenance.

Cap. 14. *To amend the Law relating to Post-Office Banks.* This act provides that money deposited in the post-office savings bank at one place may be transferred at the desire of the depositor, so as to be paid at any other savings bank, and also for the transference of the deposits of the former savings banks to the post-office savings banks.

Cap. 27. *To amend the Law relating to Marriages in Ireland.* The details of the forms to be observed in the civil celebration and registration of Protestant marriages in Ireland. Cap. 90 does the same for Roman Catholic marriages; and cap. 11 provides for the establishment of a registrar-general and assistants, for the registration of births and deaths in Ireland.

Cap. 41. *To amend the Law respecting the Liability of Innkeepers, and to prevent certain Frauds upon them.* No innkeeper is to be liable to any guest for the loss of property, or injury to goods (except horses or other live animals, or carriages) to a greater amount than 30*l.*, unless expressly deposited with the said innkeeper.

Cap. 44. *For the further Security of the Persons of her Majesty's Subjects from Personal Violence.* In awarding punishments for robbery committed with violence, the court may order any convicted male offender, in addition to other punishment, to be twice or thrice privately whipped; if under 16 a birch rod to be used, and the strokes not to exceed twenty-five; if above that age the strokes not to exceed fifty, and the exact number, with the instrument to be used, to be stated in the sentence.

Cap. 52. *To further extend and make compulsory the practice of Vaccination in Ireland.* Within six months from the time of birth every child is to be vaccinated, under a penalty of 10*s.* for neglect of the parent or guardian. Registrars are appointed, and the vaccinator is to be paid. A similar act (cap. 108) was passed for Scotland, but the penalty for neglect is here 20*s.*

Cap. 70. *To facilitate the execution of Public Works in certain manufacturing districts; to authorize for that purpose advances of Public Money to a limited amount upon Security of Local Rates; and to shorten the period for the adoption of the Local Government Act* 1858, *in certain cases.* Numbers of the laboring and manufacturing classes still remaining out of employment, the loan commissioners are authorized to advance sums not amounting in the whole to more than 1,200,000*l.* to such local boards as may wish thus to effect sanitary or other works of public improvement. No sum advanced to exceed one year's ratable value of the district to be improved.

Cap. 124. *For the more effectual Condensation of Muriatic Acid Gas in Alkali Works.* All works for the manufacture of alkali are by this act compelled to take measures for condensing and preventing the diffusion of the destructive gas that might escape. Inspectors are appointed to see that effective means are used under penalties of not exceeding 50*l.* for a first offence, and 100*l.* for every subsequent offence. The owner to be proceeded against in the first instance, but if it be proved that the offence was committed without his knowledge, by a servant, he may be proceeded against. No alkali works are to be opened until registered with the inspector.

Revenue, 70,003,501*l.*; expenditure—army, 16,204,790*l.*; navy, 11,370,588*l.*; for all objects, 69,302,008*l.*; debt, 817,559,322*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce, 146,602,342*l.*; total of exports, 196,902,409*l.*

Imports, 248,919,020*l.*

Emigration— to North American Colonies, 18,083: to the United States, 146,813; to the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 53,054; to other places, 5808: total, 223,758.

Amount of gold imported from Australia, 5,995,368*l.*: total imported, 19,142,665*l.*; exported, 15,303,279*l.*

Railway traffic: miles open, 12,322; number of passengers, 204,699,466: traffic receipts, 31,156,397*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,329,136.

1864.

Jan. 8. The Princess of Wales gave birth to a son, who was baptized on March 10 as Albert Victor Christian Edward.

Jan. 31. The proposal of Austria and Prussia that the troops of the German Confederation should be restricted to the occupation of Holstein, and should not interfere with Schleswig, having been rejected in the diet at Frankort by ten votes to five, the two powers announced that they should take the matter into their own hands, as parties to the treaty of 1852, and they summoned Denmark to annul the constitution by which Schleswig had been incorporated into the kingdom. Denmark applied for time to obtain the sanction of the Rigsraad, which was refused, and Marshal Wrangel, at the head of 70,000 men, summoned General de Aleza to evacuate Schleswig, to which the reply was that he was ordered to defend it.

Feb. 12. The King of Ashantee having made war on the Fantees (an African territory under the protection of the British at Cape Coast), who had refused to give up two fugitives claimed by him, Governor Pine ordered a force to be marched to repel and punish the Ashantees. The wet season set in much earlier than was anticipated, and, without seeing an enemy or firing a shot, the force of above 1200 men, chiefly colored men officered by Europeans, were prostrated by fever. The loss by death, independent of the suffering, was fearful, and the remains of the expedition were ordered to return. The affair gave rise to a sharp discussion in parliament on June 17.

Feb. 25. The four Italians, who were arrested on the previous

Dec. 29, charged with an intention of assassinating the Emperor of the French, were this day tried in Paris. Their names were Greco, Imperatori, Trabuco, and Scaglioni. Greco and Trabuco stated that the money, the explosive bombs, and the weapons had been furnished by Mazzini (who in London denied it). The other two pleaded that they had been drawn into the conspiracy. All were found guilty. Greco and Trabuco were sentenced to transportation; Imperatori and Scaglioni to twenty years' imprisonment.

March 10. Maximilian II., King of Bavaria, died, and was succeeded by his son, Ludwig II.

March 11. At nearly midnight the town of Sheffield and its neighborhood was overwhelmed by the bursting of the large water reservoir at Bradford. Within the space of two or three hours 250 human beings, from the man of eighty to the baby in arms, were drowned in their beds, or in the attempt to escape, or crushed beneath the falling dwellings. The destruction of property was immense.

March 16. The King of Dahomey defeated in an attack on Abeakutah, with a loss of 1000 killed and 2000 taken prisoners.

April 3. Garibaldi landed at Southampton, where he was received with great enthusiasm. On the 11th he made his entry into London, amid an immense crowd, and took up his abode with the Duke of Sutherland at Stafford House.

April 14. The Chincha Islands, of which the guano had been pledged for the security of the Peruvian public debt, seized by a Spanish squadron.

April 18. The Prussians captured Dybböl by assault, after a siege of nearly two months. The Danes in their resistance lost nearly 5000 men, killed, wounded, or taken prisoners; but they succeeded in removing the greater part of their force to the neighboring isle of Alsen, after which the bridge was destroyed. The loss of the Prussians was estimated at 2000 killed and wounded.

April 25. A conference on Danish affairs commenced in London, attended by the representatives of France, Russia, Austria, Prussia, Denmark, Sweden, and the German Confederation. The representatives of Great Britain were the Earl of Clarendon and Earl Russell.

April 27. Three tribes of Caucasians, having been subdued by Russia, commenced leaving the country to the number of 300,000, to take refuge in Turkey. Through the want of means of conveyance to Trebizond, numbers perished on the shores of the Black Sea; others arriving at Trebizond in crowded ships, in greater crowds than were expected, and insufficient means having been provided for their transport to places of permanent settlement, fever and smallpox broke out, and occasioned an enormous loss of life before their removal could be effected.

May 6 to 10. General Grant having advanced to attack General Lee, preparatory to the further advance upon Richmond, the fighting was continued from the Friday till Tuesday, the struggle on the last day having lasted for fourteen hours. General Lee maintained his position, but the loss on both sides was terrific. On Thursday, the 12th, the Federals again attacked General Lee at Spottsylvania, where he had taken up a strong position. Here the Federals claimed the advantage, as they captured some cannon and took some prisoners, but the loss of life was great, "the men on both sides falling like grain." On the 20th, having been strongly reinforced, finding he could not dislodge General Lee from his position, General Grant made a flank movement, and gained a position south of the North Anna River, where he was furiously attacked by the Confederates, but maintained his ground.

June 19. The Alabama, a Confederate steamer which had inflicted enormous loss on the Federal commerce, was on this day met, on leaving Cherbourg, by the Federal turret-armed frigate, the Kearsarge. After an engagement lasting for about an hour, the Alabama, in a sinking state, made for the French coast, which she was unable to reach. Captain Semmes, with a portion of the crew, was picked up by an English steam-yacht, and landed at Southampton.

June 25. William, King of Würtemberg, died, aged 83, and was succeeded by his son Charles.

June 25. The London conference on Danish affairs held its last sitting, Denmark and the German powers alike rejecting the proposals of the neutral mediators.

June 26. The Prussians attacked and took the Isle of Alsen.

July 19. Nanking stormed and captured by the Imperialists, aided by a disciplined force under Major Gordon. The two chief leaders of the Tae-pings surrendered to Major Gordon, stipulating that their lives should be spared; but as soon as the Imperialists obtained possession of them they were executed; upon which Major Gordon withdrew from the service.

July 31. At Petersburg, near Richmond, a mine containing seven tons of gunpowder was sprung, a breach was made, and about 500 of the Confederate garrison killed. The Federals then made an assault with 18,000 men, but after a contest of some hours were forced to retire.

Aug. 6. The Maori war in New Zealand brought to a conclusion by the unconditional submission of most of the tribes: the revolt was punished only by the forfeiture of a small portion of their lands.

Aug. 8. The statue of Daniel O'Connell installed in Dublin; on the same day his effigy was burned by the Orangemen in Belfast, and the ashes were buried with mock solemnity on the following day. The Roman Catholics assembled and attacked the procession, and from this day to the 19th the rioting was almost incessant. The two factions fought in large bands. The police were powerless; they were pelted with stones and driven away. Additional policemen and a military force were sent for, but 3000 soldiers and 1000 policemen were unable to suppress the rioting. Chapels and houses were wrecked; and the windows were broken throughout whole streets. The military had to fire on the crowd, and many of the ringleaders on both sides were captured. Before the riots were ended there were nine persons killed, and 176 wounded were attended to in the general hospital, besides many who received surgical assistance in their own houses.

Sept. 4. General Sherman, the commander of the Federal Army of the Potomac, having beaten the Confederates in several encounters, had at length cut off the communications of General Hood with the South; and on this day took possession of Atlanta in Georgia, which General Hood had felt himself compelled to abandon. This was a most serious loss to the Confederates, as it contained the arsenals, the foundries, and the manufactories, which had chiefly supplied the Confederate armies during the contest. General Hood retreated toward Virginia.

Sept. 15. A treaty concluded between France and Italy, by which it was agreed that the French troops should be withdrawn from Rome within two years, the Italian government undertaking to protect the pope against any attacks from without, and that Florence should be the seat of the Italian government. On this arrangement becoming known at Turin, a riot broke out, which was promptly quelled by the military, but an immediate change of ministry was the consequence.

Oct. 30. A treaty of peace between Denmark, Prussia, and Austria, signed at Vienna, by which Denmark consented to surrender the duchies to the two powers, to pay a large sum of money, and to submit to a rectification of the frontiers of Jutland.

Nov. 1. A violent cyclone in the Bay of Bengal, which extended along the coast from Calcutta to very near Madras. The waters of the Ganges were driven back by the wind, and submerged a large portion of the Sunderbunds; the island of Saugor was inundated, and 7000 persons out of a population of 8500 were drowned. At Masulipatam the sea broke into the land, along a distance of more than eighty miles, and in some instances penetrated inland for seventeen miles, destroying villages, their inhabitants, crops, and cattle, and filling up the wells. The total loss of life during this terrible night was estimated at not less than from 70,000 to 80,000 souls. On the flood returning the number of bodies of men and animals left behind was so great, that but for the exertions of the English authorities in burying and burning them, and providing food and shelter for the unfortunate survivors, an infectious fever would have followed close on the previous calamity.

Dec. 6. Abraham Lincoln elected President of the United States for a second time and Andrew Johnson elected Vice-President.

Dec. 21. General Sherman, having marched from Atlanta in Georgia to Savannah in South Carolina, took possession of that town without any resistance being made, General Hardee, the commander of the Confederates, retreating, as not being strong enough to resist.

Dec. 24, 25. The Federal fleet attacked Wilmington in North Carolina, which had been the great depot for the blockade-running vessels from the Bahamas. After having ineffectually exploded on the 24th a vessel with 215 tons of gunpowder under the walls of Fort Fisher, the outer fort which guarded the harbor, and bombarding it on the 25th, a party of men were landed to storm it, but they were repulsed with considerable loss, and the fleet retired.

LEGISLATION. Session 27 & 28 Victoriæ.

Cap. 44. *To amend the Act relating to Divorce and Matrimonial Causes, 20 & 21 Vict. cap. 85.* Where a wife has obtained a protecting order from one magistrate, and the husband or a creditor may have applied for the discharge of such order, the cause may be heard, and the order discharged, by the successor of the magistrate who made the order, should he have died or been removed.

Cap. 47. *To amend the Penal Servitude Act.* No convict to be sentenced to a less period than five years, and where any previous conviction has taken place, for not less than seven years. Corporal punishment may be inflicted for offences within the prison. Licenses are to be granted in a prescribed form; the holder must report himself within three days to the police of the locality where he intends to reside, and once in every three months afterward the license to be produced whenever called for by a magistrate or police officer. Any constable or police officer may apprehend, without a warrant, any licensed holder reasonably suspected of a breach of the conditions indorsed on the license, and the breach forfeits the license.

Cap. 48. *For the extension of the Factory Acts.* With some modifications, the provisions of previous acts are extended to the manufacture of earthenware (except bricks and tiles, not being ornamental tiles), lucifer matches, percussion-caps and cartridges, the employments of paper-staining and fustian-cutting.

Cap. 108. *To explain the Statutes of her present Majesty for amending the Laws relating to the Removal of the Poor.* The period of settlement within which a person likely to become chargeable to the parish or union may be removed, is altered from five years to three.

Cap. 113. *To amend the Laws relating to the Conservancy of the River Thames, and for the purposes relating thereto.* Six additional conservators are to be elected. The right of taking ballast from the Thames is taken from the Trinity House and given to the conservators. The privileges of the Watermen's Company are restricted, and certificates are to be granted by the conservators to persons above twenty years

of age, who upon examination are found capable of navigating lighters or steamboats. Barges navigated from above Teddington Lock, and not descending below London Bridge, are exempt from having a licensed waterman on board. The conservators are empowered to regulate the tolls for steamboats, and to provide rules for fishing-boats as to their nets and lines. No gravel, stones, mud, or earth, or other refuse may be thrown, or so placed as to be carried by floods, into the Thames, nor any substance produced in making gas, nor any other offensive matter, is to flow into the Thames, under a penalty not exceeding 20*l.* for each offence.

Cap. 116. *For making provision for distributing the Charge of Relief of certain classes of Poor Persons over the whole of the Metropolis.* The expense of providing a refuge for the houseless poor is by this act ordered to be divided in certain proportions among all the unions and parishes within the metropolitan district; and proper wards, or places of reception, are to be provided, to be approved of by the poor-law board, at the mutual expense.

Cap. 117. *To render permissive the use of the Metric System of Weights and Measures.* Legalizes contracts made under the French decimal system.

Revenue, 70,208,964*l.*; expenditure — army, 14,723,976*l.*; navy, 10,821,596*l.*; for all objects, 67,056,286*l.*; national debt, 813,230,-152*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce, 160,449,053*l.*; total of exports, 212,619,614*l.*

Imports, 274,952,172*l.*

Emigration—to North American Colonies, 12,721; to United States, 147,042; to the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 40,942; to all other places, 8195: total, 208,900.

Amount of gold imported from Australia, 2,656,971*l.*: total imported, 16,900,951*l.*; exported, 13,279,739*l.*

Railway traffic: miles open, 12,789; number of passengers, 229,-348,664; traffic receipts, 33,911,547*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,198,129.

1865.

Jan. 13. On this day the attack on Fort Fisher, the advanced fort of Wilmington Harbor, was renewed, and a bombardment continued until Sunday, the 15th, when the works were stormed, and the garrison, amounting to 1200 men, were compelled to surrender. The resistance was obstinate and the Federal loss severe. Within a day or two of the capture the powder magazine of the fort exploded, and 300 of the Federal troops perished.

Feb. 15. The Emperor of the French opened the session of the legislature with a speech, in which he congratulated them on the increased probability of a continued peace, with its accompanying prosperity; spoke of the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome; promised farther progress in free trade by a removal of the French navigation laws; an extension of the powers of communes and departments to manage their local affairs without the intervention of the state; to give the right of provisional release even in criminal cases, with or without bail; and to suppress altogether personal arrest in civil or commercial matters.

Feb. 17. The Confederates were forced to evacuate Charleston. Preparations had been made for several days preceding; all the wealthy inhabitants had removed; the guns were spiked, military stores destroyed, and the troops, about 14,000, retreated northward The Federals, on entering the town, found about 200 pieces of cannon, and the fortifications uninjured. After they had obtained possession a fire broke out, which destroyed 5000 bales of cotton, and the explosion of a depot occurred, by which several hundred lives were lost.

March 11. A strike of the iron-workers in North Staffordshire against a reduction of wages, rendered necessary by a fall in the price of iron, had taken place. An endeavor was made to obtain the means of resistance by those on strike by allowing the workers in other districts to accept the terms of the masters on condition of subscribing to their support; upon which the ironmasters throughout the kingdom agreed to lock out all the men unless those of North Staffordshire accepted the offered terms. They were refused, and on this day the lock-out commenced. It continued till April 5, when the men of South Staffordshire submitted to the condition of not subscribing, and the works were opened. It was calculated that the total weekly wages amounted to 120,000*l.*, the withdrawal of which occasioned extreme general distress, while the foreign trade was interrupted, and to some extent thrown into other channels.

March 13. The President of Paraguay, F. S. Lopez, addressing his council and deputies, stated that Brazil and the Argentine Confederation, by their armed interference in the domestic affairs of Uruguay and their claims as to the right of navigation on the Paraná and the Paraguay, justified the commencement of hostilities against them. He had been preparing an army and a fleet for some time, and he had fortified Humáyit, on the Paraguay River. Early in April he invaded the province of San Pedro in Brazil, and Corrientes, a state of the Argentine Confederation. As the attack was unexpected, he carried all before him for a time.

March 20. On the appeal of Dr. Colenso, Bishop of Natal, against the sentence of Dr. Grey, the Bishop of Cape Town, who had deposed him from his bishopric, the judicial committee of the privy council decided that the Bishop of Cape Town had no jurisdiction over the Bishop of Natal, and had, therefore, no power to remove him from his office, and that the proceedings against Dr. Colenso were null and void in law.

April 2. The Federals under General Grant having broken through the Confederate defences around Petersburg, General Lee evacuated both Petersburg and Richmond, retreating northward toward Lynchburg. Thus ended a siege which, with some interruptions, had lasted for three years. On the 9th, General Lee, with his army, surrendered to General Grant.

April 14. President Lincoln was shot through the head by an assassin while sitting in his private box in the theatre at Washington. The murderer leaped upon the stage, exclaiming, "Sic semper tyrannis," and succeeded for the time in making his escape. President Lincoln died early on the following morning. On the same evening a murderous attack was made on Mr. Seward in his own house, the assassin stabbing him in several places, killing one of his servants, and fracturing the skull of Mr. Frederick Seward, who endeavored to save his father. Andrew Johnson, the vice-president, succeeded to Mr. Lincoln's office.

April 26. Wilkes Booth, the assassin of President Lincoln, having been tracked to a barn near Port Royal, on the Rappahannock, Maryland, was summoned to surrender by a troop of horse; he refused, fired at the sergeant of the troop, who returned the fire, and shot him through the head, of which wound he died in about three hours. His companion, named Harrold, was taken prisoner.

May 1. Addresses of condolence for and of horror at the crime of the assassination of President Lincoln voted in the Houses of Lords and Commons. On the immediately following days similar addresses were voted in public meetings in every considerable town in the United Kingdom.

May 10. Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States, with his wife, sister, brother, and some members of his staff, captured at Irwinsville, in Georgia, by a detachment of Federal cavalry. The troops were divided into two parties, the more effectually to surround the place and prevent the escape of Davis; but when meeting they mistook each other for hostile troops, and before the mistake was rectified two men were killed and several wounded. Mr. Davis was placed in close confinement.

May 22. President Johnson issued a proclamation for opening the blockaded ports of the United States from and after July 1st, except those in the State of Texas; and on June 2d Earl Russell, in a letter to the admiralty board, announced that the Confederates would no longer be recognized as belligerents in British ports.

June 11. War having been declared against Paraguay by Brazil and the Argentine Confederation, an army and a fleet had been dispatched to repel the attack of the Paraguayans, and to carry the war into their own country. The fleet ascended the Paraná river, and on this day were attacked by the Paraguayan steamers. They were repulsed, five out of eight were destroyed, and five heavily-armed gunboats were taken.

June 17. The Prussian parliament was prorogued. During the sitting the financial and military proposals of the government had been rejected, and in dismissing them, the minister, Von Bismarck, accused them of placing difficulties in the way of the ministry, which were detrimental to the welfare of the country; told them that the government would be carried on in the way indicated by itself, and trusted that ultimately the house and the nation would approve and thank the king for the course pursued. The president of the house, Von Grabow, addressing the assembled representatives, said that the effort to transform a constitutional government into an absolute police and military despotism had been carried to the utmost limit, and would be wrecked on the loyalty of the people, manifested by their choice of constitutional representatives.

July 7. Mrs. Surratt, Messrs. Payne, Azteroth, and Harrold were hung at New York, after a trial before a court-martial which lasted for many days, as guilty accomplices and conspirators with Booth in the murder of the late President Lincoln.

July 22. Instructions were issued by the privy council for taking precautions against the introduction of cholera at the seaports. Hospitals were formed at several of them, to which seamen suffering from the disorder might be immediately removed on their arrival.

Aug. 2. An order was issued by the privy council, including regulations for guarding against the cattle plague, which had begun to spread rapidly and fatally, in consequence of which another order was issued on the 11th, commanding the destruction of infected beasts, and imposing a penalty of 20*l.* for infractions of the regulations. This was followed by other orders appointing inspectors at the ports to examine foreign cattle, and in country districts, to insure the carrying out of the orders in council. On September 22d, in consequence of the plague having extended widely to sheep, a new order was issued, by which the previous orders were made to apply to all infected animals, the word animal to include "any cow, heifer, bull, bullock, ox, calf, sheep, lamb, goat, or swine." In October a government commission was appointed to investigate the cause and the means of repressing the disease.

August 11. An insurrection of the negroes in Jamaica broke out in the parish of St. Thomas-in-the-East, near Morant Bay. The outbreak was accompanied by some atrocious murders, burning of property, and plunder. Military force was rapidly forwarded. Governor Eyre took very decided steps for its repression, and the insurrection was extinguished, but accompanied by some circum-

stances that excited much discussion in England. The negro troops behaved with great faithfulness and courage.

Aug. 16. A navigation treaty with Prussia was signed.

Aug. 26. Austria and Prussia communicate to the Diet at Frankfort the results of the interview at Gastein: they were—that the Duke of Augustenburg-Holstein had no right to the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein; that the King of Denmark was the legal possessor; and that he had resigned his claim to the two powers by the Treaty of Vienna. They would therefore hold them jointly for the present.

Aug. 29. The French fleet arrived at Portsmouth in return for the visit of the English fleet to Cherbourg, and the officers were magnificently entertained by the English officers and the mayor and corporation of the town.

Sept. 2. A deputation of upward of 2000 inhabitants of Schleswig-Holstein visited Copenhagen, and were received with great enthusiasm by the Danes.

Sept. 15. The Dublin police took possession of the office of the "Irish People" newspaper, and seized the persons found on the premises, charged with being members of the Fenian Brotherhood, and engaged in treasonable attempts against the government. On the same day numerous arrests were made in Cork, the persons arrested being charged with the like offence; but in their cases bail was taken for their appearance at a subsequent investigation, while at Dublin the persons charged were remanded to prison till another hearing. Other arrests followed, and on September 20th some persons were apprehended in Manchester and Sheffield, and conveyed to Dublin charged with complicity in the conspiracy. On November 10th Stephens, *alias* Power, the reputed chief-centre for Ireland, was apprehended, examined, and committed for trial.

Sept. 21. Valparaiso and other ports of Chili blockaded by a Spanish fleet under Admiral Pareja, upon the refusal of the Chilian government to consent to the claims of the Spanish government, on a summons of only four days; the said claims having been previously arranged by the Spanish ambassador, but who had been withdrawn and his arrangements repudiated.

Oct. 18. Viscount Palmerston, first lord of the treasury, died, aged 81. His lordship had been at the head of the cabinet from February, 1855, with the exception of the short interval of the Derby-Disraeli ministry in 1858, until his death. He was buried in Westminster Abbey. Earl Russell was his successor as chief of the cabinet.

Nov. 6. The Shenandoah, Confederate frigate, which had been active and successful in inflicting damage on the commercial vessels of the United States, arrived in the Mersey, and was surrendered to the British government on the 9th. The captain and crew having been set at large, the ship was delivered over to the consul of the United States.

Nov. 9. The Irish International Exhibition, which the Prince of Wales had opened, was closed on this day.

Nov. 23. Stephens, the head centre of the Fenians, who had been committed for trial to Richmond jail, made his escape. On the 28th the trial of the other conspirators commenced in Dublin; and on December 1st Luby, the first tried, was convicted and sentenced to twenty years' penal servitude. Other trials followed with similar results.

LEGISLATION. SESSION 28 & 29 VICTORIÆ.

Cap. 18. *For amending the Law of Evidence and Practice on Criminal Trials.* In trials for felony or misdemeanor, if evidence on the part of the accused be not called, the accused or his counsel have the right of addressing the jury last. If witnesses are called, and are adverse, it may be proved that they had made other statements previously.

Cap. 75. *For facilitating the more Useful Application of Sewage in Great Britain and Ireland.* Enables places not governed under the Public Health Act, or the Local Government Act, to form themselves into districts, levy rates, construct works for draining and cleansing, prevent the pollution of streams within their limits, and make contracts for the use of the sewage.

Cap. 79. *To provide for the better Distribution of the Charge for the Relief of the Poor in Unions.* The burial of the poor by the guardians, and all charges for vaccination and registration fees, are to be charged on the common fund of the union, and not on the parish; and the period of residence required for a settlement is further reduced from three years to one year.

Cap. 83. *For further Regulating the Use of Locomotives on Turnpike and other Roads for Agricultural and other Purposes.* When a locomotive is passing along any road, one person must precede it on foot, displaying a red flag, to warn drivers of carriages of its approach; it is not to go at a greater rate than four miles an hour along a highway, or than two miles through any town or village; towns of above 5000 inhabitants may regulate the speed and the hours at which locomotives may pass along the highways under their jurisdiction.

Cap. 90. *For the Establishment of a Fire Brigade within the Metropolis.* Under the Metropolitan Board of Works a fire brigade is established, to be supported by a rate, to which the fire insurance offices also contribute.

Cap. 99. *To confer on the County Courts a limited jurisdiction in Equity.* To the county courts are given the powers and jurisdiction of the higher chancery courts in suits which do not involve an amount in value above 500*l.* Evidence to be taken by word of mouth, and plaints to be heard in open court.

Revenue, 70,313,437*l.* Expenditure—army, 14,382,672*l.*; navy, 10,898,253*l.*; for all objects, 66,462,207*l.*; national debt. 808,289,398*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce, 165,835,725*l.*; total exports, 218,831,576*l.*

Imports, 271,072,285*l.*

Emigration to North American Colonies, 17,211; to the United States, 147,258; to the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 37,283; to all other places, 8049: total, 209,801.

Amount of gold imported from Australia, 5,051,170*l.*; total imported, 14,485,570*l.*; exported, 8,493,332*l.*

Railway traffic: miles open, 13,289; number of passengers, 251,959,862; traffic receipts, 35,751,655*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,157,884.

1866.

Jan. 2. The Gazette appointment appeared of Sir H. R. Storks, and a commission to inquire into the disturbances in Jamaica and the means taken for their suppression.

Jan. 16. The county and city of Dublin, in consequence of the discovery of quantities of concealed arms, came under the operation of a government proclamation, by which no person was allowed to appear with firearms, and empowering the police to search for arms in houses where they have reason to think they are concealed.

Jan. 23. General Prim, who had headed an abortive insurrection in Spain on the 3d of January, on this day crossed the frontier into Portugal. He had been pursued by several columns of Spanish troops, but all failed either to intercept him or bring him to action.

Jan. 29. Mr. George Peabody, the American merchant, in addition to the 150,000*l.* previously given, makes a second magnificent donation of 100,000*l.* for the relief of the poor in London. The trustees of the former gift had expended 80,000*l.* in erecting dwellings for the poor, in which very superior accommodation was afforded at rents below what they usually paid, but which gave an interest of three per cent on the capital sunk. In four blocks of buildings accommodation had been provided for 850 persons. The queen wrote a letter of thanks to Mr. Peabody, and regretted that he had not deemed it compatible with his position as an American citizen to accept the honors which she would have been glad to bestow.

Feb. 2. The special commission appointed to try the Fenian conspirators in Ireland finished its task this day. Forty-one persons had been tried, either in Dublin or in Cork, and of these, thirty-six had been convicted or pleaded guilty, three were acquitted, and in one case the jury disagreed and were discharged. The sentences were for various terms of penal imprisonment.

Feb. 20. Prince Couza, the Hospodar of the Danubian principalities, deposed, and the throne offered to the Count of Flanders, who at once declined.

March 31. The Spanish fleet, under Admiral Mendez Nunez, in spite of the remonstrances of the European consuls and the commanders of the English, French, and United States vessels, bombarded the unprotected Chilian port of Valparaiso. For seven hours the ships fired upon the town without a shot in opposition. At the end of that time they withdrew, leaving the town in flames. The inhabitants, of whom only three lost their lives, were then at liberty to extinguish the fire, in which they were assisted by the fire-engines and crews of the foreign vessels. The damage done by this useless and barbarous attack was estimated at 20,000 dollars.

April 7. Mr Johnson, the President of the United States, having passed his veto on the Civil Rights Bill, for conferring on the colored population equal rights with the whites, the Senate, by 33 votes to 15, overruled his veto.

April 16. Alexander II., Emperor of Russia, while entering his carriage at St. Petersburg, was shot at by a Russian named Karakosoff. The pistol was fortunately turned aside by a workman named Kommisaroff, who was ennobled for the act; the assassin was seized, and a military commission appointed to try the criminal and investigate the cause of the attempt. It was found that there was a secret society who had been conspiring against the safety of the state: and numerous arrests were made. Karakosoff was hung on the 16th of September; and thirty-four persons were convicted of having belonged to the secret society, of whom one was sentenced to be hung, and the others to imprisonment for life or for definite periods; but the emperor commuted the punishment of death for that of imprisonment, and reduced the terms of imprisonment of the rest.

May 10. The old-established discount house of Gurney, Overend & Co. (limited) suspended payment, with liabilities to the amount of 10,000,000*l.* This was followed on the 11th by the suspension of several other great firms, among them Peto, Betts & Co., the railway contractors, the English Joint-Stock Bank, and a number of minor ones. This was what became known as the Black Friday, and produced a panic which lasted (although the Bank of England discounted securities to the amount of 4,000,000*l.* at advanced rates of discount) until the bank was authorized by the chancellor of the exchequer to increase the issue of bank-notes at a minimum rate of 10 per cent for discount. This to some extent allayed the panic, but the consequences, immediate and remote, were long felt in all the commercial relations of the country.

May 31. An armed party of Fenians crossed the Niagara River from near Buffalo, possessed themselves of an empty mill called Fort Erie, and cut the telegraph wires. As soon as the fact became known, the Canadian volunteers were marched against them, at-

tacked them on the 2d of June, but were not successful in capturing them. In the mean time the government of the United States had given directions to General Grant to employ military force to prevent reinforcements crossing, as it was known a large number of Fenians had assembled on the United States frontier, and this was effectually done. The Canadian force having been strengthened, again advanced on Fort Erie, which the Fenians abandoned, leaving thirty-two men as a picket, who were captured, and six of them were tried by drum-head court-martial and shot. The main body, about 400, in recrossing the Niagara River, were seized by the Federal gunboats, disarmed, and after a few days' confinement, discharged on recognizances to appear when called on. On the 7th of June President Johnson issued a proclamation against the Fenians, forbidding any assistance being given to them; on the previous day General Sweeney, the organizer of the raid, had been arrested at St. Albans; on the 7th, Roberts, the Fenian civil chief, was arrested in New York; and warrants were issued for the arrest of some of the prominent members of the party.

June 5. The proposed conference at Paris abandoned in consequence of the refusal of Austria to assent to the programme for the settlement of disputes without hostilities, she demanding as a previous stipulation that no territorial addition should be made to any of the contending States.

June 15. The Prussian armies enter Saxony and Hanover, after a proclamation of war against Austria, and all states allied with her, had been issued by the King of Prussia. On the 17th one division took possession of Stade, in Hanover, and on the 18th the other entered Dresden.

June 18. Earl Russell's ministry were beaten by a majority of 315 against 304, on the rating clause of the Franchise Bill. On the 26th it was announced to the two houses that they had resigned, and that the Earl of Derby was to form a new ministry.

June 22. A military insurrection broke out in Madrid, but was repressed after 200 of the insurgents had been killed. Order was not restored until the next day with a total loss of 1000 lives, and 1750 prisoners thrown into jail, many of whom were subsequently executed.

June 23. The Italian army, numbering between 80,000 and 90,000 men, crossed the Mincio, advancing against the Austrians; they were met at Custozza, defeated after a battle of many hours, and forced to retreat across the Mincio with great loss.

June 27 and 28. The Austrians were defeated by the Prussians at Nachod, in Bohemia.

July 3. The main army of the Austrians defeated at Sadowa, near Königgrätz, with great loss. On the 4th the Emperor of Austria applied to the Prussians for an armistice, which was refused. He immediately ceded Venice and the dependent Italian territory to the Emperor of the French, and desired his mediation for the conclusion of a peace with all the belligerents.

July 5. The Princess Helena married to his royal highness Prince Christian of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg.

July 7. The shore end of the new Atlantic cable was fixed at Foilhummerum Bay, near Valencia, and paid out for thirty miles to be spliced on to the main cable on board the Great Eastern, lying ready to receive it. On the 15th it was successfully spliced, and the steamer proceeded to deposit the main cable. On the 27th the shore end was safely landed in Newfoundland, messages were sent, and the cable to connect it with the American Continent, about seventy miles, was at once commenced. Messages passed between Queen Victoria and President Johnson on the 29th and 30th.

July 23. A popular meeting in Hyde Park, London, having been forbidden by Sir R. Mayne, an immense crowd gathered in the evening, and, the gates being closed, the railings were torn down and the crowd entered, greatly damaging the flower-beds and shrubberies. Some forty or fifty persons were captured for rioting and assaults on the police, and on the following days were fined or sentenced to short terms of imprisonment by the police magistrate.

July 26. An armistice and preliminaries of peace agreed upon between Austria and Prussia, and on August 2d an armistice between Prussia and Bavaria. A truce was also agreed upon between Austria and Italy on July 25th.

Aug. 2. Peace signed at Prague between Austria and Prussia; it contained also a provision for the cession of Venetia to Italy. On the 30th the treaty was ratified. Austria consented to be entirely excluded from the German confederation, and to pay 20,000,000 Prussian thalers toward the expenses of the war.

Sept. 2. The sunken end of the Atlantic cable of 1865 recovered by the Great Eastern, spliced, and found to be in good working order. Communications were made to Valencia, and eventually was continued on to Newfoundland.

Sept. 6. The King of Prussia announces to the legislature the annexation of Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and Frankfort, with a part of Hesse-Darmstadt, which has also to pay 300,000*l.* toward the expenses of the war. Schleswig-Holstein had been previously appropriated.

Sept. 21. Treaty between Saxony and Prussia signed, by which Saxony enters the Northern Confederation. On the 26th the King and Queen of Saxony returned to Pillnitz.

Oct. 21. After much opposition and a long negotiation, Prince Charles of Hohenzollern, who had been elected Hospodar of the Danubian Provinces, now united under the name of Roumania, was received at Constantinople by the Sultan on this day with distinguished honors; a palace was assigned for his residence, he paid homage, and received the investiture.

Nov. 13. A remarkable shower of meteors occurred, lasting from 11 P.M. to 3 or 4 A.M. of the following morning.

Dec. 3. President Johnson, in his message to Congress, recommended conciliation toward the Southern States, and their readmission into the Union; stated that the differences with Great Britain respecting the Alabama were not settled; that he had caused the prosecution of the Fenians to be abandoned, considering their offence political; adding that strict neutrality must be preserved and raids prevented; that the French had consented to withdraw from Mexico; and that the finances were entirely satisfactory.

Dec. 11. The French troops evacuated Rome according to the convention of September 18th, and the papal standard replaced that of France on the castle of St. Angelo.

LEGISLATION. Session 29 & 30 Victoriæ.

Cap. 19. *To amend the Law relating to Parliamentary Oaths.* The oath now prescribed only contains a declaration of allegiance to the reigning sovereign, with an engagement to maintain the succession and the rights and liberties of the subject.

Cap. 28. *To enable the Public Works Loan Commissioners to make advances toward the erection of Dwellings for the Laboring Classes.* Loans may be made for this purpose, with the approval of the treasury commissioners, to any local or other authority invested with town or local government; to any railway, dock, or harbor company, or to a society or association established for the like purpose. Where such bodies are authorized to purchase lands, if not already a corporate body they are to be deemed such for the purposes of this act. A similar act (Cap. 44) was passed for Ireland.

Cap. 32. *To amend the Procedure and Powers of the Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes.* On a decree for dissolution of marriage, if the husband has no property on which a gross annual payment can be secured, the court may order a weekly or monthly payment.

Cap. 37. *To amend an Act of the 54 George III. Cap. 123, to prevent Frauds and Abuses in the Trade of Hops.* Heavy fines are imposed for not marking correctly the pockets or bags with the name of the grower, the place where grown, the date, and the weight; for mixing hops of different growths or dates; for packing foreign hops in British marked bags; or for wilfully defacing or altering the marks or symbols on any packages. Vendors, if required, are to give full information from whom the hops were received.

Cap. 65. *To enable Her Majesty to declare Gold Coins to be issued from Her Majesty's Colonial Branch Mints as legal tender for Payments.* The title explains itself, and the coinage of the Australian mints has been declared a legal tender. A charge for coining may be made.

Cap. 67. *For the union of the Colony of Vancouver Island with the Colony of British Columbia.* The separate government of Vancouver Island is abolished, and it is to send representatives to the Legislature of British Columbia.

Cap. 69. *For the amendment of the Law with respect to the Carriage and Deposit of Dangerous Goods.* Nitro-glycerine or glonoine oil, and other substances as may be determined by an order in council, are to be distinctly marked "specially dangerous" on the outside of each package, under heavy penalties for omission; and no warehouse owner or carrier is bound to receive any such package.

Cap. 85. *To facilitate the establishment, improvement, and maintenance of Oyster and Mussel Fisheries in Great Britain.* Under the sanction of the Board of Trade owners or occupiers of the sea or river shores may lay down an oyster-bed, within prescribed limits, supply it with oysters or spawn from any natural public oyster-bed, which are then to become private property. Within the limits no one to fish except with a line or a net fitted to catch floating fish only.

Cap. 89. *For vesting in the Conservators of the River Thames the Conservancy of the Thames and Isis, from Staines in Middlesex to Cricklade in Wiltshire.* This act abolishes the powers of the upper navigation commissioners, transfers all their rights and property in locks, canals, etc., to the Thames conservators, to whom five new members were added, and to them is given the power to make regulations for the navigation, to collect tolls, to repair and maintain the banks, weirs, and locks, to prevent the pollution of the water, and to receive payment for water taken within their limits for the supply of the public.

Cap. 90. *To amend the Law relating to the Public Health.* This important act is divided into four parts. Part I. empowers the formation in any district of a committee for the formation and due management of the sewers, with power to levy a rate for that purpose; to compel persons to drain into the public sewer or to form a cesspool; to furnish the district with water; to take charge of all wells, pumps, or fountains from which the public supply is furnished; and to dispose of the sewerage. Part II. is for the prevention of nuisances arising from overcrowded or ill-ventilated houses; to prevent nuisances from smoke; to disinfect houses where contagious diseases have prevailed; to empower the local authorities to provide a carriage for the conveyance of persons suffering from contagious disease to the hospital or elsewhere (who may not ride in a public conveyance without notice to the driver). Ships in harbor are subjected to the like regulations. Part III. is miscellaneous, and contains a number of regulations for the purpose of securing or procuring cleanli-

ness, a supply of water, and other details. Part IV. extends the act to Ireland, with certain modifications.

Cap. 114. *To amend the Public Libraries Act.* A library or museum may now be established in any town or parish, without taking proceedings under the former acts. A majority of assents at a meeting duly called being sufficient.

Cap. 122. *To make provision for the Improvement, Protection, and Management of Commons near the Metropolis.* All commons within the metropolitan district are no longer liable to inclosure; and, providing compensation for pecuniary rights, a scheme may be furnished to the inclosure commissioners for transferring their care to the local authorities or to the Metropolitan Board of Works.

Revenue, 67,812,202*l.* Expenditure—army, 14,569,279*l.*; navy, 10,259,788*l.*; for all objects, 65,914,357*l.*; national debt, 802,842,949*l.*

Exports of English and Irish produce, 188,917,536*l.*; total of exports, 238,905,082*l.*

Imports, 295,290,274*l.*

Emigration—to the North American Colonies, 13,225; to the United States, 161,000; to the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 24,097; to all other places, 6530: total, 204,882.

Amount of gold imported from Australia, 6,839,674*l.*; total imported, 23,509,641*l.*; exported, 12,742,639*l.*

Railways: miles open, 13,854; number of passengers, 274,403,895; traffic receipts, 38,164,354*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,111,009.

1867.

Feb. 11. Alarm of an attempt of the Fenians to attack the Castle of Chester. The plot had been disclosed by an accomplice, and prompt measures were taken for its defeat, which were effectual. Some 1400 or 1500 suspected persons assembled in the streets of Chester, but the swearing in of special constables, and the arrival of 500 of the Scotch Fusileers compelled them to disperse in scattered groups, without disturbing the public peace.

Feb. 13. On this day another party of Fenians, about 800 in number, assembled at Cahirciveen, in the county of Kerry. They sacked a coast-guard station at Kells, seized the arms, and shot a mounted policeman bearing dispatches, robbing him of his horse and arms. They then cut the telegraph wires, interrupting the messages by the Atlantic cable for about five hours, by which time they were restored. Troops were immediately sent from Cork to Killarney, and on the 14th the insurgents withdrew into the Toomes Mountains by the Gap of Dunlo, whither they were pursued by a strong military force on the 15th. A large number of arrests was made in the next few days, at Dublin and elsewhere, of persons coming by sea, chiefly from the United States.

Feb. 17. The first ship, the Primo, a vessel of eighty tons burden, passed through the Suez Canal, and by a temporary freshwater canal, from the Mediterranean into the Red Sea.

Feb. 24. The first parliament of the North German Confederation was opened at Berlin.

March 5. The Fenians again commenced a rising in several parts of Ireland. The mail-train from Cork to Dublin was sent off the line, and the telegraph wires were cut, destroying the communication with all Munster. The government had been informed of the intention, and were fully prepared. At Tallaght, near Dublin, a party of twelve policemen met about 200 Fenians, and summoned them to surrender, but they fired on the police, who returned the fire, wounding five, and ultimately capturing eighty-three. At Drogheda 1000 Fenians had a combat with the police for the possession of the market-house, and here forty prisoners were taken. At Kilmallock a party attacked the police-station, which was defended; three of the assailants were killed, and fourteen taken prisoners. Dromore police-barrack was burned down, a coast-guard station near Kilrush was plundered of the arms, as also were the police-barracks and several houses at Holy Cross, by different parties of Fenians.

March 23. A secret treaty was laid before the different legislatures, between Prussia and the Southern States of Germany, by which the military contingents of Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden, etc., are placed at the disposal of Prussia, thus, in fact, incorporating all Germany into one entire empire for defensive military purposes. The treaty had been concluded in the previous July.

April 1. The French great International Exhibition opened in a very incomplete state. By the early part of May it was most effectively completed.

April 10. Commencement of the trial, at the Central Criminal Court, of Colonel Nelson and Lieutenant Brand for the murder of Mr. Gordon, in Jamaica. The charge of the Lord Chief Justice to the grand jury occupied six hours, in which he laid it down as a principle that martial law could not override civil law. The grand jury threw out both the bills of indictment on the following day.

April 27. The trial of General Burke and Patrick Doran, the first two of the Fenians accused of being concerned in the late outbreak, commenced at Dublin. Both were found guilty of high treason on May 1st, and sentenced to be executed on the 29th. The sitting of the commission terminated on May 24th. A number of prisoners had been found guilty of treason-felony, and sentenced to various periods of imprisonment. Doran, after some delay, had his sentence commuted to penal servitude; Burke was left for execution until the 27th, when, in compliance with numerous petitions, his sentence was also commuted.

May 6. A popular demonstration in Hyde Park in favor of reform, which had been at first forbidden by the government, but at the last moment permitted, was held without the slightest disturbance of the public peace.

June 6. Attempt made by a young Pole in Paris to assassinate the Emperor of Russia, while seated in a carriage with his two sons and the Emperor of the French. The pistol burst, blew off the hand of the assassin, without damaging any of the persons in the carriage. He was subsequently tried and sentenced to death, but not executed, in compliance with a desire of the Emperor of Russia.

June 7. The conference for the settlement of the Luxemburg question met in London; it consisted of the representatives of England, Russia, Austria, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and Prussia. On the 11th the terms were agreed upon: Luxemburg to remain subject to the King of the Netherlands; the fortress to be evacuated by Prussia, and to be demolished as quickly as possible; the neutrality of the whole territory to be guaranteed by the subscribing powers.

June 8. The Emperor of Austria crowned King of Hungary, with great ceremony, swearing to preserve the old Hungarian constitution, which had been a source of contest between the nation and the sovereigns for many years.

June 13. Jefferson Davis, late President of the Southern Confederacy, was admitted to bail at Richmond, United States, and took his departure a few days afterward, for Montreal, in Canada.

June 19. On this day the commission sitting to inquire into the outrages committed against non-union men at Sheffield, were first able to obtain any evidence directly implicating any individual. A man named Hallam, who had been committed to prison for refusing to answer, declared himself willing to disclose all he knew. He then acknowledged the crimes of having been a party to the blowing-up of several places, and to the shooting twice at a man named Linley, who died in consequence, and in whose case a verdict of wilful murder had been found. His evidence was confirmed by a confederate named Crookes, and they said they were hired and paid by one Broadhead, the secretary of the Saw Grinders' Union, and the treasurer of the amalgamated unions. On a subsequent day this man acknowledged the truth of these accusations, and stated that for nineteen years he had been the instigator and the rewarder of most of the offences of rattening and personal outrage committed in Sheffield, but persisted in saying that the unions knew nothing about this; they only knew they were committed, and purposely left the whole management in his hands, and never examined his accounts. These discoveries were made after the announcement that truthful avowal would absolve even the most guilty participators from all personal punishment. On July 8th the investigation closed, and certificates of indemnity were granted to Broadhead, Crookes, and the other witnesses who had made the disclosures.

July 6. The Viceroy of Egypt arrived in London on a visit, and on the 12th the Sultan of Turkey. Both were received by the queen, and entertained with great hospitality by the corporation of London and other public bodies and private persons. The sultan was lodged in Buckingham Palace, the viceroy at Dudley House, the residence of Lord Ward.

July 10. On an invitation to attend the rifle-shooting at Wimbledon, 2000 Belgian volunteers were brought over in the government steamer Serapis, and were warmly welcomed by the British riflemen, the London corporation, etc.

July 17. A grand naval review at Spithead took place, in the presence of the Sultan of Turkey and Viceroy of Egypt, who were received by the queen on board her yacht. She decorated the sultan with the Order of the Garter, but the review was somewhat marred by stormy weather.

Aug. 17. An insurrection broke out in Spain; the provinces of Catalonia and Aragon were entered from France by a few armed men, under Generals Contreras and Pierrad, who were immediately joined by others. General Prim was expected to join them, but did not. Madrid, and nearly the whole of Spain were in a few days declared to be under martial law. It was suppressed with little difficulty.

Aug. 26. The first engine and train passed over the Mont Cenis Railway, the summit elevation being 6700 feet above the sea level. The train was worked on the centre-rail system, and the trip was completely successful.

Sept. 10. The sitting of the North German Parliament was opened with a speech from the King of Prussia, in which a variety of measures were promised to be introduced, most of them tending to a closer unity of the various states.

Sept. 14. Some of the transports sailed from London and Liverpool, conveying stores and ammunition for the Abyssinian expedition, for the purpose of coercing the Emperor Theodore to deliver the British captives. The military force was to be forwarded from India.

Sept. 18. A most daring attack made at Manchester on the police van which was conveying to jail two men, named Kelly and Deasy, charged with being Fenians. Between forty and fifty men had assembled, armed with revolvers and other weapons. They intercepted the van, shot the horses, knocked the driver from his seat, dispersed the few policemen who guarded it, with much difficulty broke it open, and shot the policeman inside, who refused to give up the keys of the separate cells. Ultimately the two Fenians were liberated,

and although handcuffed, made their escape, with fifteen other prisoners who were being conveyed to prison. This was about four P.M. Before the following morning William O'Meara Allen, the man who shot the policeman in the van, and Michael Larkin were in custody, charged with wilful murder, and several others charged with riot and murder, who were examined before the magistrates, and remanded. On the 26th the examination was resumed, and on the 5th of October twenty-three were committed for trial. On October 29th a special commission was opened at Manchester, before which W. O'Meara Allen, M. Larkin, W. Gould, T. Maguire, and E. Shore were indicted for the murder of Charles Brett. On November 1st they were all found guilty, and sentenced to death. On November 23d, Allen, Gould, and Larkin were hung. Shore's punishment was commuted, and Maguire was pardoned, as there seemed to have been a mistake as to his identity.

Sept. 23. General Garibaldi was arrested at Sinigaglia, in order to prevent his heading an intended insurrection at Rome, and placed in confinement at Alessandria. A number of persons were also apprehended at Rome as participators in the projected revolt. He was sent, a few days later, to his island of Caprera in a government vessel.

Oct. 20. From the time of the arrest of Garibaldi to this date continual irruptions of insurgents into the papal states were made with varying success; anarchy was prevailing, and it seemed that the Italian government could not prevent the hostilities. France threatened to interfere, and troops were embarked at Toulon; but on the 19th Rattazzi, the Italian minister, resigned, and General Cialdini was nominated in his place. He announced that stringent measures would be adopted. The insurgents, headed by Menotti Garibaldi, withdrew from the papal territories, and the French preparations for intervention were abandoned.

Oct. 28. General Garibaldi having escaped from Caprera, joined the insurgents in attacking the papal troops, and closely approached Rome; the attempt of Victor Emmanuel to form a ministry under Cialdini having likewise failed, although another under General Menabrera had been named, the Emperor of the French had dispatched an expedition from Toulon to support the Pope, and on this day the first division landed at Civita Vecchia. On October 30th a portion of the French troops entered Rome; on the same day a part of the Italian royal army crossed the papal frontier for the purpose of preserving order; and Garibaldi, with his volunteers, retired from the immediate neighborhood of Rome to Monte Rotondo.

Nov. 1. After a trial at Dublin, Colonel John Warren, the first Fenian prisoner indicted at this commission, was found guilty. He had come from the United States, and, with several others, landed near Youghal. He claimed to be a citizen of the United States, but, born in Ireland, the claim was disallowed; and his counsel, by his direction, withdrew. He had other counsel assigned, and was convicted partly on the evidence of an accomplice.

Nov. 3. Garibaldi was attacked by the papal and French troops at Mentana. After a sharp fight his band was scattered, and he fled to Terni, within the Italian territory, where he was arrested by the royal authorities, and, with his two sons, who had also been taken, was placed in confinement.

Nov. 4. A part of the expedition against Abyssinia arrived at Suez from India.

Dec. 13. A daring attempt made to effect the escape of two prisoners, remanded on a charge of having been parties to the murder of Brett, the police constable, at Manchester, by blowing up the wall of the House of Detention in Clerkenwell, London. A barrel of gunpowder was placed against the wall and exploded. About 60 feet of the wall was thrown down between 3 and 4 o'clock P.M., the usual time for exercising the prisoners; but the hour had been changed, and the prisoners were in their cells. The effect, however, was terrible. Six persons were killed, and nearly 50 men, women, and children were more or less injured. Several persons were apprehended on suspicion of having been engaged in the crime. Six were tried at the Criminal Court in April, but only one, named Barrett, was found guilty, and he was hung on May 26th.

LEGISLATION. Session 30 & 31 Victoriæ.

Cap. 3. *For the Union of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and the government thereof, and for purposes connected therewith.* The governments are united into one, under a viceroy, with a general parliament held at Ottawa, now the seat of government. Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick have each a lieutenant-governor, with a provincial legislature.

Cap. 6. *For the establishment in the Metropolis of Asylums for the Sick, Insane, and other Classes of the Poor, and of Dispensaries; and for the Distribution over the Metropolis of portions of the Charge for Poor Relief, and for other purposes relating to the Poor Relief in the Metropolis.*

Cap. 29. *To amend the Law in respect of the Sale and Purchase of Shares in Joint-Stock Banking Companies.* Contracts for sale or purchase of such shares are declared to be void, unless the shares to be sold are clearly designated in writing, either by their number or by the name of the holder.

Cap. 35. *To remove some Defects in the Administration of the Criminal Law.* Persons acquitted, in certain cases may be allowed their costs; persons accused are allowed to summon witnesses, who may have their expenses allowed by the court. Additional powers are given for taking the depositions of persons dangerously ill; and jailers are to bring up persons indicted, without a writ of *habeas corpus*, upon an order of the court.

Cap. 48. *For amending the Law of Auction of Estates.* In sales of land by auction it is to be stated in the conditions of sale whether it is to be sold with or without reserve; if it be sold without reserve no one is allowed to bid on behalf of the owner; in sales under orders from the Court of Chancery the practice of opening biddings after a sale is to be discontinued.

Cap. 75. *To remove certain Religious Disabilities affecting some of Her Majesty's Subjects, and to amend the Law relating to Oaths of Office.* The restriction as to the religion of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland is removed; judicial or corporate officers may attend their places of worship in their official robes without incurring any penalty; and a form of oath is provided to supersede the former ones of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration.

Cap. 102. *Further to amend the Laws relating to the Representation of the People in England and Wales.* This is the Reform Act of 1867. The act is long, but its details have been made widely known.

Cap. 103. *For the Extension of the Factory Acts.* The provisions of previous acts are extended to females and young persons employed in blast-furnaces, copper-mills, forges, foundries, or in the manufacture of machinery, or of any article of metal, or of india-rubber, or gutta-percha; and to any premises in which is carried on the manufacture of paper, glass, tobacco, letter-press printing, bookbinding, and any other premises in which fifty or more persons are employed, with exceptions as to night-work in blast-furnaces, iron-mills, and printing-offices; but so as no one is to be employed more than sixty hours in any one week.

Cap. 105. *To establish Equitable Councils of Conciliation to adjust Differences between Masters and Workmen.* Masters and workmen, in any locality, may call a meeting and agree to form a council of conciliation, and petition the secretary of state for a license; the council may not consist of less than two nor more than ten masters and workmen; they have power to determine questions submitted to them and to enforce their awards; a rate of wages or price of labor may not be established by them; no counsel or attorneys to be heard before the courts unless by consent of both parties.

Cap. 127. *To amend the Law relating to Railway Companies.* The rolling stock of a railway is protected from seizure by creditors by this act; the remedy is by petition to the Court of Chancery, who may appoint a receiver or manager of the railway.

Cap. 130. *For the regulation of Agricultural Gangs.* No child under eight years of age to be employed licenses to gang-masters are to be granted by magistrates; no female to be employed in the same gang with males, or without a female licensed as gang-master being present; and the magistrates are to fix the distances within which children are to be allowed to travel to their work.

Cap. 134. *For regulating the Traffic in the Metropolis, and for making Provision for the greater Security of Persons passing through the Streets.* This is the act now in operation.

Cap. 141. *To amend the Statute Law as between Master and Servant.* Compensation for breach of contract may be awarded on either side, which, with any fines imposed, are to be recovered by distress, and in default of payment to be punished by imprisonment.

Cap. 146. *For regulating the Hours of Labor for Children, Young Persons, and Women employed in Workshops.* No child under eight is to be employed in any handicraft; no child to be employed more than six hours and a half on any one day, and such employment to be between 6 A.M. and 8 P.M.; no young person or female to be so employed for more than twelve hours, with time for meals; no person to be employed in any handicraft on Sunday or after two o'clock on Saturday afternoon. There are also regulations for the children attending schools.

Revenue, 69,434,508*l.* Expenditure—army, 14,675,540*l.*; navy, 10,676,101*l.*; for all objects, 66,780,396*l.*; national debt, 800,848,847*l.*

Exports of British and Irish produce and manufactures, 181,183,971*l.*; total exports, 226,057,136*l.*

Imports, 275,249,853*l.*

Emigration—to the North American Colonies, 15,503; to the United States, 159,275; to the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, 14,466; to all other places, 6709: total, 195,953.

Amount of gold imported from Australia, 5,801,207*l.*: total imported, 15,800,159*l.*; exported, 7,889,030*l.*

Number of paupers, 1,148,643.

MISCELLANEOUS TABLES.

TABLE OF CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

ENGLAND.	SCOTLAND.	FRANCE.	SPAIN.	GERMANY.	PAPAL STATES.
800 Egbert	800 Achaius	800 Charlemagne		800 Charlemagne	800 Leo III.
		814 Louis I.		814 Louis I.	816 Stephen V.
	819 Congale III.				817 Pascal I.
					824 Eugene II.
	824 Dougal				827 Valentine
	834 Alpin				827 Gregory IV.
836 Ethelwolf	836 Kenneth II.	843 Charles the Bald		843 Louis II.	843 Sergius II.
	854 Donald V.				847 Leo IV.
857 Ethelbald	858 Constantine II.				855 Benedict III.
860 Ethelbert			858 Garcia I.		858 Nicolas I.
866 Ethelred I.					867 Adrian II.
872 Alfred	874 Ethus	877 Louis I.		876 Carloman	872 John VIII.
	876 Gregory	879 Louis II.		876 Louis III.	882 Martin I.
		879 Carloman	880 Fortunio	876 Charles le Gros	884 Adrian III.
	892 Donald VI.	884 Charles le Gros		887 Arnold	885 Stephen VI.
		888 Hugh			891 Formosus
		898 Charles the Simple		899 Louis IV.	896 Stephen VII.
900 Edward the Elder					897 Rom. Formosus
	901 Constantine III.				897 John IX.
			902 Sancho I.		900 Benedict IV.
					903 Leo V.
					904 Sergius III.
					911 Anastasius
				911 Conrad I.	913 Lando
		922 Robert		919 Henry I.	914 John X.
925 Athelstan		923 Ralph			928 Leo VI.
			926 Garcia II.		929 Stephen VIII.
					931 John XI.
					936 Leo VII.
	938 Malcolm I.	936 Louis IV.		936 Otho the Great	939 Stephen IX.
941 Edmund					943 Martin II.
					946 Agapet II.
946 Edred		954 Lothaire			956 John XII.
955 Edwy	958 Indulphus				964 Benedict V.
959 Edgar					965 John XIII.
	968 Duffus				972 Benedict VI.
	972 Cullenus		970 Sancho II.		973 Domnus II.
975 Edward the Martyr	973 Kenneth III.			973 Otho II.	974 Benedict VII.
978 Ethelred II.					983 John XIV.
		986 Louis V.		983 Otho III.	985 John XV.
		987 Hugh Capet			986 John XVI.
	994 Constantine IV.		994 Garcia III.		996 Gregory V.
	996 Grimus	997 Robert			999 Sylvester II.
					1003 John XVII.
			1000 Sancho III.	1002 Henry II.	1003 John XVIII.
	1004 Malcolm II.				1009 Sergius IV.
1016 Edmund Ironside					1012 Benedict VIII.
					1024 John XIX.
1017 Canute				1024 Conrad II.	1033 Benedict IX.
1036 Harold	1034 Duncan	1031 Henry I.	1033 Ferdinand I. (*Castile*)		1044 Gregory VI.
1039 Hardicanute	1040 Macbeth		1035 Garcia IV. (*Navarre*)	1039 Henry III.	1047 Clement II.
1041 Edward Confessor			1035 Ramirez I. (*Aragon*)		1048 Damasius II.
			1054 Sancho VII. (*Navarre*)		1049 Leo IX.

ENGLAND.	SCOTLAND.	FRANCE.	SPAIN.	GERMANY.	PAPAL STATES.
			1054 Peter II. (*Aragon*)	1056 Henry IV.	1055 Victor II.
					1057 Stephen X.
1066 Harold II.	1057 Malcolm III.	1060 Philip I.	1060 James I. (*Aragon*)		1059 Nicolas II.
1066 William I.			1061 Henry I. (*Castile*)		1061 Alexander II.
1087 William II.			1066 Sancho I. (*Aragon*)		1073 Gregory VII.
			1066 Sancho I. (*Castile*)		1086 Victor III.
	1093 Donald Bane		1072 Alphonso I. (*Castile*)		1088 Urban II.
	1094 Duncan		1076 Sancho V. (*Nav. and Ar.*)		1099 Pascal II.
			1094 Peter I. (*Nav. and Ar.*)		
	1095 Donald Bane (restored)			1107 Henry V.	1118 Gelasius II.
			1104 Alphonso I. (*Nav. and Ar.*)		1119 Calixtus II.
1100 Henry I.	1098 Edgar	1109 Louis VI.	1109 Urraca (*Castile*)	1125 Lothaire	1124 Honorius II.
			1126 Alphonso II. (*Castile*)		1130 Innocent II.
	1107 Alexander I.		1133 Garcia V. (*Navarre*)	1139 Conrad III.	1143 Celestine II.
1135 Stephen	1124 David I.		1133 Ramirez II. (*Aragon*)		1144 Lucius II.
		1137 Louis VII.	1137 Petronilla (*Aragon*)		1145 Eugenius III.
			1150 Sancho VI. (*Navarre*)	1152 Frederic I.	1153 Anastasius IV.
			1157 Sancho II. (*Castile*)		1154 Adrian IV.
	1153 Malcolm IV.		1158 Alphonso III. (*Castile*)		1159 Alexander III.
1154 Henry II.			1162 Alphonso II. (*Aragon*)		1181 Lucius III.
	1165 William	1180 Philip II.			1185 Urban III.
					1187 Gregory VIII.
					1188 Clement III.
			1194 Sancho VII. (*Navarre*)	1191 Henry VI.	1191 Celestine III.
1189 Richard I.			1196 Peter II. (*Aragon*)		1198 Innocent III.
1199 John		1223 Louis VIII.		1209 Otto IV.	1216 Honorius III.
1216 Henry III.	1214 Alexander II.				1227 Gregory IX.
			CASTILE AND LEON.		1241 Celestine IV.
		1226 Louis IX.	1230 Ferdinand III.	1212 Frederic II.	
			1252 Alphonso X.	1251 Conrad IV.	1243 Innocent IV.
				1254 Interregnum	1254 Alexander IV.
	1249 Alexander III.				1261 Urban IV.
					1265 Clement IV.
				1273 Rodolph	1272 Gregory X.
					1276 Innocent V.
1272 Edward I.		1270 Philip III.			1276 Adrian V.
					1276 John XXI.
					1277 Nicolas III.
					1281 Martin IV.
			1284 Sancho IV.		1285 Honorius IV.
	1286 Margaret	1285 Philip IV.			1288 Nicolas IV.
	1292 John Balliol		1295 Ferdinand IV.	1292 Adolphus	1294 Celestine V.
	1296 Interregnum			1298 Albert I.	1295 Boniface VIII.
1307 Edward II.	1306 Robert I.	1314 Louis X.	1312 Alphonso XI.		1303 Benedict XI.
		1316 Philip V.		1308 Henry VII.	1305 Clement V.
1327 Edward III.	1329 David II.	1322 Charles IV.		1314 Louis V.	1316 John XXII.
		1328 Philip VI.	1350 Pedro		1334 Benedict XII.

TABLE OF CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS—(CONTINUED).

ENGLAND.	SCOTLAND.	FRANCE.	SPAIN.	GERMANY.	PAPAL STATES.
		1350 John		1347 Charles IV.	1342 Clement VI.
		1364 Charles V.	1366 Henry II.		1352 Innocent VI.
			1367 Pedro (rest'd)		1362 Urban V.
1377 Edward III.	1371 Robert II.		1369 Henry II. (restored)		1370 Gregory XI.
died					
1377 Richard II.					
		1380 Charles VI.	1379 John I.	1378 Wenceslaus.	1378 Urban VI.
1399 Henry IV.	1390 Robert III.		1390 Henry III.		1390 Boniface IX.
				1400 Rupert	1404 Innocent VII.
	1406 James I.		1406 John II.		1406 Gregory XII.
					1409 Alexander V.
1413 Henry V.				1411 Sigismund	1410 John XXII.
1422 Henry VI.		1422 Charles VII.			1417 Martin V.
				1431 Albert II.	1431 Eugene IV.
	1437 James II.			1437 Frederick III.	1447 Nicolas V.
					1455 Calixtus III.
					1458 Pius II.
1461 Edward IV.	1462 James III.	1461 Louis XI.			1464 Paul II.
			1474 Ferdinand and Isabella		1471 Sixtus IV.
1483 Edward V.		1483 CharlesVIII.			1484 Innocent VIII.
Richard III.					
1485 Henry VII.	1488 James IV.				
		1498 Louis XII.		1493 Maximilian I.	1492 Alexander VI.
1509 Henry VIII.					
					1503 Pius III.
					1503 Julius II.
	1513 James V.	1515 Francis I.	1517 Charles I.	1517 Charles V.	1513 Leo X.
					1522 Adrian VI.
					1523 Clement VII.
1547 Edward VI.	1542 Mary	1547 Henry II.			1534 Paul III.

ENGLAND.	SCOTLAND.	FRANCE.	SPAIN.	GERMANY.	SWEDEN.	PAPAL STATES.
1547 Edward VI.	Mary	1547 Henry II.	Charles I.	Charles V.		Paul III.
						1550 Julius III.
1553 Mary						
			1555 Philip II.			1555 Marcellus II.
				1557 Ferdinand I.		1555 Paul IV.
1558 Elizabeth						
		1559 Francis II.				1559 Pius IV.
		1560 CharlesIX.				
				1564 Maximilian II.		1566 Pius V.
	1567 James VI.					
		1574 Henry III.		1576 Rodolph II.		1572 Gregory XIII.
						1585 Sixtus V.
		1589 Henry IV.				1590 Urban VII.
						1590 Gregory XIV.
						1591 Innocent IX.
						1592 Clement VIII.
			1599 Philip III.			
1603 James I.						
					1604 CharlesIX.	1605 Leo XI.
						1605 Paul V.
		1610 LouisXIII.				
					1611 Gustavus Adolphus	
				1612 Matthias		
				1619 Ferdinand II.		
			1621 Philip IV.			1621 Gregory XV.
1625 Charles I.						1623 Urban VIII.
					1632 Christina	
				1637 Ferdinand III.		
		1643 LouisXIV.				1644 Innocent X.

	ENGLAND.	FRANCE.	GERMANY.	PAPAL STATES.	SPAIN.	RUSSIA.
1625	Charles I.	Louis XIII.	Ferdinand II.	Urban VIII.	Philip III.	Michael Federowitch.
1637	....	....	Ferdinand III.	....	....	....
1643	....	Louis XIV.	....	....	....	....
1644	....	....	....	Innocent X.	....	....
1645	....	....	....	....	....	Alexei Michaelowitch.
1649	Charles II., King *de jure*. Commonwealth.	....	....	....	....	....
1655	....	....	....	Alexander VII.	....	....
1658	....	....	Leopold I.	....	....	....
1660	Charles II., King *de facto*.	....	....	....	....	....
1665	....	....	....	....	Charles II.	....
1667	....	....	....	Clement IX.	....	....
1670	....	....	....	Clement X.	....	....
1676	....	....	....	Innocent XI.	....	Feodore II.
1682	....	....	....	....	....	Ivan Alexandrowitch.
1685	James II.	....	....	....	....	Peter the Great.
1689	William and Mary.	....	....	Alexander VIII.	....	....

GREAT BRITAIN.	FRANCE.	GERMANY.	PRUSSIA.	SWEDEN.	RUSSIA.	SPAIN.
1690 William and Mary.	Louis XIV.	Leopold I.	Frederic William.	Charles XII.	Peter I.	Charles II.
1694 William III.	....	....	....	....	....	....
1700	....	....	....	....	....	1700 Philip V. (*disputed succession*).
1701 ...	....	....	1701 Frederic I.	....	....	....
1702 Anne.	....	....	....	....	....	....
1705	....	1705 Joseph I.	....	....	....	....
1711	....	1711 Charles VI.	....	....	....	....
1713	....	....	1713 Frederic William I.	....	....	....
1714 George I.	....	....	....	....	....	...

GREAT BRITAIN.	DENMARK.	POLAND.	PORTUGAL.	PAPAL STATES.	NAPLES.	SARDINIA.
1690 William and Mary.	Christian V.	Augustus II.	Peter II.	Alexander VIII.	Charles II.	Victor Amadeus II.
1691	....	....	....	1691 Innocent XII.	....	....
1694 William III.	....	....	....	....	....	....
1699 .. .	1699 Frederick IV.	....	....	....	....	....
1700	....	....	....	1700 Clement XI.	1700 Charles II. died (*disputed succession*).	....
1702 Anne.	....	....	....	....	....	....
1704	....	1704 Stanislaus Leczinsky.	....	....	....	....
1706	...	....	1709 John V.	....	....	....
1709	....	1709 Augustus II. (restored).	....	....	....	....
1714 George I.	....	....	....	....	....	....

GREAT BRITAIN.	FRANCE.	GERMANY.	PRUSSIA.	SWEDEN.	RUSSIA.	SPAIN.
1714 George I.	Louis XIV.	Charles VI.	Frederic William I.	UlricaEleonora.	Peter the Great.	Philip V.
1715	Louis XV.	....	....	....	....	....
1720	....	....	....	Frederic.	....	....
1725	...	....	....	....	Catherine I.	....
1727 George II.	....	....	....	....	Peter II.	....

TABLE OF CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS—(CONTINUED).

GREAT BRITAIN.	FRANCE.	GERMANY.	PRUSSIA.	SWEDEN.	RUSSIA.	SPAIN.
1730	....	....	....	....	Anne.	....
1740	....	....	Frederic the Great.	....	Ivan III.	....
1741	....	....	....	....	Elizabeth.	....
1742	....	Charles VII.	....	....	....	....
1745	....	Francis I. and Maria Teresa.	....	....	....	....
1751	....	.. .	....	....	Ferdinand VI.	....
1758	....	....	...	Adolphus Frederic.	....	....
1759	....	....	....	....	Charles III.	....
1760 George III.	....	....	....	....	...	....
1762	....	....	....	....	{ Peter III. / Catherine II. }	....
1765 ...	....	Joseph II.	....	....	....	....
1771	....	....	...	Gustavus III.	....	....
1774	Louis XVI.	..	....	....	....	....
1786	....	....	Frederic William II.	....	....	....
1788	....	....	....	...	....	Charles IV.

GREAT BRITAIN.	DENMARK.	POLAND.	PORTUGAL.	PAPAL STATES.	NAPLES.	SARDINIA.
1714 George I.	Frederic IV.	Augustus II.	John V.	Clement XI.	Charles II.	....
1720	....	....	....	...	.. .	Victor Amadeus II.
1721	....	....	...	Innocent XIII.	.. .	....
1724	....	....	....	Benedict XIII.	....	....
1727 George II.	....	....	....	...	....	....
1730	Christian VI.	....	....	Clement XII.	....	Charles Emanuel III.
1740	....	....	....	Benedict XIV.	...	....
1746	Frederic V.	....	....	....	....	....
1750	....	....	Joseph Emanuel.	....	....	....
1758	....	....	....	Clement XIII.	....	....
1759	....	....	...	....	Ferdinand IV.	....
1760 George III.	....	....	....	....	....	....
1764	....	Stanislaus.	....	....	....	....
1766	Christian VII.	....	....	...	....	....
1769	....	....	....	Clement XIV.	....	....
1772	.. .	First Partition.	....	...	....	...
1778	....	....	....	....	....	Victor Amadeus III.
1775	....	....	....	Pius VI.	....	....
1777	....	....	Maria.	....	....	....
1788	....	....	....	....	....	....

GREAT BRITAIN.	FRANCE.	GERMANY.	PRUSSIA.	SWEDEN.	RUSSIA.	SPAIN.
1789 George III.	Louis XVI.	Joseph II.	Frederic William II.	Gustavus III.	Catharine II.	Charles IV.
1790 ...	....	Leopold II.	....	....	....	....
1792	Republic.	Francis II.*	....	Gustavus IV.	....	....
1796	....	....	....	....	Paul I.	....
1797	....	....	Frederic William III.	....	. ..	....
1799	Bonaparte, 1st Consul.	....	....	....	....	....
1801	....	....	....	....	Alexander.	....
1804	Napoleon, Emperor.	....	....	....	..	....
		AUSTRIA.				

* Upon the establishment of the Confederation of the Rhine, in 1806, Francis ceased to be Emperor of Germany, and became hereditary Emperor of Austria, under the title of Francis I.

GREAT BRITAIN.	FRANCE.	GERMANY.	PRUSSIA.	SWEDEN.	RUSSIA.	SPAIN.
1806	....	Francis I.	....	....	....	....
1808	....	....	....	....	....	{ Ferdinand VII. / Joseph Napoleon.
1809	.. .	....	....	Charles XIII.	....	....
1811 Regency.	....	....	....	....	....	....
1814	Louis XVIII.	....	....	....	....	Ferdinand VII.

GREAT BRITAIN.	DENMARK.	PORTUGAL.	PAPAL STATES.	NAPLES.	SARDINIA.	UNITED STATES.
1787 George III.	Christian VII.	Maria.	Pius VI.	Ferdinand IV.	Victor Amadeus III.	George Washington (President).
1793	....	....	....	....	....	Re-elected 1793.
1795 ...	....	....	....	....	....	....
1796	....	....	....	....	Charles Emanuel IV.	....
1797	....	....	....	....	....	John Adams (President).
1799 . ..	....	John VI.	...	....	....	....
1800	....	..	Pius VII.	....	....	....
1801	....	....	....	....	....	Thomas Jefferson (President).
1802	....	....	....	....	Victor Emanuel.	....
1808	Frederic VI.	....	. ..	Joseph Napoleon.	....	....
1809	....	....	....	....	....	Thomas Madison (President).
1811 Regency.	....	....	....	....	....	Re-elected 1813.
1814 ...	....	....	....	....	....	....

GREAT BRITAIN.	FRANCE.	AUSTRIA.	PRUSSIA.	SWEDEN.	RUSSIA.	SPAIN.
1815 Regency.	Louis XVIII.	Francis I.	Frederic William III.	Charles XIII.	Alexander I.	Ferdinand VII.
1818	....	....	....	Charles John XIV.	....	....
1820 George IV.	....	....	...	....	....	..
1824	Charles X.	....	. ..	....	....	..
1825	....	....	....	....	Nicolas I.	....
1830 William IV.	Louis Philippe.	....	....	....	....	....
1833	....	....	....	....	....	Regency.
1835	....	Ferdinand I.	....	....	....	....
1837 Victoria.	....	.. .	....	....	....	....

GREAT BRITAIN.	DENMARK.	PORTUGAL.	PAPAL STATES.	NAPLES.	SARDINIA.	UNITED STATES.
1815 Regency.	Frederic VI.	John VI.	Pius VII.	[Joach. Murat], Ferdinand IV.	VictorEmanuel.	Thomas Madison (President).
1817	....	....	....	....	....	James Monroe.
1820 George IV.	....	....	....	....	....	....
1821	....	....	....	Ferdinand I.	Charles Felix.	James Monroe. Re-elected 1821.
1823	....	....	Leo XII.	....	....	....
1825	....	....	....	....	....	John Quincy Adams.
1826	....	Pedro IV.	....	Francis.	....	. ..
1828	....	Maria da Gloria.	....	....	....	....
1829	....	....	....	....	....	Andrew Jackson.
1830 William IV.	....	....	....	Ferdinand II.	....	....
1831	....	....	Gregory XVI.	.. .	Charles Albert.	....
1833	....	...	....	....	....	Andrew Jackson. Re-elected 1833.
1837 Victoria.	....	....	....	....	....	....

CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS AND RULERS FROM 1815, INCLUDING RETURNS DERIVED FROM THE CENSUSES OF 1851 AND 1861.

GREAT BRITAIN.	FRANCE.	AUSTRIA.	PRUSSIA.	SWEDEN.	RUSSIA.	SPAIN.
1815 Regency.	Louis XVIII.	Francis I.	Frederic William III.	Charles XIII.	Alexander I.	Ferdinand VII.
1818	....	....	...	Charles John XIV.	....	....
1820 George IV.	....	....	....	....	....	...
1824	Charles X.	....	...	....	....	....
1825	...	...	....	....	Nicolas I.	....
1830 William IV.	Louis Philippe.	....	....	....	....	....
1833	....	....	....	....	....	Isabella II.
1835	...	Ferdinand I.	....	....	....	....
1837 Victoria.	...	....	....	....	....	....
1840 ...	...	....	Frederic William IV.	....	....	....
1844	....	....	....	Oscar IV.	....	....
1848	Louis Napoleon (President of Republic).	Francis Joseph I.	....	....	....	....
1850 ...	....	....	....	Charles XV.	....	....
1852	Napoleon III.	....	....	....	....	....
1855	....	....	....	....	Alexander II.	....
1861	....	....	William I.	....	....	....

GREAT BRITAIN.	DENMARK.	PORTUGAL.	PAPAL STATES.	NAPLES.	SARDINIA.	UNITED STATES.
1815 Regency.	Frederick VI.	John VI.	Pius VII.	Ferdinand IV. (restored).	Victor Emmanuel I.	James Madison (President).
1817	....	....	....	....	....	James Monroe.
1820 George IV.	....	....	....	....	....	....
1821	....	...	....	....	Charles Felix.	James Monroe, Re-elected 1821.
1823	....	....	Leo XII.	....	....	....
1825	....	....	....	Francis I.	....	John Quincy Adams.
1826	....	Pedro IV. Maria da Gloria.	....	....	....	....
1829	....	Miguel.	Pius VIII.	....	....	Andrew Jackson.
1830 William IV.	....	....	...	Ferdinand II.	Charles Albert.	....
1831	....	....	Gregory XVI.	....	....	....
1833	....	Maria(restored).	....	....	...	Andrew Jackson, Re-elected 1833.
1837 Victoria.	....	....	....	....	....	Martin Van Buren.
1839	Christian VIII.	....	...	....	....	....
1841	....	....	....	....	....	W. H. Harrison. (Died in office.) John Tyler.
1845	...	....	....	....	....	James Knox Polk.
1846	...	....	Pius IX.	....	....	....
1848	Frederick VII.	....	....	....	....	....
1849	....	....	....	Francis II.	Victor Emmanuel II.	Zachary Taylor. (Died in office.)
1850	...	....	....	....	....	Millard Fillmore.
1853	....	Pedro V.	....	...	....	Franklin Pierce.
1857	....	....	....	....	....	James Buchanan.
1861	...	Louis Philip.	....	Francis II. (Dethroned.)	....	Abraham Lincoln (Assassinated).
				ITALY. Victor Emmanuel.		
1861				....		....
1863	Christian IX.	....	....	....		Andrew Johnson.
1865	....	...	....			

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF BRITISH WRITERS.

In this history the occasional notices of the progress of literature have no pretensions to completeness, and are given as illustrative of the general character of an age rather than as expressions of critical opinion. But it may be useful to our readers to have something like a connected view of the British writers in each century for purposes of reference. The following table adds to the name of each author, and the dates of his birth and death, as far as they could be ascertained, the title of the work by which he is best known. The names are arranged under three heads—Imagination; Fact; Speculative and Scientific. The first includes the poets and novelists; the second, the writers on history, geography, and other matters of exact detail; the third, those who treat of philosophy and science. This division cannot be perfect, for an author is often celebrated in various departments of knowledge. His name will here be found in the division which includes his best-known productions.

IMAGINATION.	FACT.	SPECULATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC.
A.D. 500	A.D. 500 Gildas, Conquest of Britain	A.D. 500
600 Cædmon, Saxon Poems Aldhelme, *d.* 709, Latin Poems	600 Nennius, Origin of Britons	600
700	700 Bede, 673-735, Eccl. Hist. of England	700 Alcuin, *d.* 804, Theology, History, Poetry
800 Alfred, 849-901, Saxon Poems, Translations, etc.	800 Asser, *d.* 909, Life of Alfred, Hist. of England	800 J. Scot Erigena, *d.* 883, Of the Nature of Things
900	900 Etheiwerd, Hist. of Great Britain	900
1000	1000 Ingulphus, 1030-1109, History of Croyland Eadmer, Chronicle	1000
1100 Layamon, Saxon Poetry Nigellus, Speculum Stultorum Walter Mapes, Satires, Songs Jos. of Exeter, Troj. War, War of Antioch, Epics	1100 Order. Vitalis, 1075-1132, History of England Florence of Worcester, *d.* 1118, Chron. of England Geoffrey of Monmouth, History of Britain William of Malmesbury, *d.* 1143, Hist. of Britain Henry of Huntingdon, Chronicles of England Simeon of Durham, Chronicles of England John of Salisbury, *d.* 1181, Life of Becket, etc. G. Cambrensis, Conq. of Ireland, Itin. of Wales Wm. of Newbury, *b.* 1136, Chron. of England	1100 Robert Pulleyn, *d.* 1150, Theology Richard of St. Victor, *d.* 1173, Theology Ralph Glanville, Collection of Laws
1200 Robert of Glocester, Chronicle in Verse T. Lermont, the Rhymer, Sir Tristrem, Romance	1200 Roger Hoveden, Chron. of England Gervase of Canterbury, History of England Roger of Wendover, Hist. of England Matthew Paris, *d.* 1259, History of England William Rishanger, Hist. of England	1200 Alex. Neckham, *d.* 1227, Theology Robert Grosteste, Natural Philosophy Alexander Hales, *d.* 1245, Aristotelian John Peckham, Theology John Holiwood, *d.* 1256, Astron., Mathematics Roger Bacon, 1214-1292, Chemistry, Optics, etc. Rich. Middleton, Theology

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF BRITISH WRITERS—(CONTINUED).

IMAGINATION.	FACT.	SPECULATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC.
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
1300	1300	1300 Albricus, Theology Duns Scotus, *d.* 1308, Philosophy Walter Burleigh, Philosophy Gilb. Anglicus, Medicine
Adam Davie, Metr. Romance, Life of Alex.	Nicholas Triveth, *d.* 1328, Hist. Physic, Theology	R. Aungervile, 1281-1345, Philobiblion
	Richard of Chichester, Chron. of England	
Lawrence Minot, *d.* 1352, Historical Poems	Ralph Higden, *d.* 1360, Chron. of England	
	Henry Knighton, *d.* 1370, Chron. of England	J. Wicliffe, 1324-1384, Theology, Trans. of Bible
John Barbour, 1326-1396, The Bruce	Matthew of Westminster, Flowers of History	
	John Maundeville, *d.* 1372, Travels	
	John Fordun, Chron. of Scotland	H. de Bracton, Law
R. Langlande, Pierce Plowman, a Satire		
Geof. Chaucer, 1328-1400, Canterbury Tales, etc.		
John Gower, *d.* 1402, Elegies, Romances, etc.		
1400	1400 Andrew of Wyntoun, Chron. of Scotland	1400
John Lydgate, 1380-1440, Poems		
	T. Walsingham, *d.* 1440, History of Normandy	
James I. of Scotland, 1395-1437, King's Quhair, etc.		John Fortescue, Laws of England
Harry the Minstrel, Sir W. Wallace		
	John Hardyng, Chron. of England	Thos. Littleton, *d.* 1487, Law
	Lord Berners, Trans. of Froissart	
Stephen Hawes, Passetyme of Pleasure	W. Caxton, Translations	
John Skelton, *d.* 1529, Satires, Odes	Douglas of Glastonbury, Chron. of England	
1500 Wm. Dunbar, 1465-1530, Thistle and Rose	1500 R. Fabyan, *d.* 1512, Chron. of England and France	1500 Thos. Linacre, 1460-1524, Philology, Medicine
Gawin Douglas, 1475-1522, Trans. Virgil		
Thomas More, 1480-1535, Utopia		Anth. Fitzherbert, Husbandry
Thomas Wyatt, *d.* 1541, Sonnets	T. Halls, *d.* 1547, Hist. of Houses of York and Lanc.	
		Thomas Elyot, Philology
John Heywood, *d.* 1565, Drama	John Leland, *d.* 1552, English Antiquities	H. Latimer, 1475-1555, Sermons
Earl of Surrey, *d.* 1546-7, Poems	W. Cavendish, 1505-1557, Life of Wolsey	
Geo. Gascoigne, *d.* 1577, Drama	J. Ball, 1495-1563, Lives of British Writers	Roger Ascham, 1515-1568, The Schoolmaster
	Ralph Hollingshed, *d.* 1581, Chronicles	Thomas Wilson, *d.* 1581, Logic and Rhetoric
	Geo. Buchanan, 1506-1582, History of Scotland	Thomas Tusser, *d.* 1580, Husbandry
	J. Fox, 1517-1587, Book of Martyrs	
Philip Sidney, 1554-1586, Arcadia		
Christ. Marlowe, *d.* 1593, Drama		
Edmd. Spenser, 1553-1598, Faëry Queen		J. Jewel, 1522-1570, Divinity
W. Shakspere, 1564-1616, Drama	N. Fitzherbert, 1550-1612, Biography	R. Hooker, 1553-1600, Ecclesiastical Polity
John Lylie, 1550-1600, Euphues	John Stow, 1527-1605, Chronicles, Topography	W. Gilbert, 1540-1603, On the Loadstone
	Sir T. North, Trans. of Plutarch	L. Andrews, 1565-1626, Sermons
John Fletcher, 1576-1625, Drama		
F. Beaumont, 1586-1615, Drama		
1600 John Owen, *d.* 1612, Latin Epigrams	1600 J. Pits, 1560-1616, Biog. of Kings, Bishops, etc.	1600 Edward Coke, 1550-1634, Law
	Richard Knolles, *d.* 1610, History of the Turks	John Napier, 1550-1617, Logarithms
	Wm. Camden, 1551-1623, Antiquities	

IMAGINATION.	FACT.	SPECULATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC.
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
1600	1600 R. Hackluyt, 1553-1616, Naval Histories	1600
	W. Raleigh, 1552-1617, History of the World	
	Sam. Daniel, 1567-1619, History of England	
	John Hayward, *d.* 1627, English History	
J. Ford, *b.* 1586, Drama	J. Speed, 1555-1629, Hist. of Great Britain	Robt. Burton, 1576-1639, Anat. of Melancholy
Ben Jonson, 1574-1637, Drama	Henry Spelman, 1562-1641, Antiquities	Francis Bacon, 1560-1626, Philosophy, History
P. Massinger, 1585-1639, Drama	R. B. Cotton, 1570-1631, Antiquities	Wm. Harvey, 1578-1657, Circulation of Blood
J. Harrington, 1561-1612, Trans. Ariosto	S. Purchas, 1577-1628, Collection of Voyages	
E. Fairfax, *d.* 1632, Trans. Tasso	Thomas Roe, 1580-1641, Travels in the East	John Selden, 1584-1654, Antiquities, Law, Hist.
M. Drayton, 1563-1631, Poems	E. (Ld.) Herbert, 1581-1648, Hist. of Henry VIII.	J. Harrington, 1611-1677, Oceana
G. Sandys, 1577-1643, Translations, Poems	R. Baker, *d.* 1645, Chron. of England	James Usher, 1580-1656, Divinity, Sermons, Hist.
J. Daniel, 1562-1619, Poems		Thos. Hobbes, 1588-1679, Metaphysics
W. Drummond, 1585-1649, Poems		W. Dugdale, 1605-1686, Antiquities, History
John Donne, 1573-1662, Satires, Essays		W. Chillingworth, 1602-1644, Theology
Geo. Wither, 1588-1667, Satires	Thos. Fuller, 1608-1661, History, Biography	Isaac Barrow, 1630-1677, Divinity, Mathematics
James Shirley, 1594-1666, Drama	Clarendon, 1608-1673, History of Rebellion	J. Pearson, 1612-1686, Divinity
Sir J. Suckling, 1609-1641, Poems	Thomas May, *d.* 1650, History of Parliament	Brian Walton, 1600-1661, Polyglot Bible
John Denham, 1615-1668, Tragedies, Cooper's Hill	Izaak Walton, 1593-1683, Biography	Jeremy Taylor, *d.* 1667, Divinity
Samuel Butler, 1612-1688, Hudibras	B. Whitlocke, 1605-1676, History	Algernon Sydney, 1617-1683, Discourse on Government
John Milton, 1608-1674, Paradise Lost	Mrs. Hutchinson, Biography	Thos. Browne, 1605-1682, On Vulgar Errors
Edm. Waller, 1605-1687, Poems	W. Prynne, 1660-1667, History, Politics	Edmund Castell, *d.* 1685, Lexicon Heptaglotton
A. Cowley, 1618-1667, Poems		R. Cudworth, 1617-1688, Metaphysics
A. Marvell, 1620-1678, Poems		J. Evelyn, 1620-1706, Sylva
		H. More, 1614-1687, Theology
Rochester, 1648-1680, Satires	Wm. Temple, 1629-1700, History	T. Sydenham, 1624-1689, Medicine
Roscommon, 1633-1684, Poems		W. Sherlock, *d.* 1689, Divinity
N. Lee, 1656-1691, Drama		J. Tillotson, 1630-1694, Sermons
John Bunyan, 1628-1688, Pilgrim's Progress		Archbish. Leighton, 1613-1684, Divinity
John Dryden, 1631-1701, Tragedy, Satire, Virgil		R. Baxter, 1615-1691, Saints' Everlasting Rest
Thos. Otway, 1651-1685, Tragedy	R. Brady, *d.* 1700, Hist. of England	R. Boyle, 1627-1691, Theology, Chemistry
1700 John Pomfret, 1667-1703, The Choice	1700 Thomas Rymer, *d.* 1713, Fœdera	1700
		John Ray, 1628-1705, Botany, Natural History
		John Locke, 1632-1704, Metaphysics
		R. South, 1633-1716, Divinity
John Philips, 1676-1708, Splendid Shilling		
Thos. Parnell, 1679-1717, The Hermit	S. Ockley, 1678-1720, Oriental History	Isaac Newton, 1642-1719, Principia
George Farquhar, 1678-1707, Comedies	Thos. Hearne, 1678-1735, History and Antiquities	J. Flamsteed, 1646-1719, Astronomy
	John Strype, 1643-1737, Eccl. History, Biography	R. Hooke, 1635-1702, Nat. Philosophy
	Gilbert Burnet, 1643-1715, History of his Time'	B. de Mandeville, 1670-1733, Fable of the Bees
Matthew Prior, 1664-1721, Poems	L. Echard, 1671-1730, History of England	Edmund Halley, 1656-1742, Astronomy
R. Steele, *d.* 1729, Drama, 'Tatler,' 'Spectator'	Thomas Carte, 1686-1754, History of England	Hans Sloane, 1660-1753, Natural History

IMAGINATION.	FACT.	SPECULATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC.
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
1700 Daniel Defoe, 1660-1731, Robinson Crusoe	1700 John Potter, 1674-1747, Antiquities	1700
Jos. Addison, 1672-1719, 'Spectator,' Cato	Sir W. Petty, 1623-1682, Statistics	
Nich. Rowe, 1673-1718, Tragedy		A. Clark, 1696-1742, Divinity, Philosophy
J. Vanbrugh, *d.* 1726, Comedy		D. Waterland, 1683-1740, Divinity
W. Congreve, 1672-1728, Comedy		R. Bentley, 1661-1740, Divinity, Philology
John Gay, 1688-1732, Beggar's Opera, Fables	Nathaniel Hooke, *d.* 1763, History of Rome	A. Baxter, 1687-1750, Metaphysics
M. W. Montague, 1690-1762, Letters	C. Middleton, 1683-1750, Life of Cicero, etc.	
Robert Blair, 1699-1746, The Grave		Lord Bolingbroke, 1672-1751, Politics, Literature
S. Richardson, 1689-1761, Clarissa, Pamela, etc.		G. Berkeley, 1684-1753, Metaphysics, Ethics
		P. Doddridge, 1701-1751, Divinity
		Jas. Bradley, 1692-1762, Astronomy
		F. Hutcheson, 1694-1747, Moral Philosophy
		T. Sherlock, 1678-1761, Divinity
		C. Maclaurin, 1669-1746, Mathematics
		Earl of Chesterfield, 1694-1773, Letters
D. Garrick, 1716-1779, Drama		Eph. Chambers, *d.* 1740, Cyclopædia
S. Foote, 1720-1771, Drama		B. Hoadly, 1676-1761, Polemics
R. Dodsley, 1703-1764, Drama	John Swinton, 1703-1767, History, Antiquity	
Jonathan Swift, 1667-1745, Satires, Tales, etc.		Bishop Butler, 1692-1752, Divinity
J. Watts, 1674-1748, Hymns		
Edward Young, 1681-1765, Night Thoughts		
Alex. Pope, 1688-1744, Poetry		
Will. Somerville, 1692-1743, The Chase		
Allan Ramsay, 1696-1758, The Gentle Shepherd		
Richard Savage, 1698-1743, Poems		
Jas. Thomson, 1700-1748, Seasons		J. Wesley, 1703-1791, Divinity
John Dyer, 1700-1758, Poems		
	Lord Lyttleton, 1709-1778, History, Poems, Divinity	D. Hartley, 1704-1757, Observations on Man
H. Fielding, 1707-1754, Tom Jones, etc.	James Granger, *d.* 1776, Biog. Hist. of England	Soame Jenyns, 1704-1787, Theology
Jas. Hammond, 1710-1742, Elegies		W. Warburton, 1709-1779, Theology, Criticism
Lawr. Sterne, 1713-1768, Tristram Shandy		J. Jortin, 1698-1770, Divinity, Criticism
W. Shenstone, 1714-1763, Pastorals, etc.	Sam. Johnson, 1709-1784, Lives of Poets, Dict., etc.	Lord Kaimes, 1696-1782, Elements of Criticism
W. Collins, 1720-1756, Odes	Jonas Hanway, 1712-1786, Travels in the East	R. Lowth, 1710-1787, Divinity, Philology
H. Brooke, 1706-1783, Fool of Quality	John Blair, *d.* 1782, Chronology	W. Blackstone, 1723-1780, Laws of England
M. Akenside, 1721-1770, Pleasures of Imagination	David Hume, 1711-1776, Hist. of Eng., Essays, etc.	
Thos. Gray, 1716-1771, Odes, Elegies		
T. Smollett, 1720-1771, Novels	W. Robertson, 1721-1793, Hist. of Charles V., etc.	Adam Smith, 1723-1790, Wealth of Nations
R. Glover, 1712-1789, Leonidas	Thos. Warton, 1728-1790, Hist. of Eng. Poetry, Poems	Benj. Franklin, 1706-1790, Electricity, Philosophy
O. Goldsmith, 1731-1774, Traveller, Vicar of Wakefield		J. Harris, 1709-1780, Philology
W. Mason, 1725-1797, Poems, Biography		John Hunter, 1728-1793, Medicine
T. Chatterton, 1752-1770, Poems	H. Walpole, *d.* 1797, Historic Doubts, Royal and Noble Authors, Letters	F. Balguy, 1716-1795, Divinity
Ar. Murphy, 1727-1805, Drama	J. Moore, 1730-1802, Views of Society and Manners	
Wm. Cowper, 1731-1800, Poems	James Bruce, 1730-1794, Travels	
R. Cumberland, 1732-1811, Drama	W. Gilpin, 1724-1804, Biography, Divinity	T. Reid, 1710-1796, Metaphysics
Eras. Darwin, 1732-1802, Botanic Garden		Sir J. Reynolds, 1723-1792, Art

IMAGINATION.	FACT.	SPECULATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC.
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
1700 James Beattie, 1735-1803, Poems	1700 E. Gibbon, 1737-1794, Decl. and Fall of Rom. Empire	1700 S. Horsley, *d.* 1806, Theol.
R. Ferguson, 1750-1774, Poems	J. Whitaker, 1735-1808, Hist. of Manchester, etc.	Jos. Priestley, 1733-1804, Metaphysics, Chemistry
Geo. Colman, 1733-1794, Comedies	Edmund Burke, 1730-1797, Oratory	Hugh Blair, 1718-1800, Sermons
J. Wolcot (Peter Pindar), 1738-1819, Com. Poems	J. Boswell, 1740-1795, Biography	J. Horne Tooke, 1736-1812, Philology
J. Macpherson, 1738-1796, Ossian's Poems		Wm. Jones, 1747-1794, Orientalist
		R. Price, 1723-1791, Metaphysics, Divinity
	J. Milner, 1744-1797, Church History	Wm. Paley, 1743-1805, Theology
Robert Burns, 1759-1796, Poems	Joseph Strutt, 1748-1802, Chronology, Antiquities	Richd. Porson, 1759-1808, Philology
J. Home, *d.* 1808, Drama		Thos. Beddoes, 1760-1808, Medicine
R. B. Sheridan, 1751-1816, Drama		N. Maskelyne, *d.* 1811, Astronomy
		G. L. Staunton, *d.* 1801, Chinese Code
Ann Radcliffe, 1764-1823, Novels	Charles Burney, *d.* 1814, History of Music	W. Herschel, 1738-1822, Astronomy
1800 Henry Kirke White, 1785-1806, Poems	1800 Mungo Park, 1771-1805, Travels in Africa	1800 Henry Cavendish, 1731-1810, Physics, Composition of Water.
Robert Tannahill, 1774-1810, Songs and Poems	Charles James Fox, 1749-1806, History	Richard Cecil, 1748-1810, Sermons, Religious Biography
John Leyden, 1775-1811, Poems and Translations	J. Macdiarmid, 1779-1808, Biography	Edmond Malone, 1741-1812, Commentator on Shakspere
James Grahame, 1765-1811, The Sabbath, and other Poems	James Forsyth, 1763-1815, Travels in Italy	Alexander Murray, 1775-1813, European Languages
Jane Austen, 1775-1817, Pride and Prejudice, and other Novels	Claudius Buchanan, 1766-1815, Christian Researches in India	John Playfair, 1748-1819, Euclid's Geometry
Matthew G. Lewis, 1775-1818, Poems and Novels		Arthur Young, 1741-1820, Agriculture
Hector McNeil, 1746-1818, Scottish Poems: The Scottish Adventurers, a Novel		Sir Joseph Banks, 1743-1820, Natural History
		John Bell, 1763-1820, Anatomy
		Thomas Brown, 1778-1820, Metaphysics
		J. Bonnycastle, *d.* 1821, Astronomy, Algebra
Elizabeth Inchbald, 1753-1821, A Simple Story, and other Tales	Patrick Colquhoun, 1745-1820, Statistics Police of the Metropolis	James Perry, 1756-1821, Political Journalist (Morning Chronicle)
John Keats, 1796-1821, Poems		John Aikin, 1747-1822, Evenings at Home
		James Sowerby, 1757-1822, English Botany
Percy Bysshe Shelley, 1793-1822, Poems	E. D. Clarke, 1769-1822, Travels in Russia and the East	C. Hutton, 1737-1823, Mathematics
Robert Bloomfield, 1766-1823, The Farmer's Boy, and other Poems	David Bogue, 1749-1825, History of Dissenters	David Ricardo, 1772-1823, Political Economy
Charles Wolfe, 1791-1823, Ode on the Burial of Sir John Moore		Richard Payne Knight, 1750-1824, Philology, Essay on Taste
George, Lord Byron, 1788-1824, Poems		A. Rees, 1743-1825, Cyclopædia
Anna Lætitia Barbauld, 1743-1825, Poems, Tales, Hymns in Prose		Samuel Parr, 1747-1825, Philology
Reginald Heber, 1783-1826, Palestine, and other Poems	W. Mitford, 1744-1827, History of Greece	John Flaxman, 1755-1826, Lectures on Sculpture
Robert Pollok, 1799-1827, Course of Time	George Canning, 1770-1827, Microcosm, Anti-Jacobin	William Gifford, 1757-1826, Politics and Criticism (Quarterly Rev.)
Henry Mackenzie, 1745-1831, Man of Feeling	Hugh Clapperton, 1788-1827, Travels in Africa	Dugald Stewart, 1753-1828, Metaphysics
George Crabbe, 1754-1832, Poems	James Rennell, 1782-1830, Geography	P. Elmsley, 1773-1825, Philology
Sir Walter Scott, 1771-1832, Poems, Waverley Novels	William Roscoe, 1753-1831, Biography	W. H. Wollaston, 1776-1828, Physical Science
Anna Maria Porter, 1781-1832, Historical Novels		Thomas Tredgold, 1788-1829, Building and Engineering
Hannah More, 1745-1833, Sacred Dramas, Cœlebs in Search of a Wife	Sir James Mackintosh, 1765-1832, History of England, Progress of Ethical Philosophy	Thomas Young, 1773-1829, Physics, Hieroglyphics
		Sir Humphry Davy, 1778-1829, Chemistry
		William Hazlitt, 1778-1830, Essays on Shakspere

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF BRITISH WRITERS—(CONTINUED).

IMAGINATION.

A.D.
1800 William Sotheby, 1756-1833, Poems, Translations

Samuel Taylor Coleridge, 1772-1834, Poems and Essays
Charles Lamb, 1775-1834, Poems, Essays of Elia
Thos. Pringle, 1789-1834, Poems, South African Sketches

James Hogg, 1772-1835, The Queen's Wake, and other Poems, Winter Evening Tales

Felicia Hemans, 1794-1835, Poems

William Godwin, 1756-1836, Caleb Williams, and other Novels
George Coleman, the Younger, 1762-1836, Dramas
Sir S. Egerton Brydges, 1764-1837, Poems
Anne Grant (of Laggan), 1755-1838, Poems, Translations from the Gaelic, Letters from the Mountains
Letitia E. Landon (Mrs. Maclean), 1802-1839, Poems
James Smith, 1775-1839, Novels, Rejected Addresses
John Galt, 1779-1839, Ayrshire Legatees, and other Tales of Scottish Life
W. M. Praed, 1802-1839, Poems and Essays
Thomas Haynes Bayley, *d.* 1839, Poems and Tales
Frances Burney (Madame D'Arblay), 1752-1840, Evelina, and other Novels
Thos. Dibdin, 1771-1841, Dramas
Theodore E. Hook, 1788-1841, Novels
Allan Cunningham, 1784-1842, Poems
John Banim, 1800-1842, Irish Novels
Thomas H. Lister, *d.* 1842, Granby, and other Novels

Robt. Southey, 1774-1843, Curse of Kehama, and other Poems

William Beckford, 1761-1844, Vathek, an Oriental Romance
Henry F. Cary, 1772-1844, Poems, Translation of Dante
Barbara Hofland, 1770-1844, Novels, Domestic Tales
Thomas Campbell, 1777-1844, Pleasures of Hope, and other Poems
John Sterling, 1806-1844, Poems, Tales, and Essays

FACT.

A.D.
1800

Alexander Chalmers, 1759-1834, Biographical Dictionary
James Dallaway, 1763-1834, Travels, Archæology
Thomas M'Crie, 1772-1835, Life of John Knox
H. D. Inglis (Derwent Conway), 1795-1835, Travels
John Gillies, 1747-1836, History of Ancient Greece

William Taylor, 1765-1836, History of German Poetry

Sir W. Gell, 1777-1836, Classical Topography and Antiquities
Henry Roscoe, 1799-1836, Lives of Eminent Lawyers

Sir R. C. Hoare, 1758-1838, Travels, Antiquities of Wiltshire, etc.

Sir Alexander Burnes, 1805-1841, Travels in Bokhara and Cabool

T. D. Fosbroke, 1770-1842, Topography, Archæology
Sir Robert Ker Porter, 1775-1842, Travels in the East
William Hone, 1779-1842, Every Day Book

Thomas Arnold, 1795-1842, History of Rome

SPECULATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC.

A.D.
1800 John Abernethy, 1763-1831, Physiology, Surgery
Robert Hall, 1764-1831, Sermons, Essays
Archbishop Magee, *d.* 1831, Sermons, Treatise on the Atonement
Jeremy Bentham, 1747-1832, Jurisprudence, Political Economy
George Burder, 1752-1832, Village Sermons
Adam Clarke, 1760-1832, Oriental Literature, Biblical Commentary
Sir John Leslie, 1766-1832, Physics

William Carey, 1761-1834, Translations of the Scriptures into Eastern Languages
T. R. Malthus, 1766-1834, Essay on Population
Edward Irving, 1792-1834, Interpretation of Prophecy
William Cobbett, 1762-1835, Politics and Rural Economy
Robt. Morrison, 1782-1834, Chinese Language
Sir Charles Wilkins, 1749-1836, Oriental Literature
W. Marsden, 1754-1836, Oriental Languages
Richard Valpy, 1754-1836, Philology
John Pond, 1767-1836, Astronomy

James Mill, 1773-1836, Political Economy, History of India
W. Elford Leach, 1790-1836, British Crustacea
John Latham, 1740-1837, Ornithology
Joshua Marshman, 1767-1837, Chinese Literature

John Jamieson, 1759-1838, Dictionary of the Scottish Language
Archibald Alison, 1757-1839, Essays on Taste
William Smith, 1769-1839, Geology
Sir Anthony Carlisle, 1768-1840, Anatomy and Surgery
Lant Carpenter, 1780-1840, Theology
Sir Astley Cooper, 1768-1841, Surgery
Olinthus Gregory, 1774-1841, Mathematics, Evidences of Christianity
Joseph Blanco White, 1775-1841, Letters from Spain, Controversial Writings against Roman Catholicism
Thomas Rickman, 1776-1841, Gothic Architecture

Patrick Kelly, 1756-1842, Mathematics, Universal Cambist
Sir Charles Bell, 1774-1842, Treatise on the Hand, Surgery.
William Maginn, 1793-1842, Politics, Periodical Literature
John Foster, 1770-1843, Essays on Popular Ignorance, and other subjects

IMAGINATION.

A.D.
1800

Regina Maria Roche, 1764-1845, Children of the Abbey, and other Novels
H. Barham, 1788-1845, Ingoldsby Legends
Thomas Hood, 1798-1845, Song of the Shirt, Comic Annual, etc.
Laman Blanchard, 1803-1845, Poems, Essays, and Sketches
Robert Plumer Ward, 1765-1846, Novels

Sir Thomas Dick Lauder, 1784-1848, Highland Legends
William Tennant, 1785-1848, Dramas, Anster Fair, a Poem
Frederick Marryat, 1792-1848, Peter Simple, and other Sea Novels
Maria Edgeworth, 1767-1849, Moral Tales, Novels of Irish Life
Horace Smith, 1780-1849, Brambletye House, and other Novels, Rejected Addresses
Ebenezer Elliott, 1781-1849, Poems, Corn Law Rhymes
Bernard Barton, 1784-1849, Poems
Marguerite, Countess of Blessington, 1789-1849, Novels, Idler in Italy, etc.
W. Lisle Bowles, 1762-1850, Poems
Wm. Wordsworth, 1770-1850, Poems
Jane Porter, 1776-1850, Historical Novels
W. H. Maxwell, 1794-1850, Wild Sports of the West, Random Shots from a Rifleman
Harriet Lee, 1756-1851, Canterbury Tales
Joanna Baillie, 1762-1851, Dramas, Tales of the Passions
Martha Mary Sherwood, 1774-1851, Novels and Tales
Thos. Moore, 1779-1852, Poems, Irish Melodies
Amelia Opie, 1768-1853, Poems, Tales of the Heart
James Montgomery, 1771-1854, The World before the Flood, and other Poems, Hymns for Public Worship

Miss Ferrier, 1782-1854, Marriage, Destiny, The Inheritance
Thomas Noon Talfourd, 1795-1854, Dramas
Thomas Crofton Croker, 1798-1854, Fairy Legends and Popular Songs of Ireland
Samuel Phillips, 1815-1854, Caleb Stukely, Essays from the Times
Samuel Rogers, 1763-1855, Pleasures of Memory, Italy, etc.

FACT.

A.D.
1800

Henry John Todd, 1763-1845, Bibliography, New Edition of Johnson's Dictionary
John Adolphus, 1770-1845, History of the Reign of George III.
John Gurwood, 1791-1845, Wellington's Despatches

Hugh Murray, 1779-1846, Geography
Sharon Turner, 1768-1847, Sacred History of the World, History of the Anglo-Saxons
Thomas F. Dibdin, 1776-1847, Bibliography
Sir John Barrow, 1764-1848, Biography, Arctic Voyages
Isaac Disraeli, 1766-1848, History, Curiosities of Literature
Sir N. Harris Nicolas, 1799-1848, History, Genealogy, etc.

Horace Twiss, 1786-1849, Life of Lord Eldon, etc.

Patrick Fraser Tytler, 1790-1849, Biography, History of Scotland

John Lingard, 1771-1851, History of England

H. Fynes Clinton, 1781-1852, Fasti Hellenici, etc.
George R. Porter, 1792-1852, Statistics, Progress of the Nation
Eliot Warburton, 1810-1852, Travels

Sir William Betham, 1779-1853, Irish Antiquarian Researches, The Gael and Cimbri
E. W. Brayley, 1773-1854, Topography, Antiquities
John Gibson Lockhart, 1794-1854, Life of Sir Walter Scott, Editor of Quarterly Review

Sir George Head, 1782-1855, Travels

SPECULATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC.

A.D.
1800 R. W. Rham, 1778-1843, Dictionary of the Farm
John C. Loudon, 1783-1843, Botany, Horticulture
John Dalton, 1766-1844, Chemistry
Francis Baily, 1774-1844, Astronomy
John Abercrombie, 1781-1844, Metaphysics, Theology
Sydney Smith, 1771-1845, Politics, Periodical Essays
J. F. Daniell, 1790-1845, Chemistry, Meteorology
Christopher Wordsworth, 1774-1846, Theology
H. Gally Knight, 1787-1846, Antiquities, Architecture
George Joseph Bell, 1770-1847, Principles of the Law of Scotland
Thomas Chalmers, 1780-1847, Theology, Metaphysics, Political and Social Economy
Joseph John Gurney, 1788-1847, Christian Evidences
Andrew Combe, 1797-1847, Principles of Physiology applied to Health

J. C. Prichard, 1785-1848, Ethnology
Edw. Copleston, 1776-1849, Theology
Anthony Todd Thomson, 1778-1849, Materia Medica
Edward Hawke Locker, 1777-1849, Lectures on the Bible and the Liturgy, etc.
William Kirby, 1759-1850, Entomology
Francis Jeffrey, 1773-1850, Essay on Taste, Critical Essays (Edinburgh Review)
Edward Bickersteth, 1786-1850, Scripture Help, Guide to the Prophecies
George Dunbar, 1774-1851, Greek Lexicon
John Pye Smith, 1774-1851, Scripture and Geology
Richard Phillips, 1778-1851, Chemistry
George Crabbe, 1779-1851, Dictionary of Synonyms
John Chas. Tarver, 1790-1851, English and French Dictionary
Samuel Lee, 1783-1852, Oriental Languages
John Dalrymple, 1804-1852, Anatomy of the Eye
William Jay, 1769-1853, Sermons
Ralph Wardlaw, 1779-1853, Theology, Church Establishments
James F. W. Johnston, 1796-1853, Agricultural Chemistry
F. W. Robertson, 1816-1853, Sermons, Lectures
George Stanley Faber, 1773-1854, Christian Evidences, Prophetical Interpretation
Edward Forbes, 1815-1854, Geology, Natural History
Julius C. Hare, 1796-1855, Theology
Sir H. de la Beche, 1796-1855, Geology

IMAGINATION.	FACT.	SPECULATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC.	IMAGINATION.	FACT.	SPECULATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC.
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
1800 John Wilson, 1788-1855, The Isle of Palms, Trials of Margaret Lindsay, etc.	1800 James Silk Buckingham, 1786-1855, Travels	1800 Martin Barry, 1802-1855, Physiology	1800	1800 John Hill Burton, b. 1809, Benthamiana, 1843; History of Scotland, 1853	1800
Mary Russell Mitford, 1789-1855, Poems, Our Village, and other Sketches	Josiah Conder, 1789-1855, The Modern Traveller	Thomas Tooke, 1771-1856, Political Economy, History of Prices William Buckland, 1784-1856, Geology William Yarrell, 1784-1856, Natural History	William Carleton, b. 1798, Traits and Stories of the Irish Peasantry John Clare, b. 1793, Poems of Rural Life, 1820	Thomas Carlyle, b. 1795, Life of Schiller, 1824; French Revolution, 1837	W. B. Carpenter, b. 1813, Principles of Physiology, 1839
Robert Montgomery, 1807-1855, Omnipresence of the Deity, and other Poems Charlotte Brontë (Currer Bell), 1824-1855, Jane Eyre, and other Novels Douglas Jerrold, 1803-1857, Men of Character, Mrs. Caudle's Lectures, Dramas	Sir Edward Parry, 1790-1855, Voyages to the Arctic Regions Sir T. L. Mitchell, 1792-1855, Expeditions into the Interior of Australia	John Ayrton Paris, 1785-1856, On Diet Sir William Hamilton, 1788-1856, Metaphysics John Forbes Royle, 1797-1856, Botany T. D. Hincks, 1767-1857, Oriental Languages	W. Wilkie Collins, b. 1825, Antonina, 1850; The Woman in White, 1860 Eliza Cook, b. 1817, Poems	William Chambers, b. 1800, Book of Scotland Robert Chambers, b. 1802, Traditions of Edinburgh F. R. Chesney, b. 1789, Survey of the Euphrates and the Tigris, 1850 Mrs. Cowden Clarke, b. 1809, Concordance to Shakespeare, 1845 J. Payne Collier, b. 1789, Works of Shakespeare, 1844 G. Lillie Craik, b. 1799, Pursuit of Knowledge under Difficulties, 1831 Sir E. S. Creasy, b. 1812, The Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World Peter Cunningham, b. 1816, Handbook of London, 1849	John Cumming, b. 1810, Prophetical Interpretation
Sydney, Lady Morgan, 1785-1859, Wild Irish Girl, and other Novels Leigh Hunt, 1784-1859, Poems, Essays Thomas De Quincey, 1786-1859, Confessions of an English Opium Eater, Essays Thomas K. Hervey, 1804-1859, Poems, Essays	John Britton, 1771-1857, Topography, Antiquities John Macgregor, 1799-1859, Commercial Statistics Henry Hallam, 1778-1859, Constitutional History of England Charles Macfarlane, 1800-1858, Travels, History John Lee, 1779-1859, Ecclesiastical History	Andrew Ure, 1778-1857, Chemistry, Dictionary of Arts and Manufactures John Wilson Croker, 1780-1857, Politics, Criticism John Harris, 1804-1857, Mammon (prize essay), Theology and Physics J. M. Kemble, 1807-1857, Anglo-Saxon Language and Literature Hugh Miller, 1802-1856, Geology	Chas. Dickens, b. 1812, Sketches by Boz, 1836 B. Disraeli, b. 1805, Vivian Grey, 1828	Wm. Hepworth Dixon, b. 1821, John Howard, a Memoir, 1849 Alexander Dyce, b. 1798, Editions of Greene, Peele, Marlowe, Webster, Shakespeare Sir Henry Ellis, b. 1777, Introduction to Domesday Book, 1833	Charles Darwin, b. 1816, Voyage of a Naturalist, 1838; Origin of Species, 1859 A. De Morgan, b. 1806, Elements of Arithmetic, 1830
G. P. R. James, 1801-1860, Novels	Sir James Stephen, 1788-1859, History, Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography Thomas, Lord Macaulay, 1800-1859, Essays, History of England	Stephen Robert Rintoul, 1787-1858, Politics, 'Spectator' Newspaper George Combe, 1788-1858, Phrenology, Constitution of Man Jane Webb Loudon, 1800-1858, Gardening for Ladies William J. Broderip, 1788-1859, Natural History Dionysius Lardner, 1793-1859, Physics			Sir Charles Eastlake, P.R.A., b. 1793; Contributions to the Literature of the Fine Arts William Ellis, b. 1800, Social Economy for Schools
Anna Jameson, 1794-1860, Female Characters of Shakspere, Handbook to Galleries of Art Albert Smith, 1816-1860, Novels, Tales, Burlesque Sketches Lady Charlotte Bury, 1775-1861, Novels J. W. Cunningham, 1778-1861, The Velvet Cushion, Poems Catherine Gore, 1800-1861, Mothers and Daughters, The Banker's Wife, and other Novels Elizabeth Barrett Browning, 1809-1861, Aurora Leigh, and other Poems Charles James Lever, 1808-1861, Harry Lorrequer, Charles O'Malley'	William Mure, 1799-1860, History of Greek Literature Sir Henry G. Ward, 1796-1860, Travels David Jardine, 1794-1860, History of the Gunpowder Plot Sir Charles Fellows, 1799-1860, Travels in Asia Minor Sir Francis Palgrave, 1788-1861, History of the Anglo-Saxons John, Lord Campbell, 1779-1861, Lives of the Lord Chancellors and Chief Justices of England	John P. Nichol, 1804-1859, Astronomy Alexander Fletcher, 1778-1860, Theology John Narrien, 1782-1860, Mathematics, Military Engineering William Spence, 1783-1860, Entomology Horace Hayman Wilson, 1786-1860, Sanskrit Language R. Bentley Todd, 1809-1860, Surgery Sir Howard Douglas, 1775-1861, Military and Naval Defences T. Southwood Smith, 1788-1861, Philosophy of Health W. J. Donaldson, 1812-1861, Philology	Elizabeth C. Gaskell, b. 1822, Mary Barton, 1848 T. C. Grattan, b. 1797, Highways and Byways, 1838	William Farr, b. 1807, On Vital Statistics, 1837 J. D. Forbes, b. 1809, Norway and its Glaciers, 1853 John Forster, b. 1812, Life of Oliver Goldsmith, 1848 J. A. Froude, b. 1818, History of England, 1856 George Gilfillan, b. 1813, Bards of the Bible, 1850; Gallery of Literary Portraits G. R. Gleig, b. 1795, Military History of Great Britain George Grote, b. 1794, History of Greece, 1846	Michael Faraday, b. 1794, On Chemical Manipulation, 1817 James Fergusson, b. 1808, Principles of Beauty in Art, 1849; Handbook of Architecture J. F. Ferrier, b. 1808, Institutes of Metaphysics, 1854 Albany W. Fonblanque, b. 1797, England under Seven Administrations, 1837 W. E. Gladstone, b. 1809, The State considered in its Relations with the Church, 1840 George Godwin, b. 1815, The Builder John Gould, b. 1804, A Century of Birds from the Himalaya Mountains, 1830 Thomas Graham, b. 1805, Elements of Chemistry, 1842 Robert Grant, b. 1800, History of Physical Astronomy, 1852 Thomas Guthrie, b. 1800, The Gospel in Ezekiel; Pleas for Ragged Schools.
W. H. Ainsworth, born 1805, Rookwood, 1834 W. E. Aytoun, b. 1813, Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers, 1849 P. J. Bailey, b. 1816, Festus, 1839 John S. Blackie, b. 1809, Lays and Legends of Greece Sir John Bowring, b. 1792, Specimens of the Russian Poets, 1821 C. Shirley Brooks, b. 1815, Plays, 1850; The Silver Cord, 1861 Frances Browne, b. 1818, Poems Robert Browning, b. 1812, Paracelsus, a Poem, 1835	Sir A. Alison, b. 1792, History of Europe, 1839 Charles Babbage, b. 1792, Economy of Manufactures and Machinery, 1832 Edward Baines, b. 1800, History of Cotton Manufactures, 1835 Robert Bell, b. 1800, Lives of the English Poets George Borrow, b. 1803, The Bible in Spain; The Zincali, 1841 Sir David Brewster, b. 1781, On some Principles of Light, 1813 Henry Lord Brougham, b. 1779, Enquiry into the Colonial Policy of the European Powers, 1803; Historical Memoirs; Political Philosophy Henry T. Buckle, b. 1822, History of Civilization in England (died in 1862)	Joseph Bosworth, b. 1788, Elements of Anglo-Saxon Grammar, 1823 W. T. Brande, b. 1780, Outline of Geology, 1817; Manual of Chemistry, 1819 Sir B. C. Brodie, b. 1783, Physiological Researches on the Influence of the Brain on the Action of the Heart, 1811	Anna Maria Hall, b. 1802, Sketches of Irish Character Mary Howitt, b. 1804, Forest Minstrel, and other Poems, 1823	Samuel Carter Hall, b. 1801, Ireland: its Scenery and Character; 'Art Journal,' 1839 J. O. Halliwell, b. 1821, Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words, 1846; Life of Shakespeare, 1848 William Hanna, b. 1808, Memoir of Dr. Chalmers Arthur Helps, b. 1818, Essays written in the Intervals of Business, 1841; The Spanish Conquest in America, 1855 Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., b. 1798, Ecclesiastical Biography, 1845-1852; Church Dictionary, 1854	J. Renn Hampden, b. 1792, Bampton Lectures, 1832 Sir W. Snow Harris, b. 1791, Rudimentary Laws of Electricity, 1834 Sir J. F. W. Herschel, b. 1790, Examples of the Application of the Calculus to Finite Differences, 1820; Outlines of Astronomy, 1849 M. D. Hill, b. 1792, Jurisprudence; Reformatory Legislation J. R. Hind, b. 1823, Account of Recent Comets, 1845 J. D. Hooker, b. 1817, Flora Antarctica; Flora Indica

IMAGINATION.	FACT.	SPECULATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC.
A.D. 1800	A.D. 1800 William Howitt, b. 1795, Book of the Seasons, 1831; History of Priestcraft, 1833	A.D. 1800
John Keble, b. 1790, Christian Year, 1827; Lyra Innocentium	Charles Knight, b. 1791, Results of Machinery, 1830; Pictorial Shakespeare, 1842	T. H. Key, b. 1799, Latin Grammar, 1846
Charles Kingsley, b. 1819, Alton Locke, 1846		
James Sheridan Knowles, b. 1784, Leo, or the Gipsy, 1809		
Walter Savage Landor, b. 1775, Poems, 1795; Imaginary Conversations, 1824-1829	Austen Henry Layard, b. 1817, Nineveh and its Remains, 1849	Edwin Lankester, b. 1814, Natural History
Mark Lemon, b. 1809, The Drama; Editor of 'Punch'	George H. Lewes, b. 1817, Biographical History of Philosophy, 1845	R. G. Latham, b. 1812, Varieties of Mankind, 1850
Samuel Lover, b. 1797, Rory O'More, 1831; Legends and Stories of Ireland	David Livingstone, b. 1817, Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa, 1857	Sir G. Cornewall Lewis, b. 1806, Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion, 1849
Sir E. L. Bulwer Lytton, b. 1805, Falkland, 1827; The Caxtons, 1849	George Long, b. 1800, Civil Wars of Rome, 1844-1848; Editor of 'Penny Cyclopædia'	John Lindley, b. 1799, Monographia Rosarium, 1820
		Alexander William Crawford, Lord Lindsay, b. 1812, History of Christian Art, 1847; Lives of the Lindsays, 1849
		Sir Charles Lyell, b. 1797, Principles of Geology, 1833
Charles Mackay, b. 1813, Poems: Life and Liberty in America	J. R. Macculloch, b. 1790, Principles of Political Economy, 1825	F. D. Maurice, b. 1805, The Kingdom of Christ, 1841; Religions of the World; Theological Essays, 1853
Gerald Massey, b. 1828, Poems	Sir Frederick Madden, b. 1801, Layamon's Brut, 1847; Wycliffe's Bible, 1850	Henry Melvill, Sermons, 1833
H. H. Milman, b. 1791, Fazio, a Tragedy, 1815; History of Christianity 1840	Samuel Roffey Maitland, b. 1792, The Dark Ages, 1844; Essays on the Reformation in England	Edward Miall, b. 1809, Voluntary Education; Ethics of Nonconformity
R. Monckton Milnes, b. 1809, Poems; Life of John Keats, 1848	Harriet Martineau, b. 1802, Illustrations of Political Economy, 1834; History of the Thirty Years' Peace, 1850	John Stuart Mill, b. 1806, System of Logic, 1843; Principles of Political Economy, 1848
Dinah Maria Mulock, b. 1826, John Halifax, Gentleman, 1856	David Masson, b. 1822, Life of Milton, 1859	William Allen Miller, b. 1817, Elements of Chemistry, 1857
	Henry Mayhew, b. 1812, London Labor and the London Poor	Sir R. I. Murchison, b. 1792, Silurian System, 1839
Hon. Mrs. Norton, b. 1808, The Undying One, and other Poems, 1830		Francis W. Newman, b. 1805, Phases of Faith, 1850; History of the Hebrew Monarchy, 1847
		John Henry Newman, b. 1801, Tracts for the Times, 1833-1836; Religious Development; Catholicism in England
		Richard Owen, b. 1804, Directions for preparing Animals and Parts of Animals for Anatomical Purposes, 1835
Bryan Waller Procter, b. 1790, (Barry Cornwall,) Dramatic Scenes, and other Poems, 1819	James Robinson Planché, b. 1796, History of British Costume, 1834; Dramas	John Philipps, b. 1800, Treatise on Geology, 1837-1839; Rivers of Yorkshire, 1853
		E. B. Pusey, b. 1800, Tracts for the Times, 1833-1836
Leitch Ritchie, b. 1800, Novels and Tales	W. Howard Russell, b. 1821, War in the Crimea, 1855	Sir H. C. Rawlinson, b. 1810, Philology
		Charles Richardson, b. 1775, Dictionary of the English Language, 1837
		Henry Rogers, b. 1806, Life of John Howe, 1836; Contributions to 'Edinburgh Review'
		Peter Mark Roget, b. 1780, Animal and Vegetable Physiology, 1834
		J. Forbes Royle, Flora of the Himalayan Mountains, 1839
		John Ruskin, b. 1819, Modern Painters, 1843
Catherine Sinclair, b. 1800, Beatrice: or, the Unknown Relatives, 1852	Earl Stanhope (Lord Mahon), b. 1805, History of the War of Succession in Spain, 1832; History of England, 1836	Edward Sabine, b. 1790, Terrestrial Magnetism
		Adam Sedgwick, b. 1786, Geology
		Samuel Smiles, Self Help, 1859

IMAGINATION.	FACT.	SPECULATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC.
A.D. 1800	A.D. 800 Sir James Stephen, b. 1790, Ecclesiastical Biography	A.D. 1800 William Smith, b. 1814, Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, 1842
	William Stirling, b. 1818, Annals of the Artists of Spain, 1848	Mary Somerville, b. 1790, Mechanism of the Heavens, 1832
	Agnes Strickland, b. 1805, Lives of the Queens of England, 1840-1851; Letters of Mary Queen of Scots, 1842	Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, Sinai and Palestine in connection with their History, 1856
		John Bird Sumner, b. 1780, Records of Creation, 1816
Henry Taylor, Isaac Comnenus, a Play, 1827	Sir James Emerson Tennent, b. 1804, History of Modern Greece, 1830; Ceylon, an Account of the Island, 1850	Isaac Taylor, b. 1787, Elements of Thought, 1824
Alfred Tennyson, b. 1810, Poems, 1830		Alfred Swaine Taylor, b. 1808, On Poisons in Relation to Medical Jurisprudence and Medicine, 1848
W. M. Thackeray, b. 1811, Paris Sketch Book, by Michael Angelo Titmarsh, 1840	Connop Thirlwall, b. 1797, History of Greece, 1845-1852	Tom Taylor, b. 1817, Life of Haydon, 1853
Frances Trollope, b. 1790, The Abbess, 1832	William J. Thoms, b. 1803, Early Prose Romances, 1828; Editor of 'Notes and Queries'	R. C. Trench, b. 1807, Notes on the Miracles, 1846; Philology
Martin Farquhar Tupper, b. 1810, Proverbial Philosophy, 1839	James Thorne, b. 1815, Rambles by Rivers, 1844	
	John Timbs, b. 1801, Laconics, 1825-1826; Year Book of Facts, 1839	
	Robert Vaughan, b. 1800; Life of Wycliffe, 1828	
Samuel Warren, b. 1807, Passages from the Diary of a Late Physician, 1830-1838	Sir J. G. Wilkinson, b. 1798, Materia Hieroglyphica, 1828; Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, 1836	Archbishop Whately, b. 1787, Bampton Lectures, 1822; Elements of Logic, 1826
Alaric A. Watts, b. 1799, Poems, 1822	Christopher Wordsworth, b. 1808, Athens and Attica, 1836; Greece Pictorial, Descriptive, and Historical	Charles Wheatstone, b. 1802, Binocular Vision; Electric Telegraph
William Henry Wills, b. 1810, Old Leaves gathered from Household Words, 1860	Thomas Wright, b. 1810, Queen Elizabeth and her Times, 1838; The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon, 1853	William Whewell, b. 1795, Bridgewater Treatise on Astronomy, 1833
	Matthew Digby Wyatt, b. 1820, Specimens of the Geometrical Mosaics of the Middle Ages, 1848	Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, b. 1805; Life of William Wilberforce, 1838; Sermons
		Robert Willis, b. 1800, Architecture of the Middle Ages, 1835; Principles of Mechanics, 1841
		Forbes Winslow, b. 1811, Application of the Principles of Phrenology to the Elucidation and Cure of Insanity, 1831
		Nicholas Wiseman, b. 1802, Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, 1836
		Ralph Nicholson Wornum, b. 1812, History of Painting, 1847; Analysis of Ornament, 1856

POPULATION OF GREAT BRITAIN.

COUNTIES OF ENGLAND.	ESTIMATE, 1700.	ESTIMATE, 1750.	CENSUS, 1801.	COUNTIES OF WALES.	1801.
Bedford	48,500	53,900	65,500	Anglesey	35,000
Berks	74,700	92,700	112,800	Brecon	32,700
Buckingham	80,500	90,700	111,000	Cardigan	44,100
Cambridge	76,000	72,000	92,000	Carmarthen	69,600
Chester	107,000	131,600	198,100	Carnarvon	43,000
Cornwall	105,800	135,000	194,500	Denbigh	62,400
Cumberland	62,300	86,900	121,100	Flint	41,000
Derby	93,800	109,500	166,500	Glamorgan	74,000
Devon	248,200	272,200	354,400	Merioneth	30,500

POPULATION OF GREAT BRITAIN—(CONTINUED).

COUNTIES OF ENGLAND.	ESTIMATE, 1700.	ESTIMATE, 1750.	CENSUS, 1801.
Dorset	90,000	96,400	119,100
Durham	95,500	135,000	165,700
Essex	159,200	167,800	231,000
Gloucester	155,200	207,800	259,100
Hereford	60,900	74,100	92,100
Hertford	70,500	86,500	100,800
Huntingdon	34,700	32,500	38,800
Kent	153,800	190,000	317,800
Lancaster	166,200	297,400	695,100
Leicester	80,000	95,000	134,400
Lincoln	180,000	160,200	215,500
Middlesex	624,200	641,500	845,400
Monmouth	29,700	40,600	47,100
Norfolk	210,200	215,100	282,400
Northampton	119,500	123,300	136,100
Northumberland	118,000	141,700	162,300
Nottingham	65,200	77,600	145,000
Oxford	79,000	92,400	113,200
Rutland	16,600	13,800	16,900
Salop (Shrop.)	101,600	130,300	172,200
Somerset	195,900	224,500	282,800
Hampshire	118,700	137,500	226,900
Stafford	117,200	160,000	247,100
Suffolk	152,700	156,800	217,400
Surrey	154,900	207,100	278,000
Sussex	91,400	107,400	164,600
Warwick	96,600	140,000	215,100
Westmoreland	28,600	36,300	43,000
Wilts	153,900	168,400	191,200
Worcester	88,200	108,000	143,900
York—East Riding	96,200	85,500	144,000
North Riding	98,600	117,200	160,500
West Riding	236,700	361,500	582,700
England	5,108,500	6,017,700	8,609,000
Wales	366,500	449,300	559,000
	5,475,000	6,467,000	9,168,000
Scotland			1,652,400
Total, Great Britain			10,820,400

*** The numbers of the Army, Navy, etc., are added in these enumerations to the numbers of the Resident Population.

COUNTIES OF WALES.	1801.
Montgomery	49,300
Pembroke	58,200
Radnor	19,700
Total	559,000

SHIRES OF SCOTLAND.	1801.
Aberdeen	127,200
Argyll	74,300
Ayr	87,100
Banff	37,000
Berwick	31,600
Bute	12,200
Caithness	23,400
Clackmannan	11,200
Dumbarton	21,400
Dumfries	56,400
Edinburgh	127,100
Elgin	27,600
Fife	96,900
Forfar	102,400
Haddington	31,000
Inverness	76,800
Kincardine	27,200
Kinross	6,900
Kircudbright	30,200
Lanark	151,600
Linlithgow	18,400
Nairn	8,500
Orkney and Shetland	48,400
Peebles	9,000
Perth	130,600
Renfrew	80,700
Ross and Cromarty	57,200
Roxburgh	34,800
Selkirk	5,200
Stirling	52,500
Sutherland	23,900
Wigton	23,700
Total	1,652,400

POPULATION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

COUNTIES OF ENGLAND.	1821.	1831.
Bedford	83,716	95,383
Berks	131,977	145,289
Bucks	134,068	146,529
Cambridge	121,909	143,955
Chester	270,098	334,410
Cornwall	257,447	302,440
Cumberland	156,124	169,681
Derby	213,333	237,170
Devon	439,040	494,168
Dorset	144,499	159,252
Durham	207,673	253,827
Essex	289,424	317,237
Gloucester	335,843	386,904
Hampshire	283,298	314,313
Hereford	103,243	110,976
Hertford	129,714	143,341
Huntingdon	48,771	53,149
Kent	426,016	479,155
Lancaster	1,052,859	1,336,854
Leicester	174,571	197,003
Lincoln	283,058	317,244
Middlesex	1,144,531	1,358,541
Monmouth	71,833	98,130
Norfolk	344,368	390,054
Northampton	162,483	179,276
Northumberland	198,965	222,912
Nottingham	186,873	225,320
Oxford	136,971	151,726
Rutland	18,487	19,385
Salop	206,153	222,503
Somerset	355,314	403,908
Stafford	341,040	410,483
Suffolk	270,542	296,304
Surrey	398,658	486,326
Sussex	233,019	272,328
Warwick	274,392	336,988
Westmoreland	51,359	55,041
Wilts	222,157	239,181
Worcester	184,424	211,356
York—East Riding	190,449	204,008
North Riding	183,381	190,873
West Riding	799,357	976,415
Total	11,261,437	13,089,338

PROVINCES OF IRELAND.	1821.	1831.
Leinster	1,757,492	1,909,713
Munster	1,935,612	2,227,152
Ulster	1,998,494	2,286,622
Connaught	1,110,229	1,343,914
Total	6,801,827	7,767,401

COUNTIES OF WALES.	1821.	1831.
Anglesey	45,063	48,325
Brecon	43,613	47,763
Cardigan	57,784	64,780
Carmarthen	90,239	100,655
Carnarvon	57,958	65,753
Denbigh	76,511	83,167
Flint	53,784	60,012
Glamorgan	101,737	126,612
Merioneth	34,382	35,609
Montgomery	59,899	66,485
Pembroke	74,009	81,424
Radnor	22,459	24,651
Total	717,438	805,236

SHIRES OF SCOTLAND.	1821.	1831.
Aberdeen	155,387	177,651
Argyll	97,316	101,425
Ayr	127,299	145,055
Banff	43,561	48,604
Berwick	33,385	34,048
Bute	13,797	14,151
Caithness	30,238	34,529
Clackmannan	13,263	14,729
Dumbarton	27,317	33,211
Dumfries	70,878	73,770
Edinburgh	191,514	219,592
Elgin	31,162	34,231
Fife	114,556	128,839
Forfar	113,430	139,606
Haddington	35,127	36,145
Inverness	90,157	94,797
Kincardine	29,118	31,431
Kinross	7,762	9,072
Kirkcudbright	38,903	40,590
Lanark	244,387	316,818
Linlithgow	22,685	23,291
Nairn	9,006	9,354
Orkney and Shetland	53,124	58,239
Peebles	10,046	10,578
Perth	129,050	142,894
Renfrew	112,175	133,443
Ross and Cromarty	68,828	74,820
Roxburgh	40,892	43,663
Selkirk	6,637	6,833
Stirling	65,376	72,021
Sutherland	23,840	25,518
Wigton	32,340	36,258
Total	2,093,456	2,365,807

POPULATION IN 1811.

Great Britain.	Males.	Females.	Total.
England	4,555,257	4,944,143	9,499,400
Wales	289,414	317,966	607,380
Scotland	825,377	979,487	1,804,864
Army, Navy, etc.	640,500	.....	640,500
Totals	6,310,548	6,241,596	12,552,144

	1821.			1831.		
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.
England	5,483,679	5,777,758	11,261,437	6,375,394	6,713,944	13,089,338
Wales	350,487	366,951	717,438	394,075	411,161	805,236
Scotland	983,552	1,109,904	2,093,456	1,115,132	1,250,675	2,365,807
Ireland	3,341,926	3,459,901	6,801,827	3,794,880	3,972,521	7,767,401
Total	10,159,644	10,714,514	20,874,158	11,679,481	12,348,301	24,027,782

POPULATION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

COUNTIES OF ENGLAND.	1851.	1861.
Bedford	124,478	135,287
Berks	170,065	176,256
Buckingham	163,723	167,993
Cambridge	185,405	176,016
Chester	455,725	505,128
Cornwall	355,558	369,390
Cumberland	195,492	205,276
Derby	296,084	339,327
Devon	567,098	584,373
Dorset	184,207	188,789
Durham	390,997	508,666
Essex	369,318	404,851
Gloucester	458,805	485,770
Hampshire	405,370	481,815
Hereford	115,489	123,712
Hertford	167,298	173,280
Huntingdon	64,188	64,250
Kent	615,766	733,887
Lancaster	2,031,236	2,429,440
Leicester	230,308	237,412
Lincoln	407,222	412,246
Middlesex	1,886,576	2,206,485
Monmouth	157,418	174,633
Norfolk	442,714	434,798
Northampton	212,380	227,704
Northumberland	303,568	343,025
Nottingham	270,427	293,867
Oxford	170,439	170,944
Rutland	22,983	21,861
Salop	229,341	240,959
Somerset	443,916	444,873
Stafford	608,716	746,943
Suffolk	337,215	337,070
Surrey	683,082	831,093
Sussex	336,844	363,735
Warwick	475,013	561,855
Westmoreland	58,287	68,817
Wilts	254,221	249,311
Worcester	276,926	307,397
York—East Riding	257,286	280,660
North Riding	215,214	245,154
West Riding	1,325,495	1,507,796
Total	16,921,888	18,954,444

PROVINCES OF IRELAND.	1851.	1861.
Leinster	1,672,591	1,477,635
Munster	1,857,412	1,513,558
Ulster	2,011,756	1,914,236
Connaught	1,010,211	913,135
Total	6,551,970	5,798,564

COUNTIES OF WALES.	1851.	1861.
Anglesey	57,327	54,609
Brecon	61,474	61,627
Cardigan	70,796	72,245
Carmarthen	110,632	111,796
Carnarvon	87,870	95,694
Denbigh	92,583	100,778
Flint	68,156	69,737
Glamorgan	231,849	317,752
Merioneth	38,843	38,963
Montgomery	67,335	66,919
Pembroke	94,140	96,278
Radnor	24,716	25,382
Total	1,005,721	1,111,780

SHIRES OF SCOTLAND.	1851.	1861.
Aberdeen	212,032	221,569
Argyll	89,298	79,734
Ayr	189,858	198,971
Banff	54,171	59,215
Berwick	36,297	36,613
Bute	16,608	16,331
Caithness	38,709	41,111
Clackmannan	22,951	21,450
Dumbarton	45,103	57,034
Dumfries	78,123	75,878
Edinburgh	259,435	273,997
Elgin	38,959	42,695
Fife	153,546	154,770
Forfar	191,264	204,425
Haddington	36,386	37,634
Inverness	96,500	88,888
Kincardine	34,598	34,466
Kinross	8,924	7,977
Kirkcudbright	43,121	42,495
Lanark	530,169	631,566
Linlithgow	30,135	38,645
Nairn	9,956	10,065
Orkney and Shetland	62,533	64,065
Peebles	10,738	11,408
Perth	138,660	133,500
Renfrew	161,091	177,561
Ross and Cromarty	82,707	81,406
Roxburgh	51,642	54,119
Selkirk	9,809	10,449
Stirling	86,237	91,236
Sutherland	25,793	25,246
Wigton	43,389	42,095
Total	2,888,742	3,062,294

	1851.			1861.		
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.
England	8,281,734	8,640,154	16,921,888	9,224,244	9,730,200	18,954,444
Wales	499,491	506,230	1,005,721	552,015	559,765	1,111,780
Scotland	1,375,479	1,513,263	2,888,742	1,449,848	1,612,446	3,062,294
Ireland	3,190,507	3,361,463	6,551,970	2,836,977	2,961,587	5,798,564
Total	13,347,211	14,021,110	27,368,321	14,063,084	14,863,998	28,927,082

EXPORTS.

REAL OR DECLARED VALUE OF BRITISH AND IRISH PRODUCE AND MANUFACTURES EXPORTED, 1815 TO 1850.

1815	£51,608,028	1827	£37,181,335	1839	£53,233,580
1816	41,657,873	1828	36,812,756	1840	51,406,430
1817	41,761,132	1829	35,812,623	1841	51,631,623
1818	46,603,249	1830	38,271,597	1842	47,381,023
1819	35,208,321	1831	37,164,372	1843	52,278,149
1820	36,124,652	1832	36,450,594	1844	58,584,292
1821	36,659,630	1833	39,667,347	1845	60,111,081
1822	36,968,964	1834	41,649,191	1846	57,786,875
1823	35,158,048	1835	47,372,270	1847	58,842,377
1824	38,396,300	1836	53,368,571	1848	52,849,445
1825	38,877,388	1837	42,069,245	1849	63,596,025
1826	31,536,723	1838	50,060,970	1850	70,367,885

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN GRAIN.

The framers of the law of 1829 intended it to prevent fluctuations in the price of English grain, but in seven years, notwithstanding the provision, the price varied from 75*s.* 3*d.* in 1829 to 36*s.* 8*d.* in 1835, descending regularly every year; while in the three years, 1829, 1830, and 1831, there were imported 4,557,736 quarters. The total quantity imported during the next ten years kept increasing, with occasional exceptions; but in 1845, waiting the repeal of the duty, the importation was only 1,142,700 quarters, of which only 315,615 were taken for home consumption. In 1846, after the repeal, there were imported 1,437,944 quarters, and 1,995,852 were taken for home consumption. In 1847 there were imported 2,650,058 quarters; besides 6,329,646 cwts. of wheat-meal, 3,614,637 quarters of Indian corn, and 1,451,020 cwts. of Indian corn-meal. In 1848 there were imported 2,591,013 quarters of wheat, 1,765,175 cwts. of flour, and 1,586,781 quarters of Indian corn. In 1849 the imports were 3,872,134 quarters of wheat, 3,371,301 cwts. of flour, 2,247,424 quarters of Indian corn, and 102,173 cwts. of Indian corn-meal. In 1850 were imported 3,754,593 quarters of wheat, 3,855,050 cwts. of flour, 1,286,264 quarters of Indian corn, and 11,401 cwts. of meal.

From 1851 the computation has been made in cwts., and the wheat and flour placed under the head of wheat, 1 cwt. of flour being reckoned equal to 1¼ cwt. of grain. In 1851 there was imported a total of 23,161,718 cwts. of wheat, and 7,747,011 cwts. of Indian corn. In 1852, wheat, 18,092,627 cwts.; Indian corn, 6,305,472 cwts. In 1853, wheat 27,077,079 cwts.; Indian corn, 6,619,213 cwts. In 1854, wheat, 19,426,781 cwts.; Indian corn, 5,784,420 cwts. In 1855, wheat, 13,940,322 cwts.; Indian corn, 5,208,570 cwts. In 1856, wheat, 22,611,568 cwts.; Indian corn, 7,619,199 cwts. In 1857, wheat, 17,620,499 cwts.; Indian corn, 4,931,927 cwts. In 1858, wheat, 22,300,941 cwts.; Indian corn, 7,503,536 cwts. In 1859, wheat, 21,397,734 cwts.; Indian corn, 5,632,727 cwts. In 1860, wheat, 31,841,926 cwts.; Indian corn, 7,936,123 cwts. In 1861, wheat, 37,646,705 cwts.; Indian corn, 13,244,366 cwts. In 1862, wheat, 50,042,394 cwts.; Indian corn, 11,694,818 cwts. In 1863, wheat, 30,887,892 cwts.; Indian corn, 12,736,591 cwts. In 1864, wheat, 28,837,203 cwts.; Indian corn, 6,285,938 cwts. In 1865, wheat, 25,813,552 cwts.; Indian corn, 7,096,033 cwts. In 1866, wheat, 29,371,679 cwts.; Indian corn, 14,332,863 cwts. In 1867, wheat, 39,136,780 cwts.; Indian corn, 8,540,429 cwts.

AVERAGE GAZETTE PRICES OF BRITISH WHEAT, BARLEY, AND OATS, PER IMPERIAL QUARTER.

	1847.	1848.	1849.	1850.	1860.	1867.
	s. *d.*	*s.* *d.*	*s.* *d.*	*s.* *d.*	*s.* *d.*	*s.* *d.*
Wheat	69 9	50 6	44 3	40 3	53 3	64 5
Barley	44 2	31 6	27 9	23 5	36 7	40 0
Oats	28 8	20 6	17 6	16 5	24 5	26 0

QUANTITIES OF BRITISH WHEAT, BARLEY, AND OATS SOLD IN THE PRINCIPAL MARKET TOWNS OF ENGLAND AND WALES.

The Returns were from 290 towns previous to 1865, since that date they have been from only 150 towns.

[IN QUARTERS.]	1847.	1848.	1849.	1850.	1860.	1867.
Wheat	4,637,617	5,399,834	4,453,983	4,688,247	4,623,457	2,724,673
Barley	2,011,130	2,401,130	2,099,821	2,235,271	1,787,056	1,575,733
Oats	960,334	1,022,875	851,030	866,082	495,880	284,776

RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

FROM THE CENSUS, MARCH 30TH, 1851.

[This classification was not repeated in 1861.]

ENGLAND AND WALES.

	Total Number of Places of Worship.	Open in the Morning.	Sittings (Morning).	Attendance (Morning).
Church of England	14,077	11,794	4,852,645	2,541,244
Methodists	11,974	5,566	1,538,612	808,752
Independents	3,244	2,261	901,352	524,612
Baptists	2,789	2,055	636,864	360,806
Quakers	371	362	94,805	14,364
Unitarians	229	183	60,044	28,483
Presbyterians	161	149	86,535	47,582
Plymouth Brethren	132	101	14,613	5,699
New Church (Swedenborgians)	50	44	11,465	4,846
Sandemanians	6	6	956	439
Moravians	32	28	8,543	4,993
Isolated Congregations	539	338	74,876	36,969
	33,574	22,887	8,281,310	4,378,789
FOREIGN PROTESTANTS.				
Lutherans	6	6	2,172	1,152
French Protestants	3	2	530	225
Reformed Church, Netherlands	1	1	350	70
German Protestant Reformers	1	1	200	120
	11	10	3,252	1,567
OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.				
Roman Catholics	570	542	175,309	252,783
Greek Church	3	3	291	240
German Catholics	1	1	300	500
Italian Reformers	1	0	0	0
Catholic and Apostolic (Irvingites)	32	29	5,545	3,176
Latter Day Saints	222	147	23,413	7,517
	829	722	205,858	264,216
Jews	53	50	8,100	2,910
Total	34,467	23,669	8,498,520	4,647,482

SCOTLAND.

	Total Number of Places of Worship.	Open in the Morning.	Sittings (Morning).	Attendance (Morning).
Established Church of Scotland	1,183	1,022	713,567	351,454
Other Presbyterians	1,431	1,249	743,773	467,020
Episcopal Church	134	116	35,769	26,966
Independents	192	169	70,851	26,392
Baptists	119	98	24,330	9,208
Quakers	7	7	2,153	196
Unitarians	5	5	2,438	863
Methodists	82	65	21,768	8,937
Evangelical Union	28	26	10,589	3,895
Other Protestants	13	12	1,800	667
Isolated Congregations	60	41	9,321	2,871
Roman Catholics	117	101	48,771	43,878
Irvingites	3	3	675	272
Latter Day Saints	20	18	3,177	1,304
Jews	1	1	67	28
Total	3,395	2,933	1,689,049	943,951

ABSTRACT OF A LIST OF SUCH YEOMANRY AND VOLUNTEER CORPS AS HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED AND PLACED ON THE ESTABLISHMENT IN GREAT BRITAIN.

	Cav.	Infant.	Art.	Rank and File.
Aberdeen		3,400	120	3,520
Anglesea		1,000		1,000
Argyll		2,028	63	2,091
Ayr	144	2,677		2,691
Banff		960	80	1,022
Bedford	177	1,801		1,978
Berks	634	3,006		3,484
Berwick	160	772		911
Brecon		1,196		1,196
Bucks	1,122	2,426		3,121
Bute		38		90
Caithness		1,272		1,320
Cambridge	163	2,485		2,500
Cardigan		567		531
Carmarthen	120	2,316		2,347
Carnarvon		1,100		1,073
Chester	732	4,841	105	5,372
Clackmannan	40	296		336
Cinque Ports				
Cornwall	383	5,432	2,328	7,772
Cromarty		160		164
Cumberland	56	3,431	330	3,736
Denbigh	194	2,344		2,464
Derby	330	5,277		5,852
Devon	1,873	13,197	1,325	15,212
Dorset	515	2,201		2,340
Dumbarton	88	605		630
Dumfries	84	1,875		1,879
Durham	573	3,814	300	4,440
Elgin		770		784
Essex	1,251	6,335		7,033
Fife	350	2,613	100	2,906
Flint	270	2,429		2,699
Forfar	47	2,692	70	2,717
Glamorgan	213	2,488		2,301
Gloucester	644	6,436	176	7,161
Hants	1,252	7,164	836	9,509
Hereford	180	3,720		3,532
Hertford	625	2,319	50	2,762
Huntingdon	166	840		1,006
Inverness		3,666		3,320
Kent	1,530	8,804	253	10,295
Kincardine		824		824
Kinross		280		280
Kircudbright	200	746		946
Lanark	65	4,448		4,513
Lancaster	586	13,710	560	14,278
Leicester	622	2,946		3,488
Lincoln	713	4,560		7,866
Linlithgow	80	800		638
Lothian, East	205	700		905
Lothian, Mid.	300	1,574		1,813
Loth. Mid. (Edinb. City)		4,858	415	4,757
London	560	13,338		12,460
Middlesex	82	8,299		8,370
Man, Isle of		695		693
Merioneth		464		464
Monmouth	125	1,624		1,656
Montgomery	120	1,560		1,680
Nairn		320		320
Norfolk	1,120	6,511	180	6,918
Northampton	1,037	3,430		4,089
Northumberland	517	4,411		4,726
Nottingham	472	3,635		4,107
Oxford	591	3,322		3,516
Orkney & Zetland				
Peebles	52	480		532
Pembroke	440	1,852	70	2,701
Perth	160	3,897	68	4,036
Radnor		1,000		1,000
Renfrew		2,701		2,414
Ross		1,620		1,620
Roxburgh	108	960		1,060
Rutland	160	335		495
Salop	940	5,022		5,852
Selkirk	50	100		142
Somerset	1,544	7,747		9,080
Stafford	1,090	5,425		6,072
Stirling	308	1,318	65	1,667
Suffolk	769	6,837		7,332
Sutherland		1,092		1,092
Surrey	944	7,801		8,105
Sussex	1,024	6,114	637	6,198
Tower Hamlets		4,173		3,742
Warwick	708	3,874		4,146
Westminster	260	10,438		10,684
Westmoreland		1,420		1,420
Wight, Isle of	120	1,732	184	2,030
Wigton	105	624		729
Wilts	850	4,524		5,176
Worcester	494	4,046		4,304
York—N. Riding	267	4,381		4,683
E. Riding	382	3,473	61	3,890
W. Riding	1,606	12,990	50	14,006

Total of effective Rank and File	341,687
Field Officers	1,246
Captains	4,472
Subalterns	9,918
Staff Officers	1,100
Sergeants	14,787
Drummers	6,733
Grand Total	379,943

WHITEHALL, December 9, 1803.

REGINALD POLE CAREW.

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE, FROM 1815 TO 1850.

	Income.	Expenditure.	
	Net Receipts.	Interest on Debt funded and unfunded.	Total Amount expended in the Year.
1815	£72,210,512	£31,576,074	£92,280,180
1816	62,264,546	32,938,751	65,169,771
1817	52,055,913	31,496,245	55,281,238
1818	53,747,795	30,880,244	53,348,578
1819	52,648,847	30,807,249	55,406,509
1820	54,282,953	31,157,846	54,457,247
1821	55,834,192	31,955,304	57,130,586
1822	55,663,650	29,921,493	53,710,624
1823	57,672,999	29,215,905	56,223,740
1824	59,362,403	29,066,350	59,231,161
1825	57,273,869	28,060,287	61,520,753
1826	54,894,989	28,076,957	55,081,073
1827	54,932,518	28,230,847	55,823,321
1828	55,187,142	28,095,506	54,171,141
1829	50,786,682	29,155,612	51,835,137
1830	50,056,616	29,118,858	49,078,108
1831	45,424,440	28,341,416	49,797,156
1832	46,988,735	28,323,751	46,379,692
1833	46,271,326	28,522,507	45,782,026
1834	46,425,263	28,504,096	46,678,079
1835	45,893,369	28,514,610	45,669,309
1836	48,591,180	29,243,598	48,093,196
1837	46,475,194	29,489,571	49,116,839
1838	47,333,460	29,260,238	47,686,183
1839	47,844,890	29,454,062	49,357,691
1840	47,567,565	29,381,718	49,169,552
1841	48,084,360	29,450,145	50,185,729
1842	46,965,631	29,428,120	50,945,169
1843	52,582,817	29,260,160	51,148,254
1844	54,003,754	30,495,459	52,211,000
1845	53,060,354	28,253,872	53,386,603
1846	53,790,138	28,077,987	50,943,830
1847	51,546,265	28,141,531	54,502,947
1848	53,388,717	28,563,517	54,185,136
1849	52,951,749	28,323,961	50,874,696
1850	52,810,680	28,091,590	50,231,874

SCHOOLS.—ENGLAND AND WALES.

CENSUS OF EDUCATION, 1851.

	Schools.	Scholars.
Military, Naval, Corporation, Workhouse, and Prison Schools	610	48,826
Endowed Schools—		
Collegiate and Grammar Schools	566	35,612
Other endowed Schools	2,559	170,667
	3,125	206,279
Supported by Religious Bodies—		
Church of England	10,555	929,474
Independents	453	50,186
Wesleyan Methodists	381	41,144
Roman Catholics	339	41,382
Undenominational	514	82,597
Others	466	44,003
	12,708	1,188,786
Ragged, Orphan, Blind, Deaf and Dumb, Factory, Colliery, and Mechanics' Institution Schools, Agricultural Schools, and other Public Schools	1,081	109,214
Total of Public Day Schools, as above	15,411	1,413,170
Total of Private Day Schools	29,425	695,422
Total Day Schools	44,836	2,108,592

Evening Schools, from which returns were obtained in 1851, 1,545; Scholars, 39,783, of whom 70 per cent were males.

Literary, Scientific, and Mechanics' Institutions—Returns obtained in 1851 from 1,057 Institutions, with 163,395 members.

SCOTLAND.

	Day Schools.	Scholars.
Supported by General or Local Taxation	1,039	88,900
" " Endowments	491	39,537
" " Religious Bodies	1,385	114,739
Other Public Schools	434	36,869
	3,349	280,045
Private Day Schools	1,893	88,472
	5,242	369,517

Sabbath Schools, 3,803; Scholars, 292,549; Teachers, 25,411.
Evening Schools for Adults, 438; Scholars, 15,071.
Literary and Mechanics' Institutions, 221; Members, 29,655.

The Census of 1861 did not require the returns of Education in the above form, but the Board of Education Returns, from the Reports of Inspectors, give the number of children attending the inspection of Primary Schools in England and Wales in 1861 as 879,884, and in 1867 as 1,210,391. In Scotland in 1861 (exclusive of Roman Catholic Schools) the number inspected was 148,806, and in 1867 it was 180,799.

GROWTH OF THE NATIONAL DEBT.

The present funded debt may be considered to have its root in the iniquitous measure of shutting up the Exchequer in 1672, when the revenue pledged for the payment of loans, amounting to £1,328,000, was appropriated to other purposes, and that principal sum was never redeemed. Interest was duly paid till 1681, and was then withheld. But an Act of Parliament was passed in 1699, by which, after 1705, the creditors were to receive interest of 3 per cent upon the original amount, to be redeemed whenever the Government should pay a moiety thereof. That unredeemed moiety of £660,263 is a part of the present debt; and at the Revolution there was about £400,000 outstanding debt in the shape of loans and arrears.

A general abstract of the funded and unfunded capital of the national debt of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the charge for interest and management, has been recently printed by order of the House of Commons. It must be borne in mind, that although we speak of capital and interest, the public debt consists not in capital but in annuities—that the state, having borrowed a principal sum from time to time, guarantees certain payments in the shape of perpetual or terminable annuities, without any engagement to replace the principal represented by such a general abstract of the national debt. We give the results of this abstract, separating the return into periods concurrent with marked eras of our history; and distinguishing the years of war and the years of peace. In the progress of our historical narrative, we have noticed how the amount of interest has been reduced, by the judicious measures of Sir Robert Walpole, and by those of Mr. Pelham in 1749.

William and Mary; William III.; Anne.

				Unredeemed Capital.	Interest and Annuities.
War	William III. W. & M.	3 and 4	1691	£3,130,000	£232,000
"		4 and 5	1692	3,310,547	230,000
"		5 and 6	1693	5,902,839	507,101
"		6 and 7	1694	6,734,297	818,298
"		7 and 8	1695	8,436,846	887,192
"		8 and 9	1696	11,579,178	1,086,971
War / Peace		9 and 10	1697	14,522,925	1,322,519
"		10 and 11	1698	15,445,416	1,468,511
"		11 and 12	1699	13,799,355	1,423,539
"		12 and 13	1700	12,607,080	1,252,080
"		13	1701	12,552,486	1,219,147
Peace / War		1	1702	12,767,225	1,215,324
"	Anne.	1 and 2	1703	12,325,779	1,158,460
"		2 and 3	1704	12,363,474	1,234,010
"		3 and 4	1705	12,135,351	1,210,051
"		4 and 5	1706	12,388,030	1,443,568
"		5 and 6	1707	15,244,299	1,590,630
"		6 and 7	1708	15,518,406	1,722,472
"		7 and 8	1709	18,933,339	1,921,477
"		8 and 9	1710	21,335,645	2,064,829
"		9 and 10	1711	22,398,425	2,274,377
"		10 and 11	1712	34,922,688	3,034,078
War / Peace		11 and 12	1713	34,699,847	3,004,287
"		12 and 13	1714	36,175,460	3,063,135

GROWTH OF THE NATIONAL DEBT—(CONTINUED).

GEORGE I. AND II.—*From the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle.*

				Unredeemed Capital.	Interest and Annuities.
Peace	George I.	1 and 2	1715	£37,423,234	£3,114,625
"		2 and 3	1716	37,918,468	3,167,616
"		3 and 4	1717	40,308,257	3,144,293
Peace / War		4 and 5	1718	40,379,684	2,965,889
"		5 and 6	1719	41,872,241	2,822,370
"		6 and 7	1720	53,979,708	2,846,434
War / Peace		7 and 8	1721	54,405,108	2,855,380
"		8 and 9	1722	54,202,366	2,807,584
"		9 and 10	1723	52,996,990	2,738,080
"		10 and 11	1724	53,323,570	2,737,317
"		11 and 12	1725	52,239,077	2,717,589
"		12 and 13	1726	52,850,797	2,739,628
"		13 / 1	1727	52,523,923	2,360,934
"	George II.	1 and 2	1728	51,960,576	2,306,462
"		2 and 3	1729	51,541,220	2,292,150
"		3 and 4	1730	50,830,310	2,227,127
"		4 and 5	1731	50,738,786	2,219,986
"		5 and 6	1732	49,836,638	2,189,391
"		6 and 7	1733	48,728,097	2,153,405
"		7 and 8	1734	48,821,416	2,136,147
"		8 and 9	1735	48,948,089	2,141,600
"		9 and 10	1736	50,424,651	2,108,793
"		10 and 11	1737	47,231,299	2,057,073
"		11 and 12	1738	46,497,500	2,025,898
Peace / War		12 and 13	1739	46,613,883	2,030,884
"		13 and 14	1740	47,122,579	2,051,572
"		14 and 15	1741	48,382,439	2,099,950
"		15 and 16	1742	51,847,323	2,157,136
"		16 and 17	1743	53,200,989	2,181,586
"		17 and 18	1744	56,742,418	2,293,302
"		18 and 19	1745	59,717,817	2,428,329
"		19 and 20	1746	64,617,844	2,650,231
"		20 and 21	1747	69,115,414	2,882,538
War / Peace		21 and 22	1748	75,812,132	3,165,765

GEORGE II. AND III.—*From the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle to the Peace of Paris.*

				Unredeemed Capital.	Interest and Annuities.
Peace	George II.	22 and 23	1749	£77,488,940	£3,204,858
"		23 and 24	1750	76,859,810	2,789,351
"		24 and 25	1751	77,197,026	2,769,484
"		25 and 26	1752	76,431,683	2,735,312
"		26 and 27	1753	75,034,815	2,694,038
"		27 and 28	1754	72,128,282	2,648,452
"		28 and 29	1755	72,505,572	2,650,041
Peace / War		29 and 30	1756	74,575,025	2,753,566
"		30 and 31	1757	77,825,397	2,736,254
"		31 and 32	1758	83,128,009	2,918,707
"		32 and 33	1759	91,273,459	3,181,895
"		33 and 34 / 1	1760	102,014,018	3,576,275
"	Geo. III.	1 and 2	1761	114,294,987	4,148,999
"		2 and 3	1762	126,794,987	4,747,849
War / Peace		3 and 4	1763	132,716,049	5,032,733

GEORGE III.—*From the Peace of Paris to the War of the French Revolution.*

				Unredeemed Capital.	Interest and Annuities.
Peace	George III.	4 and 5	1764	£133,287,940	£5,002,865
"		5 and 6	1765	131,816,173	4 028,250
"		6 and 7	1766	131,636,931	4,887,346
"		7 and 8	1767	132,110,822	4,875,558
"		8 and 9	1768	132,587,404	4,870,163
"		9 and 10	1769	130,313,280	4,786,941
"		10 and 11	1770	129,197,633	4,712,079
"		11 and 12	1771	128,986,012	4,733,694
"		12 and 13	1772	128,036,533	4,706,326
"		13 and 14	1773	128,871,497	4,749,567
Peace / War		14 and 15	1774	127,162,413	4,698,313
"		15 and 16	1775	126,842,811	4,703,519
"		16 and 17	1776	131,237,283	4,870,534
"		17 and 18	1777	136,776,637	5,112,344
"		18 and 19	1778	143,052,634	5,487,323
"		19 and 20	1779	153,574,350	6,100,060
"		20 and 21	1780	167,460,982	6,931,739
"		21 and 22	1781	189,258,681	7,451,052
"		22 and 23	1782	214,729,586	8,413,441
War / Peace		23 and 24	1783	231,843,631	9,065,585
"		24 and 25	1784	243,063,145	9,541,256
"		25 and 26	1785	245,586,470	9,678,942
"		26 and 27	1786	245,466,855	9,664,541
"		27 and 28	1787	244,279,225	9,595,379
"		28 and 29	1788	243,637,416	9,572,217
"		29 and 30	1789	242,752,911	9,567,359
"		30 and 31	1790	242,461,580	9,585,712
"		31 and 32	1791	241,675,999	9,513,507
"		32 and 33	1792	239,663,421	9,432,179

ABSTRACT.

Period.	Debt.	Interest.	Years of War.	Increase of Debt in Years of War.
1691	£3,130,000	£332,000		
1701	12,552,486	1,219,147	1691—1697	£11,392,925
1714	36,175,460	3,063,135	1702—1713	21,032,622
1748	75,812,132	3,165,765	1718—1721	14,025,424
			1740—1748	22,531,551
1763	132,716,049	5,032,733	1756—1763	58,141,024
1792	239,663,421	9,432,179	1774—1783	104,681,213
				£232,704,759

THE NATIONAL DEBT.

WAR OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

				Principal.	Interest.
Peace / War	George III.	33 and 34	1793	£247,874,434	£9,711,223
"		34 and 35	1794	263,322,655	10,396,645
"		35 and 36	1795	321,462,679	12 699,310
"		36 and 37	1796	363,898,894	14,765,095
"		37 and 38	1797	388,960,590	15,575,330
"		38 and 39	1798	427,525,902	16,887,399
"		39 and 40	1799	442,324,377	17,560,127
"		40 and 41	1800	470,894,280	18,582,950
"		41 and 42	1801	517,511,871	19,819,839
War / Peace		42 and 43	1802	537,653,008	20,268,551

GROWTH OF THE NATIONAL DEBT—(CONTINUED).

				Principal.	Interest.
Peace / War	George III.	43 and 44	1803	547,732,796	20,812,962
"		44 and 45	1804	571,131,318	21,658,890
"		45 and 46	1805	599,869,847	22,568,359
"		46 and 47	1806	621,096,683	23,196,582
"		47 and 48	1807	633,806,412	23,373,092
"		48 and 49	1808	643,545,783	23,595,013
"		49 and 50	1809	654,461,311	24,292,276
"		50 and 51	1810	662,193,856	24,553,162
"		51 and 52	1811	678,200,436	25,484,765
"		52 and 53	1812	706,254,587	26,853,846
"		53 and 54	1813	788,093,781	29,893,737
"		54 and 55	1814	813,140,176	31,105,644
War / Peace		55 and 56	1815	861,039,049	32,645,618

THE NATIONAL DEBT.

FROM THE PEACE OF PARIS, 1815, TILL 1837.

				Principal.	Interest.
Peace	Geo. III.	56 and 57	1816	£845,968,483	£32,055,350
"		57 and 58	1817	839,382,145	31,591,927
"		58 and 59	1818	840,582,664	31,485,753
"		59 and 60	1819	836,530,982	31,168,540
"	George IV.	60	1820	834,900,960	31,354,749
"		1			
"		2	1821	827,984,498	31,105,319
"		3	1822	835,207,294	29,722,533
"		4	1823	827,480,164	30,142,582
"		5	1824	819,023,672	29,174,122
"		6	1825	809,831,468	28,987,773
"		7	1826	808,826,590	29,415,102
"		8	1827	805,098,942	29,328,782
"		9	1828	800,032,289	29,167,877
"		10	1829	796,799,532	29,067,658
"		11	1830	784,803,997	28,325,936
"		1			
"	William IV.	1 and 2	1831	782,716,684	28,329,986
"		2 and 3	1832	781,457,599	28,351,318
"		3 and 4	1833	779,730,379	28,481,181
"		4 and 5	1834	773,234,401	28,517,236
"		5 and 6	1835	768,664,201	29,135,811
"		6 and 7	1836	789,496,896	29,667,464
"		7	1837	787,529,114	29,537,333
"	Victoria	1			

THE GROWTH OF THE DEBT.

Period.	Debt.	Interest.	Years of War.	Increase of Debt in Years of War.	Remarks.
1691	£3,130,000	£332,000			
1701	12,552,486	1,219,147	1691–1697	£11,392,925	French War.
1714	36,175,460	3,063,135	1702–1713	21,932,622	War of the Succession.
1748	75,812,132	3,165,765	1718–1721	14,025,424	Continental Wars.
			1740–1748	22,531,551	
1763	132,716,049	5,032,733	1756–1763	58,141,024	Pitt's Administration.
1792	239,663,421	9,432,179	1774–1783	104,681,213	American War.
1815	861,039,049	32,645,618	1793–1815	621,375,628	War of French Revolution and against Napoleon.
				£854,080,387	
Decrease of National Debt, 1816 to 1837				73,509,535	

NATIONAL DEBT.

				Principal.	Interest.
Peace	Victoria.	1 and 2	1838	£786,840,165	£29,432,903
"		2 and 3	1839	787,236,060	29,385,451
"		3 and 4	1840	788,644,401	29,415,924
"		4 and 5	1841	792,209,685	29,462,030
"		5 and 6	1842	791,757,816	29,300,112
"		6 and 7	1843	792,664,743	29,047,473
"		7 and 8	1844	787,987,194	28,272,652
"		8 and 9	1845	785,115,222	28,125,113
"		9 and 10	1846	782,977,684	28,025,253
"		10 and 11	1847	790,376,351	28,442,683
"		11 and 12	1848	791,817,338	28,307,343
"		12 and 13	1849	790,927,016	28,091,579
"		13 and 14	1850	787,029,162	28,025,523

PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM BEFORE THE REFORM ACTS OF 1832.

[The letter F indicates those Counties which, by Schedule F of the Reform Act, are divided into two electoral districts; F 2 is prefixed to undivided Counties, to which an additional member was given.]

COUNTIES.

ENGLAND AND WALES.—[Continuous from the reign of Edward I.]

COUNTIES.	MEMBERS.
Bedfordshire	2
F 2 Berkshire	2
F 2 Buckinghamshire	2
F 2 Cambridgeshire	2
F Cornwall	2
F Cumberland	2
F Derbyshire	2
F Devonshire	2
F 2 Dorsetshire	2
F Essex	2
F Gloucestershire	2
F Hampshire	2
F 2 Herefordshire	2
F 2 Hertfordshire	2
Huntingdonshire	2
F Kent	2
F Lancashire	2
F Leicestershire	2
Lincolnshire	2
Middlesex	2
F Norfolk	2
F Northamptonshire	2
F Northumberland	2
F Nottinghamshire	2
F 2 Oxfordshire	2
Rutlandshire	2
F Shropshire	2
F Somersetshire	2
F Staffordshire	2
F Suffolk	2
F Surrey	2
F Sussex	2
F Warwickshire	2
Westmoreland	2
F Wiltshire	2
F Worcestershire	2
Yorkshire (2 added in 1821)	4
[From Henry VIII.]	
Anglesey	1
Brecknockshire	1
Cardiganshire	1
Carmarthenshire	1
Carnarvonshire	1
F Cheshire	2
Denbighshire	1
Flintshire	1
Glamorganshire	1
Merionethshire	1
Monmouthshire	2
Montgomeryshire	1
Pembrokeshire	1
Radnorshire	1
[From Charles II.]	
F Durham	2

SCOTLAND.—*In the British Parliament, from the Union under Anne.*

Aberdeen	1	Lanark	1
Argyle	1	Linlithgow	1
Ayr	1	Orkney and Shetland	1
Banff	1	Peebles	1
Berwick	1	Perth	1
Dumbarton	1	Renfrew	1
Dumfries	1	Ross	1
Edinburgh	1	Roxburgh	1
Elgin	1	Selkirk	1
Fife	1	Stirling	1
Forfar	1	Sutherland	1
Haddington	1	Wigton	1
Inverness	1	Bute and Caithness, alternately	1
Kincardine	1	Clackmannan and Kinross, alternately	1
Kirkcudbright	1	Cromarty and Nairn, alternately	1

IRELAND.—*In the Imperial Parliament, from the Union under George III.*

Antrim	2	Limerick	2
Armagh	2	Londonderry	2
Carlow	2	Longford	2
Cavan	2	Louth	2
Clare	2	Mayo	2
Cork	2	Meath	2
Donegal	2	Monaghan	2
Down	2	Queen's County	2
Dublin	2	Roscommon	2
Fermanagh	2	Sligo	2
Galway	2	Tipperary	2
Kerry	2	Tyrone	2
Kildare	2	Waterford	2
Kilkenny	2	Westmeath	2
King's County	2	Wexford	2
Leitrim	2	Wicklow	2

CITIES AND BOROUGHS.

ENGLAND AND WALES.—[Continuous from the reign of Edward I.]

[The letters A, B, indicate the Schedule in which the Borough was placed by the Reform Act.]

	CITY OR BOROUGH.	COUNTY WHEREIN SITUATED.	MEMBERS.
A	Amersham	Bucks	2
	Andover	Hants	2
A	Appleby	Westmoreland	2
B	Arundel	Sussex	2
B	Ashburton	Devon	2
	Barnstaple	Devon	2
	Bath	Somerset	2
	Bedford	Bedfordshire	2
A	Bedwin	Wilts	2
	Beverley	Yorkshire	2
A	Blechingley	Surrey	2
	Bodmin	Cornwall	2
A	Bramber	Sussex	2
	Bridgenorth	Shropshire	2
	Bridgewater	Somerset	2
	Bridport	Dorset	2
	Bristol (co. of itself, locally between Gloucestershire and Somerset)		2
	Bury St. Edmund's	Suffolk	2
B	Calne	Wilts	2
	Cambridge	Cambridgeshire	2
	Canterbury (co. of itself, locally in Kent)		2
	Carlisle	Cumberland	2
	Chichester	Sussex	2
	Chippenham	Wilts	2
	Cockermouth	Cumberland	2
	Colchester	Essex	2
	Coventry (co. of itself, locally in Warwickshire)		2
	Cricklade	Wilts	2
B	Dartmouth	Devon	2
	Derby	Derbyshire	2
	Devizes	Wilts	2
	Dorchester	Dorset	2
A	Downton	Wilts	2
B	Droitwich	Worcestershire	2
A	Dunwich	Suffolk	2
	Evesham	Worcestershire	2
	Exeter (co. of itself, locally in Devon)		2
	Gloucester (co. of itself, locally in Gloucestershire)		2
	Great Marlow	Bucks	2
B	Grimsby	Lincolnshire	2
	Guildford	Surrey	2
A	Hedon	Yorkshire	2
B	Helston	Cornwall	2
	Hereford	Herefordshire	2
	Hertford	Hertfordshire	2
	Honiton	Devon	2
B	Horsham	Sussex	2
	Huntingdon	Huntingdonshire	2
A	Ilchester	Somerset	2
	Ipswich	Suffolk	2
	Lancaster	Lancashire	2
B	Launceston	Cornwall	2
	Leicester	Leicestershire	2
	Leominster	Herefordshire	2
	Lewes	Sussex	2
	Lichfield (co. of itself, locally in Stafford		2
	Lincoln (co. of itself, locally in Lincolnshire)		2
B	Liskeard	Cornwall	2
	Liverpool	Lancashire	2
	London (co. of itself, locally in Middlesex)		4
A	Lostwithiel	Cornwall	2
A	Ludgershall	Wilts	2
B	Lyme Regis	Dorset	2
	Lynn	Norfolk	2
B	Malmesbury	Wilts	2
	Malton	Yorkshire	2
	Marlborough	Wilts	2
A	Milbourne Port	Somerset	2
	Newcastle-upon-Tyne (co. of itself, locally in Northumberland		2
	Newport	Hants	2
A	New Sarum, or Salisbury	Wilts	2
B	Northallerton	Yorkshire	2
	Northampton	Northamptonshire	2
	Norwich (co. of itself, locally in Norfolk		2
	Nottingham (co. of itself, locally in Nottinghamshire)		2
A	Okehampton	Devon	2
A	Old Sarum	Wilts	2
A	Orford	Suffolk	2
	Oxford	Oxfordshire	2
B	Petersfield	Hants	2
	Plymouth	Devon	2
A	Plympton	Devon	2
	Pontefract	Yorkshire	2
	Portsmouth	Hants	2
	Preston	Lancashire	2
	Reading	Berkshire	2
B	Reigate	Surrey	2
	Ripon	Yorkshire	2
	Rochester	Kent	2
	St. Alban's	Hertfordshire	2
	Scarborough	Yorkshire	2
A	Seaford	Sussex	2
B	Shaftesbury	Dorset	2
	Shoreham	Sussex	2
	Shrewsbury	Shropshire	2
	Southampton (co. of itself, locally in Hants)		2
	Southwark	Surrey	2
	Stafford	Staffordshire	2
	Stamford	Lincolnshire	2
A	Steyning	Sussex	2
	Taunton	Somerset	2
	Tavistock	Devon	2
B	Thirsk	Yorkshire	2
	Totnes	Devon	2
A	Tregony	Cornwall	2
	Truro	Cornwall	2
B	Wallingford	Berks	2
B	Wareham	Dorset	2
	Warwick	Warwickshire	2
	Wells	Somerset	2
A	Wendover	Bucks	2
A	Weobly	Herefordshire	2
	Wigan	Lancashire	2
B	Wilton	Wilts	2
	Winchester	Hants	2
	Windsor	Berks	2
B	Woodstock	Oxfordshire	2
	Worcester (co. of itself, locally in Worcestershire		2
	Wycombe, Chipping	Bucks	2
A	Yarmouth	Hants	2
	Yarmouth	Norfolk	2
	York (co. of itself, locally in Yorkshire)		2

[Edward II.]

A	East Grimstead	Sussex	2
	Retford	Notts	2

[Edward III.]

	Dover	Kent	2
	Harwich	Essex	2
	Hastings	Sussex	2
B	Hythe	Kent	2
	Kingston-upon-Hull (co. of itself, locally in Yorkshire)		2
	Maldon	Essex	2
B	Midhurst	Sussex	2
	Newcastle-under-Lyne	Staffordshire	2
	Poole (co. of itself, locally in Dorset)		2
	Richmond	Yorkshire	2
A	Romney	Kent	2
B	Rye	Sussex	2
	Sandwich	Kent	2
	Weymouth and Melcombe Regis	Dorset	4
A	Winchelsea	Sussex	2

[Henry VI.]

A	Gatton	Surrey	2
A	Heytesbury	Wilts	2
A	Hindon	Wilts	2
B	Westbury	Wilts	2
A	Wootton Basset	Wilts	2

[Edward IV.]

	Grantham	Lincolnshire	2
	Ludlow	Shropshire	2
	Wenlock	Shropshire	2

[Henry VIII.]

	Beaumaris	Anglesey	1
	Berwick-upon-Tweed (co. of itself)		2
	Brecon	Brecknockshire	1
	Buckingham	Bucks	2
	Cardiff, sharing with Aberavon, Cowbridge, Kenfig, Llantrissent, Loughor, Neath, and Swansea	Glamorganshire	1
	Cardigan, sharing with Aberystwith, Adpar, and Lampeter	Cardiganshire	1
	Carmarthen (co. of itself, locally in Carmarthenshire)		1
	Carnarvon, sharing with Conway, Criccieth, Nevin, and Pwllheli	Carnarvonshire	1
	Chester (co. of itself, locally in Cheshire)		2
	Denbigh, sharing with Holt and Ruthin,	Denbighshire	1
	Flint, sharing with Caergwrley, Caerwys, Overton, and Rhyddlan	Flintshire	1
	Haverfordwest (co. of itself, locally in Pembrokeshire		1
	Monmouth, sharing with Newport and Usk,	Monmouthshire	1
	Montgomery	Montgomeryshire	1
	Pembroke, sharing with Tenby and Wiston,	Pembrokeshire	1
	Radnor, sharing with Kevinleece, Knighton, Knucklar, and Rhayder	Radnorshire	1

[Edward VI.]

A	Bossiney	Cornwall	2
	Boston	Lincolnshire	2
A	Brackley	Northamptonshire	2
A	Camelford	Cornwall	2
	Maidstone	Kent	2
A	Newport	Cornwall	2
	Penryn	Cornwall	2
	Peterborough	Northamptonshire	2
A	St. Michael's	Cornwall	2
A	Saltash	Cornwall	2
	Thetford	Norfolk	2
A	West Looe	Cornwall	2
	Westminster	Middlesex	2

[Mary.]

	Abingdon	Berks	1
A	Aldborough	Yorkshire	2
	Aylesbury	Bucks	2
	Banbury	Oxfordshire	1
A	Boroughbridge	Yorkshire	2
A	Castle Rising	Norfolk	2
A	Higham Ferrers	Northamptonshire	1
	Knaresborough	Yorkshire	2
B	Morpeth	Northumberland	2
B	St. Ives	Cornwall	2

[Elizabeth.]

A	Aldeburgh	Suffolk	2
A	Beeralston	Devon	2
A	Bishop's Castle	Shropshire	2
A	Callington	Cornwall	2
B	Christchurch	Hants	2
	Cirencester	Gloucestershire	2
B	Clitheroe	Lancashire	2
A	Corfe Castle	Dorset	2
A	East Looe	Cornwall	2
B	Eye	Suffolk	2
A	Fowey	Cornwall	2
A	Haslemere	Surrey	2
	Lymington	Hants	2
A	Minehead	Somerset	2
A	Newtown	Hants	2
A	Newton	Lancashire	2
A	Queenborough	Kent	2
A	St. Germain's	Cornwall	2
A	St. Mawe's	Cornwall	2
A	Stockbridge	Hants	2
	Sudbury	Suffolk	2
	Tamworth	Warwickshire	2
A	Whitchurch	Hants	2

[James I.]

	Bewdley	Worcestershire	1
	Tewkesbury	Gloucestershire	2
	Tiverton	Devon	2

[Charles II.]

	Durham	Durham	2
	Newark	Notts	2

SCOTLAND.—*In the British Parliament, since the Union under Anne.*

Edinburgh city..... 1 member.

[Districts of Burghs.]

DISTRICTS.	BURGHS.	COUNTIES WHEREIN LOCALLY SITUATED.	MEMBERS.
1	Dingwall	Ross	1
	Dornoch	Sutherland	
	Kirkwall	Orkney	
	Tain	Ross	
	Wick	Caithness	
2	Forres	Elgin	1
	Fortrose	Ross	
	Inverness	Inverness	
	Nairn	Nairn	
3	Banff	Banff	1
	Cullen	Banff	
	Elgin	Elgin	
	Inverury	Aberdeen	
	Kintore	Aberdeen	
4	Aberdeen	Aberdeen	1
	Aberbrothwick	Forfar	
	Brechin	Forfar	
	Inverbervie	Kincardine	
	Montrose	Forfar	
5	Cupar	Forfar and Perth	1
	Dundee	Forfar	
	Forfar	Forfar	
	Perth	Perth	
	St. Andrews	Fife	
6	Anstruther Easter	Fife	1
	Anstruther Wester	Fife	
	Crail	Fife	
	Kilrenny	Fife	
	Pittenweem	Fife	
7	Burntisland	Fife	1
	Dysart	Fife	
	Kinghorn	Fife	
	Kirkaldy	Fife	
8	Culross	Perth	1
	Dunfermline	Fife	
	Inverkeithing	Fife	
	Queensferry	Linlithgow	
	Stirling	Stirling	
9	Dumbarton	Dumbarton	1
	Glasgow	Lanark	
	Renfrew	Renfrew	
	Rutherglen	Lanark	
10	Dunbar	Haddington	1
	Haddington	Haddington	
	Jedburgh	Roxburgh	
	Lauder	Berwick	
	North Berwick	Haddington	
11	Lanark	Lanark	1
	Linlithgow	Linlithgow	
	Peebles	Peebles	
	Selkirk	Selkirk	
12	Ayr	Ayr	1
	Campbelton	Argyle	
	Inverary	Argyle	
	Irvine	Ayr	
	Rothsay	Bute	
13	Annan	Dumfries	1
	Dumfries	Dumfries	
	Kirkcudbright	Kirkcudbright	
	Lochmaben	Dumfries	
	Sanquhar	Dumfries	
14	New Galloway	Kircudbright	1
	Stranraer	Wigton	
	Whithorn	Wigton	
	Wigton	Wigton	

IRELAND.—*In the Imperial Parliament, from the Union under George III.*

CITIES AND BOROUGHS.	COUNTIES WHEREIN LOCALLY SITUATED.	MEMBERS.
Armagh	Armagh	1
Athlone	Roscommon and Westmeath	1
Bandon	Cork	1
Belfast	Antrim	1
Carlow	Carlow	1
Carrickfergus	co. corporate	1
Cashel	Tipperary	1
Clonmel	Tipperary	1
Coleraine	Londonderry	1
Cork	co. corporate	2
Downpatrick	Down	1
Drogheda	co. corporate	1
Dublin	co. corporate	1
Dundalk	Louth	1
Dungannon	Tyrone	1
Dungarvan	Waterford	1
Ennis	Clare	1
Enniskillen	Fermanagh	1
Galway	co. corporate	1
Kilkenny	co. corporate	1
Kinsale	Cork	1
Limerick	co. corporate	1
Lisburn	Antrim	1
Londonderry	Londonderry	1
Mallow	Cork	1
New Ross	Wexford	1
Newry	Down	1
Portarlington	King's County and Queen's County	1
Sligo	Sligo	1
Tralee	Kerry	1
Waterford	co. corporate	1
Wexford	Wexford	1
Youghal	Cork	1

UNIVERSITIES.

[From the reign of James I.]

Cambridge.....2 members | Oxford.....2 members.

[From the Irish Union under George III.]

Dublin..... 1 member.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE FROM THE END OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF SIR ROBERT WALPOLE, 1741, TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THAT OF LORD NORTH, 1770.

LORD CHANCELLOR.	FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY.	CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.	PRINCIPAL SECRETARIES OF STATE.
1741 Philip, Lord Hardwicke (from 1737).	1741 Sir Robert Walpole.	1741 Sir Robert Walpole.	1741 William, Lord Harrington (from 1730).
1742 "	1742 Spencer, Earl of Wilmington.	1742 Samuel Sandys, Esq.	1742 (Feb. 12). John, Lord Carteret (*vice* Lord Harrington).
1743 "	1743 Hon. Henry Pelham.	1743 Hon. Henry Pelham.	1743 "
1744 "	1744 "	1744 "	1744 (Nov. 24). William, Earl of Harrington (*vice* Lord Carteret).
1745 "	1745 "	1745 "	1745 "
1746 "	1746 "	1746 "	1746 (Feb. 10). John, Earl Granville (*vice* Earl of Harrington).
			— (Feb. 14). Thomas Holles, Duke of Newcastle.
			— (Feb. 14). William, Earl of Harrington.
			— (Nov. 4). Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield (*vice* Earl of Harrington).
1747 "	1747 "	1747 "	1747 "
1748 "	1478 "	1748 "	1748 (Feb. 13). John, Duke of Bedford (*vice* Earl of Chesterfield).
1749 "	1749 "	1749 "	1749 "
1750 "	1750 "	1750 "	1750 "
1751 "	1751 "	1751 "	1751 (July 12). Robert, Earl of Holdernesse (*vice* Duke of Bedford).
1752 "	1752 "	1752 "	1752 "
1753 "	1753 "	1753 "	1753 "
1754 "	1754 (March 16). J. H. Pelham, Duke of Newcastle.	1754 (March 9). Sir William Lee.	1754 (April 6). Sir Thos. Robinson (*vice* Duke of Newcastle).
		— (April 6). Hon. H. B. Legge.	
1755 "	1755 "	1755 Sir George Lyttleton.	1755 (Nov.) Henry Fox, Esq. (*vice* Sir T. Robinson).
1756 The Great Seal in Commission.	1756 (Nov. 16). William, Duke of Devonshire.	1756 Hon. H. B. Legge.	1756 (Dec.) William Pitt, Esq. (*vice* Mr. Fox. He resigned in April, 1757, and was re-appointed in June).
1757 Sir Robert Henley—Lord Keeper—(created Lord Henley, 1760).	1757 (April 9). W. Murray, Lord Mansfield.	1757 (April 9). W. Murray, Lord Mansfield.	1757 "
	— (July 2). J. H. Pelham, Duke of Newcastle.	— (July 2). Hon. H. B. Legge.	
1758 "	1758 "	1758 "	1758 "
1759 "	1759 "	1759 "	1759 "
1760 "	1760 "	1760 "	1760 "
1761 "	1761 "	1761 William, Viscount Barrington.	1761 (Mar. 25). John, Earl of Bute (*vice* Lord Holdernesse).
			— (Oct. 9). Charles, Lord Egremont (*vice* Mr. Pitt).
1762 "	1762 (May 29). John, Lord Bute.	1762 Sir Francis Dashwood.	1762 (May 29). Hon. G. Grenville (*vice* Lord Bute).
			— (Oct. 14). George, Earl of Halifax (*vice* Mr. Grenville).
1763 "	1763 Hon. Geo. Grenville.	1763 Hon. George Grenville.	1763 (Sept. 9). John, Earl of Sandwich (*vice* Lord Egremont).
1764 " —Lord Chancellor, as Earl of Northington.	1764 "	1764 "	1764 "
1765 "	1765 (July 13). Charles, Marquis of Rockingham.	1765 William Dowdeswell, Esq.	1765 (July 12). A. H., Duke of Grafton (*vice* Lord Halifax).
			— Hon. H. S. Conway (*vice* Lord Sandwich).
1766 (July 30). Chas., Lord Camden.	1766 (August 2). Augustus Henry, Duke of Grafton.	1766 Hon. Charles Townshend.	1766 (May 23). Charles, Duke of Richmond (*vice* Duke of Grafton).
			— (Aug. 2). William, earl of Shelburne (*vice* Duke of Richmond).

LORD CHANCELLOR.	FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY.	CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.	PRINCIPAL SECRETARIES OF STATE.
1767 (July 30). Chas., Lord Camden.	1767 (Sept. 12). William, Lord Mansfield.	1767 (Sept. 12). William, Lord Mansfield.	1767 (Aug. 2). William, earl of Shelburne (*vice* Duke of Richmond).
1768 "	— (Dec. 1). A. H., Duke of Grafton.	— (Dec. 1). Frederick, Lord North.	
	1768 "	1768 "	1768 (Jan. 20). Thomas, Viscount Weymouth (*vice* General Conway).
			— Willes, Earl of Hillsborough —(Colonies).
			— (Oct. 21). W. H., Earl of Rochford (*vice* Earl of Shelburne).
1769 "	1769 "	1769 "	1769
1770 (Jan. 17). Hon. Charles Yorke.	1770 (Feb. 10). Frederick, Lord North.	1770 "	1770 (Dec. 19) John, Earl of Sandwich (*vice* Lord Weymouth).
— (Jan. 20). Great Seal in Commission.			

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE FROM THE ADMINISTRATION OF LORD NORTH, 1770, TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE EARL OF SHELBURNE, 1783.

LORD CHANCELLOR.	FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY.	CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.	PRINCIPAL SECRETARIES OF STATE.
			1768 Earl of Rochford.
			— Earl of Hillsborough (Colonies).
	1770 Frederick, Lord North.	1770 Frederick, Lord North.	
1771 Henry, Lord Apsley (created Earl Bathurst in 1775).	1771 "	1771 "	1771 (June 12). Earl of Suffolk (*vice* Earl of Sandwich).
1772 "	1772 "	1772 "	1772 (August 14). Earl of Dartmouth (Colonies).
1773 "	1773 "	1773 "	1773 "
1774 "	1774 "	1774 "	1774 "
1775 "	1775 "	1775 "	1775 (Nov. 10). Viscount Weymouth (*vice* Earl of Rochford).
			— Lord George Sackville Germaine (*vice* Lord Dartmouth) (Colonies).
1776 "	1776 "	1776 "	1776 "
1777 "	1777 "	1777 "	1777 "
1778 (June 2). Edward, Lord Thurlow.	1778 "	1778 "	1778 "
1779 "	1779 "	1779 "	1779 (Oct. 27). Viscount Stormont (*vice* Earl of Suffolk).
			— (Nov. 24). Earl of Hillsborough (*vice* Viscount Weymouth).
1780 "	1780 "	1780 "	1780 "
1781 "	1781 "	1781 "	1781 "
1782 "	1782 "	1782 "	1782 (Feb. 24). Welbore Ellis, Esq. (*vice* Lord George Germaine) (Colonies).
— "	— (March 27). Charles, Marquis of Rockingham.	— (March 27). Lord John Cavendish.	
— "	— (July 13). William, Earl of Shelburne.	— (July 13). Hon. William Pitt.	— (March 27). William, Earl of Shelburne (*vice* Lord Stormont).
			— Hon. Charles James Fox (*vice* Lord Hillsborough).
			— (July 13). Thomas Townshead, Esq. (*vice* Mr. Fox).
			— Thomas, Lord Grantham (*vice* Earl of Shelburne).

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE FROM THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE DUKE OF PORTLAND, 1783, TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE EARL OF LIVERPOOL, 1812.

LORD CHANCELLOR.	FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY.	CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.	PRINCIPAL SECRETARIES OF STATE.		
			HOME.	FOREIGN.	WAR AND COLONIES.
1783 Alex'der Lord Loughborough (April 9).	1783 William Henry Duke of Portland (April 5).	1783 Lord John Cavendish (April 5).	1783 Frederick Lord North (April 5).	1783 Hon. Charles James Fox (April 2).	
— Edward Lord Thurlow (Dec. 23).	— Hon. William Pitt (Dec. 27).	— Hon. William Pitt (Dec. 27).	— Francis Marquis of Carmarthen (Dec. 23).	— Thomas Lord Sydney (Dec. 23).	
1784 "	1784 "	1784 "	1784 "	1784 "	
1785 "	1785 "	1785 "	1785 "	1785 "	
1786 "	1786 "	1786 "	1786 "	1786 "	
1787 "	1787 "	1787 "	1787 "	1787 "	
1788 "	1788 "	1788 "	1788 "	1788 "	
1789 "	1789 "	1789 "	1789 "	1789 W. W. Grenville, Esq. (June).	
1790 "	1790 "	1790 "	1790 "	1790 "	
1791 "	1791 "	1791 "	1791 Rt. Hon. Henry Dundas (June).	1791 Lord Grenville (May).	
1792 The Great Seal in Commission.	1792 "	1792 "	1792 "	1792 "	
1793 Alex'der Lord Loughborough.	1793 "	1793 "	1793 "	1793 "	
1794 "	1794 "	1794 "	1794 Duke of Portland (July 11).	1794 "	1794 Rt. Hon. Hy. Dundas (July).
1795 "	1795 "	1795 "	1795 "	1795 "	1795 "
1796 "	1796 "	1796 "	1796 "	1796 "	1796 "
1797 "	1797 "	1797 "	1797 "	1797 "	1797 "
1798 "	1798 "	1798 "	1798 "	1798 "	1798 "
1799 "	1799 "	1799 "	1799 "	1799 "	1799 "
1800 "	1800 "	1800 "	1800 "	1800 "	1800 "
1801 John Lord Eldon (April 14).	1801 Rt. Hon. Henry Addington, created Viscount Sidmouth, 1805 (Mar. 7).	1801 Rt. Hon. Henry Addington (Mar. 7).	1801 Thomas Lord Pelham.	1801 Robert Lord Hawkesbury (Feb.).	1801 Lord Hobart (March).
1802 "	1802 "	1802 "	1802 "	1802 "	1802 "
1803 "	1803 "	1803 "	1803 Hon. Charles Yorke.	1803 "	1803 "
1804 "	1804 Hon. William Pitt.	1804 Hon. William Pitt.	1804 Robert Lord Hawkesbury.	1804 Lord Harrowby.	1804 Earl Camden
1805 "	1805 "	1805 "	1805 "	1805 Earl Mulgrave.	1805 Viscount Castlereagh.
1806 Thomas Lord Erskine.	1806 William Lord Grenville.	1806 Lord Henry Petty.	1806 Earl Spencer.	1806 Hon. Charles James Fox.	1806 William Windham.
				— Lord Charles Howick (became Earl Grey, Nov. 1807)	
1807 John Lord Eldon.	1807 Duke of Portland.	1807 Hon. Spencer Perceval.	1807 Robert Lord Hawkesbury (afterwards Earl of Liverpool).	1807 Right Hon. George Canning.	1807 Viscount Castlereagh.
1808 "	1808 "	1808 "	1808 "	1808 "	1808 "
1809 "	1809 "	1809 "	1809 Hon. Richard Ryder.	1809 E'l Bathurst.	1809 Earl of Liverpool.
				— Marquis Wellesley.	
1810 "	1810 Hon. Spencer Perceval.	1810 "	1010 "	1810 "	1810 "
1811 "	1811 "	1811 "	1811 "	1811 "	1811 "
1812 "	1812 Earl of Liverpool.	1812 Rt. Hon. Nicholas Vansittart.	1812 Viscount Sidmouth.	1812 Viscount Castlereagh.	1812 Earl Bathurst.
1813 "	1813 "	1813 "	1813 "	1813 "	1813 "
1814 "	1814 "	1814 "	1814 "	1814 "	1814 "
1815 "	1815 "	1815 "	1815 "	1815 "	1815 "

OCCUPATIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN,

And number of Persons engaged in them (arranged in the order of the Numbers) in 1851.

[This classification was not called for in the Census for 1861.]

OCCUPATIONS.	PERSONS.
Agricultural Laborer, Farm Servant, Shepherd	1,460,896
Domestic Servant	1,038,791
Cotton, Calico, manufacture, printing, and dyeing	501,465
Laborer (branch undefined)	376,551
Farmer, Grazier	306,767
Boot and Shoe maker	274,451
Milliner, Dressmaker	267,791
Coal Miner	219,015
Carpenter, Joiner	182,696
Army and Navy *	178,773
Tailor	152,672
Washerwomen, Mangler, Laundry-keeper	146,091
Woollen Cloth manufacture	137,814
Silk manufacture	114,570
Blacksmith	112,776
Worsted manufacture	104,061
Mason, Paver	101,442
Messenger, Porter, and Errand Boy	101,425
Linen, Flax manufacture	98,860
Seamen (Merchant Service) on shore or in British Ports	89,206
Grocer	85,913
Gardener	80,946
Iron manufacture, Moulder, Founder	80,032
Innkeeper, Licensed Victualler, Beer-shop keeper	75,721
Seamstress, Shirtmaker	73,068
Bricklayer	67,989
Butcher, Meat Salesman	67,691
Hose (Stocking) manufacture	65,499
School-master, mistress	65,376
Lace manufacture	63,660
Plumber, Painter, Glazier	62,808
Baker	62,472
Carman, Carrier, Carter, Drayman	56,981
Charwoman	55,423
Draper (Linen and Woollen)	49,184
Engine and Machine maker	48,082
Commercial Clerk	43,760
Cabinet maker, Upholsterer	40,897
Teacher (various), Governess	40,575
Fisherman, Woman	38,294
Boat, Barge, Man, Woman	37,683
Miller	37,268
Earthenware manufacture	36,512
Sawyer	35,443
Railway Laborer	34,306
Straw-plait manufacture	32,062
Brickmaker, dealer	31,168
Government Civil Service	30,963
Hawker, Pedlar	30,553
Wheelwright	30,244
Glover	29,882
Shopkeeper (branch undefined)	29,800
Horsekeeper, Groom (not Domestic), Jockey	29,408
Nail manufacture	28,533
Iron Miner	28,088
Printer	26,024
Nurse (not Domestic Servant)	25,518
Shipwright, Shipbuilder	25,201
Stone Quarrier	23,489
Lodging-house Keeper	23,089
Lead Miner	22,530
Copper Miner	22,386
Straw Hat and Bonnet Maker	21,902
Cooper	20,245
Watch and Clock Maker	19,159
Brewer	18,620
Dock Laborer, Dock and Harbor Service	18,462
Clergyman of Established Church	18,587
Protestant Dissenting Minister	9,644
Police	18,348
Plasterer	17,980
Warehouse, Man, Woman	17,861
Saddler, Harnessmaker	17,583
Hatter, Hat manufacture	16,975
Coachman (not Domestic Servant), Guard, Postboy	16,836
Law Clerk	16,626
Coachmaker	16,590
Cowkeeper, Milkseller	16,526
Ropemaker	15,966
Druggist	15,643
Surgeon, Apothecary	15,163
Tin Miner	15,050
Paper Manufacture	14,501
Coalheaver, Coal Laborer	14,426
Greengrocer, Fruiterer	14,320
Muslin manufacture	14,098
Confectioner	13,865
Tinman, Tinker, Tinplate worker	13,770
Staymaker	13,699
Solicitor, Attorney, Writer to the Signet	13,256
Dyer, Scourer, Calenderer	12,964
Currier	12,920
Builder	12,818
Farm Bailiff	12,805
Hairdresser, Wigmaker	12,173
Coal Merchant, Dealer	12,092
Glass manufacture	12,005
Carpet and Rug manufacture	11,457
Goldsmith, Silversmith	11,242
Brass Founder, Moulder, manufacture	11,230
Maltster	11,150
Railway Officer, Clerk, Station Master	10,948
Bookbinder	10,953
Road Laborer	10,923
Wine and Spirit Merchant	10,467
Fishmonger	10,439
Merchant	10,256
Ribbon manufacture	10,074

* This is the Army and Navy of the United Kingdom, exclusive of the Indian Army and Navy.

INDEX.

Abbott, Justice, presides in court at Hone's first trial, 1817, 1126; and that of the Cato-street conspirators, 1820, 1149
Abbott, Charles. See Colchester, lord.
Abercrombie fails in reducing Ticonderoga, 1758, 838; general of the Bengal army, 1790, 989
Abercromby, James, elected speaker of the House of Commons, 1216; again elected, 1837, 1232; his review of the session 1837-8, 1234; raised to a peerage, 1238
Abercromby, sir Ralph, commands the army in Ireland, 1798, 1024; commands the British expedition to Holland, 1799, 1031, superseded by the duke of York, *ib.*; lands his army at Aboukir Bay, 1038; defeats the French near Alexandria, Mar. 21, 1801, *ib.*; death of, from a wound, March 28, *ib.*
Aberdeen, earl of, negotiates for peace, 1814, 1092; approves of the declaration of Frankfort, 1103; foreign secretary, 1828, 1176
Abjuration of James II., bill for, rejected 1690, 636
Abjuration of the Pretender, bill for, passed 1702, 687
Abo, peace of, 1743, 800
Abolition of slavery. See Slavery.
Aboukir, battle of, July 25, 1799, 1030
Abury, the Druidical temple at, 6
Academy of Ancient Concerts, established 1710, 747
Academy, Royal; attempts to establish an academy of art, 930; scheme for a, suggested by sir J. Thornhill, 931; the idea revived; first exhibition of the works of living artists, April 21, 1760, *ib.*; second exhibition, *ib.*; George III. first patron; Reynolds first president, *ib.*; foundation of the, Dec. 10, 1768, *ib.*; first exhibition and exhibitors in 1769, 932; exhibition and exhibitors in 1780, *ib.*; supplants all rivals; sources for the history of the, *ib.*
Acland, gen., joins Wellington at Vimiero, 1069
Acre besieged unsuccessfully by Bonaparte, 1799, 1029
Act of Grace, 1690; exceptions to, 636
Act of Security passed by Scottish parliament; assent refused, 1703, 707; granted, 1705, *ib.*
Act of Settlement, independence of judges determined by, 650; passed 1701; clauses repealed, 684; copy of, 687
Acton Burnel, statute of, passed in 1283, 115
Adam, James and Robert, their architectural works, 934
Adam, remarks of, on the sentence of Muir and Palmer, 1002
Adams, John, high-mindedness of, in defending captain Preston at Boston in 1770, 863; his conference with lord Howe, the British commissioner, 1776, 880; one of the commissioners for settling the conditions of peace between England and the United States; signs the preliminaries, Nov. 20, 1783, 907; interview with Geo. III. in 1785 as minister plenipotentiary; evidence against the charge of the king's incivility towards Jefferson and, 908; president of the United States, 1796-1800, 1095
Adams, J. Q., an American plenipotentiary for concluding the peace of Ghent, 1101, president of the United States, 1825-9, 1187
Adams, Samuel, rouses the Americans, 1773, 870; denies that the Americans have lost their good-will towards England, 1774, 870; proscribed by Gage, 875
Addington (afterwards lord Sidmouth), elected speaker of the House of Commons, Nov. 1790, 968; anecdote of Burke and Pitt by, 974; his sanguine expectations of the duke of Brunswick's campaign, 982; visits Duncan's fleet, 1019; hopes roused by Nelson's victory of the Nile, 1022; first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer, Mar. 14, 1801, 1036; remonstrates with Bonaparte for his encroachments, 1041; his policy towards France, 1042; requires, through lord Whitworth, Bonaparte to explain his views towards Great Britain, *ib.*; negotiates for sharing the power with Pitt, 1043; weakness of his ministry, 1046; resigns May 10, 1804, *ib.*; joins Pitt, 1048; viscount Sidmouth and president of the council, 1805, *ib.*; resigns, July, 1039; lord privy seal, 1806, 1056; resigns 1807, 1058; home secretary, 1083, 1148; measures recommended by, to put down the riots of 1812, *ib*; his employment of spies justified, 1124; has no faith in a favorable change in the internal condition of the country, 1125; states the difficulty of prosecuting for libel; his circular letter giving the judge increased powers in cases of libel trials, *ib.*; this proceeding considered unconstitutional, *ib.*; his opinion of the laws against reformers, 1132; promises the Manchester magistrates government support against the reformers, 1133; thanks them for their measures for preserving tranquillity, *ib.*; succeeded as home secretary by sir Robert Peel, 1822, 1156, resigns his seat in the cabinet, 1158
Addison, Joseph, defends Steele against the charge of libel imputed to him by the House of Commons, 1713, 736: writes for the "Tattler," 738; member of parliament; popularity; his influence and aims as an essayist, *ib.*; with Steele he directs the popular attention to Milton, Shakespeare, and our old English ballads, 730; the precursor of English novelists, the Spectator's Club described by, 740; his works, with those of other essayists, create a general taste for reading, 741; ridicules the political extravagances of the ladies of his day, 742; description of contemporary female characters by, 744; remarks on puppet plays and the opera, *ib.*; description of a masquerade, 745; remarks on the superstition, 746; the popular music, 747; and the translations, from the Latin and Greek, of his day, *ib.*; rebukes Pope for his controversial spirit, 748; appointed secretary of state, Apr. 1717, 769; supports the Peerage Bill, 1719, 772
Adelaide, princess, of Saxe Meiningen, marries the duke of Clarence (William IV.), July 13, 1818, 1129; character of, 1223
Adjutators, organization of the, 476; refusal of, to allow the army to be disbanded, *ib.*; seizure of Charles I. by, at Holmby, *ib.*
Adminius, son of Cunobelin, instigates a Roman invasion of Britain, 7
Adrianople, peace of, Sept. 14, 1829, 1225
Afghan War, 1838-1842, narrative of the, 1248
African, The, Company, commenced operations, 1530, 614
African and Indian Company, constituted 1695, 674; projects the founding a colony at Darien, *ib.*; three vessels, with 1200 men, sail from Leith, July 25, 1698, 675; arrive at Darien, Nov. 4, *ib.*; the colonists quarrel with and declare war against the Spaniards, *ib.*; food grows scarce; famine and pestilence prevail; they forsake Darien, *ib.*; the company send out 1300 more men, 676; the colony blockaded by the Spaniards, *ib.*; it capitulates; and abandons the settlement, *ib.*; this failure rouses the spirit of the Scotch, who inveigh against William and the English, *ib.*; it continues a source of irritation for several years between the two nations, *ib.*; but the difficulties are smoothed over in the union, *ib.*; quarrels with the East India Company; a captain of one of their vessels is seized and executed by the E. I. Company on a false charge of murder, 707
Aghrim, battle of, July 12, 1691, 644
Agincourt, description of, and its locality, 166; battle of, on Oct., 1415, 167
Agnew, sir Andrew, presents petitions to parliament praying for the better observance of the Sabbath, 1204
Agra, battle of, 1803, 1054
Agricola, the great civilizer of Britain, 8; is appointed to the command of Britain, A.D. 69, 10; campaign of, *ib.*; attack on Galgacus and the Caledonians by, *ib.*; announces the possession of "the very extremity of Britain," *ib.*; ascertains that Britain is an island, 11; recalled by Domitian, A.D. 84, *ib.*; line of forts from the Clyde to the Forth raised by, *ib.*; notice of the works of, in Britain, 13; caused the sciences and the Roman language to be taught to the sons of British chiefs, *ib.*; established municipalities, 15
Agriculture in Britain, state of, under the Romans, 12; state of, in queen Anne's time, 611; great influence of the population of London and Westminster upon, *ib.*; state of, in Norfolk, about 1770, 911; Coke's efforts for the improvement of, *ib.*; state of, in Suffolk, *ib.*; manufacture of implements of, 912; in Buckinghamshire; its dairy farm produce, *ib.*; in Oxfordshire and Northamptonshire, 913; improvements in Bedfordshire; the duke of Bedford's exertions, *ib.*; Bakewell's art of fattening cattle and sheep; improved breeds, 914; reclamation of the fens of Cambridgeshire and Lincolnshire, *ib.*; of Lincoln Heath, 915; and the Wolds, *ib.*; state of, in Nottingham and Derby-shires, *ib.*; Surrey, Middlesex, and Kent, *ib.*; in Sussex, Hants, and Berkshire, 916; in Wiltshire, *ib.*; backward state of farming in Wiltshire, *ib.*; progress of, in Dorsetshire; enclosure of lands from 1734 to 1828, *ib.*; in Devonshire and Somersetshire, 917; in Cornwall, *ib.*; Wales, *ib.*; and the west midland counties, *ib.*; system of under-drainage discovered, 1764; uncultivated wastes of Staffordshire; slow progress of, in Lancashire, 918; reclaiming of the mosses in the Fylde district, *ib.*; Cheshire; progress of Yorkshire in, promoted by the labors of the marquis of Rockingham, *ib.*; sir Digby Legard, *ib.*; and James Croft, the agricultural collier, *ib.*; land and cattle of Durham, 919; sheep and waste land of Northumberland, *ib.*; progress of, stimulated by the example of the Culleys, *ib.*; Westmoreland and its lake district, *ib.*; the Lothians, Haddington, Roxburgh, and Selkirkshires, 120; Scotch sheep, *ib.*; in Ayrshire, *ib.*; Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire, 921; progress of, in the north-western district of Scotland, *ib.*; in Ireland, 922; the potato cultivation, *ib.*; bad harvests and high prices from 1795 to 1800, 1033
Ahmedabad taken by general Goddard, 949
Ahmednuggur captured by the British, 1803, 1054
Aikenhead, Thomas, hanged for blasphemy in 1696, 673
Aislabie, Chancellor of the Exchequer, bribed by the directors of the South Sea Company, 774; accused of fraud; expelled the House of Commons, and committed to the Tower, *ib.*
Aitken, *alias* John the Painter, attempts to burn the English dockyards; his trial and confession, 880
Aix-la-Chapelle, peace of, May 2, 1668, 732; treaty of, 1748, 801, 820
Aix Roads, lord Cochrane's enterprise in, April 11, 1809, 1072
Akbar Khan, his treachery towards, and murder of MacNaughten, 1250; his conduct towards the British army, *ib.*
Akenside, Mark, his "Pleasures of Imagination" published 1744, 936
Akerman, keeper of Newgate; his house set on fire by the Gordon rioters, 1780, 891
Alba, duke of. See Philip of Spain.
Alban, St., legend of the martyrdom of, as told by Bede, 17
Albemarle, A. J. von Keppel, earl of; he is taken into William III.'s favor, which causes the jealousy of Portland, 681
Albemarle, earl of, commands the land forces in the Havannah expedition, 1762, 845
Alberoni, cardinal Giulio, prime minister of Spain; sends a million French livres to Spaar, the Swedish envoy in Paris, to stir Charles XII.'s soldiers, 769; early career; instigates disputes; and intrigues against England and France, 770; retaliates Byng's destruction of the Spanish fleet by seizing all British goods in Spanish ports, 771; leagues with the Pretender; detected plotting against the regent Orleans; France consequently declares war against Spain, 1718, *ib.*; he organizes expeditions against France, England, and Scotland, 772; dismissed his offices, and banished the country; returns to Italy, Dec., 1719, *ib.*
Albert, archduke of Austria, commands the Austrian army at the siege at Lille, 1792, 982
Albert, prince, of Saxe Coburg, marriage of, to queen Victoria, 1240; his high opinion of William III., 1256; speech of, proclaiming the unity of interest in all classes of society, 1286
Albert Edward, prince of Wales, born Nov. 9, 1841, 1261.
Albion, belief of its once having formed part of the Continent, 3
Albuera, battle of, May 16, 1811, 1083
Alcuin, notice of, 24
Aldrich, dean Henry, his architectural works, 755
Alexander I. of Russia, defeat of his army at Austerlitz; forms a treaty of alliance with the king of Prussia, 1052; wars with France, 1807, 1064; concludes the peace of Tilsit with Napoleon; the interview on the Niemen raft with Napoleon, *ib.*; terms of the treaty, patent and secret, *ib.*; offends Bonaparte by relaxing the severity of the Russian commercial law; allies himself with Sweden; Bonaparte wars against him, 1812. 1088; concludes an alliance with Prussia, 1089; his meeting with Frederick William in the great square of Leipzig, 1090; succeeds Paul I. as emperor of Russia, 1801, 1310; attends the congress of Vienna, 1814, 1109; obtains the sovereignty over Poland, 1100; organizes the Holy Alliance, 1110; succeeded by Nicholas I. 1825, 1187.
Alexandria, Bonaparte lands at, July, 1798; captured by the French, 1020; battle of, Mar. 20, 1801, 1038; capitulates to the British, Mar. 20, 1807, 1064
Alexius, emperor of the East, receives the Anglo-Saxons expelled by William the Conqueror, as his guards, 57
Alfred, son of Ethelred, is induced to make a descent on England, is betrayed by earl Godwin, and put to death, 49
Alfred the Great, birth of, in 849, 25; early years of, 26; improbability of his having been taught to read by his step-mother, *ib.*; at Rome in 853; consecrated king by pope Leo, at Rome, on the death of Ethelwulf, *ib.*; probable impression made on the mind of, by the sight of Rome, *ib.*; makes no claim to Wessex on the death of Ethelbald, 27; employment of, during the life of Ethelbert, *ib.*; description of his home at Wantage, *ib.*; the translation of Boetius by, has original passages descriptive of the state of England, *ib.*; state of the church during the youth of, *ib.*; constitution of the army, 28; state of rural industry, 875, *et seq.*; provision for the poor, *ib.*; becomes "secundarius" on the accession of Ethelred in 866, 29; marries, *ib.*; defeats the Danes who had invaded Mercia, A.D. 868, *ib.*; fights and gains the battle of Æscesdun, in 871, 30; is defeated at Wilton, 31; first naval battle of, against the Danes, in 875, *ib.*; probable unpopularity of, *ib.*; makes peace with Guthrun in 878, *ib.*; retreat of, to Athelney, 32; heads a band of outlaws in Somersetshire, *ib.*; traditional stories of, during his concealment, 33; re-appears, and gains the battle of Ethandune, in 878, *ib.*; Guthrum sues for peace and is baptized, *ib.*; terms of the treaty, *ib.*; laws of Alfred, *ib.*; writings and translations of, 34; repulses an invasion of the Danes in Kent in 884, *ib.*; his care for

the education of his family, 35; defeats an invasion of the Danes under Hasting, *ib.*; creates a navy, *ib.*; death of, in 901, *ib.*; character of, 36; share of, in the subdivision of the kingdom for administrative and judicial purposes, *ib.*; courts of justice in the time of, 37; tenure of lands, *ib.*
Alfric, earl of Mercia, treachery of, 47.
Algarves. See Godoy
Algiers, battle of, Aug. 27, 1816, 1112; see Exmouth, lord, *ib.*; captured by the French, 1830, 1181
Alibaud, attempts to take Louis Philippe's life, 1830, 1222
Alien Bill, passage of, through Parliament, 985-987; passed Jan. 4, 1793, 987
Ali-Ghur stormed by the British, Sept. 4, 1803, 1054.
Allectus assumes the government of Britain, A.D. 292, 11; defeated, and Britain re-subjected to the Romans, *ib.*
Allegiance, Oath of; many clergymen refuse to take it, 1689, 623
Allen, Ethan, an American revolutionist, 1775; captures Ticonderogs, 874; made prisoner on his march against Montreal; sent to England, 877
Alliance, The Holy, a treaty so called, concluded, at Paris, Sept. 26, 1815, 1110, 1224; denounced by the British parliament, 1110
Almanacs, duty on, repealed, 1834, 1213
Almanza, battle of, April 25, 1707, 713
Almeida, siege of, surrendered to the French, Aug. 1810, 1079
Almenara, battle of, July 27, 1710, 725
Alompra, his conquests; ascends the Birman throne, 1170
Althorp, viscount, Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1830, 1187; his budget for 1831, 1188; description of, by Francis Jeffrey, 1191; interview of Jeffrey with, just after the resignation of the Grey ministry, 1831, 1197; speech on moving the second reading of the bill for the suppression of disturbances in Ireland, 1833, 1204; financial statement, 1205; his bill for limiting the hours of labor in factories, passed, 1208; introduces the Poor-law Amendment bill, 1834, 1209, 1211; moves the adjournment of the debate on the Irish Church question and the previous question, 1212; resigns his chancellorship, 1834; reasons for doing so, *ib.*, 345; resumes it again in the Melbourne administration; brings forward a modified Coercion bill, 1213; financial statement and proposed reduction of taxes, *ib.*; his removal to the Lords (as earl Spencer); the ostensible cause of the dismissal of the Melbourne ministry, 1214
Alt Ranstadt, peace of, Sept. 24, 1706, 733
Alum Shah, Great Mogul; seeks British protection, 869; Hastings deprives him of the money and district granted by Clive, 946; his power restored to him by general Lake, 1050
Alvinzy commands the Austrian army in Italy; defeats Bonaparte at Caldiero, Nov. 12, 1796; repulses Bonaparte's attempts to cross the bridge of Arcole; retreats to Vicenza, 1012; compels Joubert to retreat to Rivoli, 1797, 1017; where he is defeated by Bonaparte, Jan. 14, *ib.*
Amboyna acquired by the British, 1810, 1167.
Ameer Khan. See Khan Ameer.
Ameer Singh. See Ochterlony.
Amelia, princess, her illness affects George III.'s mind, 1080; dies Nov. 2, 1810, *ib.*
American affairs. British possessions in North America, 828; war between the British and French, 1754-63, 828, 837, 839; government and prosperity of the British colonies, 849; the resistance to the Stamp Act, 1764-66, 850, 852; the passing of the Revenue Act causes renewed disturbances, which are slightly abated on the repeal of all the duties except that on tea, 861-864; the destruction of the tea in Boston harbor induces the home government to adopt coercionary measures, which still further embitter the American spirit, 870-873; hostilities commence April, 1775, at Lexington, 873; and the war continues till 1782, when the independence of America is recognized by Great Britain, 874-888, 892, 893, 894-898, 907-909; government and condition of the United States, 1095; party spirit, *ib.*; the United States declare war against Great Britain, June, 1812, chiefly on account of the right of search being claimed by the latter country; the war was terminated by the peace of Ghent, 1815, 1096-1101
American Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776, 878; copy of the declaration, *ib.*
American Secession: threatened separation of the North and South, 1099
American Stamp Act. See Stamp Act.
Amherst, sir Jeffery: general, 1758; commander of the English troops in America; captures Louisbourg, 837; succeeds Abercrombie; captures Ticonderoga, July, 1759, 839; co-operates with Wolfe against Quebec; embarks on Lake Champlain; driven back by storms, *ib.*; removed from the governorship of Virginia, 862
Amherst, lord, governor-general of India, 1823, 1170; unable to maintain peace; war with the Birman empire, 1824-6, 1170, 1171; comparative freedom of the press in India under his administration, 1172
Amiens, Peace of, negotiation for, 1039; concluded March 27, 1802, 1040; terms of the treaty, *ib.*
Anderson, William, a printer of libellous pamphlets against the government, indicted for high treason, convicted and executed, 657
André, major: adjutant-general; carries on a secret correspondence with Arnold on the part of Clinton; his interview with Arnold, 1780, 893; he is captured as a spy, tried by court-martial, and sentenced to death, *ib.*; execution, October 2, *ib.*
André, M. P. H., introduces lithography into England, 1801, 1140
Anglesey, H. W. Paget, marquis of, distinguishes himself in Moore's retreat, 1808, 1070; lord-lieutenant of Ireland, 1076; is convinced of the expediency of granting concessions to the Catholics, 1176
Anglo-Saxon agriculture in Alfred's time, 28 *et seq.*
Anglo-Saxon Church, ignorance of the priests of, at the accession of Alfred, 28; state of, at the time of Dunstan, 43; cathedrals and churches of the, 43; provisions for the clergy, 43; parish priests of the, *ib.*; learning of the, 44
Anglo-Saxon kings, authority of, 26; their mansions, 26
Anglo-Saxons, state of, at the time of Ethelbert, 22; literature of, 24; social ranks among, 27; love of feasting indicated in the Bayeux tapestry, 53; continued resistance of, to William the Conqueror, 57; security afforded to by the establishment of Norman fiefs, 59; continued existence of, as a people, 59.
Anhalt-Dessau, prince of, his military inventions, 662
Anjou, duke of, renounces his claim to the throne of France, 734
Ankerstroem. See Gustavus III.
Anne, the princess, and her husband, go over to William III., 597; Anne's marriage to prince George of Denmark, 1689, 34; applies to parliament for an increased income, and has it increased from 20,000*l.* to 50,000*l.* per annum, 634; friendship for Mrs. Churchill (alias Mrs. Freeman), *ib.*; quarrels with her sister, queen Mary, 650; Mrs. Freeman is commanded to leave the royal palace, Anne goes with her, 650; her position and character in 1695, 661; accession of, March 8, 1702, 688; declares to the privy council her intention of carrying on the war-like preparations against France commenced by William III., 689; her address to parliament, which continues to sit; her fine voice, *ib.*; favors the Tory party, *ib.*; speech at the close of the session, 1702, *ib.*; meets her first Parliament, Oct. 20, 690; grants Marlborough a dukedom and 5000*l.* a year, 692; opens the session of parliament, Nov. 9, 1703, *ib.*; announces the conclusion of the Methuen treaty with Portugal, *ib.*; entertains Charles, archduke of Austria, at her court, acknowledging him as king of Spain, *ib.*; stops a contest between the Lords and Commons by proroguing parliament, *ib.*; Queen Anne's bounty restoring the first fruits and tenths to the church, 693; revives the practice of touching for the king's evil, *ib.*; provides out of the privy purse for fresh recruits, 694; grants Woodstock to Marlborough, 699; prorogues parliament, Mar. 14, 1704, *ib.*; exhorts the Commons to follow up Peterborough's successes in Spain, 702; indignant at the Tories for raising the question of the succession, 705; revived the Order of the Thistle, 1703; announces the ratification of the Union treaty, 712; speech on giving her assent to the Act of Union, *ib.*; she determines to continue the war; receives speedy supplies from parliament, 713; Marlborough presents her letter to Charles XII., *ib.*; dismisses Harley; she grows cold towards Mrs. Freeman, and makes Mrs. Masham her new favorite, 715; death of her husband, George of Denmark, Oct., 1708, 716; supposed to have private audiences with Harley; her opinions regarding a successor, *ib.*; her temper tries Marlborough's patience, *ib.*; her interviews with Harley, 719; present at Dr. Sacheverel's trial, *ib.*; public addresses to, 722; advises the nation to be quiet, 723; dismissal of Whigs from office, 724; dissolves her third and calls her fourth parliament, *ib.*; announces her determination to support the Church of England, *ib.*; dismisses the Duchess of Marlborough from her service, the "key" scenes, *ib.*; her anger at the duchess's revenge; makes the duchess of Somerset her lady of the wardrobe, and Mrs. Masham the keeper of the privy purse, 725; parliament addresses her on the subject of Harley's narrow escape from assassination, 727; promises not to make peace with France unless in concert with the Dutch, 728; opens parliament Dec. 7, 729; dismisses Marlborough from his offices, *ib.*; creates twelve new peers, contrary to Lord Dartmouth's advice, 730; announces to parliament the commencement of negotiations for peace at Utrecht, *ib.*; the terms upon which peace may be made, 734, and the conclusion of the treaty, 735; intriguing of the Jacobites, 736; calls upon parliament to suppress seditious papers, *ib.*; her agitation at the contest between Oxford and Bolingbroke brings on a sudden illness, July 27, and she dies Aug. 1, 1714, *ib.*
Anson, George: commodore, 1741; his expedition to Peru; difficulties encountered in doubling Cape Horn; half his crew killed by scurvy; takes refuge in Juan Fernandez; secures prizes; attacks Paita, 794; enters Canton; returns to Spithead, June, 1744, *ib.*; defeats the French off Cape Finisterre, May 3, 1747, 819; first lord of the admiralty, 1757, 835; commands an expedition against St. Maloes. 1758; his partner, the duke of Marlborough, fails in taking St. Maloes; Cherbourg taken, 837
Anti-Corn-Law League, the, 1243
"Anti-Jacobin," the, started by Canning, Nov. 20, 1797, 1017
Antonius, wall of, 11
Antwerp surrenders to Marlborough, 1706, 706; taken by Dumouriez, Nov. 30, 1792, 983, 993
Appeal of murder: case of Ashford and Thornton; lord Eldon supports the bill for abolishing the practice, 1131
Appropriation, principle of, in granting supplies, established 1689, 624
Apsley, lord. See Bathurst, earl.
Arapiles. See Salamanca.
Arbuthnot, admiral, conveys Clinton and his forces from New York to Charleston, 892
Archer, Thomas, architect of St. John the Evangelist, Westminster, 755
Architecture, state of, in Britain, at the close of the third century, 16; as shown in English abbeys and cathedrals, 76; bishop Swinfield's house in 1209, 121; London markets and shops, *ib.*; domestic, in the 15th century, 184; large consumption of timber in building dwelling-houses, *ib.*; furniture used in the houses, *ib.*; improvements in building, temp. Henry VIII., 295; style of architecture in the reign of Elizabeth, 395; alterations by Wren, at Windsor Castle, by Charles II. in 1680, 568; encouraged by William III., 752; Wren, *ib.*; he commences the rebuilding of London, *ib.*; building of St. Paul's, 753; Wren's parish churches, 754, and miscellaneous buildings, *ib.*; Vanbrugh; his late adoption of the profession of an architect, *ib.*; general character of his works, 755; Hawksmoor; his St. Mary's, Woolnoth, Limehouse church, and St. George's, Bloomsbury, *ib.*; Gibbs' St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, *ib.*; T. Archer's St. John the Evangelist; Talman's Chatsworth; Flitcroft's Woburn Abbey; amateur architects, Dean Aldrich; Dr. Clarke; and Burlington, *ib.*; sir R. Taylor, 934; Dance; the Woods; and the Adams, *ib.*; sir W. Chambers, the architect of Somerset House, *ib.*; Stuart, Revett, Smirke, 935; Wyatt, *ib.*; bridge building and builders, *ib.*; low state of architectural taste and imitation of Greek models, 1142; the latter instanced in the case of St. Pancras church, *ib.*, 1144; James Wyatt, his classic and gothic buildings, 1142; his gothic restorations, *ib.*; Samuel Wyatt, *ib.*; sir John Soane's buildings at the Bank of England and elsewhere, 1143; Holland and Sir R. Smirke, *ib.*; Wilkins, *ib.*; Nash, the architect of Regent Street, 1144; and of the Regent's Park terraces and canals, *ib.*; St. Marylebone church; extraordinary revival of church building, *ib.*; Thomas Telford; his bridges at Montford, Buildwas, and at the Menai straits; his other grand works, *ib.*; Rennie; his Waterloo Bridge and engineering works at various dockyards, *ib.*
Arcole, battle of, Nov. 1796, 1011.
Arcos, duke of, invests Valentia, 702; opposes Peterborough's passage to Valencia; decamps; Peterborough effects an entrance, *ib.*
Arcot captured by Clive, who is besieged in it by Sahib's army 827; repulses all their attacks and drives them off, *ib.*
Arden of Feversham, story of the murder of, in 1551, 296.
Aremberg, duke of, commands the Austrians at Dettingen, 1743, 797.
Argyle, marquis of, defeated by Montrose, 467; opposes the project of sending Hamilton to invade England, 484; is restored to power after Hamilton's defeat, 485; trial and execution of, in 1661, 530.
Argyle, the earl of, refuses to take, without reserve, the test oath enacted by the Scottish parliament in 1682, is arrested and convicted of high treason, but escapes to Holland, 573; lands in Scotland in 1685 to raise an insurrection in favor of Monmouth, 580; its failure, *ib.*; and his execution, *ib.*
Argyle, Archibald Campbell, earl of, tenders the Coronation Oath to William III., 630.
Argyle, Archibald Campbell, duke of, colonel; commands the Highlanders at Falkirk, 1746, 813; his plantations at Inverary, 1108
Argyle, John Campbell, duke of, Commander of George I.'s army in Scotland, 1715, 762; commences operations against the insurgents, 763; marches against Mar; meets him at Sheriffmuir, and there fights him, 13th of Nov., 765; compels the retreat of the rebel army; pursues it to Aberdeen, and disperses the troops, *ib.*; deserts Walpole; is deprived by him of all his employments, 1739, 792; desires to form a coalition ministry; retires, 1742, 796.
Aristocracy, manners and position of, 1689-1714, 619; fear of their being destroyed by the Reform Bill of 1831, 1188; it cannot be a caste in England, 1189
Arkwright, sir Richard, establishes his first cotton-mill at Cromford, near Matlock, 915; activity of, and early career; exhibits his new machine, 1768, at Preston; mobbed; goes to Nottingham; takes out his first patent, 1769, 924; description of his machine, 925; difficulties overcome in establishing its commercial value, *ib.*
Arles, three British bishops present at first Council of, A.D. 314, 17.
Armorica, foundation of a British colony in, 18; independent government established by, *ib.*
Armstrong, John, his "Art of Preserving Health;" appeared 1744, 936.
Army, establishing of a standing, as an integral part of government, 1689, 625; strength of, in 1692, 650; 1694, 659; reduced 1697, 669; disbanded 1699, 680; number of soldiers voted in 1702, 687; standing armies denounced by Pulteney, 1732, 782; increased, 832; debate on the army estimates, 1790; its increase opposed by Burke, 967; armies of England and France, 1041.
Arnold, Benedict, an American revolutionist, 1775, 874; appears before Quebec; attacks the city, Dec. 31, and is severely wounded, 877; general, commands an army of irregular troops in conjunction with Gates, 882; attacks Burgoyne's position, *ib.*; his treachery; interview with André, 893; lands at Jamestown; makes an incursion into Virginia; burns Richmond, 896.
Arnold, Dr., sermon of, at the time of the cholera, 1831, 1195; his History of Rome, 1257.
Arnot sent from India, and his paper, "The Calcutta Journal," suppressed, 1172.
Artevelde, James, revolt of, against the count of Flanders, 136; is murdered July, 1345, *ib.*
Arthur, king, legend of, 20.
Arthur of Brittany, claims of, to the crown of England, 98; is supported by Philip of France, 99; heads an invasion of Poitou, and is captured, *ib.*; mysterious death of, *ib.*
Artois, count J. See Charles X. of France.
Arts, Society of. See Societies.
Arts, state of, in Britain at the close of the third century, 16; sketch of the state of, in the seventeenth century, 620; patronage of the, by Charles I. and his court, 751; low state of the, during the civil

war, 752; William and Mary patronize architects, but give little encouragement to painters and sculptors, *ib.*; architecture, 751-775; sculpture, 756; painting, 757; revolution in the, middle of the 18th century, 922; the duke of Bridgewater's canal schemes carried out by Gilbert, 923; and Brindley, 923; invention of machines for manufacturing cotton, 924, 926; Watt's improvements in the steam engine, 929; close connection between the fine and the industrial, *ib.*; artists stimulated by the Society of Arts, 930; low state of art temp. Geo. II., *ib.*; painting, 1760-83, *ib.*; engraving, 933; sculpture, 934; architecture, 934; restoration of the art specimens in the Louvre to their original countries, 409.
Arundel, earl of, collection of statuary formed by, 431.
Asaph ul Dowlah, nabob and vizier of Oude, consents to the seizure of his mother's and grandmother's property in liquidation of Hastings' demands upon him, 950.
Ashburton, A. Baring, lord, master of the mint, president of the board of trade, 1021; concludes the Boundary Treaty with the United States, 1060.
Ashby, his proceedings against the returning officer of Aylesbury for refusing his vote, in 1703, leading to disputes between the houses of Lords and Commons on their respective prerogatives, 692.
Ashford and Thornton, case of, 1130.
Ashley, Lord A. A. Cooper; his maiden speech in parliament on the Treason bill, 664.
Ashmolean museum built by Wren, 754.
Ashridge, Hertfordshire, built by James Wyatt; character of its architecture, 1142.
Ashton, John, a Jacobite agent, tried for high treason, and convicted, 1691, 643.
Aske, Robert, leader of the Yorkshire insurgents in 1536, 271; negotiations of, with the duke of Norfolk, *ib.*; has an interview with Henry VIII., and is pardoned, *ib.*; the king's promises to the insurgents are not kept, and Aske again takes arms, 272; is taken prisoner and executed, *ib.*
Aspern, battle of, May 21, 22, 1809, 1074.
Assassination plot, 1696, against William III., 664-666.
Assassins, notice of, 94; the scheik of, absolves Richard I. from any share in the murder of the marquis of Montferrat, 94.
Asseerghur, taken by colonel Stevenson, 1055.
Asser, his account of the early years of Alfred, 26; interpolations in the history of, 31.
Assignats circulated by the National Assembly; their depreciated value drive the people to plunder and rebel, 1793, 994.
Assye, battle of, Sept. 23, 1803, 1055.
Astley, printer, proceeded against for his concern in publishing an account of lord Lovat's trial, 1747, 819.
Asturias, prince of. See Ferdinand VII. of Spain.
Ath taken by Marlborough, Oct. 4, 1706, 706
Athelstan, accession of, in 924, 38; annexes Northumbria, and rules over all Britain, 39; continental influence and alliances of, *ib.*; attacked by the under-kings of Cumberland and Scotland, he wins the battle of Brunanburgh, *ib.*; code of laws of, 40; death of, in 940, *ib.*
"Athenian Gazette," 1691-1696, published by Dunton, 737
Atkins, alderman, opposes the formation of a gas company as being destructive of the whale fishery, 1119
Athlone, earl of. See Ginkel.
Athlone, besieged and taken by Ginkel, June 30, 1691, 644
Athol, duke of. See Tullibardine.
Athol, Marquis of, his influence and dishonesty, 629; supports the government, 1689; shut out of Blair Castle, 631
Attainder, bill of, against sir John Fenwick, 667
Atterbury, bishop of Rochester, speaks against granting indulgence to Quakers; enthusiastic in the Pretender's cause, 776; one of the editors of Clarendon's "History," *ib.*; arrest of, and committal to the Tower; causes a ferment in his church party, *ib.*; proceeded against by bill enacting his punishment and deprivation; his trial, 1723, *ib.*; and condemnation; embarks for France, June, 1723; and dies at Paris, 1732, 777
Attwood, M. P. for Birmingham; moves an inquiry into the effect of the monetary system on the distress of the people, 1833, 1205
Auchmuty, sir S., takes Monte Video, 1807, 1063; his share in the attack on Buenos Ayres, 1064
Auckland, lord, president of board of trade; master of the mint, 1196; first lord of the admiralty, 1834, 1212; governor-general of India; publishes a declaration of the causes and objects of the Afghan war, 1248.
Auerstadt. See Jena.
Augereau, one of Bonaparte's generals, 1011; arrests sixty members of the Legislative Councils, 1017
Augustin sent by Pope Gregory as Christian missionary to England, A.D. 597, 21; lands in the isle of Thanet, *ib.*; converts Ethelbert, 22; conference and disagreement of, with the priests of the old British church, *ib.*
Augustina, the brave defendress of Zaragoza, 1808, 1069
Augustus II. of Poland; elector of Saxony; deposed by Charles XII., 713-718; peace of Alt Ranstadt with Charles XII., Sept. 24, 1706, 733; king of Poland, 1690-1704; restored, 1709, *ib.*; succeeded by his son, Augustus III., 1733, 784
Augustus III. of Poland enters into the coalition against Prussia, 831; blockaded in his camp at Pirna; his army surrenders unconditionally, *ib.*
Aurungzebe refuses to give any protection to the new East India Company, 669
Austen, Jane; high character of her six novels, 1140
Austerlitz, battle of, Dec. 2, 1805, 1052
Autun, in Gaul, artificers brought from Britain by Constantine to rebuild, 16
Auverquerque. See D'Auverquerque.
Ava, king of, his aggression on British India; threatens to overrun our territory: the Birman war breaks out, 1170; his own territory is invaded by sir A. Campbell, and he is compelled to agree to the treaty of Yandaboo; terms of the treaty, *ib.*
Aylesbury election case, 1703, 692
Ayrshire, agriculture and peasantry of, 921

Bacon, John (1740-1799), character of his sculpture, 934; rilievi on Trinity House, by, 1143
Bacon, Friar Roger, notice of, 121
Bacon, sir Francis, speaks against a subsidy, and loses the Court favor, 383; dissuades Essex from undertaking the lord-lieutenancy of Ireland, 389; ungrateful conduct of, in the prosecution of the earl of Essex, 391; notice of his Apology, *ib.*; opposes the bill in the Commons against monopolies, 392; maintains the necessity of removing ancient abuses in the first parliament of James I., 399; scheme of, for the plantation of Ulster, 410; is employed to procure the sanction of sir Edward Coke to the king's arbitrary measures, but fails, 414; assures Raleigh that his appointment to command the expedition to Guiana precluded the necessity of a general pardon, 415; is impeached by the Commons and fined for bribery and corruption, 418; the king remits his fine, and he retires to private life, *ib.*
Bacon, sir Nicholas, appointed lord keeper, and opens Elizabeth's first parliament, 337; as lord keeper, introduces to parliament a new bill against papists in 1571, 356
Badajos surrenders to Soult, March 11, 1811; besieged by Beresford; relieved by Soult, May 15, 1082; siege and capture of, by the British under Wellington, April 7, 1812, 1085
Baden, margrave of, beseeches Marlborough for aid against Tallard, 695
Baden, peace of, Sept. 7, 1714, 733
Bailly, J. S., mayor of Paris, 1789, 963; harangues the king, 695; attempts to put down mob-dictation, 971; executed Nov. 1793, 1000
Baines, Mr., of Leeds, detects the spy system, 1817, 1124
Baird, sir David; general, 1038; joins Moore, 1808, 1070; second in command at Corunna; carried off from the battle, *ib.*
Bakewell, Robert, great skill of, in fattening sheep, 914
Balcarres, earl of, a confidential agent of James in Scotland, 629; with Dundee urges Gordon not to leave Edinburgh Castle, *ib.*; arrested, 630
Bales aids in bribing the duke of Leeds to procure a charter of confirmation for East India Company, 1695, 661
Balfe found guilty of murdering Mr. Clarke; pardoned, 858
Ballads, the Robin-Hood, endurance of, 96; their detestation of oppression, and poetical excellence, 97; popular amusements described in, *ib.*
Balliol, Edward, attempts to recover the crown of Scotland in 1332, 135; seeks the aid of Edward III., and agrees to hold Scotland as a fief, *ib.*; continues the struggle for several years, but is expelled from Scotland in 1341, *ib.*
Balliol, John, a claimant of the crown of Scotland in 1291, 123; agrees to do homage to Edward I., and is nominated king of Scotland, 124; summoned to Westminster for mal-administration, is treated with indignity, and is incited by his barons to assert his independence, *ib.*; renounces his fealty to Edward, *ib.*; is attacked by Edward, and resigns his crown at Montrose, *ib.*; imprisoned in the Tower, 125; dies, 127
Ballot, the; its supporters, 1209
Balmerino, Lord, trial and execution of, 1746, 818
Bamford, Samuel, a radical; quotations from his life illustrative of the acts, opinions, and objects of the demagogue reformers of 1816-19, 1121, 1123, 1132; leads the Middleton men at the great Manchester reform meeting, 1819, 1132; his description of the massacre, 1133; tried for his concern in the Manchester meeting, and sentenced to imprisonment, 1151
Bancroft, Dr., repudiates the scheme of burning the British dockyards, 880
Banda isles acquired by the British, 1810, 1167
Bandoola, Maha, commander of the Birman army, 1170; his unsuccessful attack on Rangoon; and defence of Donoopew; killed Mar. 1825, *ib.*
Bangalore stormed by lord Cornwallis, Mar. 21, 1791, 989
Bangor, massacre of the monks of, 22
Bank of England established 1694, 659; unable to pay its notes in specie, 666; competes with the South Sea Company in buying up the annuities, 1720, 773; attacked by a mob, 1780, 891; heavy pressure upon the, 1797, 1013; ordered by government to stop cash payments, *ib.*; pays all demands in bank-notes, which become the staple currency for years, *ib.*; forged notes, and the punishment for forging them, in 1816, 1820, and 1823, 1118; secret committees appointed to inquire into the state of the, 1819, 1130; Peel's act for the gradual resumption of cash payments, *ib.*; Soane enlarges and remodels it, 1143; run upon the, in consequence of a money panic, 1825, 1163; public credit saved through the measures adopted by the, *ib.*; effects of the exclusive privilege of the, on the currency circulation, *ib.*; removed by the sanctioning of joint-stock banks with any number of partners beyond sixty-five miles of the branch banks of the, established, 1826, 1164; new charter granted to the, 1833; the more important provisions of it, 1208; renewal of its charter, 1269; government interference with the Bank Act during the commercial panic of 1844, 1283
Bankruptcy Court bill, lord Brougham's, 1188; it receives the royal assent, Oct. 20, 1831, 1193
Banks, Thomas, his monument of Chatham, 886; the first great English sculptor, born 1735, died 1805; character of his works, 934, 1145
Banks, Joseph, accompanies Capt. Cook to New South Wales as naturalist, 847
Bannockburn, battle of, on June 24, 1314, 129
Barbesieux, son of Louvois; French Secretary of State; revives the project of shooting William III., 653
Barcelona besieged and taken by the Earl of Peterborough, 1705, 701; besieged by Philip V., 702; relieved by Peterborough, 703
Barclay, Sir George, one of the participators in the plot to assassinate William III., 1696, 664; the plot discovered; escape of, 665
Barére pronounces the doom of Lyon, 998; on his motion queen Marie Antoinette is sent before the Revolutionary Tribunal, 1000; his story of the Vengeur, 1005; moves that no quarter be given to the English and Hanoverians, *ib.*
Baring discerns a loss in our increased exports, 1815, 1115; foresees ruin as the result of Huskisson's free trade measures, 1160
Baring, F. T., a lord of the treasury, 1187
Baring, Alexander. See Ashburton.
Barlow, Sir George, governor-general of India, 1805, 1056; recalled by the British ministry; superseded by Lord Minto, 1168
Barnard, Sir William, M.P. for London; favors the repeal of the Septennial act, 784
Barnave, protects the French royal family from the mob, 1791, 972
Barnet, battle of, April 14, 1741, 198
Barosch surrenders to the British, 1803, 1054
Barras sent to punish the Toulonese, 1000; commands the municipal troops, 1794, 1005; general-in-chief of the army of the interior, 1795, 1009; his share in the revolution of the 18th Fructidor, 1797, 1017; a member of the French Directory, 1031; his conduct in the revolution of the 18th Brumaire, 1799, *ib.*; resigns, *ib.*
Barré, Colonel, his speech against Pitt, 1761, 844; his remarks on the repeal of the American duty, 863; remonstrates against the Massachusetts Bay Government bill, 1774, 877; pension granted to, 1782, 901; Pitt presents him with the Clerkship of the Pells, 952
Barrier, the, treaty, Nov. 15, 1715, 733
Barrington, William, viscount, moves for Wilkes' expulsion from the House of Commons, 1768, 856; Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1761, 865
Barrington, sir Jonah, his description of Dublin anticipating an attack from the United Irishmen, 1798, 1024; and of the passing the Union bill in the Irish House of Commons, 1800, 1028
Barosa, battle of, March 5, 1811, 1081
Barry, James, his mural paintings on the walls of the Society of Arts room; his enthusiasm and patriotic conduct connected with them; his attempt not quite successful, 936
Bartells, a Belgian insurrectionist; tried, found guilty, banished, 1830, 1184
Barthelemi, a member of the French Directory; arrested; banished, 1797, 1017
Bartholomew, St., priory of, in Smithfield, foundation of, 76
Barton, Andrew, the Scotch privateer, captured, and slain by Sir Thomas Howard, 227
Basle, peace of, April 5, 1795, 1040
Bassein taken by General Goddard, 949
Bassein, treaty of, Dec. 31, 1802, 1054
Bastia captured by Nelson, 1794, 1007
Bastile attacked by the mob, July, 1789, 963; defence conducted by De Launay, *ib.*; he capitulates, *ib.*; the prisoners released, *ib.*
Bataille, abbey of (Battle Abbey), foundation of, 55
Bath, the great resort of pleasure-seekers in the time of Queen Anne, 604; gaming at, 941
Bath, earl of. See Pulteney.
Bathiany, marshal, commands the Austrians at Laufeld, July, 1747, 820
Baths and wash-houses, establishment of, and benefits derived from, 1228; encouraged by an act of Parliament, 1846, 1279
Bathurst, Allen, lord, progress of America during his lifetime described by Burke, 873
Bathurst, earl; foreign secretary in the Portland ministry, 1809, 1062, 1325; secretary for war and colonies, 1812, 1148, 1325; speech on the restraints put on Napoleon, 1821, 1155; indignation caused by his circular prohibiting the flogging of slaves, 1161; resigns, 1827, 1165
Bautzen, battle of, May 20, 21, 1813, 1099
Bavaria, elector of. See Charles VII. of Germany.
Bavaria, elector of, aids William in the war with the Netherlands, 1695, 662; captures Namur, *ib.*; joins France; aids in the campaign against Marlborough, 1703; surprises Ulm, 691; refuses to quit France and join the Allies, 1704, 696; consequently his electorate is desolated by the Allies, *ib.*; joined by Tallard, 697; defeated at Blenheim, *ib.*; his hard struggle with Eugene, *ib.*; with Villeroy he threatens Holland, 704; defeated by Marlborough at Ramilies, 706
Bavaria, electoral prince of, his claim to the Spanish throne, 677; appointed successor to the throne by the Partition treaty, and Charles II.'s will; dies Feb. 5, 1699, 678
Bavaria, elector of, an ally of France; driven from his capital by the Austrians, 1805, 1050; made king of Bavaria by Bonaparte, 1805, 1052; compelled to join the Allies, 1813, 1090; attends the congress of Vienna, 1815, 1109
Bavaria, electorate of, devastated by the Allies, 1704, 696
Baxter, Richard, expelled from his ministry at Kidderminster, 456; joins the parliamentary army, *ib.*; his account of the battle at Edgehill, *ib.*; statement of, as to the oppression of non-conformists by the royalists, 458; his account of the adoption of the Covenant by the synod at Westminster and the House of

Commons, 463 ; visit of, to the battle-field of Naseby, 468 ; description of the parliamentary camp, 469 ; appointed chaplain to Charles II., 536 ; notices of the Plague of 1665 by, 543 ; of the great fire of London in 1666, 547 , notice of the duke of Buckingham by, 552 ; account of the proposals for a union of Protestants, which were rejected by parliament, 553 ; oppression experienced by, in 1675, 559 ; is tried, convicted, and imprisoned for libel in 1685, 580.
Bayeux Tapestry, illustrations of the history of England afforded by, 53
Baylen, battle of, July 21, 1808, 1069
Bayonne, treaty of, May 5, 1808, 1094
Beachy Head, battle off, June, 1690, 639
Bean, J. W., his attempt on the Queen's life, 1842, 1263
Beaufort, cardinal Henry, feuds between, and the duke of Gloucester, 171 ; continued disagreements with Gloucester, 176 ; burns heretics, *ib.* ; causes the duchess of Gloucester to be tried for sorcery and conspiracy, *ib.* ; is suspected of having caused the death of Gloucester, 177 ; dies, *ib.*
Beaulieu, an Austrian general, defeated and beaten back by Bonaparte, 1796, 1011 ; superseded in his command by general Wurmser, *ib.*
Beaumarchais, author of Figaro ; introduces Stenben to Silas Deane, 882 ; lends him money, and freights a ship for him, *ib.*
Becket, Thomas à, romance in the marriage of the father and mother of, 80 ; early education of, *ib.* ; made chancellor to Henry II., 81 ; magnificence of, *ib.* ; is sent ambassador to France, *ib.* ; his attendance with a numerous force at the siege of Toulouse, 83 ; his preferments, 81 ; created archbishop of Canterbury in 1162, 84 ; character of, 83 ; deportment and magnificence of, in his new office, 84 ; resigns the chancellorship and claims the restoration of church property, *ib.* ; interferes to prevent the subjection of the clergy to the secular laws, 85 ; consents to the Constitutions of Clarendon, *ib.* ; the pope refuses to confirm them, 86 ; Becket supports the pope's decision, is arraigned as a traitor and found guilty, *ib.*, flies from England, *ib.* ; excommunicates all those who maintain the Constitutions of Clarendon, *ib* ; meets Henry at Touraine in 1170, and a temporary peace is effected, 87 ; returns to England, *ib.* ; is murdered, *ib.* ; consequences of his murder, 88 ; canonization of, and miracles at the shrine of, *ib.* ; Henry does penance before the shrine, 90
Beckford, desires to see the king his own minister, 841 ; opposes coercionary measures against America, 862 ; alderman ; lord mayor of London, 1770 ; defends the London remonstrance ; his speech to the king, 864 ; Chatham in raptures at his spirited conduct ; death of, 1770, *ib.*
Beckwith, his shop plundered by a mob, 1816, 1122
Bede's account of the passage of the Romans at Coway stakes, 5
Bedford, John, duke of, appointed by the parliament joint protector, with the duke of Gloucester, of Henry VI., 171 ; wins the battle of Verneuil in 1424, *ib.* ; defeated at Montargis in 1427, 172 ; undertakes the siege of Orleans, 173 ; quarrels with the duke of Burgundy, *ib.* ; Orleans is relieved by Joan of Arc, *ib.* ; relinquishes the siege of Orleans, 174 ; deprives sir John Fastolf of the order of the Garter for his behavior at the battle of Patay, *ib.* ; dies, 176
Bedford, Francis, duke of, his agricultural improvements, 913 ; promotes the drainage of the Fens of Lincoln, 914
Bedford, John Russell, duke of ; secretary of state ; turned out of that office, 1752, 823 ; president of the council, 847 ; interview with George III. ; the king's indignation at his effrontery, 851 ; proposes that coercive measures be taken against America, 862
Bedfordshire, agricultural improvements of, 913
Beggars, statute of Richard II. in 1388, respecting, 151
Belgium, independence of, recognized, Nov. 1830, 1184, 1225
Belhaven, lord, a director of the African and Indian company ; found guilty, 674 ; speech of, in the Scottish parliament, against the Union, 1706, 710
Belle Ile, captured by the British, 1761, 843
Belliard commands at Cairo ; capitulates to the English, 1801, 1039
Bellingham, John, assassinates Mr. Perceval, May 11, 1812 ; trial and execution, 1082
Belmore, earl of, his opinions of the willingness of the freed slave to labor, 1207
Bennett moves for an inquiry into the state of the London police, 1118
Benningsen, general, commander of the Russian army ; engages Bernadotte at Pultusk ; defeated at Eylau, 1807, 1062
Bentinck, lord William, his operations in Italy disappoint Wellington, 1812, 1086 ; governor-general of India, 1172
Bentinck. See Portland, duke of.
Berar, rajah of. See Bhoonsla.
Beresford, marshal, drills the Portuguese, 1079 ; besieges Badajoz, 1811, 1082 ; Wellington's advice to, 1090
Bergen-op-Zoom surrendered to the French, Sept., 1747, 820
Berkeley, admiral, describes the bad state of the commissariat, 1809, 1076
Berkeley, admiral, entrusted with the reduction of Brest, 1694 ; Marlborough's treachery causes his attemps to fail, 659
Berkeley, earl of, proposes to George I. to kidnap the Prince of Wales ; first Lord of the Admiralty, 1718, 771
Berkshire, agriculture of, 916
Berlin Decree issued by Napoleon, Nov. 20, 1806, 1061, 1093 ; terms of, 1066, 1093
Berlin, treaty of, Aug. 5, 1796, 1040 ; convention of, Nov. 5, 1808, 1094
Bernadotte. See Charles XIV.
Bernard, sir Francis, governor of Massachusetts ; disputes with the Assembly, 861 ; recalled home, 862.
Bernard, sir John, his bill for regulating theatres, 790
Berne invaded and spoliated by the French, 1798, 1019
Berry, colonel, carries supplies to Enniskillen, and aids in defeating Macarthy, 1689, 626
Berry, captain, his bravery at the battle of St. Vincent, 1014
Berthier, Intendant of Paris, murdered by the mob, 1789, 964
Berthier, a general in the French army, 1011 ; withdraws Bonaparte from the Assembly, 1031 ; crosses the Alps at the head of a division of the army, 1035
Bertrand du Guesclin encounters the Black Prince at the battle of Najara, 144 ; captured and released by the English, *ib.* ; activity and success of, in the wars of Gascony, 145
Berwick, James Fitz James, duke of, defeated at Belturbet, 1690, 637 ; taken prisoner at Neerwinden, 656 ; sent to England to rouse the Jacobites, 664 ; secret visit to England for this purpose, *ib.* ; returns to France on the failure of the assassination plot, 665 ; keeps the Allied armies in check, 1704, 700 ; joins Philip of Spain, 703 ; compels the Allies to evacuate Madrid, and establishes Philip on his throne, 703, 713 ; commands the French army against Spain, 1719, 772 ; captures Fuenterabia and St. Sebastian, *ib.* ; opposes prince Eugene on the Rhine ; killed at the siege of Phillipsburg, 785.
Bewick, Thomas, reviver of wood engraving ; his principal works, 1148
Bhoonsla, rajah of Berar, joins the Alliance against the British, 1053 ; defeated at Assye and Argaum, 1055 ; signs a treaty of peace, *ib.*
Bhurtpore. See Combermere.
Bidgegur surrendered to Popham, 950
Bignor, Sussex, account of the remains of a Roman villa at, 16
Bill of Rights. See Rights.
Birkbeck, Dr., inaugurates the London Mechanics' Institution, 1823, 1174
Birmese war, 1824-1826, 1170
Birmingham, state of, in 1636, 431 ; long noted for its hardware trade, 606 ; riots at, against dissenters, 1791, 667 ; great reform meeting at, 1832, 1197 ; obtains parliamentary representation, 1200 ; population of, in 1831, and 1861, 1201 ; riots of 1839 in, 1238
Biron aids in the campaign in the Netherlands, 1792, 977
Bittern formerly existed in Lincolnshire, 608, and Wiltshire, *ib.*
Blackbourn, John, a nonjuror, ejected from two livings ; press corrector for Bowyer, 653
Blackfriars-bridge opened 1760 ; constructed by R. Mylne, 935
Blackstone, Dr., queen's solicitor-general ; his opinion as to Wilkes' rights to sit in parliament, 857
Blackwood, captain of the victory at Trafalgar, 105
Blackwood's Magazine, its influence and character, 1141
Blair, Hugh, popularity of his sermons, 1139
Blake, admiral, interrupts the operations of Rupert in the Irish seas, 494 ; follows Rupert to the mouth of the Tagus, 503 ; demands his expulsion by the Portuguese, or to be admitted into the harbor, is refused, and has a slight skirmish, *ib.* ; defeats Van Tromp in the Downs, May 19, 1652, *ib.* ; character of, 502 ; battles with Van Tromp and De Ruyter in 1652, *ib.* ; defeats Van Tromp off Cape La Hogue, Feb., 1653, and compels him to retire to Holland, *ib.* ; with Monk and Dean defeats Van Tromp near the North Foreland, *ib.* ; drives him back again to Holland in 1653, *ib.* ; gains a victory over the Dutch fleet, and Van Tromp is killed, July, 1653, 513 ; his remark on the dissolution of parliament by Cromwell, 516 ; subdues the African pirates, 519 ; conduct of, at Malaga, *ib.* ; captures two Spanish galleons off Cadiz, 521 ; gains a victory over the Spanish navy at Santa Cruz, 523 ; receives instruction to return home, *ib.* ; dies in 1657, within sight of Plymouth, *ib.* ; his body is disinterred from Westminster Abbey, and buried in St. Margaret's churchyard after the Restoration, 536
Blake, William, an engraver ; his designs, 1148
Blakeney, general, governor of Stirling Castle ; defends it against the Young Pretender, 1746, 813 ; defends St. Philip's Castle, Minorca, 1756, 830
Blanc, Louis, his remarks on the September massacres, 1792, 981
Blansac, camp marshal, surrenders the French army to the British, 1704, 698
Blanket meeting at Manchester, 1817, 934
Blenheim or Plenthiem, battle of, fought, Aug. 13, 1704, 697
Blenheim designed by Vanbrugh, 754
Blücher, marshal : routs the French at the battle of the Katzbach, Aug. 26, 1813, 1090 ; the Saxon cavalry desert to ; he places them in the rear, 1091 ; crosses the Rhine, 1092 ; battles with Napoleon at Brienne, Jan. 29, 1814, *ib.* ; Oxford degree conferred on, 1093 ; concentrates his army upon Sombref, 1105 ; maintains his position against Napoleon at the battle of Ligny, June 16, 1815, *ib.* ; marches to Wavre, *ib.* ; his share in the victory of Waterloo, 1107 ; his late arrival at the battle with Prussian troops, *ib.* ; Wellington remonstrates against his desire to kill Bonaparte, 1108 ; and interferes with his blowing up the bridge of Jena, 1109
Blunt, sir John, a South-sea director : the ministry favor his projects, 773
Boadicea, revolt led by, 9 ; destruction of Roman British cities during the revolt by, *ib.* ; defeat and death of, by poison, *ib.*
Board of Health, a central, formed, 1831, 1194
Boat, ancient, found in the river Arun in 1834, 5
Boats of the Britons, nature of, in which they went to the assistance of the Veneti, 4
Bohun, Edmund, the press licenser ; his party feeling : removed from his office, 655
Bois-le-Duc surrendered to the Dutch, 1794, 1107
Bolan Pass, passage of the, by the British army, 1839, 1249
Boleyn, Anne, birth and childhood of, 242 ; sent to the court of France with Mary, the sister of Henry VIII. in 1514, 242 ; the king's attachment to, publicly shown at Hampton Court, 242 ; incenses Henry against Wolsey, 245 ; writes to Cromwell in favor of Richard Herman, imprisoned for setting forth the Bible in English, 247 ; again incites Henry against Wolsey, 249 ; accompanies Henry to France in 1532, to meet Francis I., 252 ; married to Henry, 253 ; description of her coronation, 253 ; gives birth to Elizabeth, Sept. 7, 1533, 254 ; the king becomes jealous and sends her to the Tower, 261 ; her letter to the king, 262 ; true bills found against her and others, 263 ; trial and execution of, on May 19, 1536, 263 ; dying speech of, 263 ; doubts as to the guilt or innocence of, 264 ; letter from, to Henry VIII., 265
Bolingbroke. See St. John.
Bombay ceded to Charles II. ; by him assigned to the East India Company, 826
Bonaparte, Joseph, commands the army sent against Naples, 1060 ; enters Naples, Feb. 15, 1806, *ib.* ; proclaimed king, Mar. 30, *ib.* ; joins Victor in Spain, 1809, 1076 ; Marmont establishes a communication with, 1086 : defeated at Vittoria by Wellington, 1813, 1088 ; Napoleon declares him no longer king of Spain, 1814 ; appointed Napoleon's lieutenant, 1091 ; king of Spain, 1808-1814, 1310 ; king of Naples, 1806-1808, *ib.*
Bonaparte, Louis, proclaimed king of Holland, June, 1806, 1060 ; surrenders his sovereignty, 1811, 1081
Bonaparte, Louis Napoleon. See Napoleon III.
Bonaparte, Lucien, president of the Council of Five Hundred, 1799, 1031 ; his conduct during the overthrow of the Council on Nov. 10 (19th Brumaire), *ib.* ; urges his brother's claims to the gratitude of France, 1815, 1177.
Bonaparte, Napoleon : born at Ajaccio in Corsica, 865 ; early career, lieutenant-colonel of artillery, 1793 ; his opinion of Carteaux, 999 ; plan for reducing Toulon, *ib.* ; appointed second in command to Barras, 1795, 1009 ; suppresses the revolt of the sections of Paris, Oct. 5, *ib.* ; marries Josephine Beauharnois, Mar. 1796 ; submits a plan for the invasion of Italy to Carnot ; appointed chief of the army of Italy, 1010 ; reception by the army ; defeats D'Argenteau, Beaulieu, and Colli ; gains possession of Piedmont ; forces the passage of Lodi, 1011 ; levies heavy exactions from Milan and Pavia, *ib.* ; his plundering march to Leghorn, *ib.* ; where he seizes all the English merchandise ; defeats generals Quosnadowich and Wurmser ; defeated by Alvinzy at Caldiero, Nov. 12 ; battle of Arcole, *ib.* ; compels Alvinzy to retreat to Vicenza, *ib.* ; wins the battle of Rivoli, Jan. 14, 1797 ; Provera surrenders Jan. 16 ; and Mantua capitulates, Feb. 2, 1017 ; pursues the archduke Charles, and defeats him at Neumarkt, April 2 ; preliminaries of peace signed at Leoben, April 18 ; declares war against the Venetian republic, May 3, *ib.* ; enters Venice on the 16th and overthrows the republican government, *ib.* ; negotiates with Vienna, 1018 ; confers with the Austrian negotiators at Udine, Oct. 16 ; cedes Venice to Austria, *ib.* ; peace of Compo Formio concluded Oct. 17, *ib.* ; appointed to the command of the "Army of England," *ib.* ; arrives in Paris, Dec. 5 ; his interest in the preparations for invading England, 1019 ; persuades the Directory to send an expedition against Egypt, *ib.* ; appointed general-in-chief of the army in the East ; preparations at Toulon ; the expedition leaves Toulon, May 19, 1798, 1020 : seizes Malta, June, *ib.* ; his anxiety at the sight of a supposed English sail, *ib.* ; landing of his army at Alexandria, *ib.* ; proclamation of, to the people of Egypt, *ib.* ; marches across the desert ; gains the battle of the Pyramids, July 21 ; obtains possession of Cairo, 1021 ; receives the news of Bruey's defeat with calmness, 1022 ; his letter to Tippoo Sultaun, 1028 ; marches to Syria ; El-Arish surrenders, Mar. 18, 1799 ; and Gaza on the 25th, 1029 ; captures Jaffa, *ib.* ; siege of Acre, *ib.* ; returns to Cairo ; defeats the Turks at Aboukir, July 25, 1030 ; obtains the news of Europe for the past year, *ib.* ; posture of European affairs, July, 1799, *ib.* ; leaves Egypt, August 24 ; arrives at Frejus, Oct. 9 ; and at Paris on the 16th, 1031 ; revolution of the 18th Brumaire ; his critical position at the Assembly on the 19th, *ib.* ; overthrows the Directory, *ib.* ; becomes consul in conjunction with Sieyès and Ducos, *ib.* ; appointed First Consul for ten years, Dec., 1032 ; letter to George III., *ib.* ; hostile answer returned to it by lord Grenville, *ib* ; considers the answer a satisfactory one, 1034 ; his civil administration, *ib.* ; assumes the state of a sovereign, *ib.* ; joins his army at Dijon, *ib.* ; crosses the Alps by the pass of the Great St. Bernard, *ib.* ; enters Milan, May 30, 1800 ; gains the victory of Marengo, June 14 ; again in Paris, July 2, *ib.* ; threatens an invasion of England, 1801, 1039 ; his audience with marquis Cornwallis, *ib.* ; and demand upon England, 1802, 1041 ; effects of his rule upon French society ; Consul for life ; French encroachments, *ib.* ; his military establishment, *ib.* ; sends an expedition to reduce St. Domingo, *ib.* ; result of the expedition ; capture and death of the president, Toussaint L'Ouverture, 1042 ; publishes col. Sebastiani's report, *ib.* ; his interview with lord Whitworth, the English ambassador, *ib.* ; proceeds against Peltier for libel in an English court of law, *ib.* ; verdict given in his favor, *ib.* ; violence shown by, in his interview with lord Whitworth, 1043 ; arrests ten thousand English travellers in France, 1044 ; thus he rouses the national spirit of Great Britain, *ib.* ; prepares for invading England, *ib.* ; exercises his troops at Boulogne, 1045 ; declared emperor of France by the French senate, May 18, 1804, 1046 ; discovery of a conspiracy against ; fate of the conspirators, *ib.* ; murder of the duc d'Enghien, Mar. 20, 1047 ; Napoleon and his army at Boulogne, 1049 ; his anxiety, *ib.* ; persuaded by Decrès to give up the scheme of invading England,

breaks up his Boulogne camp, 1050; Russia, Austria, and England coalesce against; marches across the Rhine and the Danube, *ib.*; compels 30,000 Austrians under general Mack to surrender at Ulm, Oct. 20, *ib.*; his invasion projects frustrated by the battle of Trafalgar, *ib.*; enters Vienna, Nov. 13, 1052; defeats the Russians and Austrians at Austerlitz, Dec. 2, *ib.*; his inhumanity towards the Russians; peace of Presburg, *ib.*; heads the Confederation of the Rhine, 1059; aggression of; murder of Palm, *ib.*; the French take possession of Naples, of which Joseph is proclaimed king, 1060; defeat of the French at the battle of Maida, *ib.*; takes the field against Prussia, *ib.*; position of the two armies, 1061; defeats the enemy at Jena, Oct. 14, 1806, *ib.*; entry into Berlin; issues the Berlin decree against England, *ib.*; entered Warsaw, Dec. 19; battle of Pultusk, Dec. 26, 1062; battle of Eylau, Feb. 8, 1807, *ib.*; defeats the Russians at the battle of Friedland, June 14, 1064; concludes the peace of Tilsit with Alexander, July, 1065; the interview on the raft on the Niemen, *ib.*; terms of the treaty, *ib.*; its secret articles, *ib.*; they become known to the British government, *ib.*; his rage on hearing the success of the English at Copenhagen, *ib.*; his continental system; endeavors to smother the British trade, 1066; secret treaty of Fontainebleau, 1067; schemes for possessing himself of the Peninsula, *ib.*; French invasion of Portugal, *ib.*; flight of the regent of Portugal to Brazil, *ib.*; abdication of Charles IV., March, 1808; entraps the king and his son, 1068; an insurrection breaks out in Madrid, *ib.*; general Dupont defeated and baffled by the Spaniards, 1069, battle of Baylen, July 21, *ib.*; unsuccessful attempt to take Zaragoza, *ib.*; defeat of the French at Vimiero, Aug. 21, *ib.*; retreat of Torres Vedras, *ib.*; convention of Cintra, 1070; arrives at Bayonne to take the command of his army, Nov. 3, *ib.*; pursuit of sir John Moore by; gives it up to Soult at Astorga, *ib.*; the battle of Corunna and death of Moore, 1071; destruction of the French squadron in the Aix roads by captain lord Cochrane, 1072; Austria declares war against France, *ib.*; leaves Paris, April 13; reaches Donauwerth on the 17th, *ib.*; sir A. Wellesley compels Soult to retreat from Oporto, *ib.*; the nations of Europe rise against France, 1073; battle of Eckmühl, April 22; entry of the French into Vienna, May 12; battle of Aspern, May 21 and 22; Napoleon shut up in the island of Lobau; 1074; insurrection of the Tyrolese, *ib.*; battle of Wagram, July 5; determines upon divorcing Josephine, *ib.*; the peace of Vienna, *ib.*; return to Paris, *ib.*; the British expedition to Walcheren, 1075; defeat of marshal Victor at Talavera, July 28; chagrin of, 1076; divorces Josephine; and marries the archduchess of Austria, 1078; Wellington's lines of Torres Vedras, 1079; surrender of Almeida and Ciudad Rodrigo to the French, *ib.*; battle of Busaco, Sept. 27, 1810, *ib.*; Wellington retires within his lines; distress of Massena's army, 1080; Louis Bonaparte resigns the sovereignty of Holland, which state is annexed to France, 1811, 1081; his power and aggrandizing view on the continent, *ib.*; battles of Barrosa, Fuentes de Onoro, and Albuera, 1082; withdraws troops from Spain for his expedition against Russia, 1085; capture of Ciudad Rodrigo by Wellington, *ib.*; siege of Badajoz, *ib.*; Marmont's manœuvres, 1086; defeat of the French at the battle of Salamanca, July 22, 1812, *ib.*; rage of, against Marmont, 1087; siege of Burgos, *ib.*; Wellington's retreat to Ciudad Rodrigo, *ib.*; he invades Russia, June, 1088; gains the battle of Smolensk, Aug. 16, and Borodino, Sept. 7; and enters Moscow, Sept 14, *ib.*; conflagration of Moscow; its evacuation, Oct. 19, *ib.*; destruction of his army in the retreat home, *ib.*; arrives at Paris, Dec. 18, 1089; defeats the Russians and Prussians at Lützen, May 2, 1813; and at Baützen, May 21, 22; armistice concluded, *ib.*; battle of Vittoria, *ib.*; battles at Dresden; death of Moreau, 1090; the French armies sustain several defeats in Germany, *ib.*; battle of Leipzig, Oct. 19, *ib.*; his retreat wins the battle of Hanau, *ib.*; Wellington in the Pyrenees, *ib.*; San Sebastian; the British army in France, 1091; battles of Wellington and Soult, *ib.*; preparations for a campaign in France; battle of Brienne, Jan. 29, 1814, *ib.*; battles with Blücher and Schwarzenberg; capitulation of Paris; battle of Orthez, 1093; Toulouse; he abdicates April 4, *ib.*; his kingdom of Elba; peace at Paris, *ib.*; lands in the Gulf of St. Juan, near Cannes, Mar. 1, 1815, 1102; the "Hundred Days" drama, *ib.*; retrospect of the restoration of the Bourbons, 1102–1104; discontent of the people under Bourbon rule, 1102; desire of the army for his return to France, 1103; his independent position at Elba; visited by sir N. Campbell, *ib.*; his escape; attributed to English complicity, *ib.*; the powers assembled in congress declare him liable to public vengeance; his advance; joined by Labedoyère, *ib.*; and marshal Ney; arrives in Paris, Mar. 21, 1104; his speech at the Champ de Mai, *ib.*; reorganizes his army; crosses the frontier, June 15, and joins his soldiers at Charleroi, *ib.*; Wellington's knowledge of his movements, *ib.*; the battle of Ligny, 1105; his manœuvres and march to the British position near Waterloo, *ib.*; the field of Waterloo, *ib.*; the position of the two armies, 1106; the struggle at Hougoumont, *ib.*; disconcerts his plans, *ib.*; the arrival of the Prussians; rout and panic in his army; his final stand; and flight; the pursuit of the French, 1107; he returns to Paris, June 21; the Chamber of Representatives compel him to abdicate, and require him to go to America, 1108; unable to escape he yields himself to captain Maitland; becomes an object of curiosity in Plymouth Harbor; portrait taken by sir C. Eastlake; St. Helena assigned him for his future residence; legal discussions concerning him, *ib.*; Wellington remonstrates against his being executed; Napoleon's hatred for Wellington, *ib.*; history's errors regarding the disposition of the Allies, and Wellington's conduct toward Napoleon, *ib.*; his opinion of the "Holy Alliance," 1110; abolished the slave traffic in France, *ib.*; his death-scene, May 5, 1821, 1155; parliamentary complaints on the unnecessary strictures imposed upon him, *ib.*; his expansive mind and want of moral sense, *ib.*; his public interment in the church of the Invalides, 1840, 1243

Bonchamps, M. de, a Vendean commander, mortally wounded at Chollet, 1001.

Bond, Oliver, a merchant; one of the United Irish directors; arrested 1797, 1024.

Bonner, bishop of London, deprived of his see, 313; exertions of, in 1555, to suppress heresy, 326; behavior of, to Hawkes, 329.

Bordeaux, duke of, Charles X. abdicates in his favor, 1830, 1133; his mother, the duchess of Berri, attempts to get up an insurrection for his benefit, 1222

Bordino, battle of, Sept. 7, 1812, 1088.

Boscawen, admiral, appointed to watch a French fleet, 1755, 828; commands the fleet sent against Louisbourg, 1758, 837; arrives there June 2; the place capitulates, July, *ib.*; defeats the French fleet in Lagos bay, Aug. 17, 1759, 888

Bosenden Wood tragedy. See Thom.

Boston, opposition to the Revenue Act in, 1768, 861; destruction of tea in the harbor, 1773, 870; Boston port bill, *ib.*; its reception at, 871; state of parties in, 1775, 875; battle of Bunker's Hill, *ib.*; blockaded by Washington, 876; evacuated by the British, Mar. 17, 1776, 877

Boston port bill passed, 1774, 870

Boswell, his visit to Boulton's works, 929

Bosworth, battle of, on Aug. 22, 1485, 211

Bothwell, earl of. See Mary of Scotland.

Bothwell Bridge, battle of. See Charles II., and Covenanters.

Bouchain besieged by Marlborough; surrenders, 1711, 728

Boufflers, marshal; present at the battle of Steinkirk, 1692, 653; reinforces the garrison of Namur; assumes the command of it, 1695, 661; surrenders, Aug. 26; detained a prisoner, but soon released again, 662; negotiates with Portland the points of the peace of Ryswick, July, 1697, 668; threatens Holland, 1703, 691; entrusted with the defence of Lille, 1708; capitulates, Dec. 29, 717

Bouillé, marquis de, engages to protect Louis XVI. in his flight to Montmédy, 1791, 972; the plan fails; the king is captured at Varennes, and Bouillé flies from France, *ib.*

Boulogne, projected invasion of Britain from, by Caligula, 7; lighthouse built at, by Caligula, *ib.*

Boulton, Matthew; Roebuck refuses him a share in Watt's patent, 929; becomes Watt's partner, *ib.*; Boswell's visit to his works, *ib*

Boundary treaty between England United States concluded, Aug., 1842, 1263

Bounty, Queen Anne's, restoring the first fruits and tenths to the church, 1703, 693

Bourbon, the constable, leads the emperor's (Charles V.) forces against Rome in 1527, 240; takes and sacks Rome, but is himself killed, 240

Bourbon isle, acquired by the British 1810, 1169

Bourienne, Bonaparte's secretary; quotations from, 1018, 1030; withdraws Napoleon from the Assembly, 1799, 1031; chargé d'affairs at Hamburg, 1067; instances of Napoleon's infringements of the continental system given by, *ib.*

Boutetort, lord, succeeds Amherst as governor of Virginia; opens the session; dissolves the Assembly, 862

Boydell, John, a skilful engraver; his large business in engravings, 934; his Shakespeare collection, *ib.*

Boyne, battle of the, July 1, 1690, 637

Braddock, gen.; his unsuccessful campaign on the Ohio, 1755; falls into an ambuscade, 828; and is slain, *ib.*

Brandenburg, elector of. See Frederick I. of Prussia.

Brandreth, Jeremiah, captain of the Derbyshire insurrectionists; his conduct in the insurrection, 1817, 1124

Brandywine, battle of the, Sept. 13, 1777, 882

Brathwaite, sir J., captures Pondicherry, 990

Bray, Dr., founder of parochial libraries; and one of the founders of the "Christian Knowledge Society," and the "Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts," 671

Breadalbane, lord, submits to the English government; is employed by it to conciliate the rebel Highland chiefs, 646; his plans not successful; under suspicion of appropriating the secret money, *ib.*; committed to Edinburgh Castle on a charge of high treason, 649; subsequently obtains a pardon, and is released, *ib.*

Breaking the line, whose invention was this? discussed, 900

Breda possessed by Dumouriez, 1793, 993

Breed's hill. See Bunker's hill.

Brereton, col., attempts to quell the Bristol riots, 1831, 1194; tried by court martial; shoots himself, *ib.*

Brest, expedition against, 1694; its failure, 659

Bridges and their designers, 935, 1144

Bridgewater, Francis Edgerton, duke of; his canal schemes; carried out by Brindley, 923; the father of British inland navigation, *ib.*; with his brother, the marquis of Stafford, the chief promoter of the Staffordshire canal, *ib.*

Bridport, lord, mutiny in his fleet at Spithead, 1797, 1015; offers redress and pardon, *ib.*

Brienne, Loménie de, archbishop of Toulouse; controller-general of France; dismisses the notables, 814; his scheme of La Cour Plenière, *ib.*; dismissed his controllership, *ib.*

Brienne, battle of, Jan. 29, 1814, 1092

Brigantes, revolt of, 11; joined by the Mæatæ; the revolt suppressed, *ib.*

Brindley, James, a millwright, 923; employed by the duke of Bridgewater to construct canals; his great works of the aqueduct over the Irwell, *ib.*; and the subterranean canals at Worsley, *ib.*; appearance of, *ib.*

Brissot, a Paris deputy at the Assembly on the left side, 974; heads a faction, 977; quarrels with Clavière; forces on a war with Austria, *ib.*; in prison, 995

Bristol, formerly the famous port of the West, 603; slave trading pursued by the merchants of; not discontinued till George III.'s reign; streets, *ib.*; increase of population, *ib.*; glass manufactories in, 607; great riot at, Oct., 1831, 1194

Britain, civilization and population of, at the time of Cæsar's invasion, 4; first invasion of, by Cæsar, and his retreat, 5; second invasion by, *ib.*; condition of the country at the time, *ib. et seq.*; strength and prosperity of, A.D. 296, 11; panegyric of Eumenius on the state of, *ib.*; Roman provinces of, 12; review of the domestic condition of, at the close of the third century, *ib. et seq.*; never a secure possession to the Romans, 15; resistance of, to the emperor Honorius, 18; close of Roman rule in Britain, A.D. 409, *ib.*; mixed character of the population of, at the time of the invasion of the Saxons, *ib.*

British army under Maximus refuse to return from Armorica, and found a colony in Brittany, 17, 18.

British art, ancient specimens of, 6.

British captives fight as gladiators before Claudius, 8.

British institution established, 1805, 1145.

British writers, chronological and analytical list of, 1311-1316

Britons, character of, by Diodorus Siculus, 4; by Ptolemy, *ib.*; resistance offered by, to the invasion of Cæsar, *ib.*

Brittany, position of and character of the early inhabitants of, 3; assistance afforded to, by the Britons, *ib.*; probable foundation of a British colony in, A.D. 388, 18; continued connection of, with Cornwall and Wales, *ib.*; successfully resists the emperor Honorius, and maintains its independence, A.D. 409, *ib.*

Britton, Thomas, the musical coal-man, 747

Brock, major-general; opposes Hull's invasion of Canada, 1812; drives him across the river Detroit, and compels him to surrender, Aug. 16, 1097; praises the conduct of the Indians employed in the British army, *ib.*

Brodie, sir Benjamin, his remarks on Oxford's insanity, 1240

Broglie, marshal de, minister of war; commander of the French troops, 962; leaves Paris for the frontiers, 963

Broke, captain of the "Shannon," challenges the American frigate "Chesapeake" to a fight, and succeeds in capturing her, June 1, 1813, and restoring the prestige of the British navy, 1098

Brooklyn, battle of, Aug. 27, 1776, 879

Brougham, lord; his eulogy on Erskine, 1008; his description of Robespierre's character, 1006; account of Wellington's interview with Pitt; and of Pitt's death-bed, 1052; his efforts in bringing about the repeal of the orders in council declaring France and her allies in a state of blockade, 1812, 1184; heads the opposition in parliament to the renewal of the income tax in 1816, 1113; defeat of the bill, 1114; his declamatory attack upon the regent, *ib.*; describes the state of the American trade in 1816, 1115; moves an inquiry into the state of education among the London poor; impulse given to the committee's proceedings by his energy, 1120; queen Caroline's chief legal adviser; defends her title, 1150; queen's attorney-general, 1820, 1151; announces the queen's arrival in England; opposes the appointment of a secret committee; defends his own conduct, *ib.*; takes part in the conference for averting a public proceeding, 1152; conducts the queen's defence at her trial, 1153; lays the case of Mr. Smith, a missionary, before parliament, 1824, 1161; supports the Canning ministry, 1165; objects to the duke of Wellington being prime minister; states that the schoolmaster is abroad, 1174; originates the "Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge," 1826, *ib.*; promotes the formation of the London University, *ib.*; speech on law reform, 1175; obtains the appointment of two commissioners to inquire into the state of the common law, and the law, and the laws affecting real property, *ib.*; fails in obtaining the establishment of local jurisdiction, 1830; subsequent partial adoption of his views, 1179; protests against the lord steward's treatment of the Commons; subsequent explanation, *ib.*; his attack upon the Wellington ministry, *ib.*; apologizes for his strong language, 1180; gives notice in parliament of his intention to introduce the subject of reform; on the resignation of the Wellington ministry he postpones his motion for a short time; lord chancellor, 1187; reluctance to accept this office, *ib.*; introduces a bill for establishing a new court in bankruptcy, 1831, 1188; boldness in urging the king to dissolve parliament, 1190; speech on the Reform bill, 1192; his Bankruptcy Court bill receives the the royal assent, 1193; with lord Grey obtains the king's permission to create peers to insure the passing of the Reform bill, 1198; speech of, on moving the second reading of the Poor Law Amendment bill, 1834, 1212; his hostility with lord Durham; speeches at Inverness, at the Grey banquet, Edinburgh, and at Salisbury, 1213; excluded from the Melbourne ministry, 1835; his indefatigable energy, 1217; speech on submitting a series of education resolutions to the Lords, *ib.*; his attack on the earl of Durham's proceedings; proposes and carries an Indemnity Act, which causes the earl's resignation, 1233; his speech on the enthusiasm manifested towards the queen, 1234; his "Historical Sketches of Statesmen" noticed, 1256

Browne, marshal, commands an Austrian army; de-

feated at Losowitz, 1756, 831; encamps before Prague, 1757, 835; defeated by Frederick at Prague, May 6, where he receives his death wound, *ib.*
Browning, Mrs., poetical quotation from, 1161; her poetry, 1259
Bruce, Robert, the elder, a claimant for the crown of Scotland in 1291, 123; agrees to do homage to Edward I., 124; sides with Edward in his invasion of Scotland, *ib.*
Bruce, Robert, the younger, stabs Comyn, 127; assumes the crown of Scotland in 1306, *ib.*; is defeated by the earl of Pembroke, *ib.*; obtains some successes in 1307, and Edward I. assembles an army to attack him, but dies, *ib.*; is recognized as king in 1309, *ib.*; successes of, 128, 129; wins the battle of Bannockburn, on June 24, 1314, *ib.*; concludes a truce with Edward II. in 1323, 131; invades England in 1327, *ib.*; dies in 1328, *ib.*
Bruce, David, succeeds his father in 1328, 133; is attacked by Edward Balliol, who continues the struggle for some years, 135; returns from France to his kingdom in 1341, *ib.*; invades England in 1346, is defeated by queen Philippa at Nevill's Cross, is taken prisoner, ; lodged in the Tower, 138
Brueys, French admiral; conveys Bonaparte and his troops to Egypt, 1798, 1020; defeated by Nelson at the battle of the Nile, Aug. 1, 1022; killed in the battle, *ib.*
Bruges surrenders to Marlborough, 1706, 706
Brunanburgh, ode on the battle of, from the Anglo-Saxon chronicle, 39, 40
Brunswick, C. W. Ferdinand, duke of, his proclamation, 1792, 970; his advance into France; stopped by the battle of Valmy, 982; retreats, *ib.*; lieutenant-general of the Prussian army, 1806, 1060; receives his death wound at the battle of Jena; dies Nov. 10, 1806, 1061
Brunswick, W. Frederick, duke of, headed the German insurrection, 1809, 1073; heads the Brunswickers at Waterloo, 1105
Brussels saved from a bombardment by William III., 668
Brydon, Dr., the sole survivor of the British army retreating from Cabul, 1842, 1251
Buckingham, Stafford, duke of, in conjunction with the duke of Gloucester, arrests earl Rivers, lord Grey, and sir Thomas Vaughan, and takes Edward V. into his charge, 202; rewards heaped upon by Gloucester, *ib.*; Morton, bishop of Ely, committed as a prisoner to the custody of, 203; harangues the citizens of London in favor of Gloucester's claim to the crown, 205; with a deputation of citizens solicits Gloucester to become king, *ib.*; receives the estates of the earldom of Hereford from Richard, 207; with Morton, organizes an insurrection against Richard, 208; unsatisfactory causes assigned for, *ib.*; it is suppressed, and he is executed at Salisbury, Nov. 2, 1483, *ib.*
Buckingham, George Villiers, duke of, sudden rise and promotion of, by James I., 413; procures the release of Raleigh from the Tower, 415; accompanies prince Charles in his incognito visit to Spain in 1623, 419; they return home, *ib.*; popularity of, on the breaking off of the Spanish match, *ib.*; is impeached by the Commons in 1626, 421; is elected chancellor of the University of Cambridge by command of the king, *ib.*; asserted to have been the promoter of the war with France, 422; commands the expedition to aid the Protestants in Rochelle, *ib.*; attempts to take the Isle of Rhé, and fails, *ib.*; is denounced by Coke, in the House of Commons, 423; character of, by Clarendon, *ib.*; is appointed to command a second expedition to relieve Rochelle, *ib.*; is assassinated by Felton, Aug. 23, 1628, 424; execution of Felton, *ib.*
Buckingham, George Villiers, duke of, becomes a member of the Cabal ministry, in 1667, 552; seeks popularity, and advocates liberty of conscience, 552; character of, by Dryden, *ib.*; complicity of, in Charles becoming a pensioner of France, 553; retires from the Cabal ministry, 558; committed to the Tower for opinions expressed in the House of Lords in 1677, 560
Buckingham, duke of, privy seal, 689; supports the motion for inviting the princess Sophia to England, 705; a great art collector, 752
Buckingham, duke of, made duke, 1822, 1155; account of George IV.'s unreservedness, 1166
Buckingham, J. S., proprietor of "The Calcutta Journal;" proceedings against, for his strictures on Indian affairs, 1172
Buckinghamshire, low state of agriculture in; dairy farming; produce of butter; duck rearing, and pillow-lace making, 913
Buenos Ayres captured by sir Home Popham, 1806, 1060; regained by the French, *ib.*; Whitelock's expedition against, 1807, 1064; his failure, *ib.*
Büller, Charles, proposes the adoption of a systematic colonization, 1264
Bunker's Hill, battle of Breed's or, June 17, 1775, 876
Bunyan, John, release of, from prison, after twelve years' confinement, 557
Burdett, sir Francis, duel with Paull, 1807, 1056; conduct of, in the proceedings between Jones and parliament, and subsequent results, 1810, 1078; chairman of the London Hampden Club, 1121; revives the question of parliamentary reform, 1818, 1129; returned M.P. for Westminster, *ib.*; again agitates reform, 1819, 1131; found guilty of seditious libel and punished, 1150
Burgesses summoned to parliament, by Simon de Montfort, in 1264, 112
Burgh Castle, Roman ruins of, 13
Burghersh, lord, British minister at Florence; announces Napoleon's escape from Elba, 1102
Burgos Castle invested without success by Wellington, 1812, 1087
Burgoyne, general, moves for an inquiry into the East India Company's affairs, 869; invades the United States; recaptures Ticonderoga; secures Fort Edward, 882; his difficulties in procuring provisions, *ib.*; retreats to Saratoga; yields to Gates on certain conditions; the convention of Saratoga, *ib.*; cold treatment of, by the British government; vindicates the convention of Saratoga, 887; defends his conduct in employing Indians, *ib.*
Burhampoor taken by Col. Stevenson, 1055
Burke, Edmund; his speech on American taxation, April 19, 1774, 850-871; first speech in parliament, Jan. 1766, 852; said to be the author of Junius's writings, 858; opposes Bedford's proposed coercionary measures towards America, 862; moves an inquiry into the American disorders, 863; his pamphlet on American taxation, 871; urges government to adopt conciliatory measures towards America, 873; his burst of oratory on America's rapid growth, *ib.*; remarks on the public opinion regarding the American war, 884; speech on economical reform, Feb. 11, 1780, 889; his proposals, *ib.*; bill obstructed in its progress through committee, *ib.*; rejection of the practical measures, 890; rejected as M.P. for Bristol, 893; charges against him; his defence, 894; returned for Malton; brings forward his Civil List bill; it is rejected, *ib.*; his speech denouncing the American tax, 898; obtains office in the Rockingham ministry, 900; compelled to compromise his scheme of economical reform; passing of his bill; proposes a bill for regulating the profits of the office of paymaster of the forces, 901; resigns office on the accession of the Shelburne ministry, 1782, 905; an agricultural improver, 913; draws up the ninth and eleventh report on Indian affairs, 951; commends Pitt's speech on taxes, 956; passion displayed by, in the debate on the Regency bill, 957; his opinion of the French revolution, 966; opposes an increase of military power; declares France to be ruined, 967; renounces Sheridan's friendship and political opinions, 968; opposes Fox's motion for the repeal of the Test act, *ib.*; his "Reflections on the Revolution," published; its remarkable popularity; his opinions on the revolution, 969; his hatred towards the French revolutionary doctrines causes him to break friendship with Fox, 970; intensity of his hatred exemplified, *ib.*; raises the cry of the church in danger, *ib.*; anecdotes of, 974; applauds the Polish revolution, 977; remarks of, on the September massacres, 981; indignation of, at the results of the duke of Brunswick's campaign, 982; deprecates the proceedings of the French against their royal family, 985; oratorical dagger speech on the Alien bill, 987; note on the dagger scene, 988; speech of, on the expediency of war, 991; his idea of the policy that ought to be pursued towards France, 992; French opinion of, 993; shows the difficulty of negotiating with France, 995; regrets Britain's treatment of the French fleet at Toulon, 1000; objects to "a regicide peace," 1012; death of, July 9, 1797, 1016; description of the United Irishmen by, 1023; urges government not to abandon law, *ib.*; his remarks on scarcity, 1033
Burke's opinion of the ancient Britons, 6
Burnes, sir Alexander, his remarks on Russian intrigues in Cabul, 1248; his position at Cabul, 1249; massacre of, by the Afghans, 1841, 1250
Burnes, Charles, murdered by Afghans, 1250
Burnet, Dr. Gilbert, preaches at William III.'s coronation, 626; his "Pastoral Letter" condemned and publicly burnt at Charing Cross, 1693, 655; preaches at Whitehall, Dec. 2, 1697, 669; preceptor to duke of Gloucester, 632; his system of education, *ib.*; carries the news of William III.'s death to Queen Anne, 688
Burney, Fanny, writings of; description of court life by, 1139
Burns, Robert; his description of the Ayrshire farm laborer, 920; first volume of his poems published, 1786; his rapid and extensive popularity; character of his writings, 1136
Burrard, sir Harry, appointed second in command in Portugal, 1808, 1068; arrives at Vimiero, 1069; spoils Wellington's plans, *ib.*
Busaco, battle of, Sept. 27, 1810, 1079
Bussey, M. de, French minister in London, 1761, 843; delivers the French *ultimatum*, is dismissed England by Pitt, *ib.*
Bustard, formerly abundant in Wiltshire; boldness of; its extinction in the county, 916
Bute, John Stuart, earl of, groom of the stole to the prince of Wales, 1756, 831; instils him with a knowledge of the constitution, 841; appointed a member of the council and cabinet by the prince, now George III.; animadversion against his influence; Pitt's indignation at the tone of the king's first address to the Privy Council, prepared by, *ib.*; intrigues with Doddington against the ministry; proclaims the policy of the new reign, *ib.*; secretary of state, 1761, 842; condemns Pitt's proposal of war against Spain as rash, 843; rejoices at Pitt's fall, 844; whom his party lampoon and caricature, *ib.*; alienates Frederick of Prussia by refusing to grant his subsidy, *ib.*; attempts to carry out Pitt's plans, *ib.*; in his anxiety to obtain peace he offers to give up Havannah and Manilla, 845; prime minister, 1763, 846; attempts to restore the influence of the prerogative, *ib.*; attacked by Wilkes and Churchill, *ib.*; popular dislike towards; resigns his employments, April 8, 1763, *ib.*; negotiates for Pitt's return to power, 847
Butler, col., commands the force which destroyed Wyoming, 1778, 887
Butler, Charles, anecdote of Burke, by, 974
Buxton, T. F., his resolution for abolishing slavery, 1823, 1161
Byng, admiral sir George, joins Leake off the Spanish coast, 1706, 703; cruises in the channel on the watch for the French fleet conveying the Pretender and forces to Scotland; it evades him, 1708, 715; he makes pursuit, but does not follow it up when they return to France, *ib.*; sails for the Mediterranean, June 4, 1718; anchors in the Bay of Naples; pursues and destroys the Spanish fleet, Aug. 11, 771
Byng, admiral John, despatched to the relief of Port Mahon; attacked by de la Galissonière, May 21, 1756, 830; his timidity and proposal to return to Gibraltar; superseded by Hawke, *ib.*; arrest; imprisonment in Greenwich Hospital; popular fury against, *ib.*; trial at Portsmouth, *ib.*; found guilty and sentenced to be shot; efforts made to save him by Pitt and others; execution of, March 14, 1757; his demeanor, 833
Byng, sir John. See Strafford.
Byron, lord George, reproaches England with the humiliation of Venice, 1018; his description of the Waterloo field of battle, 1105; his poetic satire, "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers" published; describes the character of the writings of Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Southey, 1136; popularity; character of his verse romances, and his "Don Juan," 1137; failure of his dramas, 1139
Byron, John, commands an expedition to America, 794

CABAL MINISTRY. See Charles II., Buckingham, and Shaftesbury.
Cabot, John, and his sons, small encouragement given to, in 1496, by Henry VII., 220; discovery of Newfoundland by, 224
Cabul taken by the British, 1249; residence of the British army at, *ib.*; its retreat from, 1250; retaken by the British, 1252
Cade, John, insurrection of, in 1450, 188; defeats sir Humphrey Stafford, *ib.*; marches to London, and beheads lord Say, 189; defeated by the citizens of London, and killed, *ib.*
Cadiz burned by the earl of Essex in 1596, 384; unsuccessful expedition to, 1702, 690
Cadoudal, Georges, a royalist against Bonaparte; apprehended, executed, 1804, 1046
Caer-Caradoc, notice of, 8
Cæsar, history of England commences with, 3; his description of the Veneti, applicable to the Britons, 3; first invasion of Britain, 5; battle with the men of Kent, *ib.*; retreat of, *ib.*; second invasion of, *ib.*; description of "the inland people" by, *ib.*; advance of, into the interior, 6; opposed by Cassivelaunus, *ib.*; crosses the Thames at Coway Stakes, *ib.*; advances to St. Alban's, *ib.*; enumeration by, of the tribes he encountered, *ib.*; return of, to Gaul, taking hostages, *ib.*; did not conquer Britain, according to Tacitus, *ib.*
Caillemot, a Huguenot commander, killed at the Boyne, 1690, 638
Cairo taken by Bonaparte, 1798, 1021.
Calais, siege of, by Edward III., 138; Froissart's story of the six burgesses, 139; an English colony founded in it, *ib.*; bombarded by the English, 1694, 659
Calcutta purchased by the old E. I. Company, 700; captured by Surajah Dowlah, 1736; tragedy of the Black Hole of, 978; retaken by Clive, January 2, 1757, 978, 979
Calder, sir Robert, engages the French and Spanish fleets, and captures the Spanish vessels, July 22, 1805; tried and reprimanded, 1049; returns home just before the Trafalgar victory, 1051
Calendar Reform Bill, 1751, its provisions, 822
Caligula, intended invasion of Britain by, 7; pretended triumph of, *ib.*; Napoleon at Boulogne and, compared, 1047
Callcott, character of his paintings, 1047
Calonne, controller-general of finance, 1783; convokes the notables, 958; shows the deficit in the finance; proposes a land tax on all classes; dismissed, 1787, *ib.*
Camalodunum attacked and destroyed by Boadicea, A.D. 61, 9
Cambacérès, consul with Bonaparte, 1799, 1032; has charge of the judicial administration, 1034
Cambridge, duke of, marries princess Louisa of Hesse June 1, 1818, 1129
Cambridge university, James Pechell, the vice-chancellor, deprived of office for refusing a degree to a Benedictine monk, 586
Cambridgeshire, land of, 914; quantity unreclaimed in 1794, 1806, 1846, *ib.*; drainage and reclamation of the fens of, by the earl of Bedford and Rennie, *ib.*
Cambronne, general, accompanies Napoleon in his march to Paris, 1815, 1102; death of, at Waterloo, 1107
Camden, battles of, August 16, 1780, 892; and April 25, 1781, 896
Camden, lord, sir Charles Pratt, lord chief justice, declares Wilkes, as M.P., free from arrest, 847; gives a verdict in favor of a printer of the "North Briton," 848; thanked by the common council for his judgment on the general warrant question, 849; opposes the taxation of Americans, 852; Lord Chancellor, 1766, 854-865; disclaims the measures adopted by the ministry, 860; dismissed his office, *ib.*; supports Pitt's ministry, 1784, 952; and Fox's libel bill, 1792, 976
Camden, earl, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, 1795, 1023; recalled, 1798, 1024; holds office in the Portland ministry, 1807, 1062; secretary for war and the colonies, 1804, 1325
Cameron, Dr. Archibald, executed 1753, 821
Cameron of Lochiel joins the young Pretender, 1745, 801; accompanies the prince in his flight to France, September 17, 1746, 818
Cameronians; they reject the dispensing of the Test Act, 633; oppose the union of the two kingdoms, 1706, 712; and burn the articles at the market cross of Dumfries, Nov. 30, *ib.*; ordered to return home by the duke of Hamilton, *ib.* See Covenanters.
Cameronian regiment, it defeats the Highlanders at Dunkeld, 1690, 645

Camisards. See Cevennes; Cavalier.
Camming, Thomas, a Quaker, sent against Fort Louis, which he takes, 1758, 837; Goree surrenders to him, *ib.*
Campan, Madame, conduct of, at the storming of Versailles, 1789, 965
Campbell, colonel. See Argyle, A. C., duke of.
Campbell of Finab, his exploits in Darien, 676
Campbell, A. See Argyle, Earl of.
Campbell, sir Archibald, defends Rangoon against the Birmese, 1170; his campaign of 1825; takes Donoopew; by repeatedly defeating the Birmese he compels them to agree to the treaty of Yandaboo, *ib.*
Campbell, sir Colin, lieutenant, 1055; his description of the battle of Assye, *ib.*
Campbell, John. See Argyle, duke of.
Campbell, John, lord, anecdotes of George III., 1003; of lord Ellenborough and Hone's trial by, 1127; his remarks on the appeal of murder in 1818, 1131; his opinion of government's conduct toward the Cato street conspirators, 1149; his feelings at the dissolution of Parliament, 1831, 1190
Campbell, sir John, attorney-general in the Melbourne ministry, 1224
Campbell, sir Neil, appointed to watch over Napoleon at Elba, 403
Campbell, captain Robert, of Glenlyon, his share in the Glencoe massacre of 1692, 648; not prosecuted, 649
Campbell, Thomas, quotation from, 1232; wide reputation of his "Pleasures of Hope" and lyrics, "Gertrude of Wyoming," published 1809, 1138
Camperdown, battle of, fought between De Winter and Duncan, Oct. 11, 1797, 1019
Campion, the Jesuit, trial and torture of, for a conspiracy against Elizabeth in 1581, 358
Campo Formio, peace of, Oct. 17, 1797, 1019, 1040
Canada ceded by France, 1763, 909; doubtful loyalty of, towards England, 1793, 991; disputes with the mother country, 1233; insurrection in, 1233; lord Durham's government, *ib.*; his report on, 1234
Canals, construction of, by Bridgewater, Brindley, and others, 923; increased sums expended on navigation and, 1014; constructed by Telford, 1144
Canning, George, one of Pitt's supporters, 1008; story of his proposed connection with the Jacobins; advocates a continuance of the war, *ib.*; defends Pitt's coercive policy, 1010; starts the "Anti-Jacobin," Nov., 1797, 1018; retires from office, 1801, 1036; Foreign Secretary, 1807, 1062; obtains a knowledge of the secret article of Tilsit, 1066; in favor of aiding the Spaniards, 1068; remarks on Moore's retreat in Spain, 1809, 1071; duel with Castlereagh, 1077; resigns, *ib.*; grief at Perceval's death, 1083; returns from Lisbon, and takes his seat in parliament, 1123; President of the Indian Board of Control, 1816, 1123, 1148; imprudent expression regarding Ogden's petition, 1129; offers duel to the author of an anonymous pamphlet, *ib.*; vindicates the government's conduct towards queen Caroline, 1151; refusing to take part in the proceedings against the queen he tenders his resignation; but the king insists on his retaining it, and following his own conduct with respect to the queen, 1152; his interest in the queen's trial, 1153; resigns his office, Dec. 12, 1820; the king refuses to readmit him into the cabinet after the queen's death, 1154; his Roman Catholic relief bill thrown out twice, 1156; appointed Governor-General of India, *ib.*; but before he has started for India he is appointed Secretary for Foreign Affairs; his instructions to the duke of Wellington, the British representative at the Congress at Verona, 1151; and to the British ambassador at Paris; his declaration of neutrality, *ib.*; his declaration of April, 1823, *ib.*; his policy of the recognition of the Spanish provinces in South America; opposition towards it, 1153; the king fails in obtaining Canning's dismissal, *ib.*; conditions upon which a state which has successfully asserted its independence should be recognized by a neutral state, *ib.*; discussions with the United States minister concerning the Spanish South American states, the Oregon territory, and the right of search, 1159; his warlike attitude and promptitude prevent the war of Spain against Portugal, *ib.*; speech intimating Spain's aggression, and the conduct of the British government, *ib.*; defends Huskisson, 1160; progress and liberty, 1161; his resolutions for ameliorating the condition of slaves agreed to, *ib.*; his position with regard to the Catholic question, 1164; dislike of lord Eldon and the duke of York towards, *ib.*; anecdote of Canning and the chancellor at the funeral of the duke of York, where the former catches a cold, *ib.*; opposite opinions of Peel and Canning on Catholic Emancipation, 1165; the king orders him to form a ministry; first Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1827, 1165, 1167; his offers to cabinet ministers rejected, 1165; his appearance and manner on meeting parliament, May 1, 1827, *ib.*; opposition shown towards him, *ib.*; attack of lord Grey, 1166; charged with having pledged himself not to press the Catholic question, *ib.*; the charge probably a calumny, *ib.*, 1168; assigned causes of the hostility shown towards: speaks for the last time in parliament, June 18, on the Corn trade; unable to obtain relaxation; the king sends his physician to attend him; death of, Aug. 8, and burial, Aug. 16, 1827, 1167; concludes the treaty on Grecian affairs, *ib.*; principle of international law laid down by, *ib.*; statesmen composing his cabinet, *ib.*; *note*, on the negotiations preceding his premiership, *ib.*; difficulties of carrying out his Indian peace policy, 1170
Canterbury burnt by the Danes, 47
Cantium (Kent) resistance offered by the people of, to the invasions of Cæsar, 4
Canterbury fanatics. See Riots.
Canton blockaded by the British, 1839, 1246; again attacked by them, 1841, 1247
Canute proclaimed king of England on the death of Sweyn in 1014, 48; becomes sole king on the death of Edmund in 1017, *ib.*; exiles the sons of Edmund, *ib.*; marries Emma, the widow of Ethelred, *ib.*; proscriptions by, and tyranny of, *ib.*; introduction of Danish customs by, *ib.*; reproval of his flatterers by, *ib.*; benefits effected by, *ib.*; pilgrimage to Rome, in 1030, *ib.*; death of, in 1035, 49; buried at Winchester, *ib.*; union of the Saxon and Danish races accelerated by, *ib.*
Canute, king of Denmark, invades England in 1069, and is forced to retire by William the Conqueror, 59
Capital punishment, abolition of, for thefts, 1118, 1130, 1161; in the years before and after the Queen's accession, 1210
Caractacus, opposition offered by, to the invasion of Plautius, 7; continued resistance of, to the Romans, 8; defeat of, *ib.*; speech of, at Rome while a prisoner there, probably an historical embellishment, with a foundation on facts, *ib.*; allusion of, to the houses of the Britons, 5
Caradoc. See Caractacus.
Carausius, usurpation of, A.D. 286, 11; naval power of Britain during the reign of, *ib.*; murdered by Allectus, *ib.*; probably calculated on assistance of Germans in Britain when he revolted, 14
Carisbrook Castle, Charles I. imprisoned in, 482; he attempts to escape from, 484
Carleon, description of, by Giraldus Cambrensis, 14.
Carleton, captain George, quotations from, illustrative of Peterborough's Spanish campaign, 1705, 1706, 701
Carleton, a British general; makes his way into Quebec, defending it against Montgomery and Arnold, 1775, 877; defeats the Americans; retires from Quebec, 1776, 878
Carlisle invested by the Pretender's army, 1745; and capture, Nov., 807; taken by the duke of Cumberland, Dec. 30, 813
Carlisle, earl of, removed from the lord-lieutenancy of Ireland, 1782, 904; his excessive gaming, 941; first Commissioner of Woods and Forests, 1167; Lord Privy Seal, 1834, 1212
Carlos, Don, duke of Parma. See Charles III. of Naples.
Carlsbad, congress of, Aug. 1, 1819, 1225
Carlton House remodelled by Holland; pulled down, 1826, 1143
Carlyle, his remarks on the negro question, 1206; on the position of the agricultural laborer in 1840, 1230; on the advisability of the laboring classes emigrating, 1237; his petition for the Copyright Bill, 1253; character of his historical works on Cromwell and the French Revolution, 1256
Carmarthen, marquis of. See Leeds, duke of.
Carnac, druidical remains at, 4
Carnot compels the duke of York to raise the siege of Dunkirk, 1793, 996; captures Charlerol; and wins the battle of Fleurus, 1006; a member of the French Directory; Bonaparte submits a plan for invading Italy to, 1010; escapes being arrested by, 1017
Carnutes, Cæsar's notice of, 6
Carnwath, Robert, earl of, impeached of high treason, tried and found guilty, 766; but is reprieved, 766; released from prison by an act of grace, 770
Caroline, queen, wife of George II.; influences her husband in retaining Walpole prime minister in opposition to electing sir S. Compton, 779; receives a jointure of 100,000*l.*, *ib.*; her assistance to, and influence over her husband, 780; appointed regent, 1735, during the king's absence in Hanover, 786; regards the Porteous riots of 1736 as an insult to her authority, 788; taken ill, Nov. 9, 1737; dies Nov. 20, *ib.*; character of, *ib.*
Caroline, Matilda, sister of George III., born 1751, married in 1766 to Christian VII. of Denmark; unhappy marriage; charged with infidelity, and imprisoned in Kronberg castle; rescued by the British government, 868; retires to the castle of Zell, Hanover, dying in 1775, *ib.*
Caroline. See George IV.
Carteaux, general, suppresses a revolt at Marseilles, 998; marches against Toulon, 1792, *ib.*, 999; replaced in his command by general Dugommier, *ib.*
Carter, rear-admiral of the blue; slain at La Hogue, 1692, 651
Carteret, lord, secretary of state; removed from that office, 1724; appointed lord-lieutenant of Ireland, 777; offers 300*l.* for the discovery of the author of the Drapier's letters, *ib.*; his motion for Walpole's removal rejected, 795; becomes a favorite of Geo. II., 796; secretary of state, 1742–1744, 798; controls the cabinet, an object of attack to the opposition, *ib*; created earl Granville, *ib.*; obtains the king's confidence, 1747; fails in an attempt to obtain the administration of affairs, 819; president of the council, 1761, 843
Carthagena, attack upon, 1741, 793
Cartismandua, queen of the Brigantes, betrays Caractacus to the Romans, 8
Cartwright, Dr., invents the power loom; his anxiety on account of it; parliamentary grant to; number of looms employed in 1813, '33 and '56, 926
Cassano, battle of, 27 April, 1798, 1030
Cassivelaunus, or Caswollon, opposes the advance of Cæsar, 5
Castanos, general, compels the French to surrender at the battle of Baylen, 1808, 1069
Castle, John, betrays his fellow Spencean philanthropists, 1122
Castlereagh, lord, temporary Irish secretary, 1025; applies the secret service money to the making converts to the government measure of the Union, 1027; description of; moves the third reading of the Union bill, 1028; war and colonial secretary, 1807, 1062; challenges Canning to a duel, which takes place on Wimbledon Common, Sept. 22, 1809, 1077; cause of the quarrel, *ib.*; resigns, *ib.*; foreign secretary, 1812, 1082; 1148; one of the plenipotentiaries at the Congress at Vienna, 1814, 1109; his diplomacy with regard to the annexation of Saxony to Prussia, *ib.*; reception by the House of Commons, 1113; offensive declaration made by, *ib.*; with Wellington he represents Great Britain at Aix-la-Chapelle, 1818, 1130; takes part in the conferences for averting a public proceeding in the case of queen Caroline, 1152; commits suicide, Aug. 12, 1822, 1156; his foreign ministry, *ib.*
Catalonia invested by the French, 1693, 657
Cathcart, lord, death of, on his way to Carthagena, 1740, 793
Cathcart, lord, commander of the land forces sent against Denmark, 1807, 1065; present at the battle of Dresden, 1813, 1090
Cathelineau, Jaques, heads the Vendean insurgents, 1793, 1000; killed, 1000
Catherine of Aragon. See Henry VIII. and Wolsey.
Catherine II. of Russia, her influence procures the Polish throne for Stanislaus, 866; refuses to aid the British against America, 876; begins to reign, 1762, 1325; agrees to raise an army for Spain, 977; death of, Nov. 10, 1796, 981
Catholic relief bills passed, Feb. 1782, 903; and April, 1829, 1178
Catholics, Roman, their ineligibility for civil offices, 624; oppression of Protestants in Ireland by, 1689, 627; struggle of the, in Scotland, 629; Catholic sovereigns represented at the Hague, 1691, 642; treaty of Limerick allowing them certain religious privileges, 644; penal laws against, 1699, 681; proceedings against Popish priests, 1745, 811; certain laws against, repealed, 1778, 890; fanaticism against, roused; Protestant Associations against, formed, 890; the Gordon riots against, 891; the relief bill passed, 1782, 903; allowed to vote at elections, 1793; bill introduced for repealing all the civil disabilities of, 1024; government's desire to emancipate them, 1026; George III.'s opposition to the repeal of the disqualification laws, 1035; he requires Pitt never to support Catholic emancipation, 1046, 1062; opposes the enlistment of, *ib.*; Grattan's speech on the emancipation of, 1131; partial success of the Catholic relief measure, 1821-2, 1156; state of the Catholic question; rejection of the relief bill, 1164; sensation caused by the duke of York's speech on the bill, *ib.*; on lord Liverpool's illness the advocates for and against Roman Catholic relief marshal themselves under the leaderships of Canning and Peel; the debate in parliament, 1165; charges against Canning respecting the Catholic question, 1166; first majority obtained (1826) in favor of their claims, 1176; this resolution is not taken into consideration, *ib.*; Roman Catholic Association founded 1823; dissolved during the Canning ministry; revived, 1828; it secures the election of O'Connell for Clare, *ib.*; ministerial views on Catholic Emancipation, *ib.*; George IV.'s unwillingness to consent to his ministers attempting to settle the question, *ib.*; Emancipation announced by government, 1177; violent debates on the bill, *ib.*; it receives the royal assent, April 13, 1829, 1178; O'Connell obtains admission into parliament under the terms of the new act, *ib.*
Cato Street Conspiracy; antecedents of the ringleader, Arthur Thistlewood, 1150; who forms a plan of assassinating the members of the Cabinet, *ib.*; plot divulged and frustrated; trial and execution of Thistlewood and five accomplices, *ib.*
Cavalier, leader of the Camisards, repels marshal de Montreuil, and concludes an amnesty with marshal Villars, 1703, 691; died aged, a governor of Jersey, and major-general, 691
Cave, starts the Gentleman's Magazine, 1731, 935; deterred from publishing parliamentary proceedings by being prosecuted for publishing lord Lovat's trial, 965
Cavendish, lord John, censures the ministers for their conduct of the American war, 899; resigns office, 1782, 905; censures the terms of peace, 908; chancellor of the exchequer, March to July, 1782, 1325; April to Dec., 1783, *ib.*
Cavendish, sir Henry, M. P. for Lostwithiel; his reports of the debates of parliament, 1768–77, 855; his remarks on parliamentary privileges, 857; quotations from his debates, 856–7, 862–3–4
Caxton, William, commences printing in England, about 1474, 187; prints earl Rivers' "Dictes and Sayings of Philosophers," which is presented to Edward IV., 200; notice of other works printed by, *ib.*
Cecil, William, lord Burleigh, is arrested with Somerset, to whom he was secretary, 310; caution of, during Northumberland's rebellion, 317; intrigues in favor of queen Mary, 318; appointed to the Privy Council on the accession of Elizabeth, 335; occupations of, during the reign of Mary, 336; prepared scheme for the restoration of Protestantism, *ib.*; principle of, with regard to the right of national intervention, 338; skill displayed by, in the treaty of Edinburgh in 1560, 340; reasons of, for refusing Mary a safe conduct from France to Scotland, 342; intrigues carried on by, at the Scottish court, 345; opinions of, as to the measures to be taken with Mary of Scotland on her taking refuge in England, 351; protest of, against the duke of Norfolk being tried for high treason, 353; opinion of, as to the inefficacy of penal laws against religious beliefs, 359; advises the Council to dispatch the warrant for Mary's execution, 364; complaint of, in 1569, of the decay of obedience in the people, 382; opposes the attack on Spain in 1596, but is overruled, 384; death of, in August, 1598, 388
Cecil, Robert, earl of Salisbury, the rival of Essex and Raleigh, 389, announces to the House of Commons in 1601, the queen's intention to abate monopolies, 392; causes James I. to be proclaimed on Elizabeth's death, 396; entertains James at Theobald's, and becomes prime minister, *ib.*; remonstrates against Coke's unfairness on Raleigh's trial,

397; compelled by James to negotiate a treaty with Spain, 400; receives a communication from lord Mounteagle, with a letter that leads to the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, 401; lesson of, to James, as to his lavishness to Carr, 406; endeavors to procure from parliament a fixed revenue for the king, 409; death of, in May, 1612, 411
Cemeteries, want of, in England, 1842, 1228
Cerat heads the assassins of Sept. 1792, 980
Cevennes, the revolt of 1702-4, in the, 691
Ceylon acquired by the British, 1170
Chadwick, Edwin, reports of, on the state of the workhouse at St. Lawrence, Reading, 1210; on the sanitary condition of the laboring classes, 1227; and on interment in town, 1228
Chairs, extensive manufactory of, in Buckinghamshire, 912
Chalier, a Piedmontese; a Girondin leader; establishes the Girondin party at Lyons; his atrocities; defeated by the sections, and killed, 1793, 997
Chalmers, Dr. Thomas, his oratorical powers; popularity of his "Astronomical Discourses," published in 1816, 1139; character of his political economy writings, 1141
Chambers, Richard, resistance of, to the payment of illegal customs' duties, 426; refuses to pay Ship-Money, and is imprisoned, 430
Chambers, sir W., one of the founders of the Royal Academy, 931; his architectural designs, 934; death of, 1796, 1143
Champion, colonel, invades the Rohilla country, 1774, 948
Championnet, a French general, enters Palermo; abolishes royalty; establishes a republic, 1799, 1030
Chandernagore surrendered to the English, 1757, 834; again captured by the English, 1778, 949
Chandos, marquis of, opposes the Reform bill, 1189; his amendment of the bill, 1191
Channing, Dr., remarks of, on the abolition of slavery, 1207
Chantrey, style of his sculpture, 1145
Chapelier, guillotined, 1794, 1001
Charette commands the Vendeans, 1793, 1000; resumes arms on the occasion of the Quiberon expedition, 1795, 1009
Charlemagne, character of, ; career of, ; benefits derived by Egbert from, 24
Charlemont, lord, panic of his troops at Barcelona, 702
Charlemont, earl of, commander-in-chief of the Irish volunteers, 1782, 903
Charleroi, siege and capture of, by the French, June 25, 1794, 1006
Charleroy captured by the French, 1693, 57
Charles I., visit of, when Prince of Wales to the court of Spain in 1623, to see his proposed bride, 419; succeeds his father, March 27, 1625, 420; change in the manners of the Court on his accession, *ib.*; marriage of, with Henrietta Maria of France, *ib.*; favor shown to the Roman Catholics by the king, *ib.*; the first parliament meets and demands redress of grievances, *ib.*; it is dissolved, *ib.*; writs issued under the privy seal, demanding loans from private persons, *ib.*; failure of the naval expedition against Spain, *ib.*; meeting of the second parliament, Feb. 6, 1626, *ib.*; it impeaches Buckingham, *ib.*; Charles commits sir John Eliot to the Tower for his speech in the House, but releases him soon afterward, *ib.*; dissolves the parliament, 421; disputes of, with the Lords as to infringements on their privileges, *ib.*; subsidies illegally levied, and harsh measures pursued against such as resist, *ib.*; dismisses the queen's foreign attendants, 422; war with France and its causes, *ib.*; failure of the expedition to aid the Protestants in Rochelle, *ib.*; meeting of the third Parliament on March 17, 1628, *ib.*; debates in, on the Petition of Right, 423; gives his assent to the Act, *ib.*; prorogues parliament on its remonstrating against his arbitrarily levying customs' duties, *ib.*; prepares a second expedition under Buckingham to relieve Rochelle, 424; Buckingham is assassinated, *ib.*; the expedition sails, fails in affording relief, and Rochelle surrenders, *ib.*; parliament meets, and makes fresh remonstrances against the king's arbitrary conduct, *ib.*; progress of religious differences in the church, *ib.*; a remonstrance carried in the Commons against popish innovations and arbitrary taxation, 425; dissolves the parliament, and imprisons some of the members, *ib.*; a force raised in Scotland to assist Gustavus Adolphus, *ib.*; jurisdiction of the Star Chamber extended, 426; continued exactions of, during the cessation of parliaments, *ib.*; spirited resistance of individuals to them, *ib.*; the imprisoned members refuse to plead in the King's Bench, and are recommitted, 427; Wentworth appointed Lord President of the North and Lord Deputy of Ireland, *ib.*; prosecutions and severe punishments of the Puritan writers Prynne and Leighton, 428; republication of the Book of Sports, *ib.*; raises money by the sale of new monopolies, 429; issues a proclamation against the increase of houses in London, and raises money, in 1633, by extorting fines to avoid their being pulled down, *ib.*; other arbitrary proclamations, and hackney-coaches forbidden, in 1635, to pass up and down London streets, *ib.*; first project of Ship Money, *ib.*; the writs of Ship Money extended in 1636, 430; the judges give their opinion in favor of the writ, *ib.*; Hampden and many others refuse to pay, *ib.*; judgment given against him in 1637, *ib.*; increased resistance to the payment after the judgment, 431; prosecutions of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick for their writings, *ib.*; patronage given by Charles to the Fine Arts, *ib.*; despotic interference of, with private property in London, but not productive of any public improvement, *ib.*; visit of Mary de Medicis to, in 1638, 432; employs Inigo Jones to build Whitehall, *ib.*; note on the portraits of, by Vandyck and Mytens, *ib.*; visit of, to Scotland in 1633, *ib.*; with Laud endeavors to impose episcopacy on Scotland, *ib.*; outbreak in 1637 against it, and adoption of the National Covenant, 433; meeting of the General Assembly, *ib.*; the Covenanters take up arms, and seize Edinburgh and other places, *ib.*; he advances to Berwick with an army, and on June 18, 1639, a pacification is agreed to, 434; calls a parliament, which insists on the discontinuance of abitrary taxation, and the punishment of the judges, *ib.*; it is dissolved after sitting three weeks, *ib.*; the Convocation grants money, and passes canons that render the church still more unpopular, *ib.*; the Covenanters assemble fresh forces in 1640, and cross the Tweed, *ib.*; he assembles an army at Yore, advances to meet them, and is completely routed at Newburn near Newcastle, 435; calls a Great Council of Peers at York, *ib.*; agrees to a truce with the Scots, *ib.*; summons a new parliament (afterward named the Long Parliament), which meets in November, 1640, *ib.*; character of the House of Commons, *ib.*; difficulty of relating its history, 436; opens the sitting in a tone of conciliation, 437; Strafford is impeached by the Commons, *ib.*; Laud arrested and impeached by the Commons, 438; Finch, Windebank, and the Ship-Money judges impeached, *ib.*; trial of Strafford, *ib.*; Charles consents to his execution, 441; assents to the Act for preventing the dissolution of the Parliament without its own consent, 442; the two Houses remonstrate against the queen quitting England, and she agrees to remain, *ib.*; the Star Chamber and High Commission courts abolished by Act of Parliament, *ib.*; visits Scotland, and endeavors to conciliate the nation, 443; breaking out of the Irish insurrection of 1641, *ib.*; the rebels pretend to have the king's commission, 444; he returns to London, *ib.*; remonstrance of the Commons, *ib.*; magnificent entertainment given to, by the corporation of the city, *ib.*; formation of parties for the approaching struggle, 445; Hyde becomes the king's adviser, and Lord Falkland is made secretary of state, *ib.*; receives the remonstrance from the Commons, and publishes an answer to it, drawn up by Hyde, *ib.*; takes up his residence at Whitehall for the Christmas of 1641, *ib.*; popular tumults and cry against the bishops, 446; twelve bishops protest against the force used towards them, and are committed to the Tower for treason, *ib.*; the question of the militia raised in Jan., 1642, *ib.*; his rights invaded by the claims of the Commons, 447; refuses a guard to the Commons, and on Jan. 3 attempts to seize the Five Members, *ib.*; despondency at Whitehall, and tumults in the city, occasioned by the attempt and its failure, 448; leaves Whitehall and goes to Hampton Court, *ib.*; refuses his assent to the militia bill, but assents to that for excluding the bishops from the House of Lords, *ib.*; the queen leaves England, *ib.*; he is refused entrance into Hull, 449; some peers and commoners join him at York, *ib.*; he receives propositions from the parliament, *ib.*; sets up his standard at Nottingham, 453; attempts to negotiate with the parliament, 454; but it refuses, unless the king's proclamations, declaring them traitors, are withdrawn, 455; marches on Shrewsbury, and publishes a "Protestation," *ib.*; the first encounter in the civil war takes place at Worcester, *ib.*; want of money of, *ib.*; battle of Edgehill, Oct. 23, 1642, 456; marches upon London, 457; Parliamentarians defeated by the royal army at Brentford, Nov. 12, 1642, *ib.*; the royalists retire, *ib.*; the Londoners march to Turnham Green, and the royal army retires into winter quarters at Oxford, 458; the war spreads through England, *ib.*; the queen lands with an army, *ib.*; sufferings of the Royalists at Oxford, *ib.*; Reading surrenders to Essex, 459; proceedings of the war in other quarters, *ib.*; Edmund Waller's plot, *ib.*; defeat of the Parliamentarians at Chalgrove Field, and death of Hampden, *ib.*; the queen joins her husband, 460; various incidents of the war, *ib.*; Rupert takes Bristol, July 27, 1643, *ib.*; Gloucester besieged by Charles, August 10, 461; relieved by Essex, Sept. 5, *ib.*; battle of Newbury, *ib.*; anecdote of the king trying his fortune with Lord Falkland, by the *Sortes Virgilianæ*, 462; the Scots invade England, 464; he withdraws his troops from Ireland, who are afterward defeated at Nantwich, *ib.*; convokes a parliament at Oxford, Jan. 22, 1644, *ib.*; is besieged by Essex and Waller in Oxford, and quits the city on June 3, *ib.*; defeats Waller at Cropredy Bridge, 465; marches to the relief of York, *ib.*; but is defeated at Marston Moor, July 2, *ib.*; the queen leaves England, *ib.*; he is defeated at the second battle of Newbury, 466; negotiates with the Parliament, *ib.*; treaty of Uxbridge, *ib.*; victories of Montrose, 467; battle of Naseby, June 14, 1645, 468; the king's cabinet captured and opened, *ib.*; surrender of Bristol, 469; Basing House taken, *ib.*; Montrose defeats an army under Baillie, 470; Charles attempts to join him, but is defeated by Poyntz at Rowton Heath, and retires to Wales, *ib.*; Montrose defeated at Philiphaugh, *ib.*; defeat of Digby at Sherborne, his cabinet taken, and its contents published, 471; the king sets out for Oxford, *ib.*; desires his son to leave England, *ib.*; overtures for pacification, *ib.*; letter of, to the queen, *ib.*; Lord Hopton accepts the command of the western army, 472; but the army is soon after dissolved, and the war terminates in that quarter, *ib.*; Prince of Wales leaves for Scilly, *ib.*; the king's proposal to Parliament being rejected, he negotiates through Montreuil, with the Scots to take up his cause, *ib.*; Fairfax gradually draws his troops round Oxford, *ib.*; injunctions of the king to his wife, *ib.*; account of his flight given by Hudson and Ashburnham, 473; adventures on the way to the Scottish army, *ib.*; the Scots endeavor to induce him to consent to the abolition of Episcopacy, 474; is surrendered by the Scots to the English Commissioners, *ib.*; capitulation of Oxford, *ib.*; end of the first civil war, *ib.*; confinement of, at Holmby House, 475; is removed from Holmby by Joyce, 477; treatment of, by the army, *ib.*; proposals of the Independents to, 478; he rejects them, *ib.*; popular movement in London in favor of the king, 479; he is lodged at Hampton Court, *ib.*; the Independents still endeavor to come to terms with, but he continues to treat with both parties, 480; a letter of, intercepted by Cromwell and Ireton, *ib.*; escape of, from Hampton Court, *ib.*; narrative of the escape, 484; goes to the Isle of Wight, *ib.*; Berkeley's mission to the army, *ib.*; Scotch and English negotiations with, 482; is imprisoned in Carisbrook Castle, *ib.*; parliament declares against any further treaty, *ib.*; royalist reaction, 486; and riots, *ib.*; his attempt to escape from Carisbrook Castle, 484; Lord Goring rises in favor of, *ib.*; Scotch army enters England under the duke of Hamilton, in aid of, *ib.*; Cromwell marches from Wales, *ib.*; and defeats them at the battle of Preston, 485; Cromwell's victory disarranges the king's schemes, *ib.*; treaty of Newport, *ib.*; skill displayed by, in discussion, and appearance of, at Newport, 486; concessions made by, at Newport, *ib.*; letter of, to his son, *ib.*; is carried to Hurst Castle, 487; is removed to Windsor by Harrison, 488; treatment of, *ib.*; ordinance for his trial, *ib.*; High Court of Justice appointed, *ib.*; the king before the High Court, 489; trial of, Bradshaw presides, *ib.*; is sentenced to be executed, *ib.*; sentence of condemnation, *ib.*; behavior of, after condemnation, 490; his execution, Jan. 30, 1649, *ib.*; remarks on, and his execution, *ib.*; buried at Windsor Castle in St. George's Chapel, 491
Charles II. leaves England for Scilly in 1646, 472; goes first to Jersey, then to France, and afterward to Holland, *ib.*; is an exile at St. Germain's, 493; is proclaimed King of Scotland at Edinburgh, on Feb. 5, 1649, *ib.*; commissioners from Scotland to Charles at the Hague, requesting him to return to his kingdom, *ib.*; he refuses their proposals, and dismisses them, *ib.*; urged by the marquis of Ormond to show himself in Ireland, but only goes as far as Jersey, in consequence of hearing of the fall of Drogheda, 494; double-dealing of, in negotiations with the Scottish Parliament, 496; gives Montrose a commission to wage war in Scotland, *ib.*; who is defeated at Craigchonichen, by colonel Strachan, *ib.*; consents to proposals of Scottish Commissioners, and goes to Scotland, 497; political morality of, *ib.*; supposed influence of the preachers upon the character of, *ib.*; made to sign a declaration against Popery and Heresy in the Scottish camp, 498; battle of Dunbar, *ib.*; crowned at Scone, *ib.*; marches into England at the head of a Scotch army, 499; issues proclamations, *ib.*; battle of Worcester, in which he is totally defeated by Cromwell, *ib.*; escape and adventures of, 500; and return to France, 501; settles at Cologne, and prepares for a landing in England, 515; Wilmot organizes a general insurrection throughout England in favor of, *ib.*; which fails through Cromwell's politic measures, 516; dissoluteness of, at Cologne, 520; Sindercomb's plot in favor of, discovered, 522; meets his brother James at Calais, intending to proceed to England, 529; endeavors to persuade Monk to join his cause, *ib.*; court of, at Breda, 532; the Presbyterians send a deputation to him to offer the crown on conditions, *ib.*; Monk gives in his adhesion to his cause, *ib.*; letter of Charles to the new parliament in April, 1660, and Declaration from Breda, *ib.*, 533; meeting of the Convention Parliament on April 25, 1660, *ib.*; debates in the House on the Bill of Indemnity, *ib.*; the regicides and others excepted from it, *ib.*; he embarks for England, *ib.*; and lands at Dover, 533; enters London amidst the general joy of the people, *ib.*; the Convention Parliament declares the Long Parliament to be dissolved, and abolish knight-service and purveyance, 534; a large revenue settled on the Crown, *ib.*; money granted to enable him to disband the army, *ib.*; difficulties as to the Church and Crown lands, 535; Act of Indemnity and Oblivion passed, *ib.*; number of exceptions to it, 536; the regicides tried and executed, *ib.*; insulting disinterment of Cromwell, Ireton, Bradshaw, and Blake, *ib.*; the king's declaration respecting Episcopacy, *ib.*; a bill, founded on the declaration of Breda, brought into the House, and rejected, 537; the Convention Parliament dissolved, Dec. 29, 1660, *ib.*; the Navigation Act, and a Post-office Act, re-enacted by the House before its dissolution, *ib.*; insurrection of the Fifth-Monarchy men in April, 1661, suppressed, *ib.*; proclamation of, against Quakers, Anabaptists, and other sectaries, *ib.*; the coronation, *ib.*; a new parliament meets on May 8, and ultra-royalism of its character, *ib.*; provisions of, for strengthening the prerogatives of the Crown, 538; passing of the Corporation Act, *ib.*; and of the Act of Uniformity, 539; attempts to force Episcopacy upon Scotland, *ib.*; the urgency of parliament for more punishments of the Revolutionists resisted by Charles and Clarendon, *ib.*; Vane and Lambert tried and condemned for high treason, 540; letter of the king, approving of Vane being "put out of the way," on account of his defence, *ib.*; marriage of, to Catherine of Braganza, *ib.*; presents his mistress, Lady Castlemain, to the queen, *ib.*; sells Dunkirk to the French, 541; profligacy of the king and Court, *ib.*; a dispensing power to relax the penal laws in ecclesiastical matters denied him by the parliament, 542; the Triennial Act repealed, *ib.*; war with Holland commenced in 1665, *ib.*; first appearance of the great Plague in 1665, *ib.*; the Five-Mile Act passed against the non-conformists, 544; the Settlement Act of 1662 passed, *ib.*; naval fight of four days with the Dutch, 545; the Licensing Act and restrictions on the Press, *ib.*; the Great Fire of London, 545 *et seq.*; the king and duke of York

set examples of activity, 546; change in the temper of parliament towards, 548; commissioners appointed to examine the public accounts, *ib.*; his disgraceful state of indebtedness, *ib.*; insurrection of the Covenanters in Scotland, suppressed by Dalziel, 549; state of the navy in 1666, *ib.*; insurrection of the sailors for want of pay, 550; the Dutch attack and burn English ships in the Medway, in 1667, *ib.*; peace concluded with Holland, *ib.*; Clarendon deprived of office, *ib.*; formation of the Cabal ministry, 552; character of the ministry, *ib.*; principles of, and conduct of the king, *ib.*; his desire to imitate Louis XIV., *ib.*; general corruption of political parties, *ib.*; constitutional restraints against his becoming despotic, 553; movements of the Cabal in favor of toleration towards non-conformists, *ib.*; the House of Commons negative proposals for a union of Protestants, *ib.*; conclusion of the Triple Alliance, between England, Holland, and Sweden, in 1668, *ib.*; the duchess of Orleans visits England, 554; secret treaty concluded with Louis XIV., on May 22, 1670, for the conquest of Holland, and the receipt of a pension, *ib.*; the Commons vote a grant for a war against France, *ib.*; the Conventicle Act renewed, *ib.*; renewed persecution of non-conformists, *ib.*; the king's French concubine, 555; growing discontent of the House of Commons at the king's foreign policy, *ib.*; mutilation of Sir John Coventry, and passing of the Coventry Act, *ib.*; attempt of Blood to steal the regalia, *ib.*; he is pardoned and pensioned by the king, 556; the shutting up of the Exchequer, *ib.*; public alliance with France, and war with Holland, *ib.*; Declaration of Indulgence in religion issued by, 557; unpopularity of the measure, *ib.*; the parliament declares that penal statutes cannot be suspended but by Act of parliament, *ib.*; the Declaration is withdrawn, and the Test Act passed, *ib.*; the Commons address the king against the marriage of the duke of York with Maria Beatrix of Modena, and they vote standing armies, the alliance with France, and the ministry, to be grievances, 558; they are prorogued, the Cabal ministry is broken up, and that of the earl of Danby formed, *ib.*; composition of the House of Commons in 1673, *ib.*; peace made with Holland, *ib.*; enormous sums lavished by the king on the duchess of Portsmouth, 559; receipt of a pension from France by, *ib.*; the licenses of coffee-houses withdrawn, in order to suppress seditious discourse, in 1675, *ib.*; they are re-opened, *ib.*; parliament meets, and Buckingham, Shaftesbury, and two other peers, are sent to the Tower for maintaining that the long prorogation amounted to a dissolution, 560; the king obtains a large grant from the Commons by means of bribery, *ib.*; the Prince of Orange arrives in England, in 1677, and marries the princess Mary, *ib.*; contentions between the parliament and the king, *ib.*; the statute inflicting the punishment of death for heresy repealed in 1678, 561; personal popularity of the king, *ib.*; announcement of Titus Oates's Popish Plot, *ib.*; excitement produced, and progress of the development, *ib.*; murder of sir Edmondbury Godfrey, 562; the Commons pass an Act to exclude Catholics from both Houses, *ib.*; the king's notion of the Plot, and his support of the queen against Oates's accusation, 563; sweeping committal of prisoners, and chief justice Scroggs's intemperate behavior on their trial, *ib.*; convictions obtained on doubtful or insufficient evidence, *ib.*; the ultimate effects of the plot, *ib.*; disclosures to the public of the secret treaty between Charles and Louis XIV., *ib.*; the king's letters read in the House of Commons, *ib.*; indignation of the House, and Danby is impeached, 564; the parliament is dissolved, in 1679, and great excitement produced by the election of a new one, *ib.*; the king affirms the illegitimacy of the duke of Monmouth, to satisfy his brother, before he consents to leave England, *ib.*; a Cabinet government, on a scheme of sir W. Temple's, appointed to succeed Danby, *ib.*; the Exclusion bill read twice in the House of Commons, the Habeas Corpus Act passed, and the House prorogued, 565; and dissolved, *ib.*; fresh prosecutions and convictions on account of the Popish Plot, *ib.*; persecutions of the Covenanters in Scotland, 566; murder of archbishop Sharpe, 567; insurrection in Scotland, *ib.*; Monmouth sent to quell it, *ib.*; battle of Bothwell Bridge, *ib.*; origin of the terms *Whig* and *Tory*, *ib.*; he is attended by James and the duke of Monmouth, rivals for the succession, on his illness in 1679, 568; sends Monmouth to Flanders, and James to Scotland, *ib.*; alterations of, at Windsor Castle, *ib.*; is urged by the duchess of Portsmouth and others to name the duke of Monmouth his successor, 569; the Bill of Exclusion again brought into the House, *ib.*; it is passed, and carried to the House of Lords by lord William Russell, where it is rejected, 570; the earl of Stafford convicted and executed for participation in the Popish Plot, *ib.*; levity of the king's behavior, *ib.*; the parliament impeaches chief justice Scroggs, *ib.*; the parliament dissolved, and another summoned to meet at Oxford, *ib.*; he concludes a new treaty with France, and receives a fresh subsidy, 571; the Oxford parliament again introduce the Bill of Exclusion, *ib.*; the House of Lords refuse to receive the impeachment of Fitzharris, *ib.*; the House of Commons is suddenly dissolved, after sitting seven days, on March 28, 1681, *ib.*; the king's Declaration, and the Whig Vindication, *ib.*; trial of Plunket, the Roman Catholic archbishop of Armagh, for a Popish Plot, and of Stephen College for an attempt to seize the king's person, *ib.*; both are convicted and hanged, *ib.*; Dryden produces his "Absalom and Achitophel," after Shaftesbury's arrest for high treason, 572; Shaftesbury is indicted, and the grand jury throw out the bill, *ib.*; manœuvres of the Court to obtain the nomination of a sheriff of London, *ib.*; the army establishment, 573; a *quo warranto* against the Corporation of London, which submits to conditions, *ib.*; other corporations surrender their charters, 574; trial and acquittal of Count Königsmark for the murder of Thomas Thynne, *ib.*; satisfaction of the king at the acquittal, *ib.*; the Rye-House Plot, *ib.*; trials and executions of lord William Russell and Algernon Sidney, 575; persecution of the Covenanters in Scotland, 576; the University of Oxford publish a decree against seditious books, and its members preach passive obedience, *ib.*; Evelyn's account of the king's amusements on Sunday, Feb. 1, 1685, *ib.*; he is struck with apoplexy on Feb. 2, *ib.*; receives the rites of the Roman Catholic Church, and dies on Feb. 6, *ib.*; Chelsea Hospital, as founded by, *ib.*

Charles V., the emperor, succeeds his grandfather Ferdinand in 1516, 231; is chosen emperor in 1519, 233; meets Henry VIII. at Gravelines, and propitiates Wolsey, 234; leagues with Henry VIII. against Francis I. in 1521, 235; wins the battle of Pavia in 1525, and takes Francis prisoner, 238; releases Francis on very hard terms, 239; war of, against Pope Clement VII., *ib.*; attack and sack of Rome by the troops of, under the Constable de Bourbon, 240; character of the armies at Rome, *ib.*; is crowned emperor in 1530, 248; opposes the annulling of Henry VIII.'s marriage with Catharine, *ib.*; objects to the removal of the divorce suit from Rome, 250; caution of, in negotiating the marriage of Philip with Mary, 320; abdicates the crown in Oct., 1555, 331; dies, 334

Charles Albert of Sardinia succeeds to the throne after Charles Felix, 1831, 1187

Charles of Lorraine commands the Austrians; checks the French in Bohemia, 1742, 796; expels the French from Germany, 797; commands the Austrians at Leuthen, 1757, 836

Charles II., of Spain and Naples, represented at the Hague, 1691, 642; his early life and feebleness; the question of his succession, 677; tormented by intriguing agents, 683; alters his will in favor of France, and dies Nov. 1, 1700, 682, 732

Charles III., of Spain and Naples; as Don Carlos, duke of Parma, he invades Lombardy, Naples, and Sicily; crowned king of Naples and Sicily, 784; reigned in Spain, 1759–88, 1310; and in Naples, 1734–59, *ib.*

Charles IV., of Spain, began to reign, 1788, 1057; concludes the treaty of Fontainebleau with Napoleon, 1067; abdicates the crown, 1808, 1068

Charles, archduke, of Austria; emperor VI. of Germany; his claim to the Spanish throne supported by England; his visit to Anne's court, 1703, 692; lands at Lisbon, 700; proclaimed as Charles III., of Spain, at Denia; he presses for the siege of Barcelona, 701; his partial success in Catalonia, 702; his incompetency; besieged in Barcelona, 1706, *ib.*; his inactivity in marching on Madrid, 703; Peterborough's disgust of, *ib.*; his Spanish claims acknowledged by the Estates of Brabant, 706; sustains reverses, 1707, 713; obtains a few successes; enters Madrid, Sept., 1710, 725; discord among his allies; defeat at Villa Viciosa; cause hopeless, *ib.*; elected emperor, Oct. 8, 1711, 728, 1309; died Oct. 20, 1740, 794

Charles VII., emperor of Germany; as elector of Bavaria he disputes Maria Theresa's succession to the German throne, 795; enters Bohemia; takes Prague; crowned king of Bohemia and emperor of Germany; his capital city, Munich, taken by his opponents, 796; died at Munich, 1745, 798

Charles X., of France; count D'Artois, brother of Louis XVI.; leaves France, 1789, 964; ready to return in arms, 971; urges the emperor of Germany and king of Prussia to rescue Louis, 974; prepares an expedition, but abandons it, and returns to England, 1795, 1009; signs a convention with the allies for the cessation of hostilities, 1814, 1092; ascends the throne, 1824, 1180; government, consecration, and inconsistency of, *ib.*; his differences with the Chamber of Deputies, 1181; promulgates the royal ordinances, 1830, *ib.*; the people are roused, 1182; his wavering conduct, 1183; loses his crown, July, 1830, *ib.*; his movements, *ib.*; abdicates in favor of his grandson; compelled to leave France; takes refuge in England, *ib.*

Charles XII., of Sweden; his energy in warring against Denmark, whose navy, with Admiral Rooke's assistance, he succeeds in driving back into Copenhagen, 681; concludes a peace with England, *ib.*; his career from 1700 to 1707, 713; visited by the duke of Marlborough, *ib.*; account of the interview, *ib.*; invades Russia; defeats the native army near the Beresina; and at Smolensko; receives a signal defeat from the Czar Peter the Great at the battle of Pultowa, July 8, 1709, 718; succeeds Charles XI., 1309; reappears in history, after a seclusion of five years, 1714, 768; defeat at Stralsund, 769; and slain at Frederickshall, 1718, 771

Charles XIV., of Sweden, J. J. J. Bernadotte; serves in the army under Jourdan, 1006; joins Bonaparte with an army, 1017; opposes any change in the constitution of France, 1799, 1030; commands the army of Hanover, 1805, 1050; attacked by Benningsen at Pultusk, Dec., 1807, 1062; installed Crown Prince of Sweden, Nov. 1, 1810, 1081; alienates himself from Bonaparte and joins Alexander of Russia, 1087; defeated Oudinot at Gross Beeren, Aug. 23, 1813, 1090; and Ney at Dennewitz, Sept. 6, *ib.*; his further opposition to the French, *ib.*; becomes king of Sweden, 1818, 1187

Charleston besieged by the British; capitulates, May 12, 1780, 892

Charlotte, queen, princess of Mecklenberg; colonel Græme's favorable report of her induces George III. to choose her for his queen, 842; he marries her, Sept. 8, 1761; her appearance and character, 842; coronation of the king and queen, Sept. 22, *ib.*; entrusted with the care of the king, 1810, 1080; death of, Nov. 17, 1818, 1130

Charlotte, princess; public hopes of her marriage with Leopold, which occurs May 2, 1816, 1114; grief at her death, Nov. 6, 1817, 1128; admiration of her conduct, and sympathy with her husband; her dissension with the prince Regent; he causes an inquiry into her conduct; she refuses to marry the prince of Orange, *ib.*; flies to the princess of Wales; her character, *ib.*

Charnock joins with Barclay and others in the design against William's life, 1696, 664; the plot is discovered and he is captured, Feb. 22; tried, *ib.*; found guilty and executed, 665

Charter, the people's, principles of, 1237; parliamentary debate on, 1842, 1260

Charter house, trial and execution of the prior and some of the monks of, for refusing to take the oath of supremacy to Henry VIII., 257; continued persecution of the remainder, 258

Chartism, its prevalence among the laboring classes, 1237; principles advocated by the Chartists, *ib.*; Chartist riots, 1839, 1238; revival of, 1848, 1284; Chartist designs crushed by the government preparations, 1286

Chartreuse, castle of, surrenders to Marlborough, 1702, 689

Chatham, William Pitt, earl of, speaks in parliament, 1736, 789; gentleman of the bed-chamber to the Prince of Wales, 1738, 791; denounces the convention with Spain, 1739, *ib.*; supports the grant for continuing the war in Flanders, 1744, 798; speaks against the amendment for securing the independence of the Commons, 806; obtains office under the Pelham administration, 1747, 819; the king refuses to nominate him secretary-at-war; appointed vice-treasurer of Ireland; then paymaster-general; integrity in the discharge of his office, *ib.*; chagrined at not obtaining the secretary of state seals in 1754; marries lady Grenville, and retires to Hayes, 826; his outburst against the levity of the House of Commons; deserted by Fox, *ib.*; Newcastle offers him a seat in the Cabinet, and the probability of having the secretary of state seals, to support the subsidies; refuses the offer, 829; opposition speech, Nov. 13, 1755; dismissed from his paymaster office, Nov. 20, *ib.*; advocates an increased army, 830; opposes the bringing over foreign troops to England, *ib.*; refuses to agree to a coalition with Fox; appointed secretary of state, 1756, 832; adopts Duncan Forbes' suggestion of enlisting Highlanders into the service, *ib.*; supports the Prussian subsidy, *ib.*; endeavors to save adm. Byng; dismissed from office, 1757, 833; king's dislike to; Cumberland urges the dismissal of; freedom of London presented to; Newcastle refuses to hold power with; "Mr. Pitt's administration," *ib.*; Newcastle made first lord of the treasury, and Pitt secretary of state, having also the ministerial power, *ib.*; has the whole conduct of the war and of foreign affairs, 835; energy in conducting the latter, 837; his lavishness and energy, 838; appoints Wolfe to the command of the Quebec expedition; invites him to dinner; Wolfe's declamatory conduct, *ib.*; moves that a public monument be erected in honor of Wolfe, 839; his vigorous prosecution of the war during the conference for peace, 843; promises Frederick of Prussia his assistance, 843; breaks off negotiations with France; advocates war against Spain; his measure defeated by the court party, *ib.*; resigns his seals of secretary of state, Oct. 5, 1761; his conduct in his interview with the king; receives a pension of £3000; and wife made a baroness; storm of ridicule and abuse against; joy at his fall, *ib.*; his popularity undiminished, 844; his German policy attacked by Grenville, *ib.*; his calmness during the receipt of col. Barré's insolent speech; the new ministry adopt his plans, *ib.*; his patriotic outbreak in parliament; success of his projected expedition against Martinique, and Havannah, 845; dissatisfied with the conditions of the peace of Paris, 1763; states that "that spirit which has made us what we are" compensates for the increase in the national debt, *ib.*; negotiations for his return to power fail, 847; the king again offers him the premiership; his terms, 851; earl Temple persuades him to give up the negotiation; again applied to, but declines the post, *ib.*; speech in favor of repealing the American Stamp Act, arguing that a parliament has no right to impose a tax on a colony not represented in it, 852; his reply to Grenville's defence, *ib.*; huzzaed for his conduct in the Stamp Act Repeal Bill, 853; forms a ministry; lord privy seal and earl of Chatham, 1766; composition of his ministry; his political plans, 854; defends the order for laying an embargo on corn; forces on a parliamentary inquiry into the East India Company's affairs; his Cabinet becomes disordered, *ib.*; illness and incapacity for business; stated to be a sham, 855; loses his popularity; helpless condition of mind and body; resigns his post; retires to Burton-Pynsent; the struggles of his ministry, *ib.*; his remarks upon the king's address on opening parliament, 859; his reply to lord Mansfield's speech, 860; announces his union with the Rockingham party; his plan of parliamentary reform, 861; warns the Americans not to carry their liberty notions too far, 863; his strong approbation of Beckford's speech, 864; remarks on the publication of the parliamentary debates, 865; advises government to be moderate and prudent, 870; his speech on America, 871; moves the withdrawal of troops from Boston, 872; urges government to adopt measures of conciliation, *ib.*; his speech on Gage's conduct, 873; withdraws his son from the British army, 877; his memorandum concerning America; recovers his health slightly after a two years' illness, 1774, 881; occupies his seat in the House of Lords; sensation produced by his reappearance; his speech; moves for an address to the king advising that a stop be put to the American hostilities, *ib.*; his speech for moving an amendment upon the address;

inveighs against calling in the aid of foreign princes and Indians, 883; lord Suffolk replies defending the employment of Indians, *ib.*; Chatham counter-replies in an invective against their employment, *ib.*; lord North presses the king to apply to, to aid in supporting the administration; the king's dislike towards, 884; national feeling towards, 885; description of his appearance, 1778; speaks against the duke of Richmond's address, *ib.*; description of this his last speech, *ib.*; swoons while making an effort to address the House a second time, *ib.*; the accident throws the House into confusion, *ib.*; death of, at Hayes, May 11, 1778; funeral and monuments, *ib.*

Chatham, John, earl of, commands the expedition to the Scheldt, 1809, 1075; his indolence, *ib.*; censured; succeeded by lord Mulgrave, as master-general of the ordnance, 1078

Chaucer's descriptions of the social state of England, *temp.* Edward III., 143; costume described by, 144; manners of the people, *ib.*; satire of, on the state of the Church, 146; characteristics of, and his influence on English literature, 148

Chaumont, treaty of, March 2, 1814, 1103

Chauvelin, French ambassador in England, 1792; himself and suit received with reserve and coldness, 975; correspondence with lord Grenville, 976, 987; returns to Paris with mistaken notions of English disaffection, 973; ordered to retire from England, 1019

Chelsea hospital built by Wren, 754

Cherbourg taken by the British, August 8, 1754, 837

Cheshire, its agricultural condition, 918

Chesterfield, lord, his speech against the bill for licensing plays, 1737, 790; lord-lieutenant of Ireland, 1744; sent on a mission to the Hague to obtain the duke of Cumberland's appointment to the command of the confederate armies, 798; opposes the bill making it high treason to hold correspondence with the Pretender's sons, 799; with lord Mansfield's assistance he carries through the bill for reforming the calendar, 1751, 822; secretary of state, 1746-8, 865

Chevalier, P., account of Druidical remains in Brittany by, 4

Chevalier St. George. See Stuart, James.

Cheyte Sing, rajah of Benares; unable to comply with Hastings' extortionate demands, he is arrested, 950; the native population release him and compel Hastings to fly; routed and deposed by Popham, *ib.*

Chimney tax. See Hearth money.

China, war with, 1245-1248

Cholera in England, 1831, 1195; precautions taken against it, *ib.*

Christchurch gateway, Oxford, built by Wren, 754

Choiseul, duke de, administrates the foreign affairs of France; his negotiations with England, 843; breaks them off, and signs the Family Compact with Spain, *ib.*; desires a rupture with England; sudden fall from power, 866

Chollet, battle of, Sept., 1793, 1001

Christian VII., of Denmark, marries Caroline of England, 1766; his character; allows her and his ministers to be arrested, 868; ascends the throne, 1766, 1310; succeeded by Frederick VI., 1806, *ib.*

Christian Church in Britain, doctrinal dissensions in the, in the fourth century; influence of, in Roman Britain, 17; disunited character of, 18; suppression of the Pelagian heresies in, as related by Bede, 19; conference and disagreement of, with Augustin, 22

Christianity, first appearance and decadence of, in Britain, 6; doubtful statement of the introduction of, into Britain, by Lucius, who reigned A.D. 180, 16; certainly established in Britain as early as the beginning of the fourth century, *ib.*; persecution of, under Diocletian and Maximian, 17

Chun Castle, an early British work, 5

Chunda Sahib attacks Mahomed Ali, 827; killed, *ib.*

Church, corrupt state of, in time of Henry II., 83; state of, under Edward III., 145; attempts of Wycliffe to reform, 146; ill effects produced by its privileges of "benefit of clergy," and of sanctuary, *temp.* Henry VII., 223; position of, in the early part of the reign of Henry VIII., 231; the immunities of the clergy offensive to the laity, *ib.*; persecution of Richard Hunne for heresy, and for having Wycliffe's books, 232; the Londoners declared by the bishop to be in "favor of a heretical wickedness," *ib.*; the king maintains his prerogative against the claims of the clergy, *ib.*; the clergy in Convocation, participate with the Commons in the resistance to Henry VIII.'s demand for a large subsidy, 237; archbishop Usher's scheme for the reformation of, 446; conference of the bishops with the Puritan divines at the Savoy, in 1661, 537; earnest desire of Clarendon to re-establish, in its ancient splendor, *ib.*; resistance offered by, to the efforts of James II. to introduce Roman Catholics, 586; archbishop Sancroft and six bishops petition to be excused compliance with the king's order for the clergy to read in churches the declaration for liberty of conscience, 592; they are committed to the Tower, 593; brought before the King's Bench to plead, and are held to bail, *ib.*; tried for a seditious libel and acquitted, 594; public rejoicings at their acquittal, *ib.*; the bishops refuse King James's request that they would sign a declaration of abhorrence against the proceedings of William, prince of Orange, 597; establishment of societies for religious instruction, 670; feud between the, and the dissenters, 1702, 690; cry of "the church in danger" raised, 1705, 705; provision made at the union of the two kingdoms for the Scottish, 711; the leniency of Dr. Sacheverel's sentence regarded as a triumph of the high, 721; popular disposition in favor of the, 722; Anne determines to uphold and encourage the established English, 1710, 724; schism in the Scottish Kirk; they resent the English government's interference in their affairs, 1736, 788; Burke raises the cry of the church in danger, 1790, 970; a "more evangelical spirit" among churchmen, 1138; chief details of the bill for the reform of the Irish; it is passed, 1833, 1206; the Irish church, *ib.*; appropriations of the temporal possessions of the Irish Protestant church proposed, 1834, 1212, Lord Russell's resolution to the same effect, 1835, 1216; the "Disruption" in the Scotch church, 1265; the Free General Assembly constituted; the United Presbyterian Church formed, *ib.*; the effects of the Act for increasing spiritual instruction in populous districts, *ib.*

Church rates, proposal by government to abolish, defeated, 1837, 1223

Churchill, Charles, assists Wilkes in the "North Briton," 1762, 846; attacks Bute in his "Prophecy of Famine," 1763, *ib.*; defends Wilkes against Hogarth, 847; Hogarth's portrait of, *ib.*

Churchill, George, assists his brother the duke of Marlborough at the battle of Blenheim, 698

Chusan Islands captured and evacuated by the British, 1247.

Cibber, sculpture executed by, 752, 755

Cider tax repealed, 1766, 854

Cintra, convention of, 1808, 1069

Cities and towns of England, condition of, *temp.* Richard I., 96

Ciudad Rodrigo taken by the French, 1810, 1079; and recaptured by Wellington, Jan. 19, 1812, 1085

Clarence, George, brother of Edward IV., created duke of, in 1461, 194; marries Isabel, daughter of the earl of Warwick, 196; joins Warwick in a rising against Edward, *ib.*; Edward taken prisoner, but escapes, *ib.*; is defeated at Stamford, and escapes to France with Warwick, *ib.*; is reconciled to his brother, 198; is accused of participating in the murder of prince Edward, 199; endeavors to obtain in marriage the heiress of Burgundy, but is opposed by Edward, 201; is accused of treason, and convicted; dies in the Tower, Feb., 1478, *ib.*; no foundation for the statements of his drowning, or that Gloucester was implicated in his death, *ib.*

Clarence, William, duke of. See William IV.

Clarendon, Constitutions of, passed in 1164, 85; the Pope refuses to confirm them, *ib.*

Clarendon (sir Edward Hyde) earl of, becomes the adviser of Charles I. in 1641, 445; draws up the answer to the Remonstrance of the Commons, *ib.*; the Presbyterian party endeavor to obtain his expulsion from office as a condition of the restoration, 531; the Declaration from Breda, written by, 532; double dealing of, 535; address of, as chancellor, to the parliament, *ib.*; earnest desire to re-establish the Church of England, 538; maintains the principle of the Act of Oblivion and Indemnity, *ib.*; marriage of his daughter to the duke of York, and his singular conduct, *ib.*; opposes the desire of parliament for more punishments, 540; advises the sale of Dunkirk to the French, 541; the populace accuse him of having been bribed, *ib.*; is deprived of office in 1667, 550; character of, *ib.*; he is impeached on Nov. 12, leaves the country, and is banished by an Act, Dec. 29, *ib.*; settles at Montpelier in France, 551

Claret. See Wine.

Clarke, Mrs., the duke of York's favorite; allowed to tamper with military matters, 1071

Clarkson, Thomas, his zealous efforts to obtain the abolition of the slave trade, 1057

Claudius, invasion of Britain by, 7; joins Plautius, takes Camalodunum and returns to Rome, 7

Clausel, gen., commands the French at Salamanca after Marmont's death, 1087

Claverhouse (John Graham, of), cruelties of, towards the Covenanters, 566; is defeated by them at Drumclog in 1679, 567; behavior of, at the battle of Bothwell Bridge, 567; causes Brown, "the Christian carrier," to be shot, and insults his wife, 568

Clavering, gen., a member of the council of Calcutta, 948; claims the governor-generalship, 949; and assumes its powers; he is compelled to give it up; death of, *ib.*

Claviere, minister of finance, 1792, 977; quarrels with Brissot, *ib.*; resumes his office, 979

Clay, Henry, an American plenipotentiary for signing the peace of Ghent, 1101

Clement XIII., pope, 1758-1769; defends the Jesuits, 866

Clement XIV.; he suppresses the Jesuits, 1773, 866; pope, 1769-1774, 1310

Clergy, the position and condition of, in the 15th century, 186; intercourse of, with the laity, *ib.*; payment of curates, *ib.*; dislike of, to the monastic orders, *ib.*; influence of domestic chaplains, *ib.*; influence of, in the making of wills, *ib.*; injurious effects of the "benefit of clergy" upon the morals of the people, *temp.* Henry VII., 222; increased dissatisfaction of the people with the oppressions of, 246; statutes passed in the parliament of 1529 against ecclesiastical abuses, *ib.*; resistance offered by them to the passing of, *ib.*; visited with heavy penalties for submitting to Wolsey as legate, 250; Act abolishing the payment of annates by, to the see of Rome, carried into effect in 1533, 251; ordered to preach at Paul's Cross that the pope hath no authority in the realm, 254; visitation of the monasteries ordered in 1535, *ib.*; delinquencies of the monks, 259; dissoluteness of the inmates of religious houses exposed by the visitation commissioners, 274; occasional exceptions, *ib.*; character of the parochial clergymen, 297; married clergy expelled from their livings in 1554, 324; increased severity of the persecution against married clergymen, 328; state of, at the commencement of the Civil War in 1642, 450; number ejected from their livings on the adoption of the Presbyterian Covenant, in 1643, 464; legal provision for, not interfered with during the Civil War, 535; the ejected ministers restored in 1660, *ib.*; income of the clergy compared with that of other grades of society, 620; their condition and character, *temp.* queen Anne, *ib.*; exhorted by Burnet to "labor more," *ib.*; divisions among the clergy regarding the Comprehension Bill and the reforming the liturgy, 1689, 624; introduction of the terms High and Low Church, about 1689, *ib.*; the episcopalian clergy of Scotland "rabbled," and turned out of their livings by the Covenanters, 629; Protestant clergy of Ireland deprived of their benefices, seek refuge in England, where they are aided by public subscriptions, and appointed to lectureships, etc.; their property in Ireland is transferred to the Roman Catholics, 633; division in the Church, 635; queen Anne restores the "first fruits and tenths" of all preferments to the church for the benefit of the; it is popularly known as "Queen Anne's Bounty," 693; the English clergy, 1737-1783; their disregard of morality; neglect of their sacred functions, 944; their conviviality, card-playing, and apathy, *ib.*; Cowper's description of the clergyman of his time, 1135

Clerk, John, of Eldin, his claim to the idea of breaking the line of battle at sea considered, 900

Clinton, sir Henry, appointed commander of the British army in America, 1778, 886; sails from New York; invests Charleston, which capitulates, May 12, 1780; returns to New York leaving Cornwallis in command, 892; Washington's letter to, remonstrating against Cornwallis' severities, *ib.*; his reply, *ib.*; accepts Arnold's treacherous overture; and opens a secret correspondence with him, 893; demands André's release, 893

Clive, Robert, lord; general in the Indian army, which he enters as ensign, 827; captain; attacks and takes Arcot; besieged therein by Rajah Sahib, *ib.*; who, however, is compelled to raise the siege, *ib.*; Clive takes Trichinopoly; returns to England; marries Miss Maskelyne; appointed governor of Fort St. David, and lieutenant-colonel, 1755, 827; returns to Fort St. David, June; appointed to the command of the expedition against Surajah Dowlah; retakes Calcutta, Jan. 2, 1757; his successful night attack frightens the subahdar into a peace; enters into an alliance with him; Chandernagore taken from the French; his unscrupulous policy towards Omichund, 834; his own defence of his conduct in 1773; defeats Surarajah Dowlah at Plassey, June 23, *ib.*; instals Meer Jaffier into the subahdarship of Bengal; his character; establishes the British ascendancy in India, 835; governor and commander-in-chief of Bengal; establishes the British power in India, 860; returns to England, 1767, *ib.*

Closter-seven, convention of, Oct. 22, 1757, agreed to by the duke of Cumberland, 836; the king refuses to ratify it, 837

Cloth. See Wool; Yorkshire; Leeds.

Clothing, dearness and scarcity of, in the 15th century, 184

Club-life, picture of, early part of George III.'s reign, 941

Coal, practice of melting iron with coal introduced by lord Dudley, 1619, 605; extensive fields of, in South Wales, *ib.*; Newcastle trade in, and enormous consumption of, by London, in queen Anne's time, 610; cruelties inflicted on women and children employed in coal mines, 1229

Coal-trade to France, and restrictions on exportation, in the reign of Henry VIII., 296

Cobbett, William, his partiality for the Wiltshire Downs, 916; attributes the panic of 1816 to the scarcity of corn, 1116; advocates parliamentary reform; sudden influence of his writings among the laboring classes in 1816, 1121; flies to America, and ceases to publish his Register for four months, 1125; personal appearance of; takes his seat on the Treasury bench in the Commons, 1833, 1202; his speech against appointing Mr. Sutton speaker, 1203; against Agnew's Sabbath observance bill, 1204; his intemperate motion to dismiss Peel from the Privy Council as the author of the currency bill of 1819, rejected, 1205

Cobden, Richard, insists upon the total repeal of the corn duties, 1261; his speech laying the responsibility for the country's distress on sir R. Peel, 1264; his speech on moving for an inquiry into the agricultural distress; his motion rejected, 1273

Cobentzel, Austrian plenipotentiary, at Udine, 1797; Bonaparte's simile with his tea service, 1018

Cobham, lord, captures Vigo, 1719, 772

Coburg, prince of, commands the French at Neerwinden, 1793, 993; his contradictory proclamations, 994; commands the allied army, 996; driven over the Sambre by Jourdan, 1000

Cockburn, admiral, with general Ross, incites the American negroes to revolt, 1814, 1096

Codrington, sir Edward, admiral in command of the allied fleet; interferes with Turkey's conduct towards Greece, 1173; gains the battle of Navarino, *ib.*

Coercion Bill for Ireland, 1204; becomes law, April 2, 1833, 1205; proposed renewal of, not carried, 1834, 1213; passed in a modified form, *ib.*

Coffee, tax on, 17th century, 613

Coffee-houses, 939

Cogidubnus, British legate at Chichester, under the Roman empire, 14

Cohorn, engineer of the States-general; besieged in Namur, 1692, 652; wounded, *ib.*; aids in recapturing Namur, 1695, 662; aids Marlborough in his campaign of 1702, 689; with him plans the capture of Antwerp, 692

Coifi, chief priest of the Northumbrian Saxons, converted by Paulinus, destroys the idols, 23

Coinage. See Money.

Coins, ancient British, 7, *note*

Coke, Mr., his agricultural improvements of Norfolk, 910

Coke, sir Edward, bitterness of his speech as attorney-general against the earl of Essex, 391; brutality of

his conduct when prosecuting Raleigh, 398; as lord chief justice, issues a warrant to apprehend the earl of Somerset for the murder of Overbury, 413; dissatisfaction of James with his conduct on the trial, 414; opposes the arbitrary measures of the king, and is dismissed, *ib.*; draws up a petition in the Commons, in 1621, against the growth of popery, 419; assists in the debate on the Petition of Right in 1628, 423; denounces the duke of Buckingham in the House of Commons, *ib.*
Colchester, the ancient Camalodunum, 6; description of the castle of, 7; supposed temple to Claudius at, 8
Colchester, lord, his account of the battle of Steinkirk, 654
Colchester, Charles Abbot, lord, his account of the king's refusal to make concessions to Catholics, 1036; quotations from his diary, 1046, 1047, 1049, 1057, 1058, 1062, 1071, 1078, 1080, 1083; as Speaker gives the casting vote for censuring lord Melville, 1048
Colepepper committed to the Gate House for presenting the Kentish petition, 1701, 685
Coleridge, S. T., remarks of, on the French Revolution of 1789, 966; on Burke's "Reflections," 969; and on Robespierre, 1006; character of his poetic labors, 1137; failure of his dramas, 1139
College, Old, of Physicians, built by Wren, 654
Colli commands the Austro-Sardinian army against Bonaparte, 1796, 1011
Collier, Jeremy, castigates play writers, 671
Collingwood, Cuthbert, commands the Excellent at the battle of St. Vincent; supports Nelson in the contest, 1014; watches the French and Spanish fleet, 1049; aids Nelson in gaining the victory of Trafalgar, Oct. 21, 1805, 1051; his grief for the loss of Nelson, *ib.*; his advice to Duckworth, 1063
Collins, publication of his "Eclogues," 1742, and "Odes," 1746, 936
Collins, character of his paintings, 1147
Collot d'Herbois aids in destroying Lyon, 1793, 997
Colonization, systematic, plan of, proposed by Charles Buller, 1164
Combermere, viscount, commander-in-chief of India, 1171; bombards Bhurtpore, Nov. 23, 1825, and captures it, Jan. 18, *ib.*
Combination laws passed in the 18th century; repealed in the 19th, 821
Committee of Public Salvation instituted 1793, 994
Companies, mania for, 1689–1714, 614
Comprehension Bill introduced, not passed, 1689, 624
Compton, Henry, bishop of London, preaches the sermon at the opening of St. Paul's cathedral, Dec. 2, 1797, 669
Compton, sir Spencer, treasurer of Prince of Wales, 1727, 779; speaker of the House of Commons, *ib.*; Walpole draws up the royal speech for him; disappointed at not obtaining the premiership, *ib.*; first lord of the Treasury, 1742, 865
Conan, the leader of the British forces under Maximus, founds a colony in Brittany, A.D. 388, 18
Condé, prince de, flies from Paris, 1789, 963
Condé, surrendered to the Allies, July, 1793, 996
Condorcet, a republican, 973; a left side member of the Legislative Assembly, *ib.*
Conflans, a French admiral, defeated by Hawke, 1759, 839
Congress. See Hague, Verona, Vienna, Laybach, Carlsbad, Troppau, Radstadt.
Congreve, his estimate of the female character of his day, 743
Coningsby, lord, impeaches the earl of Oxford, 1715, 761
Constable, character of his painting, 1147
Constantine, accession of, to the government of Britain, 11; glowing account of prosperous state of Britain under, 12
Constantine raised to the imperial throne by the aid of the army in Britain, A.D. 306, 17; the civil government of Britain remodelled by, *ib.*; death of, A.D. 337, *ib.*
Constantinople, treaty of, July 8, 1833, 1225
Constantius, the emperor, supports the authority of Paulus, and applauds his savage cruelties, 17
Constitutional charter issued by Louis XVIII., 1814, 1102
Contades, mareschal de, defeated by Ferdinand, 1759, 838
Contemporary sovereigns, tables of, 1308–11
Convention, English, of 1689, declared a parliament, 623
Convention, Scotch, of 1689, proceedings of, 629
Conversation, the, of the 18th century, 942
Conway, general, takes the citadel of Aix, 1757, 836; valor displayed in campaign of 1761, 843; votes against the ministry on the question of the legality of general warrants, 849; dismissed from his regiment and parliament for so doing, *ib.*; secretary of state, 1765, 851; introduces the repeal of the American Stamp Act bill, 853; enthusiasm towards him for being the mover, *ib.*; secretary of state, 1765–1768, 854, 865; moves for the cessation of war, 899
Conyngham, marquis of, lord steward; governor of Windsor castle; delays swearing in the members of parliament, 1179; postmaster-general, 1834, 1211; lord chamberlain, 1224
Cook, captain, his voyages and discoveries; visits Otaheite, New Zealand, and New South Wales; discovers the Society Islands, 990
Cook, Thomas, chairman of E. I. Company; concerned in bribing members of parliament, 661
Cooke, Henry, restorer of the Raffaelle cartoons, 757
Cooke, M.P. for Middlesex; death of, 858
Cookham, its high parochial condition, 1209
Cooksworthy discovers a fine clay for porcelain, 937
Coote, sir Eyre, commander of the British forces in India, 950; defeats Hyder Ali, July 1, and Aug. 27, 1781, *ib.*
Coote, sir Eyre, conducts the siege of Flushing, 1809, 1075
Cope, sir John, commander-in-chief of Scotland, 802; marches from Stirling in pursuit of the rebels, 1745; declines to encounter the prince's army among the mountains; marches on to Inverness, *ib.*; embarks at Aberdeen; lands at Dunbar, Sept. 18; marches towards Edinburgh, 803; takes up his position at Preston to receive his opponent, where his troops are routed on the 22d in the battle of Preston Pans, 804
Copenhagen, battle of, April 2, 1801, 1037; bombarded by the British, 1807, 1066
Copley. See Lyndhurst.
Copley, J. S., West's rival in painting; example of his style, 1146
Copper mines and smelting, 605–610
Copyright act passed, 741; service rendered to literature by, *ib.*; passing of the new copyright act, 1842; Macaulay's amendments, 1253; beneficial application of, to old copyrights about to expire, 1254
Coracles, small fishing boats used by the Britons, 5
Coram, captain. See Foundling.
Corday, Charlotte, cause of her assassinating Marat; the deed is done July 13, 1793; she is executed, 995
Cork capitulates to Marlborough, Sept. 29, 1690, 641
Cornish, alderman, his attainder reversed, 1689, 633
Corn-law, the first passed in England in 1903, 181; effects of that passed 1815, 1114, 1156; a new act passed, 1822, 1156; relaxation of the, resisted, 1826, 1164, fears of their being repealed, 1164; general opposition manifested towards the Corn-laws; the Anti-Corn-law League, 1243; sir Robert Peel refuses to propose any alteration in the Corn-laws, 1261; after a prolonged debate sir Robert Peel's bill is adopted, *ib.*; a Corn-bill for Canada passed, 1264; debates on the 1268; proposed to be modified by sir R. Peel, 1275; their repeal advocated by lord J. Russell, *ib.*; different opinions of the Cabinet members as to their repeal, 1276; sir R. Peel's plan for a new Corn-law Bill, 1277; debate on the bill, 1278; it is ultimately passed, *ib.*; and received the Royal Assent, June, 1846, *ib.*; banquet at Manchester to celebrate the repeal of the Corn-laws, 1236
Corn trade at the end of the 17th century, 611
Cornwall, mineral products and condition of, *temp.* William and Anne, 605; agriculture of, 917
Cornwallis, Charles, sails from Cork with seven regiments, Feb., 1776; presens at the battle of Brooklyn, 879; follows Washington in his retreat as far as Trenton, *ib.*; routs the Americans at the battle of the Brandywine, Sept. 13, 1777; occupies Philadelphia 882; left in command of Charleston, 892; his severities towards deserters and prisoners, *ib.*; defeats Gates at Camden, Aug. 16, 1780, *ib.*; his march through Carolina; crippled by the defeat of Tarleton at Cowpens, 1781, 896; defeats general Greene at Guilford, Mar. 15; recommends a vigorous attack upon Virginia, *ib.*; marches into Virginia without orders; enters Charlottesville, and Yorktown, which last he fortifies, *ib.*; besieged, 897; loses hope, and surrenders Yorktown, Gloucester, and his army, Oct. 19, 897; his approbation of the conduct of the French, 898; appointed governor-general of India, 1786; labors to improve the administration and finance; complains of the insufficient European troops, 988; Tippoo forces him into a war; Cornwallis takes Bangalore, Mar. 21, 1791; defeats Tippoo, May 15; compelled to retreat by sickness and famine, 989; capture of Seringapatam, Feb., 1792; makes peace with Tippoo, Mar., *ib.*; describes France's ability to carry on war in a state of anarchy, 1006; unwilling to accept the command of the allied armies, 1794, 1023; master-general of the ordnance; advice as to volunteers, *ib.*; lord-lieutenant of Ireland and commander-in-chief, 1798; arrives in Dublin, June 20, 1024; he softens the ferocity of the troops, 1025; marches against the French under Humbert; and compels him to retreat to the quarters of general Lake, by whom the French are made to surrender, *ib.*; accused of being too lenient, *ib.*; advocates the emancipation of the Catholics, 1026; wishes to postpone the introduction of the Union measure, 1027; his opinion of Grenville's answer to Bonaparte, 1800, 1033; remarks of, on the influence of the king's narrow views on Irish affairs, 1036; has no hopes of peace, 1801, 1039; conducts the negotiations for peace at Amiens, 1801, *ib.*; his interview with Napoleon, *ib.*; difficulties in diplomacy, *ib.*; peace of Amiens concluded, *ib.*; governor-general of India, 1805; died Oct. 5, 1805, 1055
Coronation oath, dubious construction of, 625; difficulties caused by this in George III.'s time, 1035, 1046, 1061; and in George IV.'s reign, 1176
Corporation and Test Acts, attempts to obtain the repeal of the, 1730, 781, 968; repealed, 1828, 1175
Corruption, parliamentary, 1693, 4, 661, 774
Corry, chancellor of Irish exchequer; duels with Grattan, 1027
Corsica ceded to France, 1768; Paoli's resistance, 865; revolt of, 1794; annexed to Great Britain; restored to France, 1007
Corunna, battle of, Jan. 16, 1809, 1070
Cossein, Meer, subahdar of Bengal; quarrels with the English; war for deposing him; murders 150 prisoners; defeated, 869
Costume, extensive use of hoop petticoats, 742; note on the Highland, 865; pride taken in dress by the gentlemen, *temp.* 1737–1783, 942; Prince of Wales's, on his introduction to the house of peers, 1783, 952
Cotton, the first mill, established by Arkwright, 915, 925; trade in 1788, 923; John Kaye introduces the fly shuttle; improvements in machines for spinning, *ib.*; demand for yarn; Hargreaves completes his spinning jenny, 1767, 924; domestic cotton spinning about to cease, *ib.*; Arkwright's invention of his patent spinning machine, *ib.*; difficulties of bringing it into general use overcome, 925; invention of the spinning mule by Crompton; the machine completed, 1779, *ib.*; given to the public, *ib.*; rush to engage in spinning, 926; commencement of the system of employing factory children, *ib.*; employment of steam engines in the manufacture of, *ib.*; the old spinning wheel and the modern spinning mill contrasted, *ib.*; Cartwright's invention of the power loom, *ib.*; slow introduction into general use; number used in 1813, 1833, and 1856, *ib.*; British import of American, in 1785, 1791, 1801, 1811, 1812, 1813, and 1859, 1097; attempts to grow, in India, 1171
Cotton, sir S. See Combermere, Viscount.
Couthon shares in executing the Lyonnese, 1793, 997; his cruelty, 1005; and death, 1794, *ib.*
Country justices in the last century described, 943
Court Martial Bill rejected, 1757, 833
Courtenay, sir W. See Thorn.
Courts of Law, established by Henry II., 84
Covenanters, under Baillie, are defeated by Montrose in 1645, 471; obtain the rule in Scotland, after the capture of Hamilton, in 1648, 485; their exultation at the defeat and capture of Montrose, in 1650, 496; insurrection of, in the West of Scotland, in 1666, 548; cruelties practised towards, *ib.*; resistance of, to the Black Indulgence, *ib.*; attempt of Lauderdale to reduce, by military force, 566; cruelties exercised towards, *ib.*, murder of archbishop Sharpe, 567; defeat Claverhouse at Drumclog, *ib.*; are defeated at Bothwell Bridge on June 22, 1679, *ib.*; moderation of Monmouth towards, *ib.*; receive the name of Whig, *ib.*; cruelties inflicted on, by the Duke of York and Claverhouse, 568; a Test Act passed against the Covenant in 1682, 573; fresh cruelties committed upon, *ib.*; renewed and illegal persecutions of, in 1683, 576; fresh laws obtained against them by James II. in 1685, and the soldiery let loose upon them, 578
Covent Garden Theatre built by Smirke, 1808, 1809, 1143
Covered ways, or roads, of the Britons, in Wiltshire, continued existence of, 6
Cox, David, character of his paintings, 1147
Cowpens, battle of, Jan. 1781, 896
Cowper, William, earl, appointed lord keeper, 1705, 705; his faint hopes of peace with France, 723; reads George I.'s first speech to the English parliament, 761; passes sentence of death, as lord high steward, upon the lords concerned in the rebellion of 1715, 766; his motion for the repeal of the pest-house laws rejected, 775; opposes the passing of the bill of pains and penalties, 1723, 776
Cowper, William; his description of the conversation of his time, 942; of the apathy of the clergy, 944; quotations from his "Task," 963, 1081; late appearance as a writer, 1135; first volume published, 1784, and second in 1785; character of his writings; died 1800, *ib.*; manners of his age as depicted by, *ib.*
Crabbe, George, quotations from, 912, 943; a poet of two periods, 1135; his early poems; those called "The Library" and "The Newspaper" noticed, 1135; appearance of his volume containing the "Parish Register," 1807; of "The Borough," in 1810; of "Tales," in 1812; and of "Tales of the Hall," in 1819, 1138; delineations of manners contained in his poems, *ib.*; died 1832, 1254
Cracow made a free republic, 1846, 1225
Cradock, sir John, commands the British in Portugal, 1072; removed to Gibraltar, *ib.*
Craggs, postmaster-general, bribed, ; commits suicide, 774
Craggs, James, appointed secretary at war, 1717, 769; receives a bribe from the South Sea Company directors, 774; dies of small-pox during the inquiry into the bribes connected with the South Sea Scheme, 1721, 775
Cranbourne tried and executed for designing to kill Will. III., 1696, 665
Cranmer, Thomas, sent with the ambassador to the crowning of the emperor Charles V., in 1530, 248; writes a book to prove the invalidity of the king's marriage to Catherine, *ib.*; unfeeling remark of, concerning the burning of Frith, 250; returns to England, and is made archbishop of Canterbury, 253; requests Henry's license to pronounce on the divorce, and obtains it, *ib.*; holds a court at Dunstable, Catherine refuses to appear, and he pronounces sentence of divorce on May 23, 1533, *ib.*; description of the coronation of Anne Boleyn by, *ib.*; endeavors ineffectually to exempt sir Thomas More from taking an oath as to the illegality of the king's first marriage, 256; his letter to the king in favor of Anne Boleyn, 262; dissuades the king from putting the princess Mary to death, 265; servility of, 272; opposes the Act of the Six Articles, but ultimately submits to it, 277; consents to the Act declaring the marriage of Henry to Anne of Cleves invalid, 279; his opinion of Cromwell, *ib.*; discovers to the king the profligacy of Catherine Howard, 280; accused of heresy, but relieved by the king, 285; causes the Paraphrase of the New Testament by Erasmus to be translated into English, 303; prepares the Book of Common Prayer, 304; signs the death-warrant of lord Thomas Seymour, 306; writes to Warwick and the confederated lords that Somerset is secured, 311; amount of participation of, in the burning of Joan Bocher, 312; book o. Canon Laws issued by, 313; committed to the Tower on the accession of Mary, Nov. 14, 1553, 319; pleads not guilty to the charge of high treason, and withdraws his plea, 320; condemned for heresy at Oxford, 324; he recants, 330; publicly withdraws his recantation, and declares his repentance for having made it, *ib.*; is burnt on March 21, 1556, *ib.*
Cranston, lord, present at Rodney's victory over De Grasse, 1782, 901
Craufurd, general; his bravery at the siege of Ciudad Rodrigo, 1812; mortally wounded, 1085
Craven dialect, specimens of the, 919
Crayford, chalk caves at, 5
Cressy, battle of, on Aug. 26, 1346, 137, 138; won by the steady bravery of the yeomen of England, 138

Crillon, duc de, besieges Gibraltar, 1782, 906
Crime, prevalence of, 1692, 654
Criminal laws, extreme severity of, *temp.* Henry VII., 225, 251–252; statute for the punishment of offences against property, passed in 1545, 292; reforms in the, 1117
Cristall, sir Henry, Froissart's account of his captivity among the Irish, 266
Croft, James, a collier and enthusiastic agriculturist; his career and perseverance; a model of the modern British spirit, 918
Croker, J. W., his intellectual powers; his steady opposition to the Reform bill, 1831, 1191.
Cromartie, lord; trial of; found guilty; pardoned, 817
Cromlechs, supposed purpose of, 6
Crompton, Samuel, inventor of the cotton mule, 925; his character, *ib.*; secretes his machine from the rioters of 1779; works at it in secret, *ib.*; he is ultimately compelled to give it to the public for 67*l.* 6*s.* 6*d.*; general employment of his machine, *ib.*
Cromwell, Oliver, first appearance of, in the House of Commons, in 1629, 425; presents a petition from Lilburne, imprisoned by the Star-Chamber, to the Long Parliament, in 1640, 437; seizes the magazine at Cambridge, and stops the transmission of the University plate to the king, 452; letter of, to the Commissioners at Cambridge, 461; character of, 463; hazardous situation of, at the skirmish of Winceby, *ib.*; distinguished services of, at the battle of Marston Moor, 465; letter of, to his brother, concerning the battle, *ib.*; brings a charge against the earl of Manchester, 466; thinks the army ought to be remodelled, *ib.*; great importance of his military services, 467; active measures of, against the royalists, *ib.*; letter of, announcing the result of Naseby battle, to the Speaker of the House of Commons, *ib.*; commands the right wing at battle of Naseby, *ib.*; his conduct in it, 468; letter of, to Fairfax, announcing that he had taken 300 clubmen, 469; invests Bristol in company with Fairfax, *ib.*; his account of the surrender, *ib.*; Winchester surrenders to, *ib.*; batters down Basing House, *ib.*; his discipline of the Ironsides, 475; wishes to prevent the army being disbanded, in opposition to the Presbyterians, 476; organization of the Adjutators, *ib.*; leaves London, and joins the army, *ib.*; waits on Charles at Royston, *ib.*; proposals of, and of the Independents, to Charles, 478; the king rejects them, *ib.*; Cromwell and Ireton endeavor to serve the king, 479; they intercept a letter of the king's, 480; he breaks off his intercourse with the king, *ib.*; conduct of, towards the Levellers, 482; suspicion that Charles made his escape from Hampton Court at the instigation of, *ib.*; tries to effect a reconciliation between the Presbyterians and Independents, *ib.*; leaves London, to quell an outbreak in Wales, 483; takes Pembroke, 484; marches against the duke of Hamilton, *ib.*; and defeats him at Preston, 485; enters Scotland, *ib.*; the victory throws both king and parliament into alarm, *ib.*; returns from Scotland, 486; letter to Hammond, 487; arrives in London, 488; extraordinary religious enthusiasm displayed by, 489; conduct of, at the trial of the king, 490; speaks in favor of the petition of lord Capel, 492; puts down a mutiny in Whalley's regiment, *ib.*; in conjunction with Fairfax suppresses the Levellers in the army, *ib.*; is presented with a service of plate by the Corporation of London, for putting down the Levellers, *ib.*; leaves London for Ireland, as lord-lieutenant there, 493; embarks at Milford Haven, *ib.*; arrives at Dublin, *ib.*; addresses the Irish, *ib.*; issues a proclamation, *ib.*; takes Drogheda, Trim, Dundalk, and Wexford, 494; his account of the slaughters, *ib.*; meets with a stout resistance at Waterford, *ib.*; Cork surrenders to him, 495; his policy in Ireland, *ib.*; returns to London, *ib.*; leaves Ireton as deputy in Ireland, *ib.*; arrival and enthusiastic reception of, in London, 497; is created General of all the forces, *ib.*; marches to Scotland, *ib.*; meets with a vigorous resistance from Lesley, *ib.*; his danger at Dunbar, *ib.*; position of his army at Dunbar, 498; gains the battle of Dunbar, on Sept. 3, 1650, *ib.*; his letter to parliament, *ib.*; takes Perth, *ib.*; letter of, to parliament, announcing the probable invasion of England by the Scotch army, 499; totally defeats it at Worcester, on Sept. 3, 1651, *ib.*; and compels Charles II. to fly to France, 501; description of his army, *ib.*; returns to London, 502; his reforming policy, *ib.*; urges the advancement of two great measures—An Act of Amnesty, and a Law for the Election of future parliaments, *ib.*; attends a conference at Lenthall's house on the settlement of the nation, *ib.*; dialogue between Whitelocke and, 505; opposes the proposal for perpetuating the parliament, *ib.*; conference at his residence at Whitehall, *ib.*; dissolves the Long Parliament, 506; and the Council of State, *ib.*; summons a parliament, 507; receives a dispatch from Blake and Monk announcing their victory over the Dutch fleet, *ib.*; his Little Parliament meets on July 4, 1653, *ib.*; character of the Little Parliament, *ib.*; speech of, to the Little Parliament, 508; its constitution is provisional, *ib.*; it abolishes the Court of Chancery, *ib.*; the Little Parliament resigns its authority into the hands of, *ib.*; he is declared protector, Dec. 16, 1653, 509; remarks on, *ib.*; is made Chancellor of Oxford, 510; patronizes learning, *ib.*; love for music, *ib.*; character of his government as protector, 512; incentives to assassinate, 513; sagacity and prudence of, *ib.*; royalist plot to assassinate, discovered and put down, *ib.*; two of the conspirators, John Gerard and Peter Vowell, executed, *ib.*; tact displayed by, *ib.*; foreign policy of, displayed in promoting the union of the Protestant States of Europe, and in treaties and alliances with Sweden, France, and Portugal, 514; causes Don Pantaleon de Sa to be executed for murder, *ib.*; explains his policy to the first parliament of the protectorate, *ib.*; speech of, on opening the session, *ib.*; parliament questions his authority, 515; upon which he closes the door of the parliament house, *ib.*; and admits those members only who sign a pledge to obey him, *ib.*; is thrown from his coach, 516; temper of his parliament, *ib.*; dissolves it, *ib.*; puts down a royalist rising, 517; refusal to pay taxes to, *ib.*; appoints major-generals for collecting the taxes, *ib.*; conduct of the major-generals, *ib.*; toleration of, in religious matters, 518; greatness of, in his foreign policy, *ib.*; practical spirit of, infused into his army, *ib.*; increases the strength of the navy, *ib.*; disappointment of, at Venables not capturing Hispaniola, 519; his abhorrence of vice in the army, *ib.*; interference of, in favor of the Vaudois, or Waldenses, *ib.*; attempts of, to procure a settlement in England for the Jews, *ib.*; endeavors to obtain a pledge from the republican leaders not to oppose his government, 520; imprisons Vane and other political opponents, *ib.*; conference of, with Ludlow, *ib.*; speech of, at the meeting of his second parliament, *ib.*; indications of a legislative mind displayed in the speech, 521; Napoleon compared with, *ib.*; public indignation at, for excluding members from the parliament, *ib.*; Acts passed for security of his person, *ib.*; his part in the case of James Nayler, the Quaker, *ib.*; Sindercomb's plot against, 522; the trial and death of, *ib.*; his parliament congratulate him on his escape from it, *ib.*; parliament vote his being made king, *ib.*; conferences on the subject, 523; declines to accept the title, *ib.*; pamphlet entitled "Killing no Murder" published, threatening death to, *ib.*; is inaugurated as protector and invested with the kingly power, June 26, 1657, *ib.*; readmits the members he excluded from parliament, *ib.*; his daughter Mary is married to Lord Falconbridge, and Frances to the earl of Warwick, *ib.*; parliament meets, 524; a second house, *ib.*; dissensions between him and the parliament, *ib.*; it is dissolved by, *ib.*; puts down a royalist rising; several ringleaders are condemned and executed, *ib.*; successes abroad, *ib.*; Dunkirk taken, 525; his family afflictions, *ib.*; death, *ib.*; and burial, 526; disinterred from Westminster Abbey, and buried at Tyburn, 536; notice of Cromwell's free trade policy toward Scotland, 674
Cromwell, Richard, proclaimed protector, Sept. 4, 1658, 526; character of, *ib.*; financial difficulties of, *ib.*; meeting of parliament, *ib.*; bill passed for the recognition of his title, 527; hostility of the army towards, *ib.*; his weak government, *ib.*; compelled to dissolve the parliament, *ib.*; his government ends, *ib.*; restoration of Long Parliament, under the name of "The Rump," *ib.*; leaves Whitehall, *ib.*; he and his family pass into obscurity, *ib.*
Cromwell, Thomas, said to have been present at the sack of Rome, 240; adheres to Wolsey on his fall, 245; defends him in parliament, *ib.*; letter of, to Wolsey, *ib.*; writes exhortations to Frith and Tyndale, the reformers, 250; becomes viceregent, *ib.*; issues a commission for the visitation of the monasteries, *ib.*; unworthy use made of their property by, *ib.*; official corruption of, 260; effects a reconciliation between the princess Mary and her father, 265; absolute power of, in ecclesiastical affairs, 272; participation of, in the plunder of the religious houses, 275; measures taken by, to pack the parliament of 1539, *ib.*; disgraceful conduct of, in procuring the attainder and condemnation of the aged countess of Salisbury, 278; promotes the marriage of Henry with Anne of Cleves, *ib.*; dissatisfaction of the king with the match, *ib.*; is arrested for treason, 279; demands a trial by law, *ib.*; is attainted and executed, July 28, 1540, *ib.*; injunctions of, for the keeping of a parish register-book of births, deaths, and marriages, 287
Crosbie, alias Cleuch, proposes to carry off William III., 664
Crosby, Brass, lord mayor, 1771; decides a lawsuit against an officer of the House of Commons, who had arrested a printer for publishing the debates, 865; ordered to attend before the bar of the House; committed to the Tower, *ib.*; released, *ib.*
Crowle, parliamentary proceedings against, 1751, 822.
Crown Point surprised by the Americans, 1775, 874
Crusades, the first preaching of, in 1095, 67; incentives offered for prosecuting, 68
Crusaders, progress of the first, *ib.*; rout of the body under Peter the Hermit and Walter the Penniless, *ib.*
Cuesta, general, of the Spanish army, 1076; his temerity, *ib.*; forsakes the charge of sick and wounded left him by Bonaparte, *ib.*
Culleys, they reinvigorate the agriculture of Northumberland, 919
Culloden, description of the moor of, 813; battle of, April 16, 1746, 816; barbarous treatment of the wounded after the battle, *ib.*
Cullum, sir John, describes the agricultural improvements of Suffolk, 911
Cumberland, its population, products, and manufactures, 611
Cumberland, Henry Frederick, duke of, George III.'s brother; fined £10,000 on a charge of criminal conversation brought by lord Grosvenor; accompanies Mrs. Horton to Calais; there marries her; the pair are forbidden the Court; the king's disgust, 868; from these circumstances emanated the Royal Marriage Act, *ib.*
Cumberland, William Augustus, duke of, second son of George II.; accompanies his father at the battle of Dettingen; commands the English left, 797; commands the allied armies in the campaign of 1745; attacks the French at Fontenoy, May 11, *ib.*; forms a column; its extraordinary march, and steady retreat, 798; marches after the rebels, 810; pursues their retreating army, 812; invests Carlisle, Dec. 21; it capitulates, Dec. 30; his hard terms to the garrison; summoned to London to command the forces against the threatened French invasion, 813; sent back to Scotland to retrieve the disasters of Falkirk, 814; arrives at Edinburgh, Jan. 30, 1746, *ib.*; the sight of his army compels the Highlanders to fly from Stirling, *ib.*; arrives at Aberdeen, 815; advances against the rebels, April 8; the passage of the Spey; reaches Nairn, *ib.*; a night attack is attempted upon his camp; advances against the prince on Culloden Moor, *ib.*; and gains a victory over him, April 16, 816; his unpopularity, *ib.*; his view of the Rebellion, *ib.*; anecdote of his insolence, 817; commands the British at the defeat of Lauffeld, 1747, 820; George II. desires him to be Regent, 823; urges that Pitt and Temple be turned out of power, 833; driven out of Hanover by Richelieu; and the capitulation of Closter-Seven is agreed to between them; his father's anger, by whom he is insulted, 836; resigns his post of commander-in-chief, *ib.*; appointed to negotiate with Pitt for his return to power, 851
Cumberland, duke of, Ernest Augustus, his political opinions, 1063; becomes king of Hanover, 1837, 1232; his intolerant and despotic government, *ib.*
Cunningham, Alexander, description of the Highlanders by, 630
Cunobelin, state of Britain during the period of, 5; power and dominion of, and state of civilization in the reign of, 6, 7
Currency. See Money.
Curwen, M.P. for Carlisle; his account of Burke's intense hatred to French revolutionary principles, 970
Curwen institutes an inquiry into the Poor Laws, 1816, 1119
Custom House, London, built by Wren, 754
Cutts, lord, his bravery before Namur, 1695, 662; captain of the Guards, 665; sent on before to commence the attack on the village of Blenheim, Aug. 13, 1704, 697; which order he performs, *ib.*; takes part in the final struggle, 698
Cymbeline. See Cunobelin.

Dagger-scene in Burke's speech, 1792, 987, 988
D'Alegre, his escape from the Bastille, 1756, 963
D'Allegre, marquis, defeated by Marlborough, and taken prisoner, 704
Dalrymple, sir Hew.; mortification caused by his being appointed to command the troops in Portugal, 1069; recalled home, *ib.*
Dalrymple, sir John, one of the commissioners who invested William with the government, 630; master of stair; secretary of state for Scotland; orders of, to Hill and Livingstone, regarding the rebel chiefs, 645; grudge of, against the MacDonalds, of Glencoe, 646; suspected of having a "black design" against them, *ib.*; letters of, connected with the Glencoe massacre, 647; is implicated, by the commission of 1695, as the original cause of the massacre, 648; William dismisses him from his office, 649
Dalton, John, author of the Atomic theory, 1141
Dammaree, Daniel, his share in the riots of 1710, 722; he is tried for high treason, found guilty, but subsequently pardoned, 715; becomes master of queen Anne's barge, 722
Dampierre, general, commands the French republican army, 1793, 996; killed in an attack on the allied forces, May 8, *ib.*
Dance, architect of the Mansion House and Newgate, 934
Danegelt, payments of, 47; abolished by Edward the Confessor, 50
Danes, or Northmen, ravages of, 25
Danes invade Mercia, A.D. 868, 29; again in 870, and advance to East Anglia, *ib.*; obtain possession of Mercia and Northumbria, 31; massacre of, in England, in 1002, 47
Danton, G. J., a leader of the Cordeliers, 973; calls the people to arms, Aug. 9, 1792, 979; appointed minister of justice, 980; encourages the September massacres, 981; protects Dumouriez against the Jacobins, 993; supports the establishment of the revolutionary Republic, *ib.*; guillotined, 1794, 1002
Dantzic, duke of, the Tyrolese beat him back from their territory, 1074
D'Arco, count, Bavarian general; defeated at Schellenburg, 1704, 690
Dardanelles, Duckworth's expedition to the, 1807, 1064
D'Argentean defeated at Montenotte, 1796, by Bonaparte, 1011
Darien Company. See African and Indian Company.
Darmstadt, prince of, assists sir G. Rooke in his expedition against Cadiz, 1702, 690; and at the capture of Gibraltar, 1704, 700; remains there in command of the garrison, *ib.*; he is besieged by the Spaniards, and makes a successful resistance, *ib.*; joins Peterborough, 1705; urges the plan of besieging Barcelona; quarrels with Peterborough, 701; assists Peterborough in surprising Montjuich, but is killed in the attack, 702
Darnley. See Mary of Scotland.
Dartmouth, William Legge, lord; secretary of state, 1710, 724; dissuades, unsuccessfully, Anne from making twelve new peers, 730
Dartmouth, lord; colonial secretary, 1773, 869; privy seal, 1775, 876
Darwin, Erasmus, curious character of his poems, resulting from his combining science with poetry, 1136
Das Minas, a Portuguese general, defeated at Almanzar, 1707, 713
D'Aubach, general, abandons Treves and Sarsbruch, 1705, 704
Daun, marshal, of the Austrian army; advances to relieve Prague, 835; co-operates with Loudoun in surprising Frederick, 837
D'Auverquerque, a friend of William III., 622; his conduct at Steinkirk, 653; joins Marlborough

with his army, 1705, 704; makes a feint attack on the weak portion of the French lines, *ib.*; leads the Dutch cavalry at the battle of Ramilies, 1706, 706; dies 1708, 717
Davies, Rowland, chaplain in the army: a bet of his illustrative of the gambling spirit of the age, 637; quotations from, illustrative of William's campaign in Ireland, 1690, *ib.*, 638, 640
Davoust, L. N., enters Berlin, Dec. 25, 1806, 1061
Dawson, James, executed July, 1746, 817
Davy, sir Humphry, invents the safety lamp, 1815, 1041
Dean Forest destroyed to make charcoal for smelting iron, 605
Deane, Silas, the American agent at Paris, 1776, 878; appointed to make a treaty of alliance with France, 880; his share in promoting incendiarism in England, 880
Decrès, admiral, minister of marine; persuades Napoleon to postpone the invasion of England, 1805, 1050
Deccan, nizam of the, concludes an alliance with Cornwallis, 989; his contingent to the English army, 1029; cedes his Mysore territory for British aid and protection, 1053; his territories devastated by the Pindarees, 1169
Declaratory bill passed, 1766, 853
Declaratory, Indian bill, passed, 1788, 989
Declaration of Independence. See American Declaration of Independence.
Declaration of Pilnitz. See Pilnitz.
Declaration of Rights, twice brought forward by Grattan, 903
Dee, Dr. John, in trouble for casting the nativities of queen Mary and the princess Elizabeth, 331
Defoe's (Daniel) "Journal of the Plague Year," notice of, 543; his account of the effect of shutting up the exchequer in 1671, 555; reason given by, why the dissenters opposed the Declaration of Indulgence, 557; statement of, that the persecution of the dissenter arose from political, not religious, motives, 559; his account of the excitement produced by the popish plot in 1678, 562; joins the insurrection of the duke of Monmouth in 1685, 581; his opinion of the Declaration of Indulgence, 590; remarks on Bristol by, 603; opinion of, on the bills in the northern counties of England, 604; description of Bath by, *ib.*; London glass-houses used by vagrants for lodging in, supported by the statement of his "Colonel Jack," 607; stocking weaving noticed to be very extensively practised by, *ib.*; the Lincolnshire fens noticed by, 608; account of Manchester by, 609; salmon referred to by, 611; account of agricultural counties referred to by, *ib.*; opposes the drama, 671; probably the author of the Legion Memorial, 684; stir caused by his pamphlet on "The Shortest Way with Dissenters," 690; he is tried for writing seditious pamphlets, found guilty, and pilloried at the Royal Exchange, Cheapside, and Temple Bar, 1703, 691; publishes his "Hymn to the Pillory," *ib.*; and an account of the great storm, 1704, 693; his prejudiced remarks against maypoles, 694; Carleton's Memoirs erroneously ascribed to, 701; his "Review" appeared, 1704; its character and aim, 737; his honesty and independence, 742; his power of personifying his characters, 751; the main principle of his writings, *ib.*
De Grasse lands a large force at James Town, 896; his engagement with sir S. Hood, 1781, 897; defeated by Rodney, 1782; surrenders himself a prisoner, 901
De la Place, captain, commanded the garrison at Ticonderoga; surrenders the fort, May 10, 1775, 875
Delacroix, French minister for foreign affairs, considers the Rhine the boundary of France, 1012
De la Rue gives Portland warning of the assassination plot, 665
De Launay. See Launay.
Delaval, admiral, his conduct in the battle of La Hogue, 651
Delhi taken by the British, 1054
Demerara retaken from the French, 899
Democrats, an American political party; its contests, leaders, and vicissitudes, 1095, 1099
Dendermonde surrendered to Marlborough, Sept. 5, 1706, 706
Denham, sir John, the poet; surveyor-general, 752
Denia captured by the English, 1705, 701; besieged, 1708, 701
Denman, sir Thomas, counsel for the Derbyshire insurrectionists, 1817; his opinion of Brandreth, 1124; appointed queen's solicitor-general, 1820, 1151; the conferences, in which he took part, for averting public proceedings against the queen, fail in their object, 1152; boluness of his summing-up speech at the queen's trial, 1153; attorney-general in the Grey ministry, 1187; supports the bill for allowing counsel to prisoners, 1230
Denmark, George of. See George of Denmark.
Dennewitz, battle of, Sept. 6, 1813, 1090
Dennis, John, his rage at Pope's satire, 748
Denonville persuades Blansac to surrender to Marlborough, 698
De Pontis, French admiral, inability of, to take Gibraltar, 1704, 700
De Précy, his defence of Lyon, and escape, 1793, 997
Derby, earl of (E. G. S. Stanley), chief secretary for Ireland, 1830, 1187; speaks in favor of reform, 1189; his hostile speeches against O'Connell, 1833, 1203, 1205; his hostility with the agitators becoming so personal, he exchanges his Irish secretaryship for that of the colonies, *ib.*; resists the appropriation of funds to be sanctioned by the Irish Church Reform Bill, *ib.*; resolutions proposed by, for abolishing slavery in British colonies, 1201; debates on, and progress of the bill for this purpose; it becomes law, *ib.*; resigns his secretaryship, 1834, 1212; declines joining Peel's ministry, 1215; takes part in the debate on the sugar duties, 1244;
Derbyshire, silk trade and lead mines of, 607
Derbyshire, insurrection of, 1817, 1124
Derwentwater, J. Ratcliffe, earl of, joins the Pretender's army, 1715, 763; impeached of high treason by Mr. Lechmere; he is tried and found guilty, 766; his wife implores the king to pardon him, *ib.*; he is executed on Tower Hill, Feb. 24, 1716, *ib.*
Desaix, present at the battle of the Pyramids, 1798, 1021; killed at Marengo, 1800, 1034
Desèze, counsel for Louis XVI.; conducts his defence, 987
Desmoulins, Camille, calls the Parisian mob to arms, 1789, 962
Despard, colonel E. M., execution of, and accomplices, for treason against the king, Feb. 21, 1803, 1043
Desprez, his account of the destruction of the French army, 1812, 1088
D'Estaing, admiral of the French fleet; his campaign of 1778, 886
Detroit captured by the Americans, 1812, 1097
Dettingen, battle of, June 27, 1743, 797; note on, 800
Deuxponts, count de, present at Cornwallis's surrender, 1781, 897
Devonshire, Georgiana, duchess of, her interest in Fox's election, 954
Devonshire, agriculture in; Dartmoor, 917
De Winter, Dutch admiral; defeated and taken prisoner at the battle off Camperdown, Oct. 11, 1797, 1019
De Witt, John, concludes the Triple Alliance with Temple in 1668, 553; chief administrator of Holland on the French invasion in 1672, 556; he and his brother murdered by the mob, *ib.*
D'Harrach, count, Austrian ambassador to Spain; anecdote of, 68.
Dhuleep Sing restored to power by the British, 1280
Dickens, Charles, voluminousness and character of his writings, 1255–8
Dickinson, John, opposes the Revenue act, 861
Dickson, sergeant, his capture of Manchester, 1745, 808.
Dieppe bombarded, 1694, 659
Dillon, panic of his troops, 977
Dinners, style of, early part of the 18th century, 745
Diocletian, persecution of Christians in Britain by, 16
Dion Cassius, relation of the discovery of Britain being an island, 11
Disraeli, Benjamin, his acrimonious remarks on sir R. Peel, 1270–1274, 1277
Disruption, the, in the Scotch Church, 1843, 1265
Dissection of murderers, law passed for the, 1752, 823; subsequently repealed, 823
Dissenters, the sacramental test remains in force against, 1689, 624; Toleration act for, passed, *ib.*; societies for the reformation of manners encouraged by the, after the revolution, 670; feud between the Church and, 1702, 690; Defoe's pamphlet on "The shortest way with the," *ib.*; they join the whig political party, 705; riots against, 1715, 761; toleration measures for the relief of, proposed, 1718, 771; they design a project for obtaining the repeal of the Corporation and Test acts; Walpole by a manœuvre makes the attempt futile; they obtain partial relief occasionally from the Indemnity act; they obtain the repeal they sought for, 1828, 781; they agitate for the repeal of the Test act, 1790, 968; clamor raised against the, 970; the Birmingham riots chiefly directed against the, *ib.*; bill for regulating the marriage of, 1836, 1221
Doddington, G. B., his share in the quarrel between the Prince of Wales and George II., 1736, 788; treasurer of the navy; resigned, 723; promises of offices from the Prince of Wales, *ib.*; intrigues with Bute against Pitt and his ministry, 841; rejoices at Pitt's fall, 844
Doehla, J. C., his account of the surrender of the American army, 1781, 89
Dolben, M. P. for Liskeard, complains of the dangerous nature of Sacheverel's sermons, 1710, 719
Domesday Book of 1085, account of, 62; classes of the people shown by, *ib.*; industry of the country, tenure of lands, and extent of forests, shown by, *ib.*; the New Forest, 63; gardens and vineyards shown to exist by, *ib.*; mills, mines, salt-works, and fisheries noticed by, *ib.*; condition of the people in cities and burghs shown by, *ib.*, 64; number of manors held by Normans in, *ib.*; Norman castles enumerated by, *ib.*; number of churches noticed by, *ib.*
Domestic architecture of the fifteenth century, 184; consumption of timber in, *ib.*
Dominica captured by the English, 1761, 843; by the French, 1778, 886; restored to the English, 1782, 907
Donawert. See Schellenberg.
Donington Castle built by Wilkins, 1143
Donoopew captured by sir A. Campbell, 1825, 1171
Doric buildings, 1143
Dorset, Lionel Cranfield, earl of; Lord Chamberlain, 622; implicated in the Preston plot of 1691, 644
Dorsetshire, agricultural improvements in; land enclosed; wretched state of its peasantry, 917; and agricultural laborers, 1230
D'Orvilliers, count; commands the French fleet; engages the English off Ushant, 1778, 886
Dost Mahomed Khan, the usurping ruler of Afghanistan, 1248; estranges himself from the British government, who declare war against him, *ib.*; and drive him from the kingdom; gains a battle over British troops; surrenders himself prisoner to the British, 1249; released and returned to his sovereignty, 1252
Douay, surrender of, to the allies, 1710, 723
Douglas exposes the perils of sending a Scotch colony to Darien, 674
Dover, Roman lighthouse at, 7
Dover Castle, ancient chapel in, doubtful statement of its having been built by King Lucius, 16; taken by the Normans, 56
Downie, captain, his gallantry at Plattsburg, 1814, 1100
Downing College, Cambridge, built by Wilkins, 1143
Drake, sir Francis, naval successes of, in 1585, 350; successful expedition of, to Cadiz, to foil the purposed invasion by Spain, 369; Plymouth supplied with water by, *ib.*; early exploits of, 371; sails with the fleet from Plymouth on July 19, to meet the Armada, 373; captures a valuable galleon, *ib.*; attacks the Spanish fleet with fire-ships in Calais roads, 374; pursues the scattered ships after the fight off Gravelines, 375; his dispatch to Walsingham, *ib.*; assists in the destruction of the Armada in action and in its flight, *ib.*; with sir John Norris, heads an expedition to seat don Antonio on the throne of Portugal, 376; takes Corunna, fails at Lisbon, but takes and burns Vigo, *ib.*; with sir John Hawkins, sails in 1595 to attack the Spaniards in South America, but fails, and dies, 384
Drake, the English minister at Bavaria; intrigues with France, 1047
Drama, state of, in the time of Elizabeth, 381; made an instrument of, for attacking the Puritans, *ib.*; the early Elizabethan, 394; Marlowe, Peele, Greene, &c., *ib.*; characteristics of Shakspere, *ib.*; Prynne's "Histrio-Mastix," a violent attack on Stage Plays, 427; support given to, by the four Inns of Court, 428; character of the English drama, *temp.* Charles I., *ib.*; deteriorated in morals from that of Elizabeth, *ib.*; the playhouses shut up at the commencement of the Civil War in 1642, by the influence of the Puritans, 451; degraded condition of, during the time of Charles II., 549; licentiousness of, end of 17th century; an order issued in 1697 to suppress it, 670; stage estimate of the female character in the beginning of the 18th century, 743; Steele's relish for the drama, *ib.*; he notices several plays., *ib.*; popularity of puppet shows and Italian operas, 744; the stage becomes political, 790; the act for licensing plays, by which the Lord Chamberlain's interference with theatrical representations was legalized, *ib.*; improved moral state of the theatre, 1774, 793; public taste directed by Garrick, *ib.*; Garrick's acting, *ib.*
Drapier. See Swift.
Dresden, peace of, Dec. 25, 1785, 800; taken by Frederick, 1756; he spares the art specimens, 831; battles of, Aug. 24, 25, and 27, 1813, 1090
Dress. See Costume.
Drinking in the first half of the 18th century, 745
Drouet aids the French royal family in attempting to escape from France, 1791, 972
Druidicial sacrifices, 6; punishment of offenders, *ib.*
Druidism, Cæsar's statement that it was originated in Britain, 4; the system of, as described by Cæsar, *ib.*
Drummond, captain, his supposed murder, 1705, 707
Drummond, Peel's private secretary; shot by mistake instead of sir R. Peel
Drummond, Andrew, a London banker; suspected of favoring the Pretender; examined by government; found innocent; confidence in him restored; becomes the royal banker, 811
Drummond, George, urges a vigorous resistance to the Pretender, 1745, 803
Drummond, James, joins the Pretender's son; is by him created duke of Perth, 1745, 803; has differences with Lord Murray, 807; escapes from Scotland, 1746; death of, 811; skirmishes with the country people on the retreat, 812; unwillingness to forsake his men, *ib.*
Drummond, lord John, fails in seizing Edinburgh castle, 1715, 762; guards the passage of the Spey; falls back on Cumberland's approach, 1746, 815
Drummond, William, viscount Strathallan, commands the Stuart force at Perth, 808; created viscount, 1711; taken prisoner at Sheriffmuir, 1715, 811; killed at Culloden, April 16, 1746, 812; commands the Highlanders at Sheriffmuir, 813
Drumossie. See Culloden.
Dryden, John, produces his "Absalom and Architophel," preparatory to the indictment of Shaftesbury for high treason, 579; and his poem of "The Medal," after the bill had been thrown out by the grand jury, *ib.*; publishes his "Hind and Panther," in 1687, 591; bust of, by Scheemakers, Westminster Abbey, 756
Dubois-Crancé, supersedes Kellermann in his command, 998
Du Chaila, persecutor of the Cevennes Protestants, 691
Duckworth, sir J. T.; vice-admiral of the white; knight of the Bath, 1063; failure of his expedition to the Dardanelles, *ib.*
Ducos, a member of the French Directory, 1031; consul, 1799, *ib.*
Dudley, lord, introduces the smelting of iron with coal, 605
Dudley and Ward, viscount, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the Canning ministry, 1167; one of the Wellington ministry, 1828, 1173; resigns, being succeeded in his secretaryship by the earl of Aberdeen, 1176; his speech on the Reform bill, 1831, 1192
Duelling prevalence of, first half of 18th century, 745
Dugommier replaces Carteaux in the command of the army before Toulon, 1793, 999
Dulwich gallery of pictures, 1146
Dumont, Anthony, his part in Grandval's plot against William III., 1692, 652
Dumont; his remarks on the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the abolition of feudal rights, 964; on Mirabeau, 969; on the French constitution of 1791, 973; his visit to England, 1791–1792, 975; remarks on the September massacres, 1792, 981
Dumouriez, C. F.; minister of foreign affairs, 1792, 977; advocates war against Austria; plans the campaign, *ib.*; advises the dismissal of Roland,

978; opposes the duke of Brunswick, 982; concludes a secret agreement with him, *ib.*; the Austrians raise the siege of Lille on his approach; he gains the battle of Jemappes, Nov. 6, *ib.*; the Austrians retreat before him; enters Antwerp, Nov. 30, 983, 993; marches into Holland; hatred of, by the Jacobins; takes Breda, Klundert, Gertruydenberg; is defeated at Neerwinden, Mar. 18, 1793, *ib.*; deserts the Convention; makes overtures to join the prince of Coburg in re-establishing the constitutional monarchy; his army forsakes him; lives an exile in England till 1823, 994
Duncan, Adam, admiral; deserted by several of his ships in the blockade of the Texel, 1016; stratagems for deceiving the Dutch, 1019; sights the enemy on Oct. 11. 1797, and gives them a signal defeat in the battle of Camperdown, *ib.*
Duncan, Rev. H., established a savings bank at Ruthwell, 1810, 1120
Duncannon, viscount, helps to prepare the Reform bill, 1188; lord privy seal; first commissioner of the land revenue, 1224
Duncanson, major, his share in the Glencoe massacres, 647
Duncombe, Thomas, his motion for hearing the petitioners on presenting the People's Charter rejected, 1262
Dundas. See Melville, lord.
Dundas, sir David, commands the allied troops at Toulon, 1793, 999; second in command of the troops in Holland, 1007; takes part in the British expedition to Holland, 1799, 1031; commander-in-chief, Mar. 18, 1809, 1074; discourages the expedition to Walcheren, *ib.*
Dundee, viscount, wishes to make a compromise with William III., 629; the king refuses to do so, and upon the Convention giving an order to arrest Dundee, he escapes, and raises the clans, 630; meeting general Mackay, at the pass of Killiecrankie, he there defeats him, 631; but falls in the hour of victory, July 27, 1689, and with him the cause of James II., *ib.*
Dundonald, earl of, lord Cochrane; his account of the state of the navy, 1793, 1004; his opinion of Nelson, 1022; M. P. for Westminster, 1809; his enterprise in the Aix roads, April 11, 1072
Dunkirk taken by the French under Turenne, and the English under Lockhart, in 1658, and delivered to the English, 525; sold by Charles II., to the French in 1662, 541; failure of the English to take, 1793, 997
Dunning holds aloof in the proceedings against Wilkes, 1769, 856; his motion on the influence of the crown, 890; pension granted to, 901
Dunstan, St., early life and rise of, 40; becomes the chief adviser of Edred, 41; enforces celibacy on the clergy, and renders the national church more Romish, *ib.*; outrage of, at the coronation feast of Edwy, 42; banishment of, miracles attributed to, *ib.*; chief minister during the reign of Edgar, *ib.*; state of the church at the time of, 43 *et seq.*; alterations effected in, by, *ib.*; reforms effected by, 44; despotic but vigorous government of, 45; arbitrary power of, *ib.*; disputation with bishop Beornhelm at Calne, and asserted miracle, *ib.*; crowns and curses Ethelred, 46; dies in 988, 46
Dunwallo, king, formation of roads in Britain by, 5
Dupin signs the protest against the royal proceedings against the French press, 1830, 1182
Dupleix, Joseph; governor of Pondicherry, 826; aids the nizam of the Deccan, 827; he is compelled to give way before Clive, *ib.*
Dupont, a French general, defeated at Baylen by Castanos, 1069
Durand, col., commands the garrison at Carlisle Castle, 807
Durham Cathedral, foundation of, 76
Durham, low state of agriculture in, 1750–1800; famous for its breed of cattle, 919
Durham, earl of; lord privy seal, 1830, 1187; helps to prepare the Reform bill, 1188; hostile speeches of, against lord Brougham, 1834, 1213; appointed lord high commissioner for appeasing the Canadian grievances, 1233; his government and policy, *ib.*; lord Brougham's attack on his measures causes him to resign, *ib.*; dies broken-hearted; his report on the affairs of British North America, *ib.*
D'Usson, a French general; surrenders Galway, 1691, 614
Dutch, differences of the, with the Long Parliament, 503; war with England commenced, *ib.*; battles of Van Tromp and Ruyter with Blake, in 1652, *ib.*; Van Tromp again defeated in 1653, 507; Van Tromp defeated and killed, 513; war of, with Charles II. in 1665, 542; sea-fight off Lowestoffe, 544; De Ruyter's fight of four days against Monk, 545; their coasts ravaged, 546; their fleet enters the Medway, burns the ships there, and blockades London, in June, 1667, 550; defeated in Southwold bay by the duke of York, 556
Dwyer reveals the Cato-street conspiracy to the home office, 1149
Dyer, John, his poem of the "Fleece" referred to, giving an account of a weaver's labors, 602; other quotations from, 924

EARTHQUAKE at Lisbon, 1755, Nov. 28, 829
Earthenware; the Staffordshire potteries the chief seat of the trade, 606; state of the trade at the beginning of the 18th century, 1774, and 1857, 927; chiefly promoted by Wedgwood and Cooksworthy, *ib.*
East India Company, charters granted for the incorporation of, 408; first English factory at Surat, founded in 1612, *ib.*; a new company is established, and called "The English Company," 1698, 660; the two are amalgamated four years afterwards, *ib.*; seizes a vessel belonging to the Darien (African and Indian) Company, 707; retrospect of their affairs in India, 1745, 826; the French company becomes their rival, and attack Madras, 1746, *ib.*; and nearly undermine the English power; Clive enters the army, 827; organizes an attack upon Arcot, which he takes; he is besieged by rajah Sahib, *ib.*; who relinquishes the siege, *ib.*; Clive takes Trichinopoly in conjunction with major Lawrence; hostilities suspended, *ib.*; Pitt institutes an inquiry into their affairs, 854; their pecuniary affairs in disorder; they petition parliament for a loan of a million and a half; a committee appointed to inquire into their affairs, *ib.*; the directors quarrel; things go to ruin; matters mended by Clive's judicious measures, *ib.*; their rotten financial position, 869; the Regulation Act; Warren Hastings, first governor-general; allowed to export teas free of duty to the American colonies, *ib.*; Clavering, Monsell and Francis appointed members of the council, 1774, 948; Fox proposes that the authority of, be transferred to a board of commissioners, 951; they refuse to bear the expenses of sending troops to India; they are compelled to do so by the passing of Pitt's Declaratory bill, 990; inquiry made into their affairs by the House of Commons, 1813; which results in several important measures, 1168; renewal of their charter for twenty years, 1833; important alterations in the charter provisions; ceases to be a commercial company, 1854, 1208; its trade with China abolished; effects of the abolition, 1246
East India House designed by Holland, 1143
East Indies, Thomas Coryat's account of the country, 408; embassy of sir Thomas Roe to Agra, 1615-19, *ib.*; his account of the Mogul rulers of Hindostan, *ib.*; contrasted with the present state, 409
Eastlake, sir C., sketching Napoleon, 1815, 1108
Ebrington, M. P. for Devonshire, moves that the principles of the rejected Reform bill be not given up, 1193; moves that the king be implored to call a reform ministry, 1197
Ecclesiastical power, rapid growth of, in England, from the Conquest to the time of Stephen, 75; numerous religious foundations established, 76; Cistercian abbeys erected, *ib.*; churches and cathedrals, *ib.*; such foundations a substitute for personal service in the crusades, and a commutation for crimes, *ib.*
Eckmuhl, battle of, April 22, 1809, 1073
Economical Reform bill brought forward by Burke, 1780; his speech, 889; other motions proposed, *ib.*; practical measures of Burke's bill rejected, 890; the bill is again introduced, 1782, 901; passed, *ib.*
Eddystone lighthouses, their fates and constructors, 604
Eden, secretary for Ireland; moves for the repeal of the act asserting the independence of Ireland, 1782, 904; his account of the anarchy in France, 1789, 964
Edgar, accession of in 760, 43; Dunstan the chief minister during the reign of, *ib.*; peaceful reign of, 44; licentiousness of, and story of Elfrida, *ib.*; rowed down the Dee by kings, *ib.*; arbitrary power of, 45; death of, in 975, 45
Edgar Atheling chosen king by the Londoners, 56; submits to William the Conqueror, and is treated with kindness, 56; flies to Scotland, 58; invades England, with Sweyn, *ib.*, 59; becomes a pensioner of William, 61; again flies to Scotland, 67
Edgehill, battle of, on Oct. 23, 1642, 455
Edgeworth, abbé, attends Louis XVI. at his execution, 248
Edgeworth, Miss, her delineations of the Irish, 1140
Edinburgh, Charles Edward's entry into, 1745, 801
Edinburgh Castle held by the duke of Gordon for James II., 1689, 620; he surrenders it, 631
Edinburgh Review started, 1802; its services to literature, 1140
Edmund, St., king of East Anglia, defeated and slain by the Danes in 870, 30; buried at St. Edmund's Bury, *ib.*
Edmund the Etheling, accession of, in 940, 40; murdered, *ib.*
Edmund Ironside, accession of, in 1016, 48; successes of, against Canute, *ib.*; divides the kingdom with Canute, and dies in 1016, *ib.*
Edred, accession of, in 940, 41; revolt in Northumbria subdued by, *ib.*; death of, in 956, *ib.*
Edric, treachery of, to Ethelred and Edmund Ironside, 47, 48
Education, low state of, among the people in the beginning of the eighteenth century, 739; and also among ladies in higher grades of society, 742; Swift's remarks upon ladies' education, 743; Sunday-schools originated by Raikes, 947; inquiry into the state of, moved for by Henry Brougham, 1816, 1120; the Education Commission, *ib.*; it merges into the Charity Commission; extent of instruction in 1816, *ib.*; schoolmaster abroad, 1828, 1174; benefits derived from the endowed grammar schools, *ib.*; schools and scholars, 1818 and 1833; Sunday-schools and free schools, *ib.*; diffusion of knowledge by the establishment of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, a cheap and sound literature, the London Mechanics' Institution and others similar to it, the London University and King's College, *ib.*; increased popular desire for sound literature as shown by the circulation of the "Penny Magazine," 1202; lord Brougham's education resolutions, 1217; Walker's school, in the Devil's acre, the origin of the London ragged-schools; grants in aid of, 1834–1837, 1230; the board of education constituted, 1839; general state of, in 1839, *ib.*; increase of schools and scholars, 1831–1841, 1231; neglect of, in the Boughton district, 1236; sir J. Graham compelled to withdraw his education clauses in the Bill for regulating labor in factories, 1269; government grant to Maynooth college; establishment of the three Irish secular colleges of Cork, Galway, and Belfast, 1274
Edward succeeds his father Alfred in 901, 38; insurrection of Ethelwold against, *ib.*; repels the Northmen and the Welsh, and subdues East Anglia, *ib.*; death of, in 924, *ib.*
Edward the Martyr, accession of, in 975, 45; assassination of, in 978, 45, 46
Edward the Confessor, son of Ethelred, brought up in Normandy, 48, 49; brought over to England by Hardicanute, *ib.*; succeeds Hardicanute in 1042, 50; marries earl Godwin's daughter and neglects her, *ib.*; abolishes the Dane-geit, *ib.*; introduces Norman adherents and customs, 51; is opposed by earl Godwin in his wish to punish summarily the rioters against earl Eustace of Boulogne, *ib.*; banishes Harold and Godwin, *ib.*; imprisons his wife, *ib.*; triumph of the Norman party, *ib.*; is forced to restore Godwin and Harold, 52; death of, in 1066, 54
Edward I., born in 1239, 108; swears to the "Provisions of Oxford" in 1258, 111; refuses to be absolved by the pope from observing his oath, *ib.*; commands his father's forces in the civil war against the barons, 111; is defeated at the battle of Lewes, 112; wins the battle of Evesham, on Aug. 4, 1265, *ib.*; storm on the day of, 113; crusade undertaken by, in 1269, *ib.*; attempted to be assassinated at Jaffa, 114; his wife Eleanor of Castile sucks the poison from the wound, *ib.*; concludes a truce with the sultan, and returns to Europe in 1272, where he learns that his father is dead, *ib.*; succeeds "by the unanimous assent of the nobles and great men," and is crowned, Aug. 19, 1274, *ib.*; festivities at the coronation, *ib.*; attacks Llewellyn prince of Wales, who is forced to submit to do homage, *ib.*; various useful statutes passed in the first parliament of, 115; persecution and banishment of the Jews, *ib.*; visits king Philip of France, at Amiens, *ib.*; first statute of mortmain, *ib.*; insurrection of the Welsh, 116; Llewellyn is slain, and his brother executed, *ib.*; final subjection of the Welsh, and birth of prince Edward at Cærnarvon, who is created prince of Wales in 1284, *ib.*; statute passed by, for the settlement of Wales, *ib.*; condition and manners of the people in the time of, 117 *et seq.*; negotiates a marriage for his son with the heiress of the crown of Scotland, but she dies, and the succession is disputed, 122; commences his war against the independence of Scotland, *ib.*; Statute of Confirmation of the Charters, giving the sole right of raising supplies to the people, on Oct. 10, 1297, 123; is appointed umpire of the claimants to the Scottish crown, 124; demands an acknowledgment of his superiority as liege lord, *ib.*; it is not given by the states, but assented to by Bruce and Balliol, and the crown is awarded to Balliol, who does homage, *ib.*; subdues an insurrection in Wales, *ib.*; invades Scotland, and compels Balliol to resign his crown to him, 125; receives the homage of the bishops and peers of Scotland, *ib.*; revolt of Wallace against, *ib.*; defeats the Scots at Falkirk, *ib.*; the pope demands that the dispute should be left to his decision, and the claim is indignantly rejected by the parliament of Lincoln, 126; constitution of the parliament of Lincoln, *ib.*; again invades Scotland, and concludes a treaty excluding Wallace, *ib.*; besieges and takes Stirling, *ib.*; causes Wallace and Fraser to be executed, 127; Robert Bruce the younger heads another revolt in 1305, *ib.*; assembles an army to attack Bruce, but dies before he reaches Scotland, on July 7, 1307, 127
Edward II. succeeds his father in 1307, 127; conduct of, in his youth, *ib.*; is crowned Feb. 24, 1308, 128; recalls Gaveston, whom his father had banished, and marries Isabella of France, *ib.*; appoints Gaveston governor of Ireland, *ib.*; discontent occasioned by the favor shown to Gaveston, *ib.*; Gaveston is exiled, and again recalled, *ib.*; is taken prisoner and hung in 1312, *ib.*; successes of Robert Bruce against, *ib.*; reconciles himself to the barons and marches into Scotland, 129; battle of Bannockburn on June 24, 1314, *ib.*; famine in England, *ib.*; rise of the Despencers and wealth of, *ib.*; insurrection of the barons, by whom the Despensers are banished, *ib.*; the sentence against the Despensers annulled by a parliament at York, *ib.*; overcomes the barons, and causes the earl of Lancaster to be executed, 131; invades Scotland, suffers from want of provisions, is obliged to retreat, *ib.*; concludes a truce with Bruce, *ib.*; order of Knights Templars suppressed in England in 1308, *ib.*; the queen goes to France to conclude a treaty with Philip in 1325, *ib.*; Roger Mortimer joins the queen at Paris, and returns with her and Prince Edward in arms against the king in 1326, 132; Edward is deposed and imprisoned and the Despensers are hung, *ib.*; is murdered at Berkeley Castle in 1327, *ib.*; wretched state of England during the reign of, 133
Edward III., son of Edward II., is invested with the foreign possessions in 1325, and does homage to the king of France, 131; joins his mother and Roger Mortimer in an insurrection against his father, 132; is declared guardian of the kingdom, *ib.*; his father is deposed, and he is crowned, Jan. 29, 1327, *ib.*; first campaign of, against the Scots, 133; concludes a peace, recognizing the independence of Scotland in 1328, *ib.*; marries Philippa of Hainault, *ib.*; seizure and execution of Mortimer, 133; imprisonment of Isabella, *ib.*; transition state of feudality in the time of, 134; growth of independence among the people, and the effect of the writings of Wycliffe and Chaucer upon, *ib.*; establishment of the English language, *ib.*; supports Edward Balliol's claim to the Scottish crown, and wins the battle of Halidon Hill, 135; claims of, to the crown of France, stated, *ib.*; naval victory of Sluys gained by, *ib.*; comparison of the peoples of England, France, and Flanders, in the time of, *ib.*; supports James Artevelde in his revolt against the count of Flanders, 136; relieves Jane de Montfort, besieged in Hennebon by Philip of France, 136; invades France with an army in 1346, *ib.*; the strength of his army consisted in the superiority of the English yeomen over the feudal nobles, *ib.*; statute providing that England should not be sub-

ject to France in case of his acquiring that kingdom, 136; early successes in the invasion, *ib.*; march to and passage of the Somme, 137; battle of Cressy, on Aug. 26, 1346, *ib.*; Cressy, the victory of the yeomen, 138; battle of Neville's Cross, and capture of David Bruce by Queen Philippa, *ib.*; siege of Calais, *ib.*; surrender of and pardon of the six burgesses at the intercession of the queen, 139; Edward founds an English colony at Calais, *ib.*; institution of the Order of the Garter in 1349, *ib.*; decoration and enlargement by, of his palaces of Westminster and Windsor, 140; great pestilence of the Black Plague, in 1349, *ib.*; mortality and misery occasioned by, *ib.*; Statute of Laborers passed to mitigate the effects of, *ib.*; injustice and inefficiency of the statute, 141; he repels an invasion of the Scots, and ravages the Lothians, *ib.*; the battle of Poitiers won by the Black Prince on Sept. 19, 1356, and John, king of France, taken prisoner, *ib.*; chivalrous reception of John in London, 142; miseries occasioned in France by the invasion, and rise of the Jacquerie, *ib.*; renewed invasion of France in 1359, *ib.*; peace of Bretigny concluded, 143; contrast of the state of the people of England and France, *ib.*; stipulations in favor of freedom by the Commons of England, *ib.*; statutes passed for the distinction of ranks, *ib.*; accession of Charles V. in France, and resistance offered by, 144; war with France renewed, *ib.*; resumes the title of King of France, 145; the French recover the conquests of Edward, *ib.*; his queen Philippa dies in 1369, and his son Edward dies in 1376, *ib.*; Richard is presented to Parliament as his successor, *ib.*; rising influence of the Duke of Lancaster, and dotage of the king, *ib.*; dies on June 21, 1377, 145

Edward the Black Prince accompanies his father in the invasion of France in 1346, 136; conduct of, at the battle of Cressy, 138; ravages Gascony and Auvergne in 1355 and 1356, 141; cruelties of ancient war as compared with modern, *ib.*; wins the battle of Poitiers on Sept. 19, 1356; and takes prisoner John, king of France, 142; chivalrous treatment of his captive, *ib.*; appointed prince of Aquitaine, 144; supports the cause of Peter the Cruel in Spain, *ib.*; wins the battle of Najara in 1367, *ib.*; captures and releases Bertrand du Guesclin, *ib.*; summoned by Charles V. to answer complaints of misgovernment, refuses, and war recommences, 145; takes Limoges, concludes a truce, and returns to England, *ib.*; dies in 1376, *ib.*

Edward IV. (earl of March) escapes with Warwick to Calais, after being declared traitors by the parliament at Coventry, 191; is present at the battle of Northampton, 192; succeeds his father as duke of York, on his defeat and death at Wakefield, Dec. 31, 1460, *ib.*; enters London and is proclaimed as king on March 4, 1461, *ib.*; marches with Warwick to the North and wins the battle of Towton, 193; crowned June 29, 1461, 194; causes sir Baldwin Fulford to be executed, *ib.*; other Lancastrians attainted in parliament, 194; renewed attempts to restore Henry in 1462 and 1464, *ib.*; suppressed by the battle of Hexham, 195; Somerset beheaded, *ib.*; concludes a truce with Scotland, *ib.*; extravagance of, and debasement of the coin by, *ib.*; injury to the industry of the country, *ib.*; arts of, to obtain popularity, *ib.*; marriage of, to Elizabeth Woodville, *ib.*; marries his sister to the heir of the duke of Burgundy, *ib.*; insurrection in Yorkshire against an impost, *ib.*; Clarence and Warwick take him prisoner, *ib.*; he escapes, defeats them at Stamford, and they fly to France, *ib.*; queen Margaret, with Warwick and Clarence, invade England, he is deserted, and Henry is restored, 196; he flies to Holland, 197; obtains some help from the Duke of Burgundy, *ib.*; returns to England, and lands at Ravenspur, *ib.*; is reconciled to Clarence, 198; wins the battle of Barnet, *ib.*; defeats queen Margaret at Tewkesbury, on May 4, 1471, 199; insurrection of Falconbridge, suppressed by Richard, duke of Gloucester, *ib.*; patronage of literature and printing by, 200; invades France, is cajoled by Lewis XI., and concludes the treaty of Picquiny, 201; opposes the marriage of Clarence with the heiress of Burgundy, *ib.*; accuses Clarence of treason, who is condemned, and dies in the Tower, *ib.*; war with Scotland in 1480, and the town of Berwick taken from the Scotch, 202; death of, on April 9, 1483, *ib.*

Edward V., accession of, April 9, 1483, 202; provision for the education of, *ib.*; dissensions in the council of, *ib.*; earl Rivers and others of his council arrested, *ib.*; his mother and brother take sanctuary in Westminster, 203; Gloucester appointed protector, *ib.*; time of coronation appointed, *ib.*; the duke of York removed to the Tower, 205; declared illegitimate by parliament, *ib.*; death of, with his brother, 206; evidence as to the murder of, considered, 207

Edward VI., born Oct. 12, 1537, 272; succeeds his father, Jan. 28, 1547, 301; the duke of Somerset chosen protector, *ib.*; influence of the young king's character, and journal of, *ib.*; progress of the Reformation under, 303; repeal of Henry VIII.'s various statutes of treason, *ib.*; dissatisfaction of, with the guardianship of Somerset, 306; insurrection in Cornwall and Devonshire against the innovations on the old religion, 307; siege of Exeter by the insurgents, *ib.*; defeat of the insurgents at Cliff Heath, and numerous executions, 308; John Ket's Norfolk rebellion against inclosures, *ib.*; the rebels encamp on Mousehold heath, *ib.*; their regular organization, *ib.*; defeat a royal army in Norwich, *ib.*; the earl of Warwick defeats the rebels, on Aug. 27, 1549, 309; Ket and his brother hung, *ib.*; notice in Edward's Journal of the confederacy of nobles against Somerset, 310; who removes him to Windsor Castle, 311; Somerset is arrested and sent to the Tower, *ib.*; the protectorship revoked, *ib.*; new laws against the breaking of inclosures, 312; general pardon granted, except to Anabaptists, *ib.*; persecution of that sect, and burning of Joan Bocher, *ib.*; aversion of Edward to signing the warrant for her execution, *ib.*; Articles of Belief issued by, 313; popish bishops deprived of their sees, *ib.*; remonstrates with the princess Mary against her use of the mass, *ib.*; Somerset restored to a place in the council, *ib.*; Somerset again arrested, convicted of felony, and executed in Jan. 1551, 314; peace with France and restoration of Boulogne, 315; Northumberland the actual governor, *ib.*; becomes ill, *ib.*; makes a will altering the succession in favor of lady Jane Grey, *ib.*; dies on July 6, 1553, *ib.*; character of, *ib.*; educational institutions of, *ib.*; table of the female heirs to the crown named in the will of Henry VIII. and the devise of Edward VI., *ib.*

Edwin, king of Northumbria, receives and is converted to Christianity by Paulinus, 23

Edwy, accession of, in 956, 41; outrage of Dunstan during the coronation feast of, 42; marriage of, with Elgiva, *ib.*; revolt of Odo, and appointment of Edgar as joint king, *ib.*; is separated from Elgiva, *ib.*; death of, in 960, *ib.*

Egalité. See Orleans, duc d'.

Egbert, early years of, at the court of Charlemagne, 24; chosen king of Wessex in 800, 25; defeats Beornwulf, of Mercia, in 823, at Ellendune, and consolidates England; dies, 837, *ib.*

Egerton, colonel, unsuccessful results of his Mahratta expedition, 949

Egerton, lord F., urges the importance of reducing the paper duty, 1836, 1221

Egremont, lord, secretary of state, 1761–3, 844, 865; again secretary of state, 1763, 846; dies of apoplexy, 847

Egyptians or gipsies, statute of Elizabeth against, 386

Ehrenbreitstein capitulates to the French, Jan. 1799, 1030

El Arish seized by Jezzar, 1799, 1029; recovered by the Allies, 1038

Elchingen, battle of, 1805, 1050

Eldon, John Scott, lord, his maiden speech on Fox's India bill, 1783, 952; attorney-general; draws up the Traitorous Correspondence bill, 992; his prosecution speech against Hardy, 1003; chancellor, 1801–1806, 1036, 1325; his opinion of the Volunteers, 1045; against an administration on a broad basis, 1046; his political opinions, 1083; opposes any repeal of the laws, 1117; chancellor, 1807–1827, 1062, *ib.*; his opinion of the criminal code, 1117; advocates the abolition of the appeal of murder, 1131; considers the Manchester reform men as guilty of treason, 1133; promotes the passing of the six acts, 1819, *ib.*; recognizes Caroline as queen of England, 1151; opposes any measures unfavorable to the corn laws, 1164; his test of official fitness; anecdote of, at the duke of York's funeral, 1827, *ib.*; resigns his chancellorship on the accession of the Canning ministry, 1827, 1165; considers himself ill-used on being omitted from the Wellington ministry, 1173; objects to the bill for the repeal of the Corporation and Test acts, 1175; opposes the relief of Roman Catholics, 1177; endeavors to persuade the king to refuse his assent to the measure, 1178; his fears for the destruction of the aristocracy by the Reform bill, 1189; his speech against reform, 1831, 1192; against the repeal of the corn laws, 1833, 1202; laments his inability to obtain the rejection of the Municipal Reform bill, 1219

Elections and election scenes, 705, 954, 1129, 1176

Elgin marbles purchased by government, 1816, 1145

Elgiva, queen of Edwy, persecution of, by Dunstan and Odo, 41

Elie, his share in the attack on the Bastile, 1789, 963

Eliot, sir John, committed to the Tower for his speech in the House of Commons on the impeachment of the duke of Buckingham, 421; refuses to make any submission, and is released, *ib.*; assists in the debate on the Petition of Rights in 1628, 423; prepares protestations against popery and arbitrary taxation, 425; the Speaker held in the chair while they are voted, *ib.*; is sent to the Tower, after the parliament had been dissolved in 1629, *ib.*; refuses to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the King's Bench in matters committed in the House of Commons, 427; is recommitted to the Tower in March, 1629, and dies on November 27, 1632, *ib.*; his employments while imprisoned, *ib.*; the judgment against him reversed after the Restoration, *ib.*

Elizabeth, wife of Edward IV., takes sanctuary in Westminster with her second son the duke of York, 203; the duke of York taken from under her care to join his brother in the Tower, 204; submits to Richard and leaves the sanctuary, 210; alleged harsh treatment of, by Henry VII. and confinement in the nunnery of Bermondsey, 213; dies in 1492, 219

Elizabeth, queen, born Sept. 7, 1533, 254; interview of, with Edward after Henry's death, 301; is courted by Lord Thomas Seymour, who is executed for treason, 305; joins Mary in her progress to London, 318; is present at the coronation of Mary, 319; is sent for from Ashbridge to court by Mary, 323; accused of a conspiracy with Courtenay, earl of Devonshire, and committed to the Tower, *ib.*; letter of, to Mary, *ib.*; is removed to Woodstock, 324; suspected of a knowledge of the Dudley conspiracy, in 1556, 332; letter of, to Mary, *ib.*; declines a marriage with the duke of Savoy, 333; the Spanish ambassador's account of her character, 334; succeeds to the crown on Nov. 17, 1558, 335; refuses to attend mass on Christmas Day, *ib.*; the parliament press her to marry, and she replies, *ib.*; coronation and popularity of, 336; Mary's statutes in favor of popery repealed, 337; moderation of her proceedings, *ib.*; peace concluded with France, *ib.*; becomes the acknowledged head of the reformed religion, 338; lends assistance secretly to the Reformers of Scotland, 339; sends an army to the assistance of the Lords of the Congregation in Scotland, *ib.*; concludes a peace with Scotland, in which she provides for the safety of the Reformers, *ib.*; sends an ambassador to condole with Mary on the death of Francis II., 340; policy of, towards Mary, *ib.*; refuses her a safe-conduct for her return from France to Scotland, 341; increased public spirit of the people under, 342; restores the coin to its standard purity, *ib.*; processions of, 343; sends aid to the French Protestants, in 1563, *ib.*; act against papists passed, requiring the oath of supremacy to be taken, *ib.*; Edmund and Arthur Pole convicted of conspiracy, and imprisoned for life, *ib.*; Act against "fond and fantastical prophecies," *ib.*; continued refusal of, to declare Mary of Scotland her successor, 344; recommends Lord Robert Dudley to Queen Mary as a husband, *ib.*; refuses to consent to her marriage with Darnley, *ib.*; secretly aids Murray and the reforming nobles in their revolt against Mary, 345; becomes godmother to the infant James of Scotland, 347; interferes to procure an impartial trial of Bothwell, 348; remonstrates with the Scottish nobles against the imprisonment of Mary, 349; and more strongly against her extorted abdication, *ib.*; embarrassment of the government of, on Mary's taking refuge in England, 351; question as to the justice of detaining Mary as a prisoner, *ib.*; refuses to see Mary during the conference appointed to hear the charges against her, 352; anxiety of, for the safe custody of Mary, *ib.*; commits the duke of Norfolk to the Tower for contracting to marry the Queen of Scots, 353; insurrection in the North in favor of the Roman Catholic religion, *ib.*; touching story of lady Catherine Grey, *ib.*; incorrectness of the statement that she died in the Tower, *ib.*; intrigues of Philip of Spain, and the Roman Catholics against, 354; the earls of Westmoreland and Northumberland head a Roman Catholic insurrection in the north, 355; suppressed by the earl of Sussex, *ib.*; papal bull of excommunication against her, *ib.*; new statute against papists, *ib.*; she is urged to proceed criminally against Mary, *ib.*; trial of the duke of Norfolk on the discovery of a fresh intrigue, 356; reluctance of Elizabeth to order his execution, 357; massacre of St. Bartholomew's, *ib.*; conduct of Elizabeth on receiving the news, *ib.*; insecurity felt by, in consequence of the continued intrigues in favor of Mary, 358; plots of the Jesuits in England against, *ib.*; Campion and others executed, *ib.*; increased severities against the papists, *ib.*; affords assistance to the Protestants in the Netherlands, 359; declines the sovereignty of them offered to her, *ib.*; represses the ambitious views of Leicester, *ib.*; naval successes of Drake, in 1585, 360; Walsingham's announcement of new conspiracies, *ib.*; conviction and execution of Parry, *ib.*; Babington's conspiracy, *ib.*; trial of the conspirators, 361; alleged participation of Mary in the plot, *ib.*; Mary is transferred to Fotheringay, *ib.*; letter of Elizabeth to James VI., *ib.*; association for her protection, 362; statute for the protection of the queen's person, *ib.*; issues a commission for the trial of Mary under this statute, *ib.*; judgment is pronounced against Mary, 364; parliament urges the execution of the sentence, and the queen's reply, *ib.*; continued hesitation of, *ib.*; signs the warrant for Mary's execution, *ib.*; interview of, with Davison, *ib.*; endeavors to exonerate herself from the charge of having caused Mary's death, 365; slight grounds for the justification, 366; examination of the charge, in Davison's statement, that she desired that Mary might be privately assassinated, *ib.*; threatened invasion of England by Spain, 369; suspicions of, that James of Scotland intended to aid Spain, 370; fresh preparations made by Philip, *ib.*; an army assembled at Tilbury, *ib.*; measures taken for the defence of the coast, 371; speech of, to the army at Tilbury, *ib.*; loyalty of the Roman Catholics, on the threatened invasion by Spain, 372; libels published abroad against the queen, *ib.*; the Armada is sent forth, *ib.*; its force, 373; the English fleet at Plymouth, and its force, *ib.*; superiority of the mariners, *ib.*; notice of the commanders, *ib.*; the fleet leaves Plymouth on July 19, 1588, to encounter the Armada, *ib.*; the successful fight up Channel, *ib.*; tactics of the English fleet, 374; several actions off the Isle of Wight, on July 25, *ib.*; the Armada attacked by English fire-ships in Calais-roads, *ib.*; the last great fight, on July 29, 375; flight of the scattered Armada to the north, *ib.*; destructive losses of the Armada in action and in its flight, *ib.*; triumphal procession of the queen to St. Paul's, 376; expedition sent to Portugal to assist Don Antonio, *ib.*; Vigo taken and burnt, *ib.*; energy of the people shown by their volunteering against Philip, by their discoveries, and in their literature, *ib.*; religious sects in the second half of her reign, 377; progress of the Nonconformists, *ib.*; efforts of archbishop Whitgift to repress puritanism, 378; statutes against non-conforming Protestants and popish recusants, in 1593, *ib.*; sends an expedition to aid Henry IV. and the Protestants of France, 382; indications of a contest with parliament for prerogative against privilege, *ib.*; contests between the Crown and Commons, 383; Morice sent to prison for a speech in the House of Commons, *ib.*; extenuations of Elizabeth's conduct, *ib.*; attempt of Philip to procure her to be poisoned, *ib.*; expeditions against the West Indies and against Cadiz, 384; statute passed for the relief of the poor, in 1597, 385; statute against vagabondage, *ib.*; statute for regulating wages, 386; statute against Egyptians, or gipsies, *ib.*; statutes against the increase of buildings in London, 387; death of Burleigh, 388; and of Philip, *ib.*; continued war with Spain, *ib.*; state of Ireland, *ib.*; Elizabeth quarrels with Essex, and appoints him lord lieutenant of Ireland, to suppress the rebellion of Tyrone, 389; he fails, and returns to England, *ib.*; interview of, with Essex, *ib.*; her

exposition of her method of retaining the affection of the people, 390; commits Essex to "free custody," *ib.*; Essex attempts an insurrection, *ib.*; it fails, and he surrenders, 391; is tried with the earl of Southampton, *ib.*; and is executed, on Feb. 25, 1601, *ib.*; the Commons remonstrate against monopolies, 392; and she promises to abate them, *ib.*; she dies, March 24, 1603, 393; note on Essex's ring, *ib.*

Elizabeth, daughter of James I., married to the elector palatine in 1613, 412; her husband chosen king of Bohemia, on the Protestant interest, 415; the palatinate invaded by the Catholic powers, *ib.*; tardy and useless assistance afforded by James, *ib.*; the elector defeated at Prague, and expelled from the palatinate, 416

Elizabeth, princess, accompanies Louis in his flight from Paris, 1791, 972; guillotined, 1794, 1001

Elizabeth, czarina of Russia, joins the coalition against Prussia, 831; reigned, 1741–1762, 1310

Elkington, Joseph, discovers the system of under drainage, 918

Ellenborough, lord; lord chief justice, 1056; determines to preside in court, and to convict W. Hone, 1126; his harshness and persecution of the prisoner, who obtains a verdict of not guilty, *ib.*; presides over another trial with the same result, *ib.*; conduct after the trial; contemplates resigning his office, 1127; president of the Board of Control, 1215; governor-general of India, 1251; his proclamations to the people of India, 1252; makes war on the Mahrattas; recalled by the East India Company, 1268

Ellesmere, lord, denies that Wellington was surprised at Waterloo, 1104

Elliott, captain, superintendent at Canton; his proceedings; blockades Canton; his arrival at the Factory described, 1246; his futile attempts at negotiation, 1247; settles the difficulties, *ib.*

Elliot, general, governor of Gibraltar; his defence of the fort, 1782, 905

Elliott, Mrs., quotation from, on the execution of Louis XVI., 987; anecdote by, of the French feeling towards Fox and Pitt, 993

Elphinstone, major-general, appointed to command the British army in Cabul, 1250; his conference with Akbar Khan, 1251; died April 23, 1842, *ib.*

Emaun-Ghur, Napier's march to, and destruction of, 1267

Emigration, extent of, 1815-1852, 1234

Emmanuel College chapel, Cambridge, built by Wren, 754

Emmett, Robert, heads an insurrection in Dublin, July 23, 1803, 1044; trial and execution of, *ib.*

Empson, sir Richard and Edmund Dudley, ministers of Henry VII. in his extortions, 221; convicted, and executed for extortion, on the accession of Henry VIII., 227

Enghien, duc d', arrest and murder of, 21 Mar., 1804, 1047

Engraving, state of, *temp.* 1760-83, 933; Strange and Woollett, *ib.*; mezzotint engraving and engravers, 934; Boydell, his large business in engravings, *ib.*; extension of the public taste for, 1148; Sharp, and other line engravers, *ib.*; wood engraving revived by Bewick; his publications; lithography and its earliest cultivators, *ib.*

Enniskillen, the Irish Protestants take refuge in, 1689, 787; threatened siege of, 788

Episcopalian clergy, of Scotland, not well favored towards the Test Act, 788; hatred of the Scotch to the, *ib.*

Episcopalians, their strength in Scotland, 804

Erasmus's account of his pilgrimage to Walsingham and Canterbury, 223; remarks of, on the ill condition of the houses, and the inattention to diet in England, 224; his compliment to the spirit of the people, *ib.*

Ercole, Renaldo, duke of Modena, 1011; buys Bonaparte off his territories, *ib.*

Ernest Augustus of Hanover. See Cumberland.

Erskine. See Mar, earl of.

Erskine, Thomas, lord, defends lord George Gordon, 1781, 892; his maiden speech, 1783; advocates Fox's India bill, 952; defends Paine, 1792, 986; opposes the Traitorous Correspondence bill, 992; counsel for Thomas Hardy, 1001; his reply to the attorney-general's charge, 1003; defends Tooke and Thelwall, *ib.*; passage from his speech for Hardy, *ib.*; lord chancellor, 1806, 1056

Espremenil arrested and imprisoned for opposing the establishment of "La Cour Plenière," 960

Essayists; the "Tatler," commenced by Richard Steele, 1709, 737; its aim; it becomes the substitute of the old newspapers, *ib.*; influence and objects of the, 738; their endeavors in diffusing knowledge, 739; they direct the attention of the people to our old English ballads, and our standard poets, *ib*; and create a general taste for reading, 741; their description of the prude and the coquette, 744; of puppet shows and the masquerade, *ib.*; their reprobation of drinking in excess, 745; of giving luxurious dinners, and of duelling, 745; the "Rambler," commenced by Johnson, 1750; the "Idler," 1758; the "Adventurer," issued 1752; the "World," 1753; and the "Connoisseur," 1754; Moore and Cambridge Colman and Thornton, 937

Essequibo retaken by the French, 899

Essex, London supply of food from, 912; extinction of saffron cultivation in *ib.*

Essex, Robert Devereux, earl of, accompanies Drake in the expedition to attack Spain, 376; early career of, 382; commands the expedition sent to aid Henry IV., *ib.*; defeats the attempt of Philip to poison Elizabeth, 384; is appointed to the command of an expedition to attack Spain, *ib.*; takes and burns Cadiz, in 1596, *ib.*; commands another expedition with Raleigh, with whom he disagrees, *ib.*; quarrels with the queen, and is then appointed lord-lieutenant of Ireland, in 1599, 389; fails to suppress the rebellion of Tyrone, and returns to England, *ib.*; interview of, with the queen, *ib.*; is committed to "free custody," *ib.*; schemes of, in favor of James, *ib.*; attempts to raise an insurrection, 390; it fails, and he surrenders, 391; trial of, with his accomplice the earl of Southampton, *ib.*; conduct of Bacon, *ib.*; the execution of Essex, on Feb. 25, 1601, *ib.*; note on the story of the ring, 393

Essex, Robert Devereux, earl of, divorced from his wife, 410; proclaimed a traitor by Charles I. as captain-general of the parliamentary army, 449; marches from London against the king on Sept. 9, 1642, 454; at Northampton, 455; moves his army to Worcester, and is defeated by Rupert, *ib.*; engages the royal forces at Edgehill, and marches to London, 456; indecision of, 457; Reading surrenders to, 459; relieves Gloucester, 461; surprises Cirencester, *ib.*; engages the royal forces at Newbury, *ib.*; blockades Oxford, 465; disagreements between Waller and, *ib.*; besieges Exeter, *ib.*; sad condition of, in Cornwall, *ib.*; he leaves his troops, and his army is dispersed, 466; meeting at the house of, *ib.*; death of, Sept. 16, 1647, 474; medal struck in honor of, *ib.*

Essling. See Aspern.

Ethelbald, ravages in England by the Danes during the reign of, 25; aids his father in a battle against the Danes in 850, 26; had obtained the kingdom of Wessex from his father during his lifetime, 27; death of, *ib.*

Ethelbert, king of Kent, power and dominions of, 21; receives the Christian missionary, Augustin, 22; is converted, *ib.*; account of the code of laws published by, 23; death of, A.D. 616, *ib.*

Ethelbert, succeeds Ethelwulf, as king of Kent, 27; and his brother, Ethelbald, as king of Wessex, in 860, *ib.*; dies, 866, 29

Ethelfleda, daughter of Alfred, energetic character, military successes, and death of, 38

Ethelred, succeeds Ethelbert, 966, 29; death of, 31

Ethelred the Unready, accession of in 978, 46; crowned and cursed by Dunstan, *ib.*, attacked by the Danes, under Sweyn, in 980; and following years, *ib.*; pays tribute to them first in 991, *ib.*; continued in succeeding attacks, 47; massacre of the Danes by order of, in 1002, *ib.*; is again attacked by Sweyn, and England is ravaged, *ib.*; Canterbury burnt by the Danes, *ib.*; attacked again by Sweyn, king of Denmark, who proclaims himself king of England, 48; retires to Normandy, *ib.*; recalled to England, *ib.*; death of, in 1016, *ib.*

Ethelwulf, ravages in England by the Danes during the reign of, 25; journey of, to Rome, 26; death of, in 858, *ib.*

Eugene, prince, commands the Austrian army, 1701, 686; becomes a confidant of Marlborough's, 695; sent to cover the Rhine in the campaign of 1704, *ib.*; announces the movements of the Gallo-Bavarian army to Marlborough, 697; having united his force with Marlborough's, they resolve to give the enemy battle, *ib.*; marches against them, Aug. 13, and takes up his position on the right, in front of the elector, with difficulty, *ib.*; his attacks upon whom meet with but slight success, 698; his troops are mistaken for those of the enemy, *ib.*; joins the duke of Savoy's forces, defeats the French, and drives them out of Italy, 1706, 703; plans with Marlborough an attack upon France; crosses the Alps and the Var, and sets down before Toulon, July 25, 1707, 714; joins Marlborough, 715; directs the siege of Lille, 1708, 717; encamps with Marlborough and 100,000 men before Lille, June 21, 1709; Tournay surrenders, 718; aids in investing Douay, 1710, 723; visits London, 733; conducts the campaign of 1712, in co-operation with the duke of Ormond; opens the siege of Quesnoy; it surrenders, July 4, *ib.*; he is deserted by the duke of Ormond, and defeated by Villars at Denain, July 24, 734; defeats the Turks at Peterwaradin, 1717, 770; conducts the war against marshal Berwick, 1734, 784; died 1736, *ib.*

Evans, sir De Lacy; commands the British Legion in Spain, 1122

Evelyn, John, his uncertainty as to James II.'s whereabouts, 626; his grumble at Duncombe, 639; his house at Sayes Court is hired by William for Peter the Great, 1698, 672; notes on Wren, and the rebuilding of St. Paul's, 753; introduces Gibbons into notice, 755

Evertsen, Dutch admiral, engaged in the defeat off Beachy Head, 1690, 639

Evesham, battle of, Aug. 4, 1265, 112

Ewart introduces the Counsel for Prisoners' bill twice, 1221

Excise scheme, by Walpole; he falls in passing the bill embodying this scheme, 1733, 783

Excommunication, small effect of, on the people, *temp.* John, 101

Exmouth, lord, concludes a treaty with Algiers; an outrage having been committed on the British, he is sent out with an expedition, 1111; his offered terms not being answered, *ib.*; he fights the battle of Algiers, Aug. 27, 1816, 1112; and on the following morning the Dey accepts the terms originally offered, *ib.*

Eylau, battle of, Feb. 9, 1807, 1062

Fairfax, sir Thomas, presents the people's petition to Charles I. at York, 449; disputes the supremacy of the north with lord Newcastle, 459; commands one of the parliamentarian armies, 465; besieges Lathom house, *ib.*; nominated general, 466; urges that Cromwell should be chief commander of the horse, 467; takes an active part in the battle of Naseby, *ib.*, etc.; letter from Cromwell to, 469; Bristol invested by him and Cromwell, *ib.*; advances upon Oxford, 472; which surrenders to him, 474; secures the Bodleian library from spoliation, *ib.*; influence of, in the army, not so great as that of Cromwell's, 475; allows the king to have an interview with his children, 478; advances upon London, 479; it submits, *ib.*; marches through London in triumph, *ib.*; he and Cromwell put down the Levellers in the army, 482; fights the insurgents at Maidstone, and quells the insurrection, 484; invests London, which surrenders to him, *ib.*; orders sir Charles Lucas and sir George Lisle to be shot, *ib.*; his lady's conduct at the trial of Charles I., 489; suppresses the Levellers in the army, 492; unwilling to invade the Scots, 497; resigns his office of general, *ib.*

Falczi, peace of, July 2, 1711, 733

Falkirk, battle of, Jan. 17, 1746, 813

Falkland, Lucius Cary, lord, charges of, against the lord chancellor Finch, 434; becomes secretary of state, in 1641, 445; his tolerance and moderation the cause of his quitting the parliamentary party, 446; prince Rupert refuses to take directions through, 455; death of, at battle of Newbury, Sept. 20, 1643, 462; character of, and conduct at battle of Newbury, *ib.*

Falkland Islands, vicissitudes of the, 866

Family Compact, treaty known as the, Aug. 15, 1761, 843, 909

Famine in England, and terrible effects of, in 1258, 110

Fancourt, colonel, slain, 1806, in attempting to save his men from mutinied sepoys, 1056.

Farnham, a great provincial corn market formerly, 611

Fastolf, sir John, wins the battle of Herrings, 172; degraded from the Order of the Garter for cowardice at the battle of Patay, 174

Fearney, William, his share in capturing the San Josef, 1797, 1015

Federation fête at Paris, July 14, 1790, 968

Females, political zeal of, first half of 18th century, 742; employments and dress of, 742; estimate of their character, 743

Fens, drainage of the Lincolnshire, 608, 914

Fenwick, sir John, implicated by Goodman in the Invasion plot, 1696, 667; there being deficient legal evidence to convict him, he is attainted and executed, Jan. 28, 1697, 668

Ferand, a deputy in the French Convention; murdered, 1795, 1009

Ferdinand of Castile marries his daughter Catherine to prince Arthur, the eldest son of Henry VII., 220; uses the English army for the furtherance of his own plans, 228; concludes a truce with France, 229; dies in 1516, and is succeeded by his grandson, Charles V., 231

Ferdinand I. of the two Sicilies. See Ferdinand IV. of Naples.

Ferdinand III., grand-duke of Tuscany; recognizes the French republic, 1011

Ferdinand IV. of Naples, 1759–1806, 1310; flies to Palermo, 1799, 1030; 1806, 1060; reascends the throne, 1815; in 1816 he assumed the title of Ferdinand I. of the Two Sicilies, succeeded by Francis in 1825, *ib.*

Ferdinand VII. of Spain, solicits Napoleon's protection, 1808, 1068; Charles IV. abdicates the crown in favor of, March 19, *ib.*; falls into Napoleon's power, *ib.*; proclaimed king of Spain, 1808; war declared against France, *ib.*; recognized by Napoleon as king of Spain, 1814, 1092; released by the French, 1823, 1157; died 1833, 1187, 1222

Ferdinand, Don, duke of Parma, 1011; buys Napoleon off his territories, *ib.*

Ferguson, his march on Solignac hindered, 1069

Ferozeshah, battle of, Dec. 21 and 22, 1845, 1280

Fersen, count de, aids in contriving Louis's flight from Paris, 1791, 972

Feudal system introduced into England by William the Conqueror, 64; exactions imposed through it by William, 65; substitution of rent and wages for feudal services, 180; death struggle of, *temp.* Henry VI., 187

Feudality, transition state of, *temp.* Edward III., 134; description of as given by Froissart, *ib.*; military spirit fostered by, *ib.*

Feudal rights abolished in France, 1789, 964

Feuillans, a French political party, twice obtains the administration of affairs, 1792, 977, 978

Fielding, Henry, produces his "Pasquin," 1737, 790; his "Inquiry into the Causes of the late Increase of Robbers," 1750; places of entertainment; drunkenness, *ib.*; gaming among the vulgar; his account of the state of London, 824; his "Adventures of Joseph Andrews," published, 1742; its success; Johnson's opinion of, 937; "Jonathan Wild," published, 1743; "Tom Jones," 1749; "Amelia," 1751; died 1754, *ib.*; description of contemporary manners by, 938, 942, 945, 947

Fieschi. See Louis Philippe.

Fire of London. See London.

Firmin, his scheme for employing the poor; his religious tenets; his death puts a stop to the printing of Socinian books, 670

Fisher, John, bishop of Rochester, is accused of participation in the treason of the Holy Maid of Kent, 256; is sent to the Tower for refusing to swear to the illegality of the marriage of Henry VIII. with Catherine, *ib.*; is tried, convicted, and executed, 258

Fisher, captain, communicates to Portland a design against William's life, 665

Fitzgerald, lord Edward, brother of the duke of Leinster, 1074; a member of the Irish Directory; on the arrest of the other members he conceals himself; his house surrounded by the military; he resists, kills the magistrate, and is himself shot, *ib.*; died June 5, 1798, *ib.*

Fitzgerald, captain Robert, saves Dublin from being plundered and burnt, 1690, 639

Fitzgerald, Vesey, president of the Board of Trade, 1176; influence among the Clare Roman Catholics, *ib.*

Fitzharris, lord, description of Pitt's feelings on lord Melville being censured by parliament, 1805, 1048
Fitzherbert, Mrs., marries the Prince of Wales (George IV.), Dec. 21, 1787, 957
Fitz-Osbert, or William with the Long Beard, complains to Richard I., in 1196, of civic corruptions and oppressions, raises an insurrection, is stabbed and hanged, 95
Fitzwilliam, earl, lord lieutenant of Ireland; recalled the same year, 1007, 1023; dismissed his lord lieutenancy of the West Riding, 1133
Flaxman, John, an eminent sculptor, 934; high character of his designs, 1145
Fleet prison, state of the, 1729, 1730, 781
Flesselles, mayor of Paris, shot July, 1789, 964
Fletcher of Saltoun, his opinion on the relative positions of England and Scotland, 674
Fletcher, lieutenant-colonel, helps Wellington in constructing the lines of Torres Vedras, 1077
Fleurus, battle of, 1690, 641; May 29, 1794, 1006
Fleury, cardinal, prime minister of Louis XV., 778; his offers to the English, 792
Flitcroft, architect of Woburn House, 755
Flodden Field, battle of, on Sept 9, 1513, 230
Florida ceded to Spain, 1782, 907; to Great Britain, 1763, 909; to the United States, 1820, 1225
Flushing, failure of the British to take, 1809, 1075
Foley, captain, commander of the Goliath at the battle of the Nile, 1798, 1021; present at the battle of Copenhagen, 1801, 1037
Folly, the coffee-house; its visitors, 619
Fontainebleau, peace of, Sept. 2, 1679, 732; treaty of, 1067; concordat at, Jan. 25, 1813, 1094
Fontenoy, battle of, May 11, 1745, 798
Fonthill erected by Wyatt, 1142
Food, supply of London with, 19th century, 1226
Forbes, Duncan, lord advocate, 1736, 788; conducts the inquiry into the Porteous riots, *ib.*; proposed the enlisting of Scotch regiments, 799; MacDonald informs him of Charles Edward's descent upon Scotland, 801; considers it rash and desperate, 802
Forser commands the English in the Pretender's army, 763; assumes the command of the whole army on English ground, 763; his preparations for the enemy, 764; tries to obtain favorable terms of surrender, 764; escapes from Newgate, 766
Fort Augustus destroyed by the Highlanders, 815
Fort Boyer captured by the British, Feb. 1815, 1101
Fort Edward taken by Burgoyne, 1777, 882.
Fort St. George capitulates to the British, 1746, 826
Foster, speaker of Irish House of Commons; his passing the Union bill described, 1028
Foster, John, his "Essays," 1141.
Fouché, his share in the execution of the Lyonnese, 1793, 998; assists Bonaparte's intrigues, 1030
Foulon, intendant of marine, 962; murdered by the mob, 963; La Fayette attempts to save him, *ib.*
Foundling Hospital established by captain Coram; it promotes, instead of repressing, the great social evil, 946
Fourbin, admiral, commands the fleet conveying the pretender James and his force to Scotland; he fails in making a landing and returns to Dunkirk, 1708, 716
Fox, Charles James, his first speech in parliament, 1769, 856; indignation of, at government's conduct towards Burgoyne, 883; leader of his party; character, 899; strong language used by, in moving for an amendment of the king's address; motion lost, *ib.*; secretary of state, 1782, 900; his resolution to carry Burke's Economical Reform bill, 901; moves the repeal of the statute asserting Ireland's dependence, 904; has differences with Shelburne in the negotiations with Franklin for a treaty of peace, 905; resigns his secretaryship, *ib.*; mistake of, *ib.*; commencement of the party conflict between Pitt and, 908; secretary of state, 1782, 1325; excesses in gambling, and remarkable elasticity of mind, 942; coalesces with lord North, appointed secretary of state, 951; re-elected for Westminster; unpopularity, *ib.*; his India bill; proposes to govern India by a board, 952; bill carried in the Commons, *ib.*; rejected by the Lords, *ib.*; the king orders him to give up his office, *ib.*; contests the seat for Westminster; enthusiasm of the duchess of Devonshire in his cause; fails but takes his seat as a Scotch representative, 954; considers France England's natural foe, 956; denies that the prince of Wales had married Mrs. Fitzherbert, 957; renounces the prince's acquaintance on hearing that such really was the case, *ib.*; supports the prince's claim to the regency, *ib.*; in raptures on hearing of the fall of the Bastile, 966; opposes the army estimates, 967; disputes with Burke, *ib.*; proposes the abolition of the Corporation and Test acts, 968; differs with Burke in his opinion on the new constitution of France, 970; which results in a breach of friendship, *ib.*; emotion evinced by, *ib.*; favors the abolition of the slave trade, 976; his Libel bill; difficulty of passing it through the Lords, *ib.*; attempts made by lord Loughborough to bring about a coalition between Pitt and, *ib.*; his opinion of the September massacres, 1792, 981; joy of, at the Prussian retreat, 982; anxiety for Louis's fate; proposes that the national sense against his execution be made known to France, 985; Portland and other whigs separate from Fox, and join Pitt's party, *ib.*; opposes Pitt's Indian Declaratory bill, 1788, 989; opposes the policy of warring with France, 991; and the Traitorous Correspondence bill, 992; popularity of, in France, 993; proposes that peace be re-established with France, 995; defends the duke of York and blames Pitt for the Dunkirk failure, 1793, 997; speech of, on the stability of the Jacobin government, 1000; his indignation at the project of assimilating the English and Scottish laws on sedition and leasing-making, 1002; his indignation at Pitt's coercive measures; dreads the approach of absolutism, 1010; secedes from the whig party, 1019; again appears in his place in parliament, Jan., 1800, 1033; desires peace, 1041; his admiration of Pitt's speech, 1044; the king refuses to admit him to his counsels, 1804, 1046; secretary of state for foreign affairs, 1806, 1056; the king becomes reconciled to, 1057; declining health of, *ib.*; died Sept. 13, 1806, *ib.*, 1059; his last speech in parliament, 1058; fails in obtaining peace, 1059; buried with public honors, Oct. 10, *ib.*; rivalry with Pitt, *ib.*
Fox, Henry, lord Holland, his opinion of the rebellion of 1745, 805; married the duke of Richmond's daughter clandestinely; opposes the marriage act of 1753, 824; Newcastle offers him the secretaryship of state with the lead of the Commons; refuses them, 826; obtains a seat in the cabinet, deserting Pitt, 1754, *ib.*; favors the bringing over foreign troops for the defence of this country, 830; secretary of state; resigns this office, Oct., 1756, 831; created lord Holland, 1763; retires from public affairs, retaining his office of paymaster, 846
Fox, commodore, takes 40 French ships, 1747, 813
France, rival factions of the Burgundians and Armagnacs, during the reign of Charles VI., 163; distress occasioned by, 168; a great cause of the success of Henry V., *ib.*; the Armagnacs massacred and expelled from Paris by the mob in 1418, *ib.*; duke of Burgundy murdered at Montereau, 169; accession of Charles VII. to the throne in 1422, 171; Charles VII. is conducted to Rheims by Joan of Arc, and crowned there in 1430, 175; invaded by Edward IV. in 1475, 201; treaty of peace with England agreed to at Picquiny, *ib.*
Francis I. succeeds to the throne of France in January, 1515, 231; commences war against Charles V. and takes Milan, *ib.*; meets Henry VIII. in the Field of the Cloth of Gold, 233, 234; is taken prisoner at the battle of Pavia in 1525, 238; is released by Charles V. on agreeing to very severe terms, 239; project of, for invading England and marching to London, 283; death of, in 1547, 302
Francis I. of Austria. See Francis II. of Germany.
Francis II. of Germany succeeds Leopold as king of Hungary, 1792, 967; rules Lombardy, 1011; welcomes the Russians into Moravia, 1030; joins the coalition against France, *ib.*; joins his army at Austerlitz; interview with Napoleon; his cessions by the peace of Presburg, 1052; emperor of Germany, 1792–1806; Francis I. of Austria, 1806–1835, 1187
Francis, John, his attempt on the queen's life, 1842, 1263
Francis, sir Philip, said to be the author of Junius' letters, 857; reports the speeches of Mansfield and Chatham, 1770, 860; appointed a member of the Calcutta council; opposes Hastings; brings charges of corruption against him, 948; immoralities of; assumes the governor-general's power on hearing of Hastings' resignation, 949; duels with Hastings; wounded; resigns office; returns to England, *ib.*; his speech on our alliance with France, 956
Franklin, Benjamin, printer of the "Craftsman;" convicted of libel for writing an article therein, 1731, 783; opposes the passing of the Stamp Act, 1765, 849; recommends the Americans to submit for a while, *ib.*; examined by the House of Commons on the American Stamp Act; the condition of the North American colonies, 852; the temper of the colonists towards Great Britain before 1763; the American spirit and resolution never to pay the stamp duty, *ib.*; appears before the lords of the council, as agent for Massachusetts; insulted by them; dismissed his post of deputy postmaster-general, 870; returns to America; deprecates attempting to restore the interests between England and America, 875; but still shrinks from war, *ib.*; his conference with lord Howe; despatched to Paris to procure a treaty of alliance with the French court; lands in France, Dec. 8, 1776; presents a memorial to count de Vergennes, 880; his reception in the Parisian court circles; his influence upon the national thought, *ib.*; besieged by applications to recommend officers for the American service, 882; minister plenipotentiary of the United States, May 1779; entrusts Paul Jones with the command of an expedition against the British coasts, 887; his predictions of the future of America, 895; negotiates with Shelburne and Fox for a treaty of peace, 904; one of the commissioners for settling the articles of peace between England and America; signs the preliminaries, Nov. 30, 1783, 907; recommends amity between England and America, 908
Frank-pledge, nature of, 36
Fraser, John. See MacIver.
Frazer, general, repulsed at Alexandria, 1807, 1064
Frederick, Prince of Wales; his income dependent upon the will of his father, George II., 780; his arrival in England, 1728; fails in obtaining princess Wilhelmina of Prussia in marriage, 781; his popularity; marries the princess of Saxe-Gotha, April 27, 1736, 788; opposes his father; applies to parliament for an increase of income, *ib.*; fails in obtaining it, *ib.*; will not allow his wife to be confined at Hampton Court; hurries her to St. James's, 789; where she gives birth to a girl; the king's anger at his conduct; he is banished from St. James's; removes to Norfolk House, 1737, *ib.*; his popularity increases, *ib.*; his mother refuses to see him on her dying-bed, *ib.*; his son George Augustus (afterward George III.) born, May 25, 1738, 790; his apparent reconciliation with his father, 796; his death, March 20, 1751, 823; receives but few honors at his burial; his son George created Prince of Wales; a revenue is assigned to his widow, *ib.*; who dies Feb., 1772, 870
Frederick I. of Prussia; elector of Brandenburg; fights against the French at Fleurus, 641; present at the congress at the Hague, 642; invested with the Garter, *ib.*; his character, *ib.*; concludes a treaty with Marlborough, 1704, 699; reigns 1701–1713, 1309
Frederick II., king of Prussia, succeeds Frederick William I., 1740, 795, 1310; lays claim to Silesia, *ib.*; it not being recognized, he invades the country; secures the greater part of it; defeats general Neipperg at Molwitz, April 10, 1741; his conduct in the battle, 796; again presses the cession of Silesia; his demand refused; and the Austrians receive a second defeat from him, May 17, 1742; enters into a treaty with Great Britain and Hungary, *ib.*; overruns Bohemia, 798; treaty between George II. and, concluded at Westminster, Jan. 16, 1756, 831; his power as a king; suddenly commences war, *ib.*; takes Dresden, Sept. 10; blockades Pirna; spares the picture gallery at Dresden; obtains possession of the state papers; defeats the Austrians at Losowitz, Oct. 1; Pirna surrenders; retires into winter quarters, *ib.*; receives 200,000*l.* from the British government, 1757, 832; commences his second campaign, April; his character; marches into Bohemia; defeats the Austrians, in the battle of Prague, May 6; bombards Prague; defeated by the Austrian marshal Daun at the battle of Kolin, June 17, 835; defeats prince de Soubise at Rosbach, Nov. 5, and prince Charles de Lorraine at Leuthen, Dec. 5, 836; a subsidy of 670,000*l.* voted to, by the British government, 837; defeats the Russians at Zorndorf, Aug. 25, 1758, *ib.*; popularity of, among the English, *ib.*; surprised by the Austrians; his presence of mind saves the troops, 838; defeated by the Russians at Kunersdorf; wins the victories of Legnitz and Torgau, 840; his unsuccessful campaign; writes to Pitt, who promises the king's support, 843; Bute refuses him his subsidy, 844; succeeded by Frederick William II., 1786, 1310;
Frederick IV. of Denmark, 1699–1730, 1309; his conquests, and contest with Charles XII., 768
Frederick VI. of Denmark, crown prince; refuses the demands of the English envoy, 1065; declares war against Great Britain, 1066; ascends the throne, 1808, 1310; present at the Vienna congress, 1109
Frederick William I. of Prussia, 1713–1740, 1309; wars against Charles XII., 1715, 768; died May 31, 1740, 794
Frederick William II. of Prussia, 1786–1797, 1310; succeeds Frederick the Great, 956; interviews with the emperor of Germany; they issue the declaration of Pilnitz, 974; surrender of Mayence to, 1793, 996; obtains a subsidy from England, 1006; his Polish raid, 1794, 1007
Frederick William III. of Prussia succeeds Frederick William II., 1797, 1310; takes the part of Orange against France, 956; his wavering conduct; joins France, 1805, 1052; bribed into hostilities with Britain, 1059; uneasiness of his ties with France, *ib.*; commands the Prussian armies, 1806, 1060; defeated at Jena, 1061; rejects Napoleon's overtures for peace, 1063; concludes an alliance with Russia, 1090; his meeting with Alexander at Leipzig, 1813, *ib*; present at the Vienna congress, 1815, 1109
Fremantle, captain, his account of and conduct at the battle of Copenhagen, 1801, 1037
Frere, J. H., writer in the "Anti-Jacobin," 1017; British ambassador in Spain; advises Moore to advance on Madrid, 1071
Freron aids in massacring the Toulonese, 1793, 1000
Friedland, battle of, June 14, 1807, 1064
Friend, sir John, trial of, 665
Frobisher, sir Martin, expeditions of, to the Polar seas, 371; takes part in the attack on the Armada, 373; takes Brest from the Spaniards in 1594, and is killed, 384
Froissart, sir John, picture of chivalry by, 134
Froude, Mr., view of, as to state interference in social affairs, 150
Fuenterabia captured by the French, 1719, 772
Fuentes, count de, ordered to leave London, 1762, 844
Fuentes de Onoro, battle of, May 5, 1811, 1082
Furniture and utensils, notice of those in use in the 15th century, 184
Fuseli, his paintings, 1146

Gage, general, supersedes Hutchinson as governor of Massachusetts; appointed the colonial commander-in-chief, 1774, 872; coldly received at Boston; fortifies Boston isthmus, *ib.*; orders a detachment to destroy the military stores at Concord, 873; offers pardon to all on certain conditions, excepting Hancock and S. Adams, 875; called home, 876
Gainsborough, Thomas, exhibits at the Royal Academy, 1769, 932; portrait and landscape painter, *ib.*; his merits and excellences, *ib.*
Galgacus, resistance of, to the invasion of Agricola, 10; doubtful speech, and defeat of, 10
Galissoniere, admiral La; engages Byng, 1756, 830
Galt, John, died 1839; his novels, 1254
Galway, lord; he is defeated by the French and Spaniards on the plains of Almanza, 713; placed at the bar of the House of Lords to give an account of his proceedings in Spain, 725
Galway surrenders to Ginkell, 644
Gambier, admiral lord, commands the expedition against Copenhagen, 1807, 1065; commands the expedition against the French in Aix roads, 1809; fails to assist heartily his subordinate officer, lord Cochrane; tried by court-martial and acquitted, 1072; British commissioner for concluding the peace of Ghent, 1101
Game laws, 1120
Game in Anne's reign, 746; in those of George I. and II., 941
Ganganelli. See Clement XIV.
Gaols, inquiry into the state of the, 1729, 1730, 780; the fraud and extortion of the wardens of the Fleet; shocking case of cruelty towards captain Macpheadris by Bambridge, 782; the horrors of the Marshalsea prison, *ib.*; public attention drawn to the state of the, by Howard, 946; state of prisons in England and Scotland, 1221
Garat, his visit to England, 1791, 1792, 975

Gardiner, colonel, killed at Preston Pans, 1745, 804; Dr. Doddridge's account of his death, *ib.*
Gardiner, Stephen, bishop of Winchester, supports the king's supremacy, but opposes the Reformation, 284; becomes a great heretic hunter, *ib.*; prepares articles for queen Catherine Parr's impeachment, but the king rejects them, 286; objects to the printing of a book of homilies, and of a translation of Erasmus's paraphrase of the New Testament, 303; continued resistance of, to the Reformation, 305; deprived of his bishopric and committed to the Tower in 1550, in the reign of Edward VI., 313; consents to use the Common Prayer, 314; released on the accession of Mary, 318; is made lord chancellor, 319; sermon of, before Mary, exhorting her to severity, 322; exertions of, to suppress heresy, 326; colloquy of, with Rogers, 327; increased severity of, against the married clergy, 328; death of, 331
Garnet, Henry, the Jesuit, tried for his complicity in the Gunpowder Plot, 405; his doctrine of equivocation, *ib.*
Garrick improves the tone of the stage, 743; his Shaksperian acting, 940
Garter, the Order of the, instituted by Edward III., in 1349, 139
Gas, Pall Mall lighted by, 1807; its introduction has considerable influence in preventing crime; opposition shown to it by the partisans of the persons employed in the whale fisheries, 118
Gascoigne, general, moves for a diminution in the number of parliamentary members, 1190
Gastanga, marquis of, governor of the Netherlands; represents Charles of Spain at the Hague Congress, 1691, 642
Gates, general in the United States army, 882; encamps on Behmus' heights: compels Burgoyne to yield with the honors of war, 1777, 883
Gaul, Druidism in, 4; Cæsar's account of the Druidical judges of, 6
Gauls, the, assisted by the Britons, 3
Gaveston, Piers. See Edward II.
Gawilghur taken by the British, Dec. 15, 1803, 1055
Gay, author of the Beggar's Opera, 744
Gaza surrendered to the French, March 25, 1799, 1029
Gazi Hassan resists the Russians, capitan pasha, 868
General warrants, debates on the legality of; officers dismissed for voting their illegality, 848, 850
Genoa, annexation of, to France, 1805, 1049
Gentleman, country, character and description of, the *temp.* William and Anne, 721, 741; *temp.* Geo. III., 1135
Gentleman's magazine started by Cave, 1731, 935
Geoffrey of Monmouth, fables of, 3
George of Denmark marries queen Anne, 1689, 634; votes for the Occasional Conformity bill, 691; lord high admiral, 714; died October, 1708, 71
George I., elector of Hanover, 1698, 682; refuses to co-operate with Marlborough, 705, becomes heir-apparent on the death of his mother, the princess Sophia; born May 28, 1660, 736; proclaimed king on the death of queen Anne, 1714; lands at Greenwich, Sept. 18, 760; personal appearance and character, *ib.*; Sophia, princess of Zell, and the Königsmark tragedy, *ib.*; his account of an early impression as king of England, *ib.*; coronation of, October 20; opens his first parliament, March 17, 1715, *ib.*; speech on adjourning parliament, 761; speech on opening parliament, 1716, 766; refuses to see lady Nithisdale's petition; appealed to for mercy towards the rebel lords; his power to pardon affirmed, *ib.*; leaves for Germany; his awkward position as king of England, 768; his hostility towards Russia; jealousy of his son, 769; dismisses Townshend his secretaryship; offers him the lord lieutenancy of Ireland, *ib.*; announcements on opening parliament, 1717, of the triple alliance, and Gyllenberg's arrest, *ib.*; quarrels with the prince of Wales, 771; speech on opening parliament, 1718, 771; recommends the settling of the peerage question, 772; recommends the consideration of the national debts, 773; dissuaded from going to Hanover, 1722, 776; James' proposal to, 776; announces the treaty of Hanover, 1725, 778; speech at closing the session, 1727, sets out for Hanover, June 3; dies on his journey, June 10, 779
George II., his father's jealousy of him, 1716, 769; appointed guardian of the realm during George I.'s absence in Hanover, *ib.*; quarrels with his father, 1717, 770; banished from the royal residence; sets up an opposition court at Leicester House; the earl of Berkeley makes a proposal to George I. to seize him and carry him to America, 771; governor of a Welsh copper company, 773; succeeds his father to the throne of England, June, 1727, 779; R. Walpole obtains a confirmation of his power through queen Caroline's influence, and by bribing the king, 779; the civil list revenue settled on him as income, *ib.*; his son, Frederick, prince of Wales, dependent upon him for his income, *ib.*; fought at Oudenarde and Dettingen; influence of the queen over, 780; conduct of, towards the prince of Wales, *ib.*; remarks on opening parliament, 1732; strikes Pulteney's name off the privy council list, 782; determined to stand by Walpole, 784; speech on opening parliament, 1734, *ib.*; his warlike desires, *ib.*; visits Hanover; returns to England, Oct. 22, 1735, 786; his unpopularity; pasquinade on, 788; returns to England, Dec. 1736; quarrels with his son, 789; banishes him from St. James' palace, *ib.*; illness of the queen; and death, Nov. 20, 1737, *ib.*; his grief, *ib.*; the birth of George III. excites in him a stronger jealousy towards his son, 790; announces the convention with Spain on opening parliament, 1739, 791; calls upon parliament for support against Spain, 792; speech to parliament, 1740, 794; goes to Hanover, 1741; concludes a treaty of neutrality without his minister's knowledge, 795; exults at the results of his mediation between Hungary and Prussia, 796; reconciled to his son, whom he admits to court, 797; national jealousy roused by his taking Hanoverian troops into English pay, *ib.*; prorogues parliament; lends his army to Maria Theresa; departs for Germany, *ib.*; joins his army, June 19, 1743; commands the rear guard; his gallantry; gains the battle of Dettingen, June 27; and expels the French from Germany; his enthusiastic reception in England, *ib.*; restrained from leaving England, 1744, 798; returns from Hanover, Aug. 31, 1745, 806; Andrew Drummond becomes his private banker, 811; refuses to nominate Pitt secretary at war; 819; speech on opening parliament, 1747, 820; death of the prince of Wales, March 20, 1751, 823; his grandson assumes the title: desires the duke of Cumberland to be sole regent, *ib.*; asks for increased forces, 826; goes to Hanover; ministerial difficulties about subsidies, 829; his address; supported by Hamilton and Fox; opposed by Pitt, *ib.*; introduces Hessian troops for England's defence, 830; speech of, 1756; forms a treaty with Frederick of Prussia, 831; different tone of speech, 1756; his real opinions, 832; asks parliament for a subsidy to Prussia, *ib.*; attempts made to dupe, 833; his strong dislike to Pitt and Temple; fails to form a ministry, 833; finally compelled to accept the Pitt administration, *ib.*; his anger at the duke of Cumberland, 836; refuses to ratify the convention of Closter-Seven, 837; recommends a Prussian subsidy, *ib.*; death of, Oct. 25, 1760, 840
George III., born May 24, O. S. 1738, 790; attains his majority; entreats not to be separated from his mother, 831; lord Bute is made his groom of the stole, *ib.*; succeeds George II. as king, 1760; his conduct on hearing of his father's death, 840; character and education, 841; Bute's influence over, *ib.*; opens parliament, Nov. 15, *ib.*; his speech; the Commons vote him £800,000; his enthusiastic reception by the people; policy of his reign, *ib.*; recommends an act for securing the independence of judges, 842; marriage projects; his choice falls upon princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, 842; whom he marries, Sept. 8, 1761; her character and appearance, *ib.*; coronation, Sept. 22, 842; gives Pitt a pension, 844; promises a vigorous prosecution of the war, 844; resolves on war with Spain, *ib.*; speech of, 1762, 845; Bute attempts to uphold the principle of prerogative, 846; speech on the peace, 1763, and its advantages, *ib.*; desires to govern and form a ministry of his own, 847; his sensitiveness on the general warrants question, 849; orders Conway and others voting against the ministry to be dismissed their offices, *ib.*; illness of, 851; his indignation at the conduct of his ministers in the Regency bill matter induces him to offer Pitt the premiership; Pitt's terms, *ib.*; Temple persuades Pitt to break off the negotiations; his disgust at the conduct of Grenville and Bedford, *ib.*; orders the suppression of the American disturbances, 852; his right to make laws for the colonies declared, 853; expresses himself as being now for and now against the repeal of the Stamp act, *ib.*; seeks Pitt's advice as to a new ministry, 854; urges Pitt's expulsion from parliament, 856; Junius' address to; speech on proroguing parliament, 1769; his graziers' speech on opening parliament, 1770, 859; offers North the lord commissionership of the treasury, 861; speech, 1768, on North American proceedings, 862; address and remonstrance of the City of London to, 864; his harsh reply, *ib.*; a second remonstrance presented to, by Beckford, with a speech; no intimation having previously been given he is at a loss what to do, *ib.*; his indignation at the lord mayor's charging a House of Commons' officer with assault for arresting Miller, a printer, 865; speech on opening the session, 1770, 866; imprisonment of his sister the queen of Denmark; obtains her release, 868; requests parliament to amend the laws respecting royal marriages, *ib.*; message to parliament on the Boston outrages, 870; his letter to North favoring military measures against America, *ib.*; speech, 1774, 872; his answer to a remonstrance presented by Wilkes, 873; his estimate of the value of addresses; speech, 1775, on the American war, 876; the petition of congress to, rejected, *ib.*; his opinion of Chatham's speech advising a cessation of hostilities with America, 881; speech, 1777, 882; announces a treaty between France and America, and withdrawal of the British minister from Paris, 884; his surprise at Chatham's being buried with public honors, 885; rejoices at the rejection of Burke's Economical Reform bill, 890; takes measures for repressing the riots of 1780, 891; holds a council to explain the riot act; his opinion of the right construction, *ib.*; gives his claims on St. Eustatius to the army and navy, 895; inconsistency of his speech, 1781, 898; his hatred of Fox, 899; his reply to the address praying for a discontinuance of the war, *ib.*; his dislike of having the opposition for his ministers, 899; compelled to change his ministers, 900; recommends economical reform, 901; expresses his concern at the discontent in Ireland, 904; appoints Shelburne to the lordship of the Treasury, 905; speech, 1782, announcing the independence of America, 907; his alleged incivility towards Jefferson and Adams, 908; Jefferson's testimony to this effect, *ib.*, and that of Adams to the contrary, *ib.*; fond of agricultural pursuits, 917; chosen patron of the Royal Academy, 931; patronizes West; his delight in West's pictures, 933; his remarks on India, 1782, 951; his dislike to Fox's India bill, 952; dismisses the coalition ministry, *ib.*; his firmness in retaining the Pitt ministry, 953; speech, 1786, 955; announces the commercial treaty with France, *ib.*; speech, 1787, 956; refuses to help the prince of Wales to pay his debts, 957; attacked by insanity; the prince of Wales appointed regent, *ib.*; recovers; public rejoicing; his gratitude to Pitt for his firm attachment, 958; speech, 1788, *ib.*; speech, 1790, 967; his coldness towards Talleyrand, 974; pacific speech, 1792, 975; dismisses the lord chancellor, Loughborough, 976; royal proclamation against seditious writings, *ib.*; speech, 1792, 977; speech, Dec., 1792, 983; reconciled to lord Loughborough, 985; his popularity; calibre of his mind, 986; asks for increased forces, 1793, 988; parliament's address to, *ib.*; announces France's declaration of war against Britain, 991; speech, 1793, 996; anecdote of, and Loughborough's constructive treason, 1003; objects to his son's removal from his military command, 1006; speech, 1794, 1007; cuts Wilberforce, 1008; orders lord Malmesbury to demand the princess Caroline for the prince of Wales, *ib.*; speech, 1795, *ib.*; assailed by the mob; his courage, 1019; holds a council to provide a remedy for the money panic, 1797, 1013; speech, 1797, 1014; speech, 1798; congratulates the nation on the victory of the Nile, 1021; speech, Nov., 1798; remarks on the volunteers and the Irish union, 1022; speech, 1799, 1026; pernicious effects of his resistance to the proposed union with Ireland, *ib.*; expresses his satisfaction at the measure, 1027; remarks on the completion of the union, 1028; speech, July, 1799, 1030; speech, 1801, 1035; opposes any concessions to Catholics, *ib.*; again attacked by insanity, 1036; attributes its cause to Pitt's conduct, *ib.*; speech, 1802, alludes to France's encroachments, 1041; Despard's conspiracy for killing; message to parliament for calling out the militia, 1043; reviews the volunteers, Oct., 1803, 1045; another attack of insanity, Feb. 12 to April, 1804, 1046; refuses Pitt's requests for an administration on a broad basis, but offers him the premiership under certain prescribed limitations, which Pitt accepts, May, 1804; opposes Catholic emancipation, *ib.*; curious incident in reading his speech on proroguing parliament, 1804; indications of a new grand alliance, 1047; Napoleon's letter to, 1048; desires Grenville to form a ministry, 1056; requires a pledge of the Grenville ministry, which causes them to resign, 1061; opposes the Roman Catholic enlistment bill, *ib.*; sympathy of the people with, on account of his infirmities; nearly blind, 1062; speech, 1807, 1064; speech, 1808, 1066; his high opinion of Wellington, 1077; celebration of "The Jubilee," the fiftieth year of his reign, *ib.*; speech, 1810; alludes to the Peninsular war, 1078; the distressing condition of his daughter brings on his last attack of insanity, Oct., 1810, 1080; death of, Jan. 19, 1820, 1134
George IV., born Aug. 12, 1762, 851; introduced to the House of Peers, 1783; Carlton House assigned him as a residence, 951; his income, 956; embarrassed by debts; marries Mrs. Fitzherbert, 957; his claims to the regency disputed, *ib.*; Pitt's proposition for restricting his power as regent, *ib.*; his first speech in parliament, 976; the princess Caroline of Brunswick demanded in marriage for him, 1008; her character, arrival in England, and meeting with the prince; they are married, April 8, 1795, *ib.*; George III. causes an inquiry to be made as to the princess's conduct, 1057; reappointed regent, Feb. 5, 1811, 1080; restriction on, about to expire; his letter as to the choice of a ministry, 1082; his character, *ib.*; the formation of the Liverpool ministry, 1083; declaration of, on the American war, 1098; speech, 1814, 1100; message to parliament, 1815, 1104; his unpopularity, 1114; speech, 1817, on the state of the country; outraged; parliament addresses him on the subject, 1123; speech, 1817, 1125; serious illness of, 1128; his dissension with his daughter, *ib.*; causes of his gloom; opens parliament by commission, *ib.*; dissolves parliament, 1818, 1130; speech, 1818, *ib.*; speech, 1819, on the state of the country, 1131; his satisfaction with the conduct of those who put down the Manchester reform meeting; his reply to the London address, 1133; quiet transition from one reign to another, 1134; patronizes Nash, 1144; presents the Phigaleian marbles to the nation, 1145; speech, 1820, alludes to the Cato street conspiracy, 1149; the queen Caroline debate, 1150; the queen intimates her intention to come to England, *ib.*; his desire for divorce, and to have the queen tried for high treason; his differences with his cabinet, *ib.*; the ministerial propositions agreed to, *ib.*; prepares for his coronation, 1151; opens parliament in person, and leaves the settling of his revenues to its disposal, *ib.*; the queen's journey towards and arrival in England, *ib.*; message of, to parliament, and the green bag containing papers concerning the queen's conduct, which is laid before parliament; Canning (for government) and Brougham vindicate their respective conduct in the affair of queen Caroline, *ib.*; conferences for averting a public proceeding; these negotiations fail, 1152; Canning sends in his resignation, but the king insists on his retaining office; secret committee appointed, and the consequence of their report is that a bill of Pains and Penalties is brought against the queen; her trial commenced Aug. 7, 1820, *ib.*; swarm of addresses presented to the queen, *ib.*; Brougham's defence; Denman's bold and unmeasured language, 1153; motions for the second and third reading carried, and abandonment of the bill of Penalties, *ib.*; the national rejoicing thereat, *ib.*; discussions in the next session on the queen's affairs; she accepts a 50,000*l.* annuity, and all general interest in her ceases, 1154; the king's coronation, July 19, 1821, *ib.*; the queen vainly attempts to be present at the ceremonial; she dies Aug. 7; the king sails for Dublin, Aug. 1; the passage of the queen's remains through the city to Brunswick causes a riot; Canning having resigned, the king refuses to allow of his re-admission into the cabinet, *ib.*; speech, 1822, on Irish outrage and agricultural distress, 1155; embarks at Greenwich for Scotland, Aug. 10, 1822; lands at Leith, Aug. 18; his cordial reception, 1156; speech, 1824, 1158; his manifesto, *ib.*; fails to obtain Canning's dismissal; foreign influence upon the king; speech, 1825; recognizes the South American

republics, *ib.* ; speeches of, illustrative of the suddenness of the money panic of 1825, 1162 ; his difficulty in choosing a new ministry, 1165 ; his unreservedness in talking of state affairs, 1166 ; his compassion for Canning's ill-health, *ib.*; his share in the negotiations preceding Canning's premiership, 1167 ; desires Wellington to form a ministry, 1173 ; speech, 1828, *ib.* ; refuses to acquiesce in the emancipation of Roman Catholics ; gives a reluctant consent to a passage to that effect in his speech ; speech, 1829, 1177 ; dismisses the Wellington ministry, but foreseeing the difficulties of forming another, he recalls it, *ib.* ; his interviews with Eldon, 1178 ; speech, 1830, 1179 ; illness of ; his death, June 26, 1830 ; his position in life and character, *ib.*
Germaine, lord George Sackville ; present at Minden ; unable to understand prince Ferdinand's messages ; tried by court-martial ; declared unfit for any military post, 835 ; secretary of state, 1775–1782, 876 ; approves of Cornwallis's severity in America, 896 ; refuses to sign any treaty giving independence to America ; retires from office ; created a peer, 899
Germanus, the arrival of, in Britain, about 449, and his suppression of the Pelagian heresy, 19
Gertruydenberg taken by Dumouriez, 1793, 993
Ghent surrenders to Marlborough, 1706, 706 ; to the French, 1708, 715 ; retaken by the Allies, 716 ; pacification of, Nov. 8, 1576, 731 ; peace of, Dec. 24, 1814, 1094 ; it concludes the war with America, 1101
Ghorka war, 1814, 1815, 1169
Ghuznee, siege and capture of, by the British, 1839, 1249 ; recapture, *ib.*
Gibbon, inconsistencies of the account given by Gildas of the Britons after the departure of the Romans, pointed out by, 19 ; a member of parliament, 1774, 871 ; describes a scene in the House of Commons, *ib.* ; his experience of club life in London, 941
Gibbons, G., statue of Charles II. at Windsor Castle by, 569
Gibbs, architect of St. Martin's in the Fields, 755
Gibbs, counsel for Hardy, 1794, 1003
Gibraltar taken by Rooke and Darmstadt, Aug. 3, 1704, 700 ; besieged by the Spaniards ineffectually, 1727, 770 ; and again, 1779–82, 892, 905, 906 ; siege ended by the peace, 907
Gibson, proceedings against, for obstructing a scrutiny into an election, 1751, 822
Gifford, William, supports the "Anti-Jacobin," 1018 ; destroys the Della Cruscan school by his "Baviad" and "Mæviad," 1136 ; edits the "Quarterly Review," 1140
Gilbert, John, aids in constructing the Bridgewater Canal, 923
Gildas the historian, inconsistencies in the account of the Britons, given by, 19
Gin act, 1736, 786
Ginkell, earl of Athlone ; captures Athlone, June 30, 1691, 644 ; defeats the Irish, under St. Ruth, at the battle of Aghrim, July 12, 644 ; takes Limerick, and quells all opposition to William's cause, *ib.* ; accompanies William in his campaign of 1695, 661
Girondins, a French political party, 973 ; obtains the administration of affairs, 977 ; dismissed from power, 978 ; they desire a republic, 979 ; their power and policy, *ib.* ; they vote the abolition of royalty, 982 ; and the death of the king, 987 ; insurrection against them, 995 ; its political existence extinguished, *ib.* ; their triumph in the provinces, 997
Girtin, Thomas, his water-color paintings, 1147
Gladsmuir. See Preston Pans
Gladstone, W. E., remarks of, on the opium war, 1246; colonial secretary, 1276
Glass, duty on ; glass-houses in Defoe's time, 607 ; reduction of the duty on, 1831, 1188 ; and repeal, 1845 ; important results consequent thereon, 1273
Glencoe ; dislike of lord Breadalbane towards the MacDonalds of, 646 ; tardy submission of the chief MacIan to William's government, *ib.*; letters of Dalrymple concerning the extirpation of the tribe of, 647 ; captain Campbell dispatched to, with a troop of soldiers, *ib.*; description of the glen ; treacherous behavior of Campbell, 648 ; perpetration of the massacre, Feb. 13, 1692, *ib.*; inquiries are made into the massacre, 649 ; but no one is punished but Dalrympie, who is merely dismissed from his secretaryship, and Breadalbane, who is imprisoned for a short time, and then pardoned, 649
Glendower, Owen, heads a revolt of the Welsh against Henry IV., 160 ; is declared prince of Wales, *ib.*; repulses the army of sir Edmund Mortimer, *ib.*; and that of the king, *ib.*; concludes a treaty with, and receives assistance from France, 162 ; successful resistance of, *ib.*; is exempted from the general pardon of Henry IV. to the Welsh in 1411, 163 ; uncertain time of the death of, *ib.*
Gloucester, Humphrey, duke of, appointed joint protector of Henry VI. with the duke of Bedford, 171 ; marries Jacqueline of Hainault and quarrels with the duke of Burgundy, *ib.*; the pope declares the marriage void, *ib.*; marries Eleanor Cobham, *ib.*; feuds between Gloucester and Henry Beaufort, bishop of Winchester, *ib.*; continued struggle with Beaufort for predominance in the council, 176 ; his wife accused of sorcery, *ib.*; trial of the duchess with Bolingbroke and Southwell for sorcery and conspiracy, in 1440, *ib.*; they are found guilty, the duchess imprisoned for life and Bolingbroke executed, 177 ; is arrested for high treason, and found dead in his bed on Feb. 28, 1447, *ib.*
Gloucester, duke of, son of princess Anne, died at Windsor July 30, 1700 ; system upon which his education was pursued, 682
Gloucester, William, duke of ; George III.'s brother ; born 1743 ; married lady Waldegrave privately, 1766, 868
Glynn, sergeant, counsel for Wilkes, 1763, 847; elected M.P. for Middlesex, 1769, 858
Goddard, general, takes Ahmedabad and Bassein, 949
Goderich, F. J. Robinson, viscount ; treasurer of the navy and president of the board of trade, 1149 ; chancellor of the exchequer ; his sanguine views of the state of the country, 1825, 1162 ; secretary of state for war and the colonies, 1167 ; placed at the head of the government, 1827, 1172 ; unable to reconcile Mr. Herries and Mr. Huskisson, he resigns, Jan. 9, 1828, 1172 ; colonial secretary, 1187 ; lord privy seal and earl of Ripon, 1833, 1205 ; resigns, 1834, 1212
Godiva of Coventry, story of, 54
Godolphin, lord, betrays the Brest expedition to James, 659; implicated by Fenwick with holding treasonous correspondence with James II., 667 ; made first commissioner of the treasury, 1701, 684 ; obtains a high place among queen Anne's councillors, 1702, 689 ; he call the Whigs into public service, giving them the places formerly possessed by the Tories, 700 ; joins Marlborough in insisting on Harley's dismissal from office, 1708, 715 ; has to struggle for office in opposition to Harley, 719 ; Harley obtaining the upperhand, Godolphin is dismissed from office, 1710, 724
Godoy, prince of Algarves ; a favorite at the Spanish court, 1067 ; his schemes against the royal family, 1068; seized by the French, *ib.*
Godwin, earl, induces Alfred, son of Ethelred, to land in England to oppose king Harold, and betrays him, 49 ; importance of, in the reign of Edward the Confessor, 50 ; his daughter Edith is married to Edward, *ib.*; patriotism of, *ib.*; origin and rise of, *ib.*; refuses to punish arbitrarily the men of Dover for the riot against earl Eustace, 51 ; is banished with his sons, Sweyn and Harold, *ib.*; is recalled, and the Anglo-Saxon party triumphs, 52 ; dies, *ib.*; his death a public calamity, *ib.*
Godwin, his improbable proposal to Canning, 1202
Goethe served in the German army in the campaign of 1792, 982
Gohier, a member of the French Directory, 1030; imprisoned in the Luxembourg, 1031
Goldsmith, Oliver, his history of England published, 1771, 824; asserts that the Marriage Act had impeded marriages, 825
Goodman, concerned in the Assassination plot, 664 ; implicates Fenwick with plotting against William, *ib.*; tampered with, 667
Goodwin helps to suppress the Derbyshire insurrection, 1817, 1124
Gordon, duke of, holds Edinburgh castle in favor of James II., 629 ; refuses to fire on the town at the instigation of some partisans of James II., 630 ; the castle is surrendered by him, 631
Gordon, lord George, president of the Protestant Association; his fanaticism against the Papists; assembles 60,000 of his adherents at St. George's-fields ; marches to parliament, and presents his petition to repeal the act passed in favor of Roman Catholics, 1780, 890 ; from this resulted the "Gordon" riots, 891 ; committed to the Tower ; tried and acquitted, 892
Goree surrendered to the British, 1758, 837
Gortz, baron, plans an insurrection in England, 769
Gospel Propagation Society established 1701, 620
Gothic architecture and architects, 1784–1820, 1142
Gough, sir Hugh, general ; commands the British land forces in China, 1247 ; attacks Canton, *ib.*; defeats the Mahrattas at the battle of Maharajpoor, 1843, 1268; advances to relieve Ferozepoor, 1280 ; with sir H. Hardinge gains the battle of Ferozeshah, *ib.* ; wins the battle of Sobraon, *ib*
Goulburn, Henry, a British commissioner for concluding the peace of Ghent, 1101 ; chancellor of the exchequer, 1187; secretary of state, 1215; his motion on the London university, 1216 ; his free-trade financial propositions, 1244
Gower, characteristics of his poetry, 150
Gower, earl, British minister at Paris, 966 ; recalled Aug., 1792, 980
Græm, colonel, employed to report on the marriageable princesses for George III., 842
Grafton, duke of, killed in attacking Cork, Oct. 9, 1690, 641
Grafton, A. H. Fitzroy, duke of, visits Wilkes in the Tower, 690 ; secretary of state, 1765, 851 ; resigns his office on account of Rockingham's weak administration, 1766, 854 ; appointed first lord of the treasury in Chatham's ministry, 1766, *ib.*; becomes the real minister during Chatham's illness, 855 ; agonized by "Junius'" attacks, 858 ; divorced from his wife ; marries the duchess of Bedford's niece, 859 ; resigns Jan. 28, 1770, 861 ; accuses Hillsborough of suppressing some of the council minutes, 862 ; first lord of the treasury, Aug. 2, 1766 to Sept. 12, 1767 ; Dec. 1, 1767 to Feb. 1770, 865 ; resigns his office of privy seal, 1775, 876
Graham, general, wins the battle of Barrosa, 1811, 1081 ; captures San Sebastian, 1091
Graham, sir James, first lord of the admiralty, 1830, 1187 ; helps to prepare the parliamentary reform bill, 1188 ; resigns his office, 1834, 1212 ; declines joining Peel's ministry in 1834, 1215 ; his motion against the queen's advisers, 1246 ; introduces his bill for regulating labor in factories ; compelled to withdraw his education clauses, 1269 ; debate on the bill, *ib.* ; ultimately passed, *ib.*
Grammont, duke de, his conduct at Dettingen, 1743, 797 ; falls at Fontenoy, 1745, 798
Granada ceded to England, 1782, 907
Granby, marquis of, second in command at Minden, 1759. 838 ; commands the British in the campaign of 1761, 843 ; commander-in-chief ; resigns, 1770, 861
Grand Alliance formed by William, 686
Grandval plans a design for assassinating William, 652; tried by court-martial ; executed, 653
Grant, Charles, secretary for Ireland, 1148 ; joins the Wellington ministry, 1173 ; resigns, 1828, 1176; president of the board of control, 1187
Grant, R., moves for a regency, 1830, 1180 ; judge advocate general, 1187
Grantham, lord, secretary of state, 1782, 905
Granville, earl. See Carteret.
Grattan, Henry, champion of Irish liberty ; his character, 903 ; claims free trade and legislative independence as his country's right ; supports the Roman Catholic relief bill, *ib.*; fails twice in carrying his declaration of rights, *ib.*; congratulates Ireland in having acquired her freedom ; repeal of statute of George I. asserting the dependence of Ireland, 904 ; national acknowledgment to, *ib.*; speech on parliamentary reform, 1023 ; brings in a bill for repealing Catholic disqualification, *ib.*; states that he will not attend the House of Commons, 1024 ; returned member for Wicklow, Jan., 1800 ; his orations against the Union, 1026 ; duels with Mr. Corry, *ib.*; his last speech in favor of Catholic emancipation, 1131 ; death of, May 14, 1820, *ib.*
Graves, admiral, his encounter with de Grasse, 1781, 897
Gray, his account of the trial of the rebel lords, 1746, 818 ; his description of Westmoreland, 919
Green, captain, prosecuted and executed for the supposed murder of captain Drummond, 1705, 707
Green, attacked by rioters, 1768 ; tried for murder ; acquitted, 856
Greene, president of an American judicial court ; refuses to release or exchange André, 893
Greene, general, commands the American army in Washington's absence, 892 ; defeated at Guilford, 1781, compels the British to fall back, 896 ; defeated at Camden, *ib.*
Greenwich Hospital, William determines to erect, 660
Gregg, a clerk of Harley's ; he is detected in a correspondence with the French secretary of state ; he is tried, convicted, and executed, 715
Gregory, pope, and the Anglo-Saxon slaves in Rome, Bede's story of, 21
Grenada captured by the British, 1763, 845
Grenville, George, opposes Pitt's proposal to war with Spain, 843 ; leader of the House of Commons, and treasurer of the navy, 844 ; opposes Pitt's German policy, *ib.*; secretary of state, 846 ; first lord of the treasury ; chancellor of the exchequer, 1763 ; his ministry, *ib.*; moves that duties be laid on articles of American commerce ; a stamp duty on paper, and others, 849 ; his stamp act is passed, 1765, 850 ; and rouses the American spirit, *ib.*; refuses to put the princess dowager's name in the Regency bill ; the king contemplates dismissing him, 851 ; but is obliged to retain him, *ib.*; defends his stamp act against Pitt's oratory, 852 ; mobbed, 853 ; opposes Wilkes' expulsion from parliament ; his emotion, 857 ; his last speech in parliament ; died Nov., 1770, 863 ; first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer, 1763–5 ; secretary of state, 1762, 877
Grenville, lady Hester. See Chatham, 826, 843
Grenville, sir Richard, heroic conduct of, in a naval fight with the Spaniards, 382
Grenville, Thomas, sent to negotiate with Franklin, 1782 ; returns from Paris, 905 ; negotiates at Vienna, 1794, 1006 ; first lord of the admiralty, 1807, 1063 ; plans an expedition to the Dardanelles, *ib.*; its failure, 1063
Grenville, lord W. W., secretary of state ; his correspondence with Chauvelin, 976, 987 ; remonstrates against the aggressive measures adopted by France, 983 ; brings forward a Treasonable Attempts bill, 1010 ; it is passed, *ib.*; his hostile reply to Bonaparte's letter to the king, Jan., 1800, 1036 ; opinion of statesmen on it, *ib.*; his speech against Bonaparte, 1033 ; succeeded as foreign secretary by lord Hawkesbury, 1801, 1036 ; administration of Fox and, 1806, 1056 ; first lord of the treasury, *ib.*; weakness of his ministry after Fox's death, 1061 ; they deliver up the seals of office, March 25, 1807, *ib.*; retires to Dropmore, 1155
Grey, Charles, earl, his efforts in favor of reform in the representation of the people, 1792, 696 ; moves an address to the king to postpone the Irish Union, 1028 ; first lord of the admiralty, 1806, 1056 ; advocates resistance against Napoleon, 1061 ; his remarks on the negotiations with France, 1059 ; Dissenters' enlistment bill ; the king opposes it, 1062 ; applied to to form a government, 1812, 1083 ; foreign secretary, 1806, 1325 ; his speech against lord Sidmouth's unconstitutional conduct in the case of trials for libel, 1125 ; his attacks upon Canning ; he charges him with having pledged himself not to press the Catholic question, 1166 ; approves of the ready recognition of the New Orleans French government by parliament, 1183 ; declares the necessity of reform in parliament, 1186 ; formation of his ministry, 1187 ; principles of his government, *ib.*; members of his ministry, *ib.* ; with lord Brougham he urges the king to dissolve parliament on the defeat of his ministry on the reform question, 1190 ; his speech explanatory of the proposed reform bill, 1831, 1191 ; his reply to the principal arguments against the bill, 1192 ; resists the entreaties of his friends to obtain the passage of the reform bill by the creation of peers, 1196 ; replies to lord Lyndhurst's speech, *ib.*; upon the king refusing to create peers his ministry resigns, 1197 ; Wellington failing to form an administration, he is recalled ; obtains the king's consent to the creation of peers ; power not exercised, 1198 ; passing of the reform bills, *ib.*; introduces the coercion bill for Ireland, which is passed, 1833, 1204 ; defends the commission for inquiring into the state of the Irish church against unjust imputations, 1212 ; overpowered by his feelings in telling the Lords of his resignation, 1834, *ib.*; cause of his resignation, 1213 ; great banquet to, at Edinburgh, *ib.*
Grey, lady Jane, married to lord Guilford Dudley, proclaimed queen by Northumberland, June 10, 1553, 317 ; conversation of, in prison, respecting Northumberland's apostasy, 319 ; with her husband, lord Guilford Dudley, pleads guilty to the charge

of high treason, 320; execution of both, and her remarkable fortitude, 322; memorial of, in the Beauchamp tower, *ib.*
Griffiths, admiral, his accounts of the "La Vengeur's" story, 1005
Grimaldi, marquis of; Spanish ambassador in France; signs the "Family compact," 843
Grosley, his remarks on England and Londoners, 914
Gross-Beeren, battle of, Aug. 23, 1813, 1090
Grote advocates the ballot principle, 1209; supports the poor law amendment bill, 1211; and the Irish church appropriation motion, 1212
Grouchy appointed to watch Blücher at Waterloo, 1105
Grumbkow, general, sent on a mission to Charles of Sweden, to whom he gives an account of Marlborough, 712, 1105
Guadaloupe capitulated to the English, 1759, 837
Guest, general, governor of Edinburgh castle, 1745; the young Pretender prevents food from going in; the governor fires upon the town; the prince revokes his order, 804
Guickwar, a Mahratta chieftain, takes no part against the British, 1053
Guilds of trade, oppressions exercised by, 95
Guiscard, marquis de, his early career; employed as a French spy in England; has a meeting with the queen; he is arrested March 8, 1711, his correspondence with France having been detected; he is taken before the council, where he stabs Harley with a pen-knife; he is killed by the councillors, 727
Guizot, M., opinion of, as to the application of the Britons for Roman aid against the Picts and Scots, 19; his remarks on Canning's foreign policy, 1160; joins in protesting against the royal decrees of 1830, 1183; description of the meeting of Lafayette and the duke of Orleans; made minister of the interior, 1182; at the head of the cabinet, 1832, 1836, 1222; his official revelations respecting Louis Napoleon's enterprise, *ib.*; his picture of English society, 1231; appointed to keep a watch over prince Napoleon's movements, 1241; his return to England; satisfied of the good-will of the natives to France, 1242; with Soult succeeds Thiers in the ministry, 1243; describes the difficulties of Peel's position, 1245; his description of a visit to Westminster Abbey with Macaulay, 1255; his Spanish marriage plans, 1284; his conduct vindicated, *ib.*; resigns his post as minister, 1285
Gunpowder plot. See James I.
Guntzburg, battle at, 1805, 1050
Gustavus III. of Sweden, succeeds Adolphus Frederic, 1771, 1310; agrees to subsidize an army to Spain, 974; shot by Aukerstroem, March 6, 1792, 977
Guy, an M. P. and secretary to the treasury; sent to the Tower for being bribed, 661
Gwalior captured by the British, 949; again occupied by them, 1264
Gwyn, revives the idea of an academy of painting, 930; his bridges, 935
Gyllenberg, count, the Swedish envoy in London; arrested for intriguing to raise a rebellion in England, 769

Habeas Corpus act passed in 1679, 565; suspended, 1689, 625; 1695, 664; 1722, 776; 1794, 1002; 1800, 1033; 1817, 1123; a second time in 1817, 1125; the suspension repealed, 1818, 1129
Hadrian visits Britain, A.D. 120, and builds Hadrian's wall, 11; character of, by Gibbon, *ib.*
Hague, congress at the, 1691, 642; treaty of the, May 21, 1659, 732; triple alliance of the, Jan. 4, 1717, 733
Haileybury college, built by Wilkins, 1143
Halidon Hill, battle of, July 19, 1333, 135
Halifax, Charles Montague, earl of, forms part of William's new ministry in 1693; his eloquence, 658; chancellor of the exchequer, 663; instrumental in establishing the standard of money, 1696, 667; first lord of the treasury, 1697, 668; impeached for advising a partition treaty, 684; loses his place in the privy council on Anne's accession, 1702, 688; votes an inquiry into the alleged danger of the Church, 705; patron of letters, 741
Halifax, George Savile, earl of, parliament endeavors to find some charge against him, 634
Halifax, earl of, secretary of state, 1763-1765, 846, 865; proceedings against, for arresting Wilkes and Wood, 849
Hall, Robert, character of his preaching, 1139
Hallam, Henry, character of his historical writings, 1256
Halle, treaty of, 1610. 731; taken by the Bavarians, 1809.
Hamburg, peace of, May 22, 1762, 909
Hamilton, duke of. See Long Parliament, and Cromwell, Oliver.
Hamilton, lieutenant-colonel, his share in the Glencoe massacre, 647
Hamilton, duke of, president of the Scottish convention of estates, 629; alleged with others to have secreted soldiers in cellars and other places, *ib.*; causes the convention doors to be locked, *ib.*; authorized by William, in 1693, to investigate the massacre of Glencoe, but the duke dying, the inquiry was not proceeded with till 1695, 648
Hamilton, duke of; he disperses the Cameronians assembled to oppose the union, 712; killed in a duel with lord Mohun, 1712, 745
Hamilton, Gerard, his speech in favor of the subsidies, 1755; from which he is known as single speech Hamilton, 829
Hamilton, John, governor of Carlisle; surrenders to the Duke of Cumberland, 1745, 813
Hamilton, lady, aids Nelson at Naples; recommended to the national gratitude, 1021
Hamilton, Richard, his baseness and treachery, 626; his faithlessness causes the son of sir W. Temple, who had pledged to his being faithful, to drown himself in the Thames, *ib.*; placed at the head of troops for bringing the Ulster Protestants to subjection, 627; succeeds Maumont as commander of James II.'s forces, *ib.*; is superseded by Rosen, *ib.*; leads the Irish cavalry at the battle of the Boyne, 638; is taken prisoner, *ib.*
Hampden, John, refuses, in 1636, to pay the illegal assessment of Ship Money, 430; contests the right in the Exchequer Court, *ib.*; difference of the judges, but ultimate decision against him, 431; increased importance of, after the trial. *ib.*; sent as commissioner to attend the king on his visit to Scotland in 1641, 442; attempted to be seized by the king on Jan. 3, 1642, 447; is recalled when about to attack the royal army, 457; takes an active part in the siege of Reading, and urges Essex to attack Oxford, 459; and to concentrate his forces, *ib.*; is wounded at Chalgrove Field, *ib.*; dies June, 1643, *ib.*; character of, described by Clarendon, 460
Hampden clubs for parliamentary reform, 1121
Hanau, battle of, 1813, 1090
Hancock, John, proscribed by Gage, 875
Handel, statue of, by Roubiliac, 756
Hanover, George, elector of. See George I.
Hanover, treaty of, Sept. 3, 1725, 733, 778
Hansard and Stockdale, case of, 1240
Hanway, Jonas, his philanthropy; the first to use an umbrella in London, 946
Harcourt, sir S., conducts Sacheverel's defence, 1710, 721; lord chancellor, 725; his motions at Oxford's trial, 770
Harcourt, colonel, commands the Madras army, 1054
Hardicanute, accession of, in 1039, 49; tyranny, dissolutenes, and death of, in 1042, *ib.*
Hardinge, sir Henry, secretary at war, 1828, 1176; secretary for Ireland, 1215; governor-general of India, 1268, 1280; his courtesy towards sir H. Gough, *ib.*; shares with him the gaining of the Ferozeshah victory, *ib.*
Hardware trade, *temp.* William and Anne, 606
Hardwick, architect of Marylebone church, 1144
Hardwicke, Philip York, earl of, chancellor 1737-1756, 824, 865; introduces the Marriage bill, 1753, 824; retires from his office, 1756, 832; negotiates with Newcastle and Pitt, 833; prepares George III.'s first speech in parliament, 841; speech on the independence of the judges, 1761, 842
Hardy, sir C., commands a fleet; tactics, 887
Hardy, captain, present at the battle of Copenhagen, 1037; and at Nelson's death at Trafalgar, 1805, 1051
Hardy, Thomas, trial of, for high treason, Oct., 1794, 1003; Erskine's defence, *ib.*; acquittal of, *ib.*
Hare, one of the conspirators against William's life, 1696, 664
Hargreaves, James, completes his spinning-jenny, 1767, 925; how he discovered it, *ib.*; mobbed and ill-used, *ib.*
Harlay, president of the French parliament, fails in obtaining peace from the Dutch, 660; represents France at the Ryswick congress, 668
Harley. See Oxford, earl of.
Harlow, his painting, 1146
Harold succeeds Canute as king of Mercia and Northumbria, in 1035, 49; seduces Alfred, son of Ethelred, to land in England, and puts him to death, *ib.*; death of, in 1039, *ib.*
Harold, son of earl Godwin, banished with his father, 51; they return, and are favorably received by the inhabitants of London and Southwark, 52; restored to their dignities and possessions by the Witan, *ib.*; conduct and character of, during the reign of Edward, 53; sets out for Normandy, but is wrecked, made a prisoner by the earl of Ponthieu, but released by the interference of William of Normandy, *ib.*; assists William in his war against the duke of Brittany, *ib.*; swears to support William in his claims to the throne of England, *ib.*; returns to England, and suppresses an insurrection in Northumbria, 54; marries, 54; the crown of England bestowed on him by the Witan in Sept. 1066, *ib.*; defeats his brother Tostig and the Norwegians, 55; is himself defeated and slain at Hastings in Oct., 1066, *ib.*; buried at Waltham Abbey, *ib.*
Harrington, earl of, English ambassador at Spain, 770
Harris. See Malmesbury, earl of.
Harris conspired against William's life, 1696, 664
Harris, general, commands an Indian army; enters the Mysore territory, 1029
Harrison improves the spinning wheel, 924
Harrison arrested at a Reform meeting, 1819, 1132
Harrowby, earl of, foreign secretary of state, 1804, 1325; president of the council, 1148; Cato-street conspiracy revealed to, by Hidon and Dwyer, 1149; succeeded as president by the duke of Portland, 1167; his partial advocacy of the Reform bill of 1832, 1196
Harwich, a great port of the eastern coast; vicissitudes of its condition in the 18th century, 612
Hastings, battle of, Oct. 13, 1066, 55; obstinate resistance of the Saxons at, *ib.*
Hastings, marquis of. See Moira, lord.
Hastings, Warren, first governor-general of India, 869, 948; previous career and conduct as governor of Bengal; nefarious bargains with the nabob of Oude, *ib.*; opposition towards, by the Indian council, *ib.*, accused upon a charge of corruption by Nuncomar and others, *ib.*; disputes with Francis; Clavering illegally assumes the governor-generalship on the false announcement of his having resigned, 949; reappointed at the expiration of his five years' term, *ib.*; makes war against the Mahrattas, *ib.*; duels with Francis, and quarrels with Impey, *ib.*; pressed for money, 950; lays Cheyte Sing, the rajah of Benares, under heavy contributions; arrests him for neglect of payment, *ib.*; a native insurrection compels him to release the rajah and quit the city; his heavy exactions from the nabobs and begums of Oude, *ib.*; his defense of his conduct in this case, *ib.*; concludes peace with Tippoo Saib; his administration ceases, 1785, 951; acquitted of all the charges brought against him, 1794, 1008; examined before a committee of the House of Commons on Indian affairs, 1813, 1169
Haughton, John, prior of the Charter House, with his brethren, refuses to take the oath of supremacy to Henry VIII., 257; he is tried and executed, *ib.*
Havannah, conquest of the, 1762, 845
Haversham, lord, moves for inviting the princess Sophia to England, 705; his remarks on the Scotch, 708; denounces the naval miscarriages of 1707, 714
Havre bombarded by the British, 1694, 818
Hawke, admiral, sir E., defeats the French fleet off Belle Isle, Oct. 14, 1747, 819; captures some French merchantmen, 1755, 829; supersedes Byng in the command of the fleet sent against the French, 1756, 830; sent out on an expedition against Rochefort; quarrels with Mordaunt, and nothing is done, 836; driven, by stormy weather, from before Brest, 839; attacks the French fleet in Quiberon Bay, Sept. 20, 1759, and gains a victory; intrepid conduct in the battle, *ib.*
Hawkesbury, lord. See Liverpool, earl of.
Hawkesmoor, his architectural works, 755
Hawley, general, left in command of the English troops in Scotland by the duke of Cumberland, 1745, 813; marches through Linlithgow to Falkirk; his contempt for the "undisciplined rabble," *ib.*; he engages with them at Falkirk, Jan. 17, 1746; and is disgracefully defeated, *ib.*; his retreat; causes several officers and soldiers to be tried by court-martial; two soldiers are shot, 814
Hay, James, earl of Carlisle, lavish extravagance of king James towards, 406; Clarendon's character of, *ib.*
Hayden, count de, a Russian rear-admiral; present at the battle of Navarino, 1827, 1173
Haydon, his paintings, 1146
Hazlitt, William, character of his essays, 1141
Head, sir Francis, governor of Canada; orders the "Caroline" to be burnt; repels the insurgents attacking Toronto, 1233
Healey, Joseph, a reformer; tried and imprisoned, 1820, 1150
Hearth money, 601
Hemskerk, Dutch painter; patronized by William III., 757
Hengist and Horsa, landing of, in England, A.D. 449, 20
Henley. See Northington.
Henrietta Maria, advice of, to Charles, concerning Rupert, 455; letter of, to Charles, *ib.*; lands at Burlington with an army, 458; letter of, to Charles, *ib.*; warning of, to her husband, *ib.*; joins him, 460; her character, *ib.*; enters Stratford-upon-Avon, and sleeps in Shakspere's house, *ib.*; meets Charles on his first battle-field, *ib.*; conduct of, 463; goes to Exeter, 465; gives birth to a princess there, while being besieged by Essex, *ib.*; flies to France, *ib.*; condition of, at the Louvre, 501
Henriot, death of, 1794, 1005
Henry of Huntingdon, his account of the invasion of the Northmen or Danes, 25
Henry, surnamed Beau-Clerc, knighted in 1086, 65; is bequeathed 5000 pounds of silver by his father, *ib.*; assists his brother, duke Robert, at the siege of Rouen, and kills Conan, 66; becomes possessed of Mount St. Michael, and maintains a siege against his two brothers, 67; hastens to England and seizes on the crown treasures on the death of his brother William in 1100, 69; is crowned, *ib.*; publishes a charter of liberties, *ib.*; finds the necessity of English support against the Norman barons, 70; reforms effected by, *ib.*; marriage of, with Matilda, the niece of Edgar Atheling, *ib.*; induces his brother Robert to relinquish his claim to the crown, to establish which he had invaded England, *ib.*; subdues many of the disaffected barons, 70; quarrels with his brother for protecting Robert de Belèsme, 71; fosters the disaffection of the barons in Normandy against Robert, *ib.*; invades Normandy in 1105, *ib.*; wins the battle of Tenchebrai, and takes Robert prisoner, *ib.*; the son of Robert is patronized by Louis of France, a war takes place, and the battle of Noyon is fought in 1119, *ib.*; devastation of Normandy, 72; death of Matilda in 1118, *ib.*; marriage of his son William the Atheling, *ib.*; inhumanity of, towards the children of his natural daughter Juliana, wife of Eustace de Breteuil, *ib.*; wreck of the Blanche-Nef, and the death of his son William, *ib.*; second marriage of Henry in 1121 with Adelaide, *ib.*; declares his daughter Matilda, the widow of the emperor of Germany, his heir, in 1126, *ib.*; dies on Nov. 30, 1135, 73
Henry II., born in 1133, *ib.*, 79; early career and marriage of, *ib.*; is acknowledged successor to Stephen, 80; crowned on Dec. 19, 1154, *ib.*; beneficial vigor of, in the establishment of order, *ib.*; makes Thomas à Becket chancellor and his chief adviser in 1157, 81; character of, *ib.*; sends Becket as ambassador to France, to contract a marriage between his eldest son and a daughter of the French king, *ib.*; declines to surrender Maine and Anjou to his brother Geoffrey, and gives him a pension instead, 82; compels Malcolm of Scotland to surrender Cumberland and Northumberland, *ib.*; invades Wales, and is unsuccessful, *ib.*; continental wars of, 83; creates Becket archbishop of Canterbury, *ib.*; quarrels with him as to his claim for the resumption of church property, 84; state of secular law and establishment of law courts, *ib.*; evils of the clerical exemption from the secular law, 85; Constitutions of Clarendon passed to enforce the secular law, *ib.*; the pope refuses to confirm them, 86; Becket supports the pope's decision, is arraigned as a traitor, is found guilty, *ib.*; and flies from England, *ib.*; Henry convenes a synod at Oxford in

1166, which orders the persecution of heretics, *ib.*; meets Becket at Touraine in 1170, and a hollow peace is effected, 87; Becket returns to England and is murdered, *ib.*; contrast of the characters of Henry and Becket, 88; first landing of the Anglo-Normans in Ireland in 1169, *ib.*; commands Strongbow to return to England, who obeys, *ib.*; goes himself to Ireland, and receives homage as feudal superior, 89; swears his innocence of Becket's murder before the pope's legate, and is absolved, *ib.*; facts of the story of Rosamund Clifford, *ib.*; rebellion of his sons, *ib.*; imprisons his wife Eleanor, *ib.*; insurrection in England repressed, *ib.*; William king of Scotland invades England, *ib.*; and is taken prisoner, 90; is liberated on doing homage to Henry, *ib.*; Henry does penance at the tomb of Becket, *ib.*; is reconciled to his eldest son, *ib.*; important reforms in the administration of justice effected by, *ib.*; mission from Jerusalem in 1185 to urge him to undertake its relief, *ib.*; resolves to take the cross in 1188, *ib.*; his sons Richard and John join the king of France in a war against him, *ib.*; dies on July 6, 1189, 91

Henry III. succeeds his father John on Oct. 18, 1216, when only ten years old, and is crowned at Gloucester, Oct. 28, 106; the battle of Lincoln gained against the French army of prince Louis, *ib.*; the regent Pembroke dies in 1219, and is succeeded by Hubert de Burgh, *ib.*; redress of grievances obtained by the right preserved by the people to grant supplies, 107; the Charters confirmed for a third time in 1225 in order to obtain supplies, *ib.*; declares himself of age in 1227, and asserts his right to govern of his "own free will," *ib.*; denial of this doctrine by one of his judges, *ib.*; quarrels with De Burgh, but together with the pope continues his exactions on the people, *ib.*; satirical and political songs, *ib.*; marries Eleanor, daughter of the count of Provence, in 1236, 108; extortions of, *ib.*; tyrannical exercise of the privilege of purveyance, *ib.*; sale of justice by, *ib.*; oppressions on the Londoners by, *ib.*; disaffection occasioned, *ib.*; repeated violation of the Charters by, 109; swears again to observe them, *ib.*; ill success of his foreign enterprises, *ib.*; condition of the nation under, 110; value of money, and fluctuating prices of provisions in the reign of, *ib.*; taxation of the industry of the people by, and resistance made to by the clergy, *ib.*; famine in 1258, *ib.*; parliament meets at Westminster, and demands the appointment of a commission, 111; the "Provisions of Oxford," *ib.*; obtains a dispensation from the pope to violate them, *ib.*; a civil war takes place, headed by Simon de Montford, *ib.*; prince Edward commands for his father against the barons, *ib.*; taken prisoner at the battle of Lewes, 112; the queen collects troops abroad, but does not attempt to land in England, *ib.*; burgesses summoned to parliament in 1264, by Simon de Montford, *ib.*; released by the issue of the battle of Evesham, in which De Montford is slain, *ib.*; Award of Kenilworth, and efforts of the parliament to restore tranquillity, 113; continued resistance of Simon de Montford the younger, *ib.*; dies, Nov. 16, 1272, 114

Henry IV. [see Hereford, duke of] ascends the throne, Sept. 30, 1399, 157; confederacy of nobles against, 159; revolt of the Welsh under Owen Glendower against, 160; is repulsed by Glendower, *ib.*; accused of the murder of Richard II., *ib.*; persecutes the followers of Wycliffe, 161; statute "de heretico comburendo" passed for the suppression of the Lollards, *ib.*; burning William Salter, *ib.*; the Commons pray for repeal of the statute, and he rejects the prayer, *ib.*; signs a warrant for burning John Badby, *ib.*; France and Scotland refuse to acknowledge him as king, *ib.*; war with Scotland, and battle of Homildon Hill on Sept. 14, 1402, 162; revolt of the Percies against, and its probable causes, *ib.*; battle of Hateley Field at Shrewsbury, *ib.*; politic clemency of Henry, *ib.*; hostilities with France, *ib.*; revolt of Archbishop Scrope and others, *ib.*; suppression of the revolt, and execution of Scrope and Nottingham, 163; continued struggle of the Welsh under Owen Glendower, *ib.*; invades France, *ib.*; dies, Mar. 20, 1413, *ib.*

Henry V., knighted by Richard II. in 1399, when eleven years old, 156; commands in Wales against the insurgents in 1402, 160; joins his father to oppose the revolt of the Percies, 162; is wounded at the battle of Shrewsbury, *ib.*; obtains a victory over the Welsh in 1405, *ib.*; early character of, 163; made captain of Calais, *ib.*; proclaimed king, Mar. 21, 1413, *ib.*; clemency of, *ib.*; alleged conspiracy of the Lollards, headed by sir John Oldcastle in 1414, against, 164; suppressed, and all the conspirators pardoned except Oldcastle and eleven others, *ib.*; claims the crown of France and the restoration of the old English possessions, *ib.*; injustice of the demands, *ib.*; preparations for the invasion of France, *ib.*; conspiracy of the earl of Cambridge, lord Scrope, and others against, 165; lands near Harfleur, Aug. 14, 1415, *ib.*; nature of the forces, *ib.*; siege of Harfleur, *ib.*; sickness of the English army, *ib.*; march from Harfleur, *ib.*; passage of the Somme, 166; description of Agincourt and its locality, *ib.*; battle of Agincourt on Oct. 25, 1415, 167; rejoicings in London on arrival of the news, *ib.*; triumphant entry of, into London, *ib.*; the factions in France a cause of his success, 168; second expedition against France in 1417, *ib.*; takes Caen, *ib.*; besieges Rouen, *ib.*; it surrenders after severe famine, *ib.*; ineffectual conferences at Meulan, *ib.*; the duke of Burgundy murdered at an interview with the Dauphin at Montereau, 169; concludes a treaty with Philip, the young duke of Burgundy, *ib.*; and the treaty of Troyes with Charles VI. on May 21, 1420, by which he was to marry Katherine and be recognized as heir to the crown on the death of Charles, *ib.*; Henry and his queen return to England, *ib.*; ill effects of his conquests on the condition of England, *ib.*; the duke of Clarence killed, 170; releases James I. of Scotland, who accompanies him in his expedition to France in 1421, *ib.*; besieges and takes Meaux, *ib.*; dies, Aug. 31, 1422, *ib.*; estimate of the character of, *ib.*

Henry VI., born Dec. 6, 1421, 170; succeeds his father, Sept. 1, 1422, and the dukes of Bedford and Gloucester are appointed Protectors by the parliament, 171; Charles VI. of France dies, and Henry is proclaimed king, *ib.*; victory of Verneuil gained by the duke of Bedford, *ib.*; tutelage of, under the earl of Warwick, 172; apparent severity of Warwick's discipline, *ib.*; siege of Orleans commenced, *ib.*; Orleans is relieved by Joan of Arc, 173; is crowned king of France, at Paris, on Dec. 17, 1430, 175; death of the duke of Bedford, 176; continued disgraces and losses in France, *ib.*; marries Margaret of Anjou, and surrenders or loses all the possessions in France, *ib.*; the duke of Suffolk takes the side of cardinal Beaufort against the duke of Gloucester, 177; Gloucester and Beaufort die, *ib.*; rise of the house of York, 188; power of the duke of Suffolk, 188; impeachment and banishment of Suffolk, *ib.*; his murder, 188; insurrection of Jack Cade in 1450, *ib.*; other revolts in England, 189; unpopularity of Somerset, on account of his losses in France, *ib.*; Henry becomes imbecile, *ib.*; intrigues of the queen and Somerset to secure their power, 190; the duke of York elected Protector by the peers, *ib.*; the king recovers his faculties, *ib.*; selfishness of the barons, *ib.*; Somerset is released from arrest, and York superseded, *ib.*; York marches towards London, *ib.*; first battle of St. Albans, on May 22, 1455, and death of Somerset, *ib.*; is conducted to London by York, *ib.*; a parliament summoned, and York made Protector a second time, *ib.*; the parliament not revolutionary, but influenced by a desire to remove oppressive taxation, 191; the Protectorate superseded in 1456, *ib.*; attempts to reconcile the Lancastrian and York factions, *ib.*; commencement of the Civil War, in 1459, *ib.*; battle of Blore Heath, *ib.*; is taken prisoner at the battle of Northampton, in 1460, *ib.*; a parliament assembled at Westminster, and York claims the crown, 192; the peers effect a compromise that York should succeed on Henry's death, *ib.*; the queen resists the compromise, and assembles an army, *ib.*; battle of Wakefield, and death of York, Dec. 31, 1460, *ib.*; Margaret advances to London, *ib.*; defeats Warwick in the second battle of St. Albans, and recaptures the king, 193; Henry is deposed by parliament, and Edward IV. proclaimed, March 4, 1461, *ib.*; battle of Towton, *ib.*; attainted in parliament for the death of Richard, duke of York, 194; renewed attempt of queen Margarer, in 1462, repulsed, *ib.*; story of her throwing herself and son on the protection of an outlaw, *ib.*; renewed attempt against Edward, and loss of the battle of Hexham, *ib.*; the king is recaptured, and committed to the Tower, and Margaret retires to the Continent, 196; Margaret is reconciled to Warwick, 197; invades England with Warwick and Clarence, Edward is deserted, and Henry restored, *ib.*; Warwick and Clarence appointed Protectors, *ib.*; is taken prisoner at the battle of Barnet, and recommitted to the Tower, 198; queen Margaret lands at Weymouth, assembles forces, and is defeated at the battle of Tewkesbury, *ib.*; she is taken prisoner, 199; death of Henry, in May, 1471, and doubts as to the duke of Gloucester having been his murderer, *ib.*

Henry VII. (earl of Richmond) taken by his uncle, the earl of Pembroke, to Brittany, after the battle of Tewkesbury, 200; the duke of Buckingham and bishop Morton put themselves in communication with, previous to their revolt against Richard III., 208; assembles soldiers for a landing in England, *ib.*; is prevented by a storm, *ib.*; leaves Brittany to avoid being delivered up to Richard, 210; receives some forces from the king of France, and lands at Milford Haven, Aug. 7, 1485, 210; battle of Bosworth, Aug. 22, 211; crowned on the field of Bosworth, *ib.*; parliamentary title to the crown given him, 212; marries Elizabeth of York, *ib.*; suitableness of the character of, for his times, *ib.*; aversion of, to the House of York, *ib.*; imprisons the earl of Warwick, son of George, duke of Clarence, *ib.*; insurrection against, headed by Lambert Simnel, who pretended to be earl of Warwick, *ib.*; suppression of the insurrection at the battle of Stoke, on June 4, 1487, 213; alleged harsh treatment of the dowager queen Elizabeth, *ib.*; exhibits the real earl of Warwick to the people, *ib.*; timid foreign policy of, 214; allows France to annex Brittany, *ib.*; insurrection in the northern counties on account of oppressive taxation, *ib.*; the earl of Northumberland killed, but the insurrection suppressed by the earl of Surrey, *ib.*; invades France, in 1492, and invests Boulogne, *ib.*; concludes a hurried peace on receiving a large sum of money from Charles VIII., *ib.*; probable motives for the peace, *ib.*; demands the surrender of Perkin Warbeck from the duke of Burgundy, but compliance is evaded, 216; execution of sir William Stanley, and others, for corresponding with Warbeck, *ib.*; concludes a treaty with the duke of Burgundy, by which Warbeck is compelled to go to Scotland, 217; statute of treason passed, providing that subjects are bound to serve the king *de facto*, *ib.*; employment of spies by, *ib.*; letters of Bothwell to, describing the position of Warbeck in Scotland in 1496, *ib.*; is attacked by Warbeck and James IV., but they are compelled to retreat, 218; insurrection in Cornwall against renewed taxation, *ib.*; suppressed, *ib.*; concludes a truce with James IV., by which Warbeck is forced to leave Scotland, *ib.*; Warbeck lands in Cornwall, attacks Exeter, and is repulsed, *ib.*; is deserted, and flies to sanctuary at Beaulieu Abbey, *ib.*; his treatment of Warbeck after his surrender, 219; Warbeck attempts to escape, is retaken, and confined in the Tower, 219; exhibited to the public, and reads his confession, *ib.*; the earl of Warwick accused of treason, and of joining in conspiracy with Warbeck, *ib.*; they are both executed in Nov., 1499, *ib.*; commits Edward de la Pole, earl of Suffolk, to the Tower, 220; marries his eldest son, Arthur, to the princess Catherine of Arragon, in 1501, *ib.*; account of the royal court, *ib.*; his fondness for jewels, *ib.*; erection of his palace at Richmond, and chapel at Westminster, *ib.*; encouragement by, of Cabot and his sons, *ib.*; passion of, for wealth, *ib.*; concludes a treaty with Scotland, and gives Margaret, his daughter, in marriage to James IV., in 1502, 221; his son Arthur dies, *ib.*; marries Arthur's widow to his next son, Henry, after obtaining the pope's dispensation, *ib.*; his queen Elizabeth dies, *ib.*; seeks for an advantageous marriage for himself, *ib.*; dies on April 21, 1509, *ib.*; extortions of Henry through the agency of Empson and Dudley, *ib.*; depression of the aristocracy by, *ib.*; originates the Star-chamber court, *ib.*; few parliaments held during his reign, 222; progress of maritime discovery in his reign, 224

Henry VIII. succeeds his father, April 22, 1509, 226; Empson and Dudley convicted and executed for extortion, *ib.*; marriage of, to Catherine of Arragon, *ib.*; remarkable modification of the coronation oath by, *ib.*; skill of, in music, 227; interferes in favor of pope Julius II. in a war against France, *ib.*; revives the claim to the crown of France, *ib.*; claims a feudal superiority over Scotland, *ib.*; retains his sister's legacy, in order to compel her husband, James IV. of Scotland, to abandon the French alliance, 228; an army sent to Spain to invade Guienne, *ib.*; Wolsey, the almoner, acts as war-minister, *ib.*; rise of Wolsey, *ib.*; the army returns from Spain without effecting its object, *ib.*; naval warfare and mutual ravages on the coasts of France and England, *ib.*; despotic measures of, for the security of the coast, 229; expedition of, to France, in 1513, *ib.*; ostentatious display of magnificence, *ib.*; the emperor Maximilian takes military service under him, *ib.*; wins the Battle of the Spurs, *ib.*; Terouenne and Tournay surrender, *ib.*; war with Scotland, *ib.*; battle of Flodden Field, on Sept. 9, 1513, and death of James IV. of Scotland, 230; ravages on both sides of the Scottish border, *ib.*; attack by the French on Brighton, *ib.*; peace with France, and marriage of the princess Mary to Louis XII., *ib.*; death of Louis, and accession of Francis, 231; Henry asserts the rights of the crown against the claims of the clergy, 232; desires to be chosen emperor, and sends Pace on a mission to Germany, *ib.*; Henry and Francis meet in the Field of the Cloth of Gold, 233; meets Charles V. at Gravelines, 234; conviction and execution of John Stafford, duke of Buckingham, *ib.*; increasing despotism and cruelty of, *ib.*; writes a book against Luther, "On the Seven Sacraments," 235; Leo X. bestows on him, in 1521, the title of "Defender of the Faith," *ib.*; concludes a league with Charles V. against Francis I., *ib.*; arbitrary measures of, to raise money, 236; riot of the Londoners on "Evil May Day" against the Flemish traders, *ib.*; parliament summoned, in 1523, and earnest debate on the granting of a subsidy, *ib.*; opposes the endeavor of his sister Margaret to obtain a divorce, *ib.*; Scotland is invaded to enforce the removal of the duke of Albany from the regency, 237; the earl of Surrey destroys Jedburgh, and ravages the borders, *ib.*; the duke of Suffolk sent with an army to France, in 1523, which devastates the country, but has no other success, 238; resistance of the people to taxes levied without the authority of parliament, *ib.*; insurrection in Suffolk occasioned by, *ib.*; the levy revoked, and the insurgents pardoned, 239; his opinion as to the war between the emperor and the pope, in 1527, 240; first agitation of the question of divorce from queen Catherine, 241; sends supplies to the pope while in confinement, *ib.*; growing attachment of, to Anne Boleyn, 242; war declared against the emperor, *ib.*; the pope sends a commission for Wolsey and cardinal Campegius to inquire into the validity of his marriage, 243; interview of the legates with Catherine, *ib.*; unpopularity of the divorce with the people, 244; opening of the legatine commission on June 18, 1529, *ib.*; Catherine refuses to acknowledge its jurisdiction, *ib.*; is declared contumacious, *ib.*; Wolsey is deprived of the Great Seal, on Oct. 17, 1529, 245; creates sir Thomas More chancellor, *ib.*; the parliament passes statutes against ecclesiastical abuses, 246; opposition of the clergy to the reading of the scriptures, 246; the king is released from his debts by act of parliament, 247; Christmas amusements of, and large sums lost by, at gambling, *ib.*; sends the earl of Wiltshire and Cranmer to obtain the pope's consent to the dissolution of his marriage, 248; opinions of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge in favor of the divorce, *ib.*; hypocrisy of the plea of conscience for desiring a divorce, *ib.*; grants a general pardon to Wolsey, who retires to his see, 249; causes him to be arrested for high treason, *ib.*; unfeeling conduct of, on hearing of Wolsey's death, 250; commencement of the Reformation in England, *ib.*; prosecutes the clergy for having submitted to Wolsey as legate, *ib.*; fears being cited to Rome on the divorce cause, *ib.*; threatens the pope with the loss of his power in England, but persecutes reformers, 251; requires Frith and Tyndale to renounce their errors and to return from the Netherlands to England, *ib.*; the payment of annates to the see of Rome abolished by, in 1533, *ib.*; increased cruelty and tyranny of, after the death of Wolsey, *ib.*; severe laws passed against poisoners, gypsies, vagabonds, and for punishing wanderers by death on a third offense, *ib.*; goes with Anne Boleyn to France, in 1532, to meet Francis, 252; marries Anne Boleyn, 253; Cranmer pronounces

sentence of divorce, on May 23, 1533, 253; description of the coronation of Anne Boleyn, by Cranmer, *ib.*; Catherine steadily refuses to renounce the title of queen, 244; princess Elizabeth born, Sept. 7, 1533, 254; statute forbidding appeals to Rome passed, *ib.*; statute for the punishment of heresy, 255; Frith burnt, *ib.*; statute vesting the succession in the issue of Queen Anne, *ib.*; the Holy Maid of Kent and her visions, *ib.*; she is tried and executed for treason, *ib.*; Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and sir Thomas More, included in the charge, *ib.*; they are sent to the Tower for refusing to swear to the illegality of the king's first marriage, 256; Act of Supremacy passed, *ib.*; Act of Succession passed, with new definitions of treason, *ib.*; execution of the monks of the Charterhouse for refusing to take the oath of supremacy, 257; Hollanders burnt for heresy, 258; the act allowing the free importation of books repealed, *ib.*; Fisher and More tried for treason, convicted, and executed, *ib.*; Cromwell appointed vicegerent, 259; visitation of the monasteries, in 1535, *ib.*; statute for the dissolution of the smaller monasteries, 260; statutes passed for the regulation of trade and prices, *ib*; death of Catherine on Jan. 7, 1536, *ib.*; Anne Boleyn suspected of heresy, 261; May-day at Greenwich, 1536, *ib.*; Anne Boleyn sent to the Tower, *ib.*; her letter to the king, 262, 265; Cranmer's letter to the king, 262; true bills found against Anne Boleyn and others, 263; her trial and execution on May 19, 1536, *ib.*; her dying speech, *ib.*; marriage of Henry to Jane Seymour, on May 20, *ib.*; doubts as to the guilt of Anne, 264; new law of succession passed, 265; state of Ireland, 266; rebellion of the Fitzgeralds in Ireland in 1534, 267; it is suppressed, and the Fitzgeralds executed, in violation of a promise given, 268; assumes the title of king of Ireland, 269; proclamation of, against holidays, 270; insurrection in Lincolnshire in 1536, occasioned by the proclamation and the suppression of monastic establishments, *ib.*; rude answer of, to the Lincolnshire petitioners, *ib.*; the insurrection suppressed, 271; insurrection in Yorkshire, headed by Robert Aske, *ib.*; crafty instructions of, to the duke of Norfolk, as to treating with the insurgents, *ib.*; dissatisfaction of, with Norfolk, for granting a free pardon on their dispersion, *ib.*; renewal of the insurrection in Yorkshire in 1537, *ib.*; the insurgents repulsed from Carlisle and Hull, martial law proclaimed, and many hung, *ib.*; execution of many of the leaders in London, 272; orders martial law to be proclaimed, which is to apply to monks and canons that be faulty, *ib.*; executions at Windsor for sympathy with the insurgents of the North, *ib.*; birth of Edward VI., and death of queen Jane Seymour, *ib.*; negotiations abroad for a new wife, *ib.*; sanctions the printing of Coverdale's Bible, 273; disputes in Westminster Hall with John Lambert on the eucharist, *ib.*; Lambert is burnt, *ib.*; Act of 1539, for the dissolution of abbeys, *ib.*; assigns pensions to the abbots, monks, and others who surrender, 274; wasteful disposal of the possessions of the religious houses, 275; destruction of the buildings, *ib.*; subserviency of the parliament summoned in 1539, *ib.*; Acts passed for the dissolution of abbeys, and to enable Henry to found and endow bishoprics, 276; projected appropriations of the monastic revenues, and their subsequent misapplication, *ib.*; suppresses the hospital of the Knights of St. John, *ib.*; passing of the intolerant and atrocious statute of the Six Articles, in 1539, *ib.*; persecutions and executions under this statute, 277; preposterous claim of, to unlimited obedience, embodied in this statute, *ib.*; causes the De la Pole family to be arrested, on Reginald Pole having written against his divorce, 278; the aged countess of Salisbury, Pole's mother, executed in 1541, *ib.*; marries Anne of Cleves, *ib.*; dislikes her, 279; the marriage declared invalid, *ib.*; causes Cromwell to be arrested, *ib.*; and attainted of high treason, *ib.*; Cromwell is executed, July 28, 1540, and on the same day Henry marries Catherine Howard, 280; heretics burnt for affirming the legality of his marriage with Catherine of Arragon, and for denying his supremacy, *ib.*; the profligacy of Catherine Howard revealed to him by Cranmer, *ib.*; promises her life on confession, but breaks the promise, *ib.*; she is attainted and executed, Feb. 12, 1541, *ib.*; another new treason declared by the Act of attainder, 281; marries Catherine Parr, in July, 1543, *ib.*; endeavors to effect a marriage between his son Edward and Mary of Scotland, *ib.*; sends the earl of Hertford to Scotland, who ravages it, burns Leith, and other places, 282, 283; is opposed by cardinal Beaton in his claims to supremacy, and in his attempt on the independence of Scotland, *ib.*; sanctions a proposal to assassinate Beaton, *ib.*; invades France with great pomp, having obtained a subsidy and a second extinction of his debts from parliament, in 1544, *ib.*; besieges and takes Boulogne, *ib.*; wants funds for providing land defences against a projected invasion by France, 284; peace concluded with France and Scotland, *ib.*; continued persecution for heresies under Act of the Six Articles, 284, 285; relieves Cranmer from an accusation of heresy, *ib.*; Anne Askew and others burnt, *ib.*; queen Catherine Parr suspected of heresy, *ib.*; the duke of Norfolk and earl of Surrey arrested on charges of high treason, 286; Surrey beheaded, and Norfolk remitted for execution, but escapes owing to the king's death, *ib.*; death of Henry on Jan. 28, 1547, *ib.*

Henry IV., of France, succeeds to the throne in August, 1589, 382; English expedition sent in aid of, *ib.*; abjures the Protestant religion, 384; concludes a separate treaty with Spain, 388; sends Sully to congratulate James I. on his accession, 397; is assassinated in 1610; scheme of, for an European confederacy, *ib.*

Henry, Patrick, his early career, 850; his eloquence in opposing the Stamp act, 1765, *ib.*

Heptarchy, little interest afforded by the events of the, 23; incessant wars during the, *ib.*

Hereford, Henry duke of (afterwards Henry IV.), quarrel of, with the Duke of Norfolk, 156; is banished, *ib.*; his patrimony seized by Richard II., *ib.*; lands at Ravenspur, July 4, 1399, 157; interview of, with Richard II., *ib.*; entry of, with the captive Richard, into London, *ib.*; claims the crown, *ib.*; his hereditary pretensions, 159; superior right of Edmund Mortimer, the progenitor of the House of York, *ib.* See Henry IV.

Hereward heads an insurrection in 1072, in the Isle of Ely, 60; successes of, *ib*; is compelled to submit to William I., *ib.*; fate of, *ib.*

Hermann, general, defeated by the French and Dutch, 1799, 1031

Hero-worship, ancient tumuli, probable memorials of, 6

Herries, J. C., chancellor of the exchequer, 1173; quarrels with Huskisson, *ib.*; secretary at war, 1215

Herschell, sir William, discovered Uranus, 1781, 1141; his great telescope erected at Slough, Aug. 28, 1798, *ib.*

Hertford, Edward Seymour, earl of, commands the forces in the invasion of Scotland, and burns Leith, 282; ravages the southern counties, *ib.*; conceals for a time the will of Henry VIII., 301; raised to the office of Protector, by the executors of the will, and created Duke of Somerset, *ib.*; endeavors to enforce the treaty for the marriage of Edward VI. with the queen of Scotland, 302; invades Scotland, and proposes terms for an union, *ib.*; wins the battle of Pinkie and returns to London, 303; causes Henry VIII.'s statutes of treason and other arbitrary laws to be repealed, *ib.*; difficulties of the government of, arising from the circumstances of the times and his own character, 305; causes his brother, lord Thomas Seymour, to be attainted for treason, and signs the warrant for his execution, *ib.*; probable guilt of Seymour, and justification of Somerset, 306; evidence of Sharrington against Seymour, *ib.*; ineffectual endeavors of Somerset to redress grievances, *ib.*; proclamations against unreasonable prices and against inclosures, 307; insurrection in Cornwall and Devonshire against innovations in religion, *ib.*; suppressed at the battle of Cliff, near Exeter, *ib.*; insurrection of Ket, the tanner in Norfolk, against inclosures, 308; suppressed by the earl of Warwick at Mousehold-heath, 309; marriage of Mary of Scotland to the dauphin of France, and war declared with both those countries, *ib.*; successes of the Scotch, *ib.*; becomes obnoxious to the nobility from his protection of the rights of the poor, *ib.*; confederacy of the nobles, headed by Warwick, against, 310; issues a proclamation inviting the king's subjects to repair to Hampton Court, where Edward was, for the king's protection, *ib.*; fails to get the support of the army or to move the people to rise in his favor, *ib.*; removes Edward to Windsor, 311; lord Russell and the army join Warwick, *ib.*; is arrested, *ib.*; conveyed to the Tower, *ib.*; articles exhibited against, 312; the Protectorship is revoked, he is imprisoned till Feb. 6, 1550, and fined, *ib.*; attempts of, to re-establish his power, 314; is arrested and tried for high treason, *ib.*; acquitted of treason and found guilty of felony, *ib.*; is beheaded January, 22, 1551, *ib.*; character of, and his influence on the progress of the Reformation, 314

Hertford, lord, English ambassador at Paris, 849

Hervey, lord, vice-chamberlain, 1730, 781; duels with Pulteney; character of, 782; conversation of, with Walpole, on Caroline's death, 789

Hervey, colonel, advises Wellington to cease pursuing the enemy at Waterloo, 1107

Hesse, elector of, subsidied by England, 829

Hewlet, lady, her bequest; discussion as to the claimants thereof, 1271

Hexham, battle of, May 15, 1464, 195

Hicks, Mrs., hanged for witchcraft, 1716, 747

Hickson, an agent of the young Pretender; apprehended, 804

Hickson, his description of the evils of the poor-law system, 1210

Hidon, Thomas, reveals the Cato street conspiracy, 1149

High and Low Church, introduction of the distinction of, 626

Highlanders, description of the, by Cunningham, 630; government proceedings against the, 645 *et seq.*; their share in the rebellion of 1715, 761; description of the; the Black Watch, or 42d Regiment, 799; aid the rebellion of 1745, 802–805; costume of, early part of 18th century, *ib.*; their further operations in the rebellion of 1745, 1746, 807–809; drafted into the British army by Chatham, 832

Highs, Thomas, invents a machine similar to the "jenny," 924

Highwaymen, 18th century, 938

Hill, colonel, commands the garrison at Fort William, 1690, 645; his share in the Glencoe massacre, 646; declared not guilty by the Scotch parliament, 649

Hill, captain, murders Mountford, the player, 655

Hill, general, his struggle with Soult, Dec. 1813, 1091

Hill, Frederic, first inspector of Scotch prisons; their state according to his reports, 1221

Hill, sir G. F., vice-treasurer of Ireland, 1148

Hill, M. D., M.P. for Hull; description of Aguew's Sabbath Observance bill, 1204; history of public opinion on the question of counsel for prisoners by, 1220

Hill, Rowland, revolutionizes the routine of the Post Office, 1227; his proposed penny postage plan; opposition to it; it is tried and found completely successful, 1239

Hill, T. W., his remarks on Worcestershire potato cultivation, 957; engaged in the Birmingham riots, 1791, 978

Hillsborough, lord, secretary for the colonies, 1768–1772, 658; orders Bernard to rescind the resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Assembly, to oppose the Revenue act, 861; accused of garbling the council minutes; appoints lord Boutetort governor of Virginia, in room of sir J. Amherst, 862; secretary of state, 1779-1782, 1325

Hislop, sir Thomas, commands the army of the Deccan, 1169

Hispaniola. See San Domingo.

Historian, province of the, 2; duties of, *ib.*

History, specimens of the false statements of, 1108; differently treated by our leading historians, Macaulay, Hallam, and Carlisle, 1255–1256

Hoadley, Dr. Benjamin; his treatises burnt by the mob, 721; bishop of Salisbury; urges Walpole to give the Dissenters promise of future relief, 781

Hobhouse, his objection to the income tax, 1022

Hobhouse, sir J. C., secretary of state, 1205; president of the board of control, 1224; his speech, moving a vote of thanks to the Indian army, 1248

Hoche, sergeant, commands a detachment of French guards in the riots, 1789, 965; his exploits at Quiberon, 1009; appointed to command the expedition to Ireland, 1796, 1012

Hofer, Andrew, leader of the Tyrolese insurrectionists, 1809, 1073; his exploits, 1074; capture and death, Feb. 20, 1810, *ib.*

Hofland, a river scenery painter, 1147

Hogarth, William, the regenerator of modern English painting, 757, 930; his character as a painter, 757; his pictures a delineation of cotemporary manners, *ib.*; dramatic character of his paintings and prints, *ib.*; the life of the streets as shown in his works, 758; profligacy among the high and low ranks of society, *ib.*; manners of the time as delineated in his pictures of the scene at the cock-pit and at the gaming-house, *ib.*; that of the rake's levee, *ib.*; marriage-a-la-mode, 759; in his election prints, *ib.*; in his pictures of "The Sleeping Congregation," *ib.*; and "Credulity, Superstition, and Fanaticism, a medley," *ib.*; attacked by Wilkes in the "North Briton," 848; his caricature portrait of Wilkes; attacked by Churchill, *ib.*; whose portrait he publishes, *ib.*

Hohenlinden, battle of, Dec. 3, 1880, 1035

Hohenlohe, prince of, commands the Prussians at Jena, 1061

Holbein, Hans, productions of, under Henry VIII., 300

Holbourne, admiral, shrinks from attacking the French, 836

Holcroft, Thomas, remarks on Hardy's trial, 1002

Holderness, earl of, secretary of state, 1751–1761, 833, 839, 865; removed from this office, 1761, 842

Holkar, a Mahratta chief, 1053; war declared against, 1804; subdued by the British, 1055

Holkar the younger aids the Pindarees in their war with the British, 1169; defeated Dec. 21, 1817, at the battle of Meehudpore; peace concluded with the British, Jan. 6, 1818, 1170

Holland, Henry, his architectural designs, 1143

Holland, lord. See Fox, Henry.

Holland, lord, remarks on lord North's conduct, 1781, 898; his account of North's announcement of his resignation, 1782, 900; remarks on the income tax, 1022; a member of the Grenville ministry, 1061; defends himself for defending lord Grey, 1827, 1166; chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, 1187–1224

Holland annexed to France, 1810, 1081

Holmes, major, concerned in the assassination plot, 1696, 664

Holstein Beck, prince of, takes an active part in the battle of Blenheim, 1704, 698

Holwell, his account of the tragedy of the Black Hole, 834

Holy Alliance. See Alliance.

Home, John, his estimate of the Highland forces, 1745, 803; his description of the battle of Falkirk, 813

Homildon-Hill, battle of, Sept. 14, 1402, 162

Hompesch, general, pursues the Gallo-Bavarian army after their defeat at Blenheim, 698

Hone, William, prosecuted for libel, 1125; his first, 1126; second, *ib.*; and third trials, *ib.*; in all he is found not guilty

Hood, captain, present at the battle of the Nile, 1798, 1021

Hood, sir Samuel, unable to hinder De Grasse's operations, 1781, 895; joined by Rodney, 1782, 900; compels the "Ville de Paris" to strike, 901; captures four French vessels, *ib.*; sails against Toulon; negotiates with the inhabitants, 998; the fleet and port are surrendered on his agreeing to support them in the restoration of peace and monarchy, *ib.*; compelled to evacuate the place by the French, 999

Hood, Thomas, his poetry, 1259

Hook, Theodore, his novels, 1254

Hooke, colonel, a Jacobite agent; offers French assistance to the Cameronians, and other Scots disaffected toward the government, 714

Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, martyrdom of, 327

Hope, sir John, retreats through Spain, 1808, 1070; succeeds to the command of the army on Moore's death; embarks his troops, 1071; captures Balitz and the South Beveland, 1809, 1075; battles against Soult, 1813, 1091

Horner, Francis, remarks of, on the reduction of the circulating medium, 1816, 1116; died Feb. 6, 1817, 1127

Horton, Mrs., her connection and marriage with the duke of Cumberland, 868

Hosier, admiral, blockades Porto Bello, 778

Hospitals, London medical, dates of the opening of the, 946

Houchard, general in the French army; defeats the Austrians near Hondscoote, Sept. 8, 1793, 997; the convention puts him to death for not stopping the English in their retreat from Dunkirk, *ib.*

Howard, Mrs. See Suffolk, lady.

Howard, John, high'sheriff of Bedfordshire; his philanthropical effort to remedy the state of prisoners; publication of his book "on prisons," 1777, 946
Howe, Richard, earl; captain; captures two French vessels, 1755, 829; takes Aix, 1757, 836; reinforces the troops in America; appointed one of the British commissioners, 875; employs conciliatory measures toward the Americans, 879; his negotiations with Franklin and others, 880; sails to Newport; hindered from engaging the enemy by a storm, 886; admiral; gives chase to the Brest fleet, 1004; gains a victory over it, June 1, 1794, 1016; his personal visit to the fleet quells the mutiny at Spithead, 1016
Howe, major-general sir William, engaged in the battle of Breed's, or Bunker's hill, 1775, 876; leads an attack against the Americans, *ib.*; left in command of the British American army, *ib.*; leaves Halifax; lands in Staten Island, 1776, 878; his letter to George Washington, Esq., refused, 879; gains the battle of Brooklyn, *ib.*; his further operations against Washington, 1776, *ib.*; evacuates Jersey; his strategic movements, 1777, 882
Howe, lord, slain at the head of his regiment in America, 1758, 837
Hudson's Bay Company, chartered 1670, 614
Huggins, John, reprimanded for selling the wardenship of the Fleet, 782
Hull, port of, and trades, 610; whale fishery carried on by the vessels of, *ib.*; obtains parliamentary representation, 1832, 1200
Hull, general, capitulates to Brock, 1812, 1097
Hullin aids in attacking the Bastile, 1789, 963
Humbert, general, commands the French force sent to Ireland, 1025; which surrenders to general Lake, Sept. 8, 1799, 1025
Hume, erroneous statement of, as to the condition of Britain in the third century, 12
Hume, M.P. for Montrose; his complaints on behalf of queen Caroline, 1150; moves the issuing of a proclamation for her coronation, 1154; his efforts to promote the recognition of true principles of financial economy, 1175; votes for Littleton as speaker, 1202; reviews the work of the session of 1830, 1219
"Hundred Days," account of the crisis called the, 1102, 1104, 1197
Hunne, Richard, persecution of, for heresy and being possessed of Wycliffe's books, 277; violent death of, *ib.*; the bishop of London's chancellor accused of his murder, *ib.*
Hunt, Henry, attends a meeting of the Hampden club in London, 1121; and also the Spa-field meeting, 1122; fails in being returned M.P. for Westminster, 1129; presides over a reform meeting in Smithfield, 1131; takes the chair at the great reform meeting at Manchester, 1819, 1132; he is arrested and tried, 1133; found guilty and punished, 1150
Hunt, Leigh, his "Story of Rimini" published, 1816, 1138; charm and pleasantness of his essays, 1141
Hunt, Robert, his evidence of the assassination plot, 1696, 664
Huskisson, William, present at the taking of the Bastile; defends his conduct in the French revolution. 966; praises Louis's firmness in the insurrection of the 20th of June, 1792, 978; first commissioner of Woods and Forests and Land revenues, 1148; president of the board of trade, January, 1823; obtains a seat in the Cabinet, 1825; develops a system of commercial policy on a broad and liberal basis; his reciprocity of duties bill passed, July 4, 1823, 1160; clamor against his proposal to abolish the prohibitory duties on silk; vindicates his motives for advocating free trade, *ib.*; he is eloquently defended by Canning, *ib.*; colonial secretary in the Goderich ministry, 1827, 1172; his differences with Mr. Herries causes lord Goderich to resign, 1173; joins the Wellington administration, *ib.*; opposes the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, 1175; compelled, for consistency's sake, to vote against the government, he retires from the ministry, 1828, 1176; his speech on the power of steam; returned M.P. for Liverpool, 1185; present at the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester railway, 1186; killed by an accident, Sept. 15, 1830, *ib.*
Huss, John, adopts the tenets of Wycliffe, 163; is summoned to Constance and there burnt in 1415, *ib.*
Hussey, Dr., remarks of, on the state of Ireland, 1796, 1023
Hutchinson, colonel, studies the state of public affairs, 434; conference of, with lord Newark, 449; defends Nottingham Castle with bravery, 460; returned as member of parliament, 471; presents a petition in favor of sir John Owen, 492; goes to London and submits, like others, to Cromwell's government, 506; effects of the Civil War described by Mrs. Hutchinson, 510; she cites the colonel as a good example of an accomplished gentleman of the Independent party, *ib.*; kind of life led by, after his retirement from public affairs, 511; reveals Lambert's plot to Oliver Cromwell, 625
Hutchinson, governor of Massachusetts, 862; removes all the troops from Boston, 863; superseded in his post by general Gage, 872
Hutchinson, general, engages the French at Castlebar, 1025; succeeds to the command of the army in Egypt; invests Cairo, 1038
Hutchinson, lord, appointed to offer queen Caroline an annuity under certain conditions, 1151
Hutton, William, established a circulating library at Birmingham, 1751, 935; remarks on a handbill celebrating the fall of the Bastile, 1791, 961: his warehouse plundered by the Birmingham mob, 971
Huy taken by Marlborough, 1703, 692; by Villeroy, 1705, 704
Hyde, sir Edward. See Clarendon, earl of.
Hyder-Ali defeats the English in Madras and obtains possession of the country, 869; his inroad upon the Carnatic, 950; defeated by Coote, *ib.*; death of, 1782, 951

Ibrahim Bey evacuates Cairo, 1798, 1021
Ibrahim Pasha, proceedings of, at Navarino and the Morea, 1827, 1173
Imhoff, Mrs., married Warren Hastings, 949
Impey, sir Elijah, chief justice of the Supreme Court at Calcutta; causes Nuncomar to be tried for forgery, 948; who is found guilty and executed, 949; quarrels with Hastings, *ib.*; collects evidence against the begums of Oude, 950
Impressment, system of, established by law, 1704, 694; evils of impressment exaggerated, 1096
Inclosure bills passed, 1760–1779, 911; 1789–1797, 1014
Income, Gregory King's scheme of the, of the various grades of society in 1688, 612, 621; of clergy compared with that of other classes, *temp.* queen Anne, 620
Income tax, first proposed by Pitt, 1798; objections to it, 1022; proposed continuance of, 1816; opposition to it; the proposal rejected, 1113; renewal of, proposed by sir R. Peel, and resolved upon by parliament, notwithstanding great opposition, 1202; reimposition of, proposed by sir R. Peel, 1273
Indemnity Acts for Dissenters passed, 1727–1828, 781
Indemnity Act passed, 1766, to exonerate those who had advised an embargo on corn, 854
Indemnity bill introduced, 1689, 625
Indemnity bill, 1818, 1129
Independents. See Nonconformists.
India bill, Fox's, brought forward, Nov. 18, 1783; the plan of government proposed, 952; opposition to it; carried in the House of Commons, Dec. 9, *ib.*; rejected in the Lords, *ib.*; Pitt introduces his, Jan. 14, 1784; thrown out, and Fox's re-introduced, *ib.*; Pitt's India bills passed; plan of government laid down by them, 954
Indian affairs, history of, 1744–1754, 827; 1756–1757, 834; 1760–1773, 869; 1773–1784, 947; India bills of Fox and Pitt, 951, 953, 954; history, from 1785 to 1793, 968; 1798, 1799, 1029; 1799–1806, 1053; 1807–1826, 1168; 1836–1842, 1248–1252; 1842–1844, 1266–1268; 1845, 1846, 1280
Indian Trade Reform bill suffered to drop, 1692, 650
Indians employed by the Americans, 1759, 838; by the British, 1777, 883; Chatham denounces the practice as a national stain, 883; Burgoyne defends his conduct in employing them, 886; destruction of Wyoming by, 1778, 887; again employed by the British, 1812, 1097; their steadiness and order praised by Brock, *ib.*
Industrious classes, state of the, *temp.* Richard I., 97; sports, games, and amusements of, 97
Industry; variety of employments among the western counties of England, 605; the hardware trade of Birmingham, 606; earthenware trade, *ib.*; glass manufacture, *ib.*; stocking trade, 607; progress and vicissitudes of the lace trade, *ib.*; Lombe's and vicissitudes of silk mill completed in 1717, *ib.*; progress of the silk trade, *ib.*; rapid development of the cotton trade between 1700 and 1850, 608; linen trade at Warrington, and discouragement given to it, 609; most prosperous when guided by natural laws, 610; of the Yorkshiremen in queen Anne's time, *ib.*; of Leeds, *ib.*; cutlery trade of Sheffield, 610; imports, exports, and trade of Hull, *ib.*; the coal trade, 610; the salmon trade, 611; of Scotland, very limited before the Union, in 1707, *ib.*; of the inhabitants in the Norwich district, 612; curious evidence of this, *ib.*; great difficulty of passing from one occupation to another about the time of queen Anne, 616; jealousy of the great formerly shown towards the rise of the lower classes, 617; progress of the national, in agriculture, 911; and the arts, 922, 923-929; general depression of, 1812, 1063; and again in 1816, from the exhaustion of war, 1114; and the heavy poor rates levied, 1119
Inglis, sir R. H., returned M.P. for Oxford, 1829, 1177; his speech against the Reform bill, 1831, 1188; opposes the granting a charter to the University of London, 1216
Ingulphus, abbot of Croyland, account of the invasion of the Danes in 870 by, 29; his behavior to his predecessor, 59; account by, of the resistance of Hereward, 60
Innocent XII., his pacific turn, 642; his decision as to the Spanish succession, 683; pope, 1691–1700, 1309
Inns as described by the poets and novelists of the 18th century, 938
Innspruck surrendered to the Bavarians, 1809, 1074
Insurance offices, date of the establishment of the earlier, 614
Interregnum, period of, in 1688-9, 598
Inverness taken by the young Pretender, 1746, 815
Inwoods, the architects of St. Pancras church, 1144
Iona, religion and learning fostered at, by Columba, in the 8th century, 24
Ipswich loses its colliery and cloth trade; takes the lead in the manufacture of agricultural implements, 612; mutiny at, 1689, 625
Ireton, Henry, commands the left wing at Naseby, 467; intercepts a letter of the king's in 1647, 480; saves the life of sir John Owen, seconded by col. Hutchinson, 492; left in Ireland by Cromwell as his deputy, 496; dies there in Nov., 1651, 507; his body disinterred from Westminster Abbey after the Restoration, and buried at Tyburn, 536
Irish Church Reform bill. See Church.
Iron; England before and after the iron era, contrasted, 604; Forest of Dean formerly the seat of the manufacture of, 605; evidences of the Romans having smelted, *ib.*; coal first used for smelting; state of the iron trade in 1740 and 1851 compared, *ib.*; hardware trade at Birmingham, 606; extensive manufacture of steel at Sheffield, 611; improvements in the manufacture of; Carron iron works founded by Dr. Roebuck, 1759, 927; coal used for smelting, *ib.*; invention of the art of converting cast-iron into malleable-iron; modern and ancient iron structures compared, *ib.*

Isabel of Spain, her claim to the throne disputed by Don Carlos, 1122
Isabella, queen of Edward II. See Edward II. and Edward III.
Ismail, siege of, 1790; stormed by the Russians; massacre of the besieged, 969

Jackson, capt. Andrew, organizes the opposition to sir E. Pakenham's advance upon New Orleans, Dec. 1814, and Jan. 1815, 1101; president of the United States, 1829–1837, 1187
Jacobins, a French political party; Robespierre its head, 973; they attempt to impeach La Fayette, 978; suspend their hostility towards Dumouriez. 993; their measures for governing France, 994; energy, their characteristic, 975; their vigor in meeting the Toulon revolt, 998; their energy and atrocities, 1000; they recognize the existence of the Supreme Being, 1005; fall of Robespierre and his adherents, *ib.*
Jacquerie, in France, the consequence of the miseries occasioned by the ravages of the English, 142
Jaffa taken by the French, 1799, 1029; massacre of its inhabitants, *ib.*
Jaffier, Meer, Surajah Dowlah's general, conspires, with Clive's assistance, to obtain supreme power, 834; Clive's treaty with, *ib.*; becomes subahdar of Bengal, 835; the English make war on Cossein to dethrone him, and restore Jaffier, 869
Jamaica, critical state of affairs in, 1237
James I. of Scotland is released from his captivity at Windsor, and accompanies Henry V. in his expedition to France in 1421, 170
James IV. of Scotland receives and protects Perkin Warbeck in 1495, 217; invades England on his behalf but retreats, 218; concludes a truce, and sends Warbeck from Scotland, *ib.*; marries Margaret, daughter of Henry VII. in 1502, 221; concludes a treaty with France in May, 1512, 228; invades England, 229; valor displayed by, at Flodden Field, Sept. 9, 1513, 230; slain, 231
James I. of England (VI. of Scotland), born June 19, 1566, 347; is crowned in Scotland, July 29, 1567, on his mother's abdication. 349; writes to Elizabeth in favor of his mother on her condemnation, 364; suspected of joining in the projects of Spain against England, 370; he represses the insurrection fostered by Spain, 384; attempts to obtain a subsidy to enable him to assert his claim to the succession of the crown of England, 302; the Gowrie conspiracy, *ib.*; proclaimed king of England, March 24, 1603, as James I., 396; quits Scotland with his queen, Anne of Denmark, 396; absurd dispensations of knighthood by, *ib.*; expectations of the Roman Catholics from, 397; coronation of, *ib.*; the two plots, the "Main" and the "Bye," *ib.*; Raleigh, Cobham, and Grey indicted for endeavoring to advance Arabella Stuart to the throne, *ib.*; Raleigh is confined in the Tower, *ib.*; he presides at a conference at Hampton Court between the heads of the Church and the leaders of the Puritans, 398; a new version of the Holy Scriptures ordered by, *ib.*; meeting of his first parliament, and dispute with it respecting its privileges, *ib.*; assertion of their rights by the Commons, in their "Apology," *ib.*; they remonstrate against some innovations on the canons, aiming at excluding nonconformists from civil rights, 399; recommends an Union with Scotland, *ib.*; the Commons complain of the grievances of purveyance and wardship, *ib.*; he concludes a treaty of peace with Spain in Aug. 1604, *ib.*; unpopularity of, *ib.*; character of, 400; Cecil communicates the letter of Mounteagle respecting the Gunpowder Plot to the king, 401; the vaults under the Parliament House searched, and Guido Fawkes is taken, *ib.*; dispersion of the conspirators, *ib.*; examination and torture of Fawkes, 402; confession of Winter, and details of the plot, *ib.*; the conspirators attempt to raise a revolt, 403; resist their arrest, *ib.*; are killed or taken prisoners, *ib.*; employment of Ben Jonson as a spy, *ib.*; trial of the conspirators, 404; trial of Garnet the Jesuit, and unfair means taken to procure his conviction, 405; Garnet's doctrine of equivocation, *ib.*; new statute against papists, imposing an oath of allegiance, *ib.*; statutes against poaching and drunkenness, *ib.*; addiction of James to field sports, 406; lavishness of to favorites, *ib.*; levies a feudal aid on his eldest son being knighted, *ib.*; imposes taxes on merchandise, and the Commons remonstrate against their illegality, *ib.*; the colonization of North America commenced in 1606, *ib.*; New England colonized by the Pilgrim Fathers in 1620, 407; charters granted to the East India Company, 408; sir Thomas Roe sent ambassador to the East Indies, *ib.*; the Commons continue to remonstrate against the king's arbitrary measures, and are dissolved, 409; the cowardly and selfish policy of James in matters of religion, *ib.*; forces episcopacy on Scotland and burns an Arian in London, *ib.*; dedication to, of the authorized translation of the Bible in 1611, *ib.*; judicious measures for the plantation of Ulster in 1613, 410; raises money by the sale of the new title of baronet, *ib.*; assists Middleton in bringing the New River to London, *ib.*; attempts to repress the growth of London, *ib.*; threatens to remove his court from, and is requested to leave the Thames, *ib.*; story and death of Arabella Stuart, 411; death of Cecil, and Carr assumes the government, *ib.*; death and character of prince Henry, *ib.*; marriage of the princess Elizabeth to the elector palatine in 1613, 412; a parliament called in 1614; they pass a vote against the king's right of imposing customs duties, and are dissolved without passing a single bill, *ib.*; commits five of the members to the Tower, *ib.*; levies a Benevolence, to which Oliver St. John refuses to contribute, and is fined 5000*l.*, *ib.*; sales of public offices by, *ib.*; rise of the new favorite, George Villiers, *ib.*; trial of the earl and

countess of Somerset for the murder of sir Thomas Overbury, 413; deceitful conduct of James towards the earl, *ib.*; they are convicted and pardoned, *ib.*; mysteries of the causes for the murder of Overbury, and for the king's pardon to the murderers, 414; letters of James in refereuce to the affair, *ib.*; he is opposed in his arbitrary measures by lord chief justice Coke, whom he dismisses, *ib.*; issues a proclamation for sports on Sundays after divine service, *ib.*; releases Raleigh from the Tower, in 1616, and allows him to undertake an expedition to Guiana, 416; causes him to be executed under his previous sentence on his return unsuccessful in 1618, at the instigation of the Spanish ambassador, *ib.*; the elector palatine chosen king of Bohemia in the Protestant interest, 417; protection to papists given by the Spanish ambassador, and anger of the populace caused by it, *ib.*; calls a parliament and solicits money, *ib.*; the Commons reply by impeaching monopolists, *ib.*; lord Bacon is also impeached for and convicted of bribery and corruption, 418; conduct of the parliament in punishing Floyd, *ib.*; strong feeling evinced by the Commons in favor of the elector palatine, *ib.*; negotiates for a marriage of Charles with an infanta of Spain, *ib.*; the king and the Commons at issue on a question of privilege, *ib.*; he dissolves the parliament, *ib.*; journey of prince Charles and Villiers to the court of Spain, 419; the Spanish match broken off, *ib.*; statute passed declaring all monopolies to be contrary to law, *ib.*; the earl of Middlesex impeached for bribery, *ib.*; war commenced in favor of the elector palatine, *ib.*; death of James, March 27, 1625, *ib.*, 420

James II., when duke of York, marries Ann Hyde, the daughter of Clarendon, in 1661, 538; gains a victory over the Dutch off Lowestoffe in 1665, 544; takes the command of the English fleet in 1672, and fights an obstinate battle with the Dutch in Southwold Bay, 556; refuses to take the oath prescribed by the Test Act, and resigns his post of lord high admiral, 557; the House of Commons address the king against the duke's marriage with Maria Beatrix of Modena, 558; his daughter Mary marries the prince of Orange, 560; leaves England in 1679, 564; the bill for the exclusion of, read twice in the House of Commons, 565; returns to England in disguise on learning the sickness of Charles, 568; is sent to Scotland and cruelly persecutes the Covenanters, *ib.*; assumes a more active share in the government of England, 569; is presented before the Grand Jury at Westminster as a popish recusant by Shaftesbury and others, *ib.*; returns to Scotland, *ib.*; he procures a Test Act against the Covenanters to be passed by the Scottish Parliament, 573; fresh persecution of the Covenanters by, *ib.*; he returns to England, *ib.*; prosecution of alderman Pilkington for a libel, who is fined £100,000, 574; and of Titus Oates, for a libel, who is also fined £100,000, 576; marriage of his daughter Anne to prince George of Denmark, *ib.*; succeeds to the throne, Feb. 6, 1665, 577; his address to the Council promising to preserve the established religion, *ib.*; alteration in the ritual of the coronation by, *ib.*; issues a proclamation for the levying of customs duties, *ib.*; selection of ministers by, *ib.*; releases Papists and Quakers from imprisonment, but no other dissenters, 578; requires and obtains new laws against the Covenanters, *ib.*; outrageous attempts to secure the elections for the new House of Commons, and large increase of the number of peers, *ib.*; servile spirit of the Commons, who vote a revenue for life, 579; they address him, praying that the laws may be enforced against all dissenters, *ib.*; Titus Oates convicted and punished for perjury, *ib.*; and Richard Baxter for libel, *ib.*; insurrection in Scotland, headed by the earl of Argyle, *ib.*; its failure, and Argyle's execution, 580; landing of the duke of Monmouth at Lyme, *ib.*; the House of Commons pass a Bill of Attainder against him, *ib.*; the insurgents defeated at the battle of Sedgemoor, 583; interview of, with Monmouth, *ib.*; Monmouth executed, *ib.*; military executions in the West, under Kirke and others, *ib.*; and judicial atrocities committed by Jeffreys on the insurgents, *ib.*; scandalous traffic in the prisoners sanctioned by the king, *ib.*; tendencies of, to absolutism, 584; dismissal of Halifax, *ib.*; opens parliament, announces his employment of Popish officers, and of having dispensed with the Test Act, 585; the Commons timidly address him in favor of Protestantism, *ib.*; opposition to the dispensing power shown in the House of Lords, *ib.*; fresh trials and convictions for political offences, *ib.*; parliament, after two prorogations, is dissolved, *ib.*; Sunderland becomes a Roman Catholic and chief minister, *ib.*; the Jesuits paramount in the government, 586; sends an embassy to Rome, *ib.*; obtains the sanction of the King's Bench as to his power of dispensing with the Test Laws, *ib.*; appoints Roman Catholics to benefices, *ib.*; an Ecclesiastical Commission constituted, *ib.*; monastic establishments opened in London in 1686, 587; Rev. Samuel Johnson tried and convicted of a libellous publication concerning the army, *ib.*; and he is degraded from the ecclesiastical office, and publicly whipped, *ib.*; recommends Anthony Farmer, a suspected papist, to be elected president of Magdalen college, 588; the Fellows are expelled by the Ecclesiastical Commission on their electing Dr. John Hough, 589; Tyrconnel is appointed the lord-deputy of Ireland, *ib.*; publishes a declaration for liberty of conscience in Scotland, *ib.*, and in England, *ib.*; camp formed on Hounslow Heath, 590; receives the Papal nuncio publicly at Windsor, 591; makes a progress through the country, *ib.*; orders the declaration for liberty of conscience to be read in churches, 592; the seven bishops petition against compliance, *ib.*; the bishops are committed to the Tower, 593; brought before the King's Bench to plead, and held to bail, *ib.*; tried for a libel, and acquitted, *ib.*; public rejoicings on their acquittal, *ib.*; birth of a son announced, 594; his legitimacy violently disputed, *ib.*; James solicits advice of the bishops, 596; he adopts measures of concession, *ib.*; restores the Charter of London, *ib.*; reinstates the President and Fellows of Magdalen college, *ib.*; dissolves the Ecclesiastical Commission, *ib.*; joins the main body of his army at Salisbury, 597; lord Cornbury and other officers desert his cause, *ib.*; the duke of Grafton, lord Churchill, and other commanders, go over to William, *ib.*; prince of Denmark, and princess Anne, join William, *ib.*; returns to London, *ib.*; publishes a proclamation appointing Parliament to meet, and nominates Commissioners to bring about an agreement with the prince of Orange, *ib.*; issues a proclamation for a general amnesty, *ib.*; his queen, with the infant prince, flies from Whitehall on Dec. 10, and goes to France, *ib.*; he quits Whitehall Dec. 11, 598; throws the Great Seal into the Thames, *ib.*; being discovered at Sheerness, is brought back to London, *ib.*; quits the kingdom, *ib.*; lands at Kinsale, March 12, 1689, 626; Tyrconnel secures Ireland in favor of, *ib.*; enters Dublin March 24, 627; his wavering conduct, *ib.*; displeased at Rosen's cruel order, 628; takes a personal share in the besieging of Londonderry, and the defeat of Macarthy, viscount Mountcashel, at the battle of Newton Butler, *ib.*; his letter to the Scotch convention, 629; his cause falls on the death of Dundee at the pass of Killiecrankie, 633; opens a parliament at Dublin, May 7, *ib.*; its severity towards Protestants; issues a coinage of money, *ib.*; Shrewsbury resigns his seals by order of, 606; meets with disappointment from Louis XIV. of France, 607; effects of his bad administration of public affairs in Ireland, *ib.*; prepares to oppose William; leaves Dublin, June 16, 1690; retires before his opponent, and comes to a stand on the banks of the Boyne, *ib.*; on the 1st of July the battle takes place; he is defeated; and retreats to Dublin, 608, *et seq.*; his speech to the magistrates and resolve to forsake the Irish, *ib.*; quits Dublin July 3, 639; embarks at Passage, and arrives at Brest on the 4th; his project of invading England is coldly received by Louis, *ib.*; his courtiers persuade the French that he was deserted by the Irish; Irish refugees in France are on that account harshly dealt with by them, *ib.*; sends Tyrconnel over to Ireland as his viceroy there, 644; issues a declaration to the English, 651; induces Louis to aid him in an invasion of England, *ib.*; joins his camp at Normandy, April, 1692, *ib.*; commiserates the slaughter of his "poor English" at the battle of Steinkirk, 652; his petty revenge on William's relations on the decease of queen Mary, 660; contemplates the invasion of England, 1696, 664; sends Berwick to head the Jacobites if they should rise, *ib.*; issues protestations against William, 1697, 668; dies at St. Germains, Sept. 16, 1701, 686; he opposed Wren's first design for St. Paul's, 753

James, John, his architectural works, 755

Jameson, colonel, commands the American militia, 893

Java, conquered by the British, 1810; lost at the peace, 1169

Jedburgh, burnt by the earl of Hertford, in 1545, 282

Jefferson, Thomas, his admiration of Henry's eloquence, 850; makes the draught of the declaration of independence, 878; governor of Virginia, 896; defends himself against charges of neglect, *ib.*; narrow escape from being made prisoner, *ib.*; succeeds Franklin as minister at Paris; accuses George III. of incivility towards himself, 908; heads the Democratic party, 1012; president of United States, 1801-1809, 1095; considers his election as a pacific revolution, *ib.*; dreads going to war, 1096; his extravagant hopes of success in the war with Great Britain, 1812, *ib.*; his prophetic fears of the separation of the Union, 1099; his opinion of Bonaparte, 1155; and cordiality with Great Britain, 1159

Jeffrey, Francis, despairs of British success in Spain, 1808, 1070; remarks on Wordsworth's poetry, 1137; and Scott's, *ib.*; his reviews, 1140; description of a steamboat on Loch Lomond, 1141; lord advocate, 1187; description of early morning after the rejection of the reform bill, 1190; his anxiety for the prevention of riots, 1191; his description of lord Althorp, *ib.*; his interview with Althorp on the resignation of the Grey ministry, 1831, 1197; his remarks on the bad working of the new parliamentary system, 1204

Jeffreys, George, as recorder of London, fines and imprisons a jury for having found a verdict in favor of Penn and Mead, indicted for attending a conventicle, 554; exertions of, to procure the return of Dudley North as sheriff of London, 572; services of, while lord chief justice, in making towns surrender their charters in 1683, 574; brutal behavior of, on the trial of Sidney in 1683, 575; and on that of Richard Baxter for libel in 1685, 579; atrocious cruelty of, in punishing the followers of Monmouth, 583; condemnation of Lady Alice Lisle, *ib.*; is rewarded with the Great Seal for his conduct, *ib.*; the insolence of, repressed in the House of Lords, 585; he fails to procure the conviction of lord Delamere for treason, *ib.*; is discovered in disguise at Wapping in London, and committed to the Tower, 598

Jekyll, sir Joseph, regards Sacheverel's sentence as a triumph, 721; returned a member of the parliament, 1710, 724

Jellalabad, Sale's defence of, 1215

Jemappes, battle of, Nov. 6, 1792, 983

Jena, or Auerstadt, battle of, Oct. 14, 1806, 1061

Jenkins, Rev. H., notice of his account of Colchester Castle, 8, *note.*

Jenkins, Capt. R., ordered to appear before the House of Commons; states the barbarities he had received from the Spaniards to the duke of Newcastle, but obtains no redress; he appears before the House, and there exhibits the ear that had been cut off, 791

Jenkinson. See Liverpool, earl of.

Jenner, Edward, benefit to the world resulting from his discovery of vaccination, 1141

Jenys, Soame, describes his visit to sir J. Jolly, 942

Jerdan, William, his account of Percival's death, 1812, 1082

Jersey, French attack upon, 1781, 894

Jerusalem, mission from the kingdom of, to England in 1185, 90; capture of, by Saladin, in 1187, 91

Jervas, Charles, his paintings, 756

Jervis, sir John, sails in command of a fleet against the Spaniards, 1014; considerably aided by commodore Nelson in gaining the battle of St. Vincent, Feb. 14, 1797, *ib.*; rewarded with an earldom, 1015; provides Nelson with a fleet to go against Bonaparte, 1020

Jesuits, suppression of the, 1773; their beneficial aid in advancing literature and science, 867

Jews, massacre of, at the coronation of Richard I., 91; plundered by John in 1211, 101; persecution and banishment of, *temp.* Edw. I., 115; attempt of Cromwell to re-introduce into England, 519; the mines chiefly worked by them in John's reign, 605; bill passed, 1753, for the naturalization of; popular clamor against the bill, 824; bill for their relief from civil disabilities passed the Commons; thrown out in the Lords, 1833, 1205; another introduced by lord Russell, but not passed, 1283

Jezzar, pasha of Acre, seizes El Arish; his defence of Acre, 1029

Joan of Arc, first appearance of, 173; account of her youth, and introduction to the king of France, *ib.*; relieves Orleans, *ib.*; terrors inspired in the English troops by, 174; the siege of Orleans raised by, *ib.*; her enthusiasm a sufficient cause for her success, without assigning miraculous powers, *ib.*; wins the battle of Patay, *ib.*; conducts Charles VII. to Rheims, where he is crowned in 1430, 175; attacks Paris, and is repulsed, *ib.*; is taken prisoner at Compeigne by the Burgundians, *ib.*; is tried for sorcery at Rouen before the bishop of Beauvais, *ib.*; is burnt on May 30, 1431, *ib.*

John, son of Henry II., joins Philip of France in a war against his father, 91; intrigues against his brother Richard, 93; deposes the chancellor William Longchamp, 94; surrenders some of his brother's continental territories to Philip, and does homage for the rest, 95; gives out that Richard has died in prison, *ib.*; attempts to bribe the emperor of Germany to keep his brother a prisoner, *ib.*; crowned May 27, 1199, 98; the claim of Arthur of Brittany supported by Philip of France, 99; war with Philip, truce, and war renewed, *ib.*; captures Arthur at Tours, *ib.*; suspicions of having caused him to be murdered, *ib.*; is driven out of Normandy by Philip, 100; quarrels with pope Innocent III. in 1207, respecting the appointment of an archbishop of Canterbury, *ib.*; the kingdom placed under an interdict, *ib.*; leads an army into Ireland in 1210, *ib.*; and effects some useful reforms, 101; represses the incursions of the Welsh, *ib.*; plunders the Jews to raise money for his expeditions, *ib.*; small effect of the interdict on the industry of the people, *ib.*; the kingdom excommunicated and the king deposed by the pope in 1212, and the crown promised to Philip, 102; he anticipates Philip's warlike measures by sending a fleet, which burnt Dieppe, and destroyed many French ships, *ib.*; he submits, and swears fealty to the pope, *ib.*; France prepares to invade England, and a naval victory is gained by the English, *ib.*; admits Langton to the see of Canterbury, *ib.*; invades France in 1214, and is defeated at Bouvines, *ib.*; the clergy and barons enter into a league against him at St. Edmundsbury, 103; he solicits the aid of the pope, *ib.*; the army of God and holy church (the army of the barons) march to London, *ib.*; signs Magna Charta on June 15, 1215, at Runnymede, *ib.*; provisions of the great charter, 104; effects of, upon the nation, *ib.*; rapid movements of John, after signing the charter, and fallacy of the tradition as to his retirement, 105; with an army of mercenaries he ravages England, and the pope annuls the charter and excommunicates the barons, *ib.*; the crown offered by the barons to Louis of France, *ib.*; resistance of the fortresses to the French, *ib.*; suspected treachery of Louis, *ib.*; death of John on Oct. 18, 1216; buried at Worcester, *ib.*

John, archduke, of Austria, commands the Austrian army; his campaign with Moreau; concludes an armistice with him, 1035

Johnson, Joseph, tried and imprisoned for being concerned in the Manchester reform meeting, 1150

Johnson, Rev. Sam., tried and imprisoned in 1683 for writing Julian the Apostate, 576; tried and convicted for a libellous publication concerning the army, *ib.*; degraded from the ecclesiastical office and publicly whipped, 587

Johnson, Dr. Samuel; he is touched for the king's evil by queen Anne, 694; his gratitude to gen. Oglethorpe, 781; does penance at a book-stall at Uttoxeter, 935; forms a link between two periods of literature, *ib.*; goes to London, 1737, *ib.*; his vicissitudes and employments for half a century; dies, 1784; his delight in Crabbe's poem "The Village," *ib.*; his "London," published 1738; "Vanity of Human Wishes," 1749, 936; brings out the "Rambler," 1750, and the "Idler," 1758; writes for the "Adventurer," 937; his partiality for tavern life, 939; his prejudice against tradesmen, 945

Johnstone, sir James; his remarks on Fox's India declaratory bill, 989

Joinville, prince de, his pamphlet on the naval forces of France, 1272

Jolliffe, sir William, his account of the Manchester reform meeting of 1819, 1132

Jones, col., describes the British system of taking towns, 1085; and the capture of Badajoz, *ib.*

Jones, Inigo, the first to imitate Grecian temples in British churches, 754
Jones, John Gale, proceeding between parliament and, on a question of privilege, 1810, 1078
Jones, John Paul, employed by Franklin in an expedition against Great Britain, 1779, 887; attempts to capture Leith and Edinburgh, but is driven back by a gale; attacks some ships convoyed by the Serapis and Scarborough; takes the former; a native of Scotland, *ib.*
Jones, Rev. Richard, aids in establishing the principle of the Tithe Commutation Act, 1220
Jordan, Mrs., her happy connection with the duke of Clarence, 1224
Joseph II. of Germany, 1765–1790, 1310; attempts to coerce Holland, 955
Josephine Beauharnois. See Bonaparte, 1010, 1074, 1075.
Joubert, Alvinzy compels him to retreat, 1017; joined by Bonaparte, *ib.*
Jourdan, J. B., rises from a packman to command a French army, 992; driven by the prince of Cobourg over the Sambre, Oct. 1793, 1000; marshal; appointed to the command of the army of the Moselle, 1794, 1006; defeats the Austrians at Arlon; captures Charleroi; wins the battle of Fleurus, June 29, and compels the duke of York to retreat, *ib.*; appointed to the command of the Sambre and Meuse, 1796, 1010; failure of the campaign, 1012; his campaign with the archduke Charles, 1799, 1031; major-general; defeated by Wellington at Vittoria, June 21, 1813, 1090
Joyce, Rev. Jeremiah; Stanhope's private secretary; charged with high treason, 1002
Joyeuse, Villaret, admiral of the Brest fleet; defeated by Howe, June 1, 1794, 1004
Judges, independence of, 651
Julian, the emperor, builds warehouses for the reception of British corn, 12; large quantity furnished to the continent, *ib.*; commands Paulus, governor of Britain, to be burnt, 17
Juliana, Maria, Christian VII.'s stepmother; heads a court party against the queen, Struensee and Brandt, 868
Junius, his letters, 857; characteristics of his writings; abuses Wilkes, 857; a master of personal invective, 857; attempts made to give the credit of his productions to sir P. Francis, lord Temple, and Burke; lord Lyttleton probably the writer, 858; personality of his libels; his attacks upon the duke of Grafton, whose administration he wished to destroy, *ib.*; his private letters; his character; paltry-minded, ambitious, vain, cowardly, *ib.*; assaults the duke of Bedford, 859; his address to the king; prosecution of the publisher, Mr. Woodfall, who escapes punishment, *ib.*
Junot, A., crosses the Bidassoa; captures the Spanish capital, 1808, 1067; defeated by sir A. Wellesley at Vimiero, Aug. 21, 1808, 1069; retreats to Torres Vedras, *ib.*

Kalendar, note on the French Revolutionary, 996
Kandy, king of, acquiesces in the British possessing the maritime provinces of Ceylon, 1170; deposed for his cruelties, *ib.*
Katzbach, battle of the, Aug. 26, 1813, 1090
Kay, John, introduces the use of the fly-shuttle about 1760, 923
Keane, sir John, general, has temporary command of the army in America; commands a division; advances against New Orleans, 1101; is wounded, *ib.*; commands the Bombay division of the Indian army, 1248; his passage through the Bolan Pass; besieges Ghuznee, 1249
Keate, Thomas, surgeon-general of the army; not consulted about the Walcheren expedition, 1809, 1074
Keith joins his brother in an expedition to collect the Jacobites in Scotland, 772
Keith, marshal, slain at Hochkirchen, Oct. 1758, 838
Keith, Rev. Alexander, his cheap marriage trade; damaged by the new marriage act, 1753, 282
Keith, lord, announces to Napoleon that St. Helena is to be his future residence, 1815.
Kellermann, gains the battle of Valmy, Sept. 20, 1792, 982; besieges Lyon, 1793, 997; superseded in his command by Dubois-Crancé, 998
Kelso burnt by the earl of Hertford, in 1545, 282
Kempenfeldt, admiral, his unsuccessful cruise, 1782, 899; perishes at the sinking of the Royal George, Aug. 29, 1782, 906
Kendal, duchess of, bribed by the South Sea directors, 774; caricatures of, 775; bribed to promote Wood's patent, 777; accompanies George I. on his last visit to Hanover, 1727, 779
Kenmure, viscount, commands the Pretender's Scotch forces, 1715, 763; sentenced to death for his concern in the rebellion, 766; executed on Tower Hill, Feb. 24, 1716, 766
Kent, duchess of, marries the duke of Kent, July 13, 1818, 1129; birth of their daughter, the future queen, Victoria, May 24, 1819, *ib.*; death of the duke of Kent, Jan. 23, 1820, 1132; appointed sole regent should the king die before the 18th year of the princess Victoria, 1180; present at queen Victoria's audience with the privy council, 1224
Kent, his painting, etc., 755
Kent, agriculture of, 915
Kentish petition; its purport, 685; ferment caused by the imprisonment of the presenters, 685
Keppel, admiral; appointed to the command of the channel fleet; sails from St. Helens, June 17, 1778; captures the Lecorne; sails to Portsmouth, 886; again puts to sea, July 9; engages D'Orvilliers off Ushant; his second in command, sir H. Palliser, unable to renew the conflict; debates on their conduct; Palliser charges Keppel with misconduct and incapacity; court-martial on, and acquittal of, *ib.*; created a viscount, and appointed first lord of the admiralty, 906
Ker, John, of Kersland, his account of the Cameronian demonstration in 1706; he joins them, acting as a spy to watch their proceedings, 712; performs the same part in the Jacobite plots of 1707; offers the services of 5000 men to colonel Hooke, 714
Key, John, lord-mayor, 1830; warns the duke of Wellington to come guarded to his banquet, 1186
Keyes, an assassination plotter; tried, 1696, 665
Khan, Ameer, joins the Pindarees against the British, 1169
Kiel, treaty of, Jan. 14, 1814, 1094
Killiecrankie, battle of, July 27, 1689, 621
Killigrew, admiral, fails in keeping back the French fleet, 657
Kilmarnock, lord, joins the rebel ranks, 1745, 803; fails in raising his tenants to fight for the Stuart cause, 807; trial of, July 28, 1746; pleads guilty; description of his appearance, 813; executed on Tower Hill, Aug. 18, *ib.*
Kilwarden, lord; lord chief justice, murdered by the Emmett insurrectionists, 1803, 1044
Kimbolton, lord. See Manchester, earl of.
King, Gregory, estimates the population from the hearth tax returns, 601; his "scheme of the income and expense of the several families in England," analyzed, 612, 616, 618, 620
King tried for taking part in the assassination plot, 665
King, lord, extract from his diary on a petition for lord George Murray, 767; lord chancellor; causes a bill to be introduced enacting that all law proceedings be in the English language, 782
King, Dr., his interview with Charles Edward in 1750 in London, 820
King's Weston, built by Vanbrugh, 754
Kingsley, Charles; his novel entitled "Alton Locke;" quotation from, descriptive of the enlightened behavior of class toward class in 1862, 1258
Kinsale capitulates to Marlborough, 1690, 641
Kirchdenkern, battle of, July 15, 1761, 843
Kit's Coty House, description of, 6
Kleber, J. B., defeated by the Vendeans at Chollet, Sept. 1793, 1001; serves in Jourdan's army, 1006; surrender of Maestricht to, 1794, 1007; his struggle against a Mussulman army, 1029; assassinated, June 14, 1800, 1038
Klundert taken by Dumouriez, 993
Kneller, Godfrey, a German; patronized by the duke of Monmouth; and becomes the fashionable portrait painter in England, 756; list of his more famous likenesses, and their general characteristics, 757; president of a private academy of painting, 930
Knight, Miss C., quotations from her "Autobiography," illustrative of the relations between the prince Regent and princess Charlotte, 1118
Knight, sir John, complains of the exportation of corn, 662
Knight, John, imprisoned for being concerned in the Manchester reform meeting, 1819, 1150
Knight, cashier of the South Sea Company; flies to Brabant; his tamperings with the cash-books, 775
Knight service instituted by William the Conqueror, 64; finally abolished in 1660, 501
Knights Templars. See Templars.
Knox, John, preaches at Perth, and the monastic houses are destroyed, 338; preaches against the seizure of the Church patrimony by the nobles, 340; attacks of, upon Mary, and her avowed hatred of him, 341; preaches against the marriage of Mary with a Roman Catholic prince, 343; returns to Scotland in 1567, and preaches violently against Mary, 340
Kœnig invents the steam printing machine, 1141
Kolin, battle of, June 17, 1757, 836
Königsmark, count Philip, tragedy of his death, 760
Kosciusko, engages in the American cause, 1777, 882; appointed leader of the Polish army, 1794, 1007; defeats the Russians, April 4. *ib.*; compelled to retreat by the Prussian and Austrian forces, wounded in battle, Oct. 10, 1007
Kuchuk Kanarji, peace of, 1774; its terms, 868
Kunersdorf, battle of, 1759, 846
Kyrle, John, "The Man of Ross," a descendant from a serf of bishop Swinfield, 119.

Labedoyère, colonel in the Grenoble garrison; joins Napoleon, 1815, 1104; tried by court-martial on Louis' restoration, and shot, 1111
Labelye, the builder of Westminster Bridge, 935
Laborde engaged in the battle of Vimiero, 1069
Labouchere, Henry, master of the mint; vice-president of the board of trade, 1220
La Bourdonnais, governor of the Isle de France; Fort St. George capitulates to, 1746, 827
Laborers, wages of, in 1288, 119; statute for regulating the wages of, 140; statute for preventing their removal, 141; gradual emancipation of, from serfdom, 150; statute of 1388 against their changing their professions, *ib.*; in husbandry, not sufficient for the demand, *ib.*; the wives of, subjected to the statute for the regulation of apparel, 179; statute for regulating the hours of labor of, 182; scale of wages for, 183; injury done to, by parliamentary interference with, *ib.*; combinations among, and statute against, in 1423, *ib.*; distress occasioned among, by the fluctuation in the price of wheat, and the statutes fixing a rate of wages, 225; the effects of inclosures upon, 291; sufferings of, in the reign of Henry VIII., from the Statute of Wages in 1515, and the debasement of the coin, 294; love of old ceremonies among, 304; the Protector Somerset's efforts in behalf of, 307; insurrection of, against inclosures, in 1549, *ib.*; festivals and sports of, *temp.* Eliz., 381; severities exercised upon, by the Law of Settlement, 385; statute against the able-bodied, who refuse to work at the usual wages, 386; the legislature declare, in 1563, that the statutes for the regulation of wages cannot be enforced, on account of the high price of provisions, 387; other causes of suffering, *ib.*; healthful influence of the Puritan gentry upon, *temp.* Charles I., 510; their repulsion of strict Puritanism, *ib.*; condition of an agricultural laborer, *regno* of queen Anne, as compared with one of the present day, 617; character of the agricultural, *temp.* queen Anne, *ib.*; hardship and distress among, caused by the corrupt state of the silver coinage, 663; labor question between master and, from the reign of Edward III. to the present time, 821; the laws against the combination of, 822; number of agricultural, in 1770 and 1851, 910; condition of the farm, of Suffolk, 912; the Luddite riots and destruction of machinery, 1812, 1083; desire and attempts to level all distinction between laborers and artisans, 1193; incendiary fires and machine breaking, *ib.*; riots at Derby, Nottingham, and Bristol, 1831, 1194; admonition to, *ib.*; limitation of labor in factories, 1206; pauperized condition of, 1834; injustice done to the independent, by the old parochial system, 1210; sanitary condition of; state of their dwellings; evil effects of bad drainage on their health, 1227; cleanliness among town laborers, promoted by public baths and washhouses, 1228; condition of the factory workers, 1229; cruelties inflicted on the children and women employed in the coal mines, *ib.*; condition of agricultural, *ib.*; condition of, during the prevalence of Chartism in 1839, 1237; popularity of Chartist principles amongst, *ib.*; sir J. Graham's bill for limiting the hours of labor in factories to twelve; debate and amendments on it, 1269; the bill passed, 1270; Fielden's bill, for limiting the number of working hours in factories to ten, passed, 1283
Lace trade, reigns of William and Anne, 607
La Fayette, G. M., appointed major-general in the United States army, 1777, 882; present at Cornwallis's surrender, 1781, 897; elected commander of the French national guard, 1789, 963; attempts to save Foulon, *ib.*; ordered to march to Versailles, 965; conducts the royal family to Paris, *ib.*; takes the oath at the federation fête, 968; keeps watch over the royal family in the Tuilleries, 971; they escape, 972; causes them to be captured and conducted back to Paris, *ib.*; commands the centre army sent against Austria, 1792, 977; denounces the instigators of the insurrection of June 20; the mob compel him to fly from Paris, 978; opposes the orders of the assembly; is declared a traitor; quits his army; is arrested by the Austrians, and imprisoned, 980; commands the national guard of Paris, July, 1830; obtains possession of the Hotel de Ville, 1183; where he receives the duke of Orleans, *ib.*
La Fenillade, French general, besieges Turin, 703
Lafitte heads a deputation requesting Marmont to suspend hostilities, 1183; obtains the premiership of France, 1830,
Laguerre, patronized by Charles II. and his court, 752
Lahar reduced by captain Popham, 950
La Hogue, battle of, May 19, 1692, 651
Lake school of poetry, 1137
Lake, general Gerard, his campaign against the Irish rebels, 1798, 1024; surrender of the French under Humbert to, 1025; commands the troops in Hindostan; compels the French to retreat; his triumphant campaign completed in the victory of Laswarree, Nov. 1, 1803, 1054
Lake district, farmers of the, 919; the home of poetry, *ib.*; cultivation in the; changes in the social condition of its inhabitants; turnips first grown as a field crop, 1793, 920
Lamartine, remarks of, on the September massacres, 1792, 981
Lamb, sir C. M., his account of Burk's dagger speech, 988
Lamb, Charles, character of his essays, 1140
Lamb, William. See Melbourne.
Lamballe, princesse de, a friend of Marie Antoinette; her death scene, Aug. 10, 1792, 980
Lambert, John, trial of, for denying the real presence in the eucharist, 273; disputation of, with Henry VIII., 273; is burnt, 273
Lambert, general, engaged in the attack on New Orleans, 1815, 1101
Lambese, prince, attempts to quell the Paris riots, 1789, 962
Lancashire before the cotton era, 608; formerly an agricultural county, 918; the hill farmers of, now and eighty years ago, *ib.*; Fylde moss converted into productive land, *ib.*; double occupation of farmer and weaver in, 924; rapid increase of Bolton, Bury, Birmingham, and Manchester, 926
Lancaster, John of Gaunt, duke of, apprehensions entertained of the ambitious designs of, 147; is accused of treason, 152; demands a trial, but the witness against him dies, *ib.*; leaves England to assert his claim to the crown of Castile, 153; returns to England in 1389, 154; dies in 1398, and his possessions are seized by Richard II., 156
Lancastrian party, defeat of the, at the battle of Towton, 193; extreme distress of, in exile, 194; total depression of, after the battle of Tewkesbury, 200
Landau, siege of, capitulates to the allies, 1704, 699
Landen, or Neerwinden, battle of, July 29, 1693, 656
Landseer, sir Edwin, succeeds Ward as an animal painter, 1147
Langara, admiral of the Spanish fleet; taken prisoner by the British; surprise at William IV.'s obedience as a midshipman, 905
Langdale, destruction of his distillery by the Gordon rioters, 1780, 892
Langton, Stephen, elected archbishop of Canterbury, in 1207; but John refuses him admission, and banishes the monks, 100; takes possession of his see, in 1213, 102; opposes the despotism of John, *ib.*; joins the barons at Saint Edmundsbury, in their league against John, 103; conveys the provisions of Magna Charta to John at Oxford, who rejects them, *ib.*; refuses to excommunicate the barons on

the order of the pope, *ib.*; excommunicates "all violators of the liberties of the Church," 109
Lansdown, lord, Henry Petty; chancellor of the exchequer, 1806, 1056, ; his financial propositions, 1061; lord president of the council, 1187, 1224
Lanusse leads the French infantry at the battle of Alexandria; slain, Mar. 21, 1801, 1038
Las Torres, count of, besieges San Mateo, 1705; is compelled to raise the siege by Peterborough, who follows his retreating army, 702
Laswarree, battle of, Nov. 1, 1803, 1054
Latimer, Hugh, offer of a bribe by, to Cromwell, 261; participation of, in the burning of heretics, 273; preaches against images and relics, 274; resigns his bishopric on the passing of the Six Articles Act in 1539, and is committed to prison, 277; commendation of archery by, 289; advice of, to pay sufficient salaries to officials, and to prevent their taking bribes, *ib.*; description of a farmer's life by, 291; accused of speaking seditiously against the debasement of the coinage, 294; remonstrance of, against burials in towns, 296; sermon of, on the execution of lord Thomas Seymour, 306; committed to the Tower, after the accession of Mary, on Nov. 13, 1553, 319; condemned, with Ridley and Cranmer, for heresy, at Oxford, 324; burning of, with Ridley, at Oxford, in Sept., 1555, 330
Latin language, probable prevalence of, in England, under the Romans, 13; opinion of Lord Macaulay as to its non-prevalence, *ib.*; incorporation of much Latin in the Anglo-Saxon and Welsh languages, 161
Latour, an Austrian general, defeated by Moreau, 1796, 1012
Latude, his escape from the Bastille, 1756, 963
Laud, archbishop, introduction of ceremonial observances into the Church service by, 425; persecution of William Prynne, 428, and of Dr. Alexander Leighton, *ib.*; approves of Strafford's principle of *thorough*, *ib.*; urges on the establishment of episcopacy in Scotland, 432; which occasions, in 1637, the revolt of Scotland, and the adoption of the National Covenant, *ib.*; his palace, at Lambeth, attacked by the populace, on May 11, 1640, 434; his fears of the parliament of 1640, and his superstitious forebodings, 435; opinion of, as to infringements of law, 436; is arrested, and impeached by the Commons, 438; parliament resumes proceedings against, 466; defends himself with skill and courage, but is condemned for high treason, and is beheaded on Jan. 10, 1645, *ib.*
Lauderdale, earl of, visits Paris, Aug., 1792, 979; his doubts of British operations in Holland, 1793, 993; sent to Paris to negotiate for peace, 1058; opposes the gas company, 1816, 1118
Launay, De, governor of the Bastile, 963; defends it against the mob, July 14, 1789, 963; capitulates on condition of having a free pass; he is seized and murdered by the mob, 963
Laurens, Henry, president of congress; foresees more war, May, 1778, 885; a commissioner for acquiring peace, 1782, 907
Lauriston, general, enthusiastic reception of, in London, as the bearer of peace, 1801, 1039; his despatch to Bonaparte, 1805, 1050
Lauzun, general, his conduct at the Boyne, 1690, 638; considers Limerick untenable, 640
Lavalette tried by court martial for aiding Bonaparte; condemned to death; escapes, 1111
La Vendée, the war in, 1793, 1000
Law, proceedings of, ordered to be transacted in the English language, 1731, 782
Law, John, his Mississippi scheme, 774
Law of Settlement. See Settlement.
Law reform. See Brougham.
Lawrence, captain of the "Chesapeake," his combat with Broke; died 1813, 1098
Lawrence, his conference with Akbar Khan; suspects his good faith; placed as a hostage in his hands, 1250
Lawrence, major, commands the forces blockading Trichinopoly, 1752, 827
Lawrence, sir Thomas, popularity of, as a portrait painter; died, 1830, 1146
Laybach, congress at; circular issued by, 1821, 1155
Layer, Christopher, executed for being concerned in a conspiracy against George I., 1722, 776
Leach, sir John, vice-chancellor, 1148; the king's adviser in the matter of the queen, 1150
Lead mines of Derbyshire, 607
Lead, black, mine of Borrowdale, 610
Leake, admiral sir John, attacks De Pontis, and destroys his fleet, March, 1704, 700; as admiral sails with reinforcements for the relief of Barcelona, 1706, 703; captures Sardinia; carries Port Mahon, 1708, 716
Lear, legend of, given by Geoffrey of Monmouth, 3
Lebas guillotined, 1794, 1006
Le Brun imprisoned, 995; associated with Bonaparte as consul, 1032; has the control of the finances, 1034
Lechmere returned M.P., 1710, 724; impeaches the earl of Derwentwater of high treason, 1716, 766; brings in a bill to strengthen the Protestant interest, 767; his amendment of the Septennial bill, 768
Leclerc aids in expelling the Assembly from their hall, 1799, 1031
Lede, marquis di, lands in Sicily with an army; his operations, 1718, 771
Lee, Arthur, appointed a commissioner to take charge of American affairs in Europe; his negotiations, 880
Leeds, description of its cloth market, and the clothiers attending it, 610; obtains parliamentary representation, 1832, 1200; population of, in 1831 and 1861, *ib.*
Leeds, Thomas Osborne, duke of, urges William not to abandon England, 634; authorized by William to present an Act of Grace for political offences to the peers, 636; presides at Mohun's trial, 655; impeached for bribery, but on the prorogation of parliament, the impeachment fell to the ground, 661
Leefdale, baron de, a partner in Grandval's plot to assassinate William, 1692, 652
Lee Priory, Kent, built by Wyatt, 1142
Lefebvre, general, taken prisoner by the British, 1808, 1070
Legard, sir Digby, his agricultural improvements, 918
Legendre, his petition to Louis, 1792, 978
Legends, early British, 829
Legge, H. B., chancellor of the exchequer, 829, 865; refuses his signature to the subsidy warrants, 1755, 829; he is dismissed his office, *ib.*; reappointed to it, 1756, 832, 865; again dismissed, 1757, 833; receives the freedom of London, *ib.*; again reappointed, 1757, 835, 1324; again removed, 1761, 842
Legion Memorial, the, 1701, 685
Legislative Assembly established, 1791; its constitution and parties, 973
Legnitz, battle of, 1760, 840
Leicester, Simon de Montfort, earl of. See Montfort.
Leicester, earl of, recommended as a husband to Mary of Scotland in 1564, 343; is appointed to the command of the army in the Netherlands, 359; ambitious views of, *ib.*; repulsed at the battle of Zutphen, *ib.*; death of, 376
Leicestershire, its trades and manufactures, 607
Leipzig, alliance of, April, 1631, 732; battles of, Oct. 16 and 18, 1813, 1090
Leith burnt by the earl of Hertford, in 1545, 282
Lely, extensive employment of, by the court of Charles II., 752-756
Lennox, lady Sarah, George III.'s love for, 842
Leoben, preliminaries of peace of, signed April 18, 1797, 1017, 1040
Leopold I., of Germany, represented at the Hague congress, 1691; his interests, 643; desires the prolongation of war, 1697, 668; married one of Charles II. of Spain's sisters, 677; delays signing the Partition treaty, 1700, 683; joins the Grand Alliance against France, 1701, 686; succeeded by Joseph I., 1705, 760
Leopold II., of Germany; meets the king of Prussia at Pilnitz; they issue the declaration of Pilnitz, 1791, 974; died, Mar. 1, 1792, 977; the French declare war against him, 1792, 1040; emperor, 1790-1792, 1310
Leopold of Belgium, prince of Saxe Coburg; marries princess Charlotte, May 2, 1816; national acquiescence in the marriage, 1114; national sympathy at his loss of the princess, 1818. 1129; chosen king, 1831; marries Louis Philippe's eldest daughter, 1122
Lepaux, president of the French Directory, his proclamation, 1797, 1014
Lescure, a Vendean leader, 1000; his humanity saves 5000 Vendeans; his horror on hearing of the queen's death; death of, 1793, 1001
Lesley, general David (afterward earl of Leven), a military leader of the Covenanters, surprises Edinburgh Castle in 1639, 434; commands an army which marches to oppose Charles I. at Berwick, *ib.*; commands the forces, in 1640, sent with a petition to England, 435; routs the king's troops at Newburn, near Newcastle, on Aug. 28, *ib.*; enters England at the head of the Scottish army, 464; defeats Montrose at Philiphaugh, 470; re-establishes the Covenanting power in the Lowlands, *ib.*; letter of, to the Committee of both kingdoms, concerning the king's arrival at Newark, May 6, 1646; Charles I. returns to Scotland with the Scotch army, *ib.*; Cromwell meets with a vigorous resistance from, in his advance into Scotland in 1650, 497; position of his army at Dunbar, 498; where he is defeated, *ib.*; makes another stand at Stirling, *ib.*; invades England as lieutenant-general under Charles, *ib.*; defeated at Worcester, 499
L'Estrange, sir Roger, establishment of the London Gazette by, in 1665, 545; is made licenser of the press, *ib.*
L'Estrange, colonel, commands the hussars at the Manchester massacre, 1819, 1133
Lethbridge, sir Thomas, his motion against Burdett, 1078
Letters, difficulties of transmission of, in the 15th century, 187
Letters opened by the secretary of state; agitated state of the country thereat; inquiry into the extent of the practice, 1271; reports of the committees; they tranquillize the public, *ib.*
Leuthen, or Lissa, battle of, Dec. 5, 1757, 836
Levellers, rise of, in the army, 481; the mutiny of, suppressed by Cromwell, in 1647, 482; character of, 492; a mutiny of, in 1649, again suppressed by Cromwell and Fairfax, *ib.*
Leven, earl of. See Lesley, general David.
Lewes, battle of, on May 13, 1264, 112
Leycester, moves for Melville's impeachment, 1805, 1049
Libel bill fails in being passed, 1791, but is carried, June 11, 1792, 976
Libraries, parochial, founded by Dr. Bray, 670; and established by act of parliament in 1708, *ib.*
Licensing act, expiration of the, 1693, 655; proposed renewal of, rejected, 1695, 661
Licensing plays, the act for, 1737, 790
Licentiousness of society at various periods in the 17th and 18th centuries, 619, 671, 941, 944
Liége, captured by Marlborough, Oct. 23, 1702, 689; invested by Villeroy, 1705, 704
Ligny, battle of, June 16, 1815, 1105
Ligonier, sir John, commander of the English cavalry at Lauffeld; taken prisoner, 820
Lilburne, John, taken prisoner at Brentford, but is released, 457; publishes, in 1647, bitter denunciations against the betrayers of the people, 479; permitted to ride out for his health, having been sent to the Tower, he goes to the rendezvous of the Adjutators, *ib.*; conduct of his regiment there, 482; publishes several pamphlets, for which he is committed to the Tower, 492; sends out another pamphlet, 492; sends forth more pamphlets, 493; in consequence of which he is tried in 1649, but is acquitted, *ib.*; speech of, at his trial, *ib.*; rejoicings throughout London at his acquittal, *ib.*
Lille, besieged by the Allies, 1708, 716; surrender, Dec. 29, 718; bombarded unsuccessfully by the Austrians, Oct. 1792, 982
Limbourg taken by Marlborough, 1703, 692
Linchouse church, built by Hawksmoor, 755
Limerick, the Jacobites take refuge in, 639; description of the town and surrounding country in a military point of view, 640; invested by William III., Aug. 9, 1690, *ib.*; Sarsfield, the commander of the garrison, with 500 horse, makes a successful attack upon William's supplies and artillery, *ib.*; several attempts to take the town by assault failed, and the siege raised on the 29th, 641; capitulates to general Ginkell, 1691, 644; treaty of, 645
Lincoln, general, commands the forces in Charleston; capitulates May 12, 1780, 892
Lincoln, Abraham, president of the United States; his message proposing a gradual emancipation of the slaves, 1862, 1207
Lincolnshire, population of; reclaiming the land in, 608; fens of, drained and reclaimed by Rennie, 914; reclamation of the heath and wolds of, 914; 22 persons to every 100 acres in 1841, 917
Lind, captain of the Edinburgh city guard; his evidence as to the Porteous riot, 787
Lindsay, lieutenant, his share in the Glencoe massacre, 1692, 648
Line engraving and engravers, 1784-1820, 1148
Linen trade, the, *temp.* William and Anne, 609
Lingard, Dr., character of his "History of England," 1256
Linieres, general, commands the troops in Buenos Ayres, 1817; obtains favorable terms from general Whitelock, 1064
Lisbon, peace of, Feb. 13, 1668, 732; earthquake at, 1755, 829
Lisle, lady Alice, execution of, for harboring a traitor, 583
Lisle, negotiations at, for peace, 1797, 1017
Lissa. See Leuthen.
Literature, view of the, *temp.* William and Anne, 620; sketch of the, from 1709 to 1742; the essayists; general literal capacity of the period; the legislature connected with, and the poets, 736-741; manners of the same period illustrated by its, 741-747; rise of a reading public, 747; spread of knowledge of ancient, 748; popular element in controversy, *ib.*; "battle of the books," by Swift, published 1704, *ib.*; Pope's essay on criticism, *ib.*; banter upon antiquaries, *ib.*; his "Dunciad," 749; character of Swift's writings, 750; his "Tale of a Tub," *ib.*; "Gulliver's Travels," 751; Defoe, *ib.*; "The Craftsman," the party organ for Walpole's opponents, Pulteney and others, printed by Benjamin Franklin, who is convicted of a libel, 1731, 782; the proceedings of Parliament not published for several years subsequent to 1747, 819; Henry Fielding's "Inquiry into the Causes of the late Increase of Robbers, 1750," 823; Goldsmith's "History of England," 1771, 824; Wilkes and Churchill start the "North Briton," June, 1762, 846; Churchill's "Prophecy of Famine," Jan., 1763, 846; Dickenson's "Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania," 861; arrest of printers for publishing the debates of parliament, 865; after much agitation and rioting, the affair blows over, and the printers and others are released from prison, *ib.*; advanced by Jesuitical efforts, 867; Yorkshire dialect 60 years since, 919; changes in the commerce of, 935; the age of magazines, *ib.*; Johnson the link between the two periods, 1737-1783, 936; state of, time of George II, *ib.*; Richardson, *ib.*; Fielding, 937; Smollett, Sterne, Goldsmith, 937; the writers from 1760-1783, *ib.*; publication of Burke's "Reflections on the French Revolution," 1790, 968; "Anti-Jacobin" started by Canning; first number appeared Nov. 20, 1797, 1017; immense influence of Cobbett's "Two-penny Register" upon the laboring classes, 1816, 1121; sketch of English, 1784-1820, 1135-1142; Cowper, *ib.*; Crabbe, 1135; Burns, 1136; Darwin, *ib.*; Della Cruscan school, *ib.*; the Lake school, *ib.*; Southey, Coleridge, 1137; and Wordsworth, *ib.*; Scott, *ib.*; Byron, *ib.*; Shelley and Keats; the narrative poems of Campbell, Rogers, Byron, Hunt, Moore, 1138; and Crabbe; delineation of manners contained in his works, *ib.*; a more Evangelical spirit is revived amongst the people, *ib.*; the theological literature, 1139; sermons of Chalmers, Blair, and Hall, *ib.*; hatred of the stage, *ib.*; plays written by Byron, Coleridge, and Milman, *ib.*; the smaller novelists, *ib.*; the Waverley novels, 1087; and Jane Austen's writings; the Edinburgh Review, *ib.*; and the Quarterly; Blackwood's Magazine, 1140; the essayists; Lamb, 1141; Hazlitt, *ib.*; Hunt and Foster; the political economists—Malthus, Mill, Ricardo, and Chalmers, *ib.*; coarseness of the journalism of 1820, 1152; the press and its regulation in India, 1172; "Penny Magazine" started, March 31, 1832, 1202; its large circulation a proof of the increased desire of the people for knowledge, *ib.*; the new law of copyright of 1842, and its application to copyrights about to expire, 1253; the novelists—Galt, 1264; Hook, *ib.*; ephemeral critics and superficially informed writers, 1254; utilitarianism, 1255; changes in the character of literature, *ib.*; the historians — Macaulay, *ib.*; Hallam, *ib.*; Carlyle, 1256; Lingard, Tytler, Forster, Mahon, *ib.*; Brougham, *ib.*; Napier, Mitford, Thirlwall, Grote, 1257; the novelists—Lytton, Dickens, Ainsworth, Thackeray, and others, *ib.*; prevalence of serials and works of

fiction, *ib.*; Miss Martineau's political economy tales, 1258; the novels of Dickens, Gaskell, *ib.*; Kingsley, *ib.*; Thackeray, *ib.*; the poets—Tennyson, Browning, 1259; Hood, *ib.*; Punch; Theological writers, *ib.*; the political economy and statistical writers; the scientific writers, 1260; the essayists and critics, *ib.*; antiquarian publication; travels, the book trade, *ib.*; newspapers, *ib.*; analysis of the literature issued, 1816–1851, 1261; chronological table of the British writers of the present century, 1311
Lithography, invention of; introduced into England; early prints and lithographs, 1149
Littleton contests the speakership of the Commons with Harley, 1701, 686
Liturgy, bill for the reform of, rejected, 1689, 624
Liverpool, communication between the trading towns, and, very imperfect before the Mersey, Irwell, and Weaver were made navigable, 609; rapid progress of, *ib.*; formerly engaged in the slave trade, *ib.*
Liverpool, earl of, Robert Jenkinson; lord Hawkesbury; makes his first speech on the side of government, 1794, 1008; foreign secretary, 1801–1804, 1036, 1325; his frequent interviews with Otto; signs the preliminaries of peace with France, 1801, 1039; complains of Napoleon's conduct, 1040; his correspondence with Talleyrand, 1804, 1047; declines the premiership; lord warden of the Cinque Ports, 1806, 1056; home secretary, 1807, 1062; unable to send Wellington fresh troops, 1076; his fears for the safety of the British army in Portugal, 1809, 1077; war and colonial secretary of state, 1809–1812, *ib.*; declares England unable to continue operations long in the Peninsula, 1081; prime minister; first commissioner of the treasury, June, 1812, 1083; home secretary, 1804–1806, 1325; congratulates Wellington on his victory at Salamanca, 1087; proposes a bill of pains and penalties against queen Caroline, 1152; but subsequently abandons it, 1153; presses for the readmission of Canning into the Cabinet, 1154; tries a second time in vain, 1157; his answer to the king's question as to what political principles were to be followed, 1158; measures proposed for insuring the stability of the public credit, 1163; he is against granting relief to Roman Catholics, 1164; taken with a fit of apoplexy, Feb. 18, 1827, which incapacitates him for business; his long friendship with Canning, *ib.*
Livingstone, sir Thomas, commander of the forces in Scotland, 645; instructions to, as to Highland rebels, *ib.*; considered not guilty of the Glencoe massacre, 649
Local Jurisdiction Courts bill rejected, 1833, 1205
Lochiel. See Camerou of Lochiel.
Locke opposes the depreciated currency theory, 663
Locker, E. H., note on; quotation from his memoir on major André, 893
Lollards, rise and increase of the, 149; the doctrines of, enforced by Piers Ploughman, *ib.*; the statute de heretico comburendo, the first in England for punishing heresy with death, passed in 1400 for the suppression of, 161; burning of William Salter, a London clergyman, *ib.*; alleged conspiracy of, against the State, on the conviction of Oldcastle for heresy, 163; suppressed, and some of the conspirators executed, *ib.*; new statute against, *ib.*; the spirit of, not wholly trodden out in time of Henry VIII., 231
Londinium, sacked and destroyed by Boadicea, A.D. 61, 9; Roman antiquities of, discovered in 1784, *ib.*
London, state of, under the Romans, 14; Roman remains found at, *ib.*; power and population of, in the time of Stephen, 78; amusements and exercises of the inhabitants, *ib.*; they assist in the "Rout of Winchester," and capture the earl of Gloucester, 78; oppression on the industry of, by Henry III., 108; riots in, in consequence, *ib.*; unpopularity of Queen Eleanor, 109; notice of bishop Swinfield's house in Old Fish street, in 1289, 120; markets and shops, *ib.*; state of the streets and highways, *ib.*; construction of the houses, 121; coal not then generally used, *ib.*; state of, in 1458, 191; sanitary regulations for, 226; riot in, on Evil May Day, 1517, against the Flemings, 236; buildings of, *temp.* Henry VIII., 295; state of the highways and streets, *ib.*; statute of sewers passed for, in 1427, *ib.*; Act for supplying with water, from Hampstead and other places, *ib.*; provision for lighting, *ib.*; statute for regulating watermen's fares, *ib.*; unwholesomeness of the churchyards in, 296; wealth of the traders, in, *ib.*; Henry Machyn's Diary of the sights and events in, during the first year of the Marian persecution, 331, *et seq.*; villainies practised in, *temp.* Eliz. 386; increase of London and Westminster, 387; statutes against the increase of buildings, *ib.*; hospitals and almshouses, *ib.*; plague of 1603, in, 397; New River brought to, by sir Hugh Myddleton in 1613, 410; continued increase of, *ib.*; ravages of the plague in 1625, 420; proclamation by Charles I. against the increase of houses in, and fines extorted in 1633 to prevent their being pulled down, 429; hackney-coaches forbidden, in 1635, to pass up and down the streets, *ib.*; despotic order of Charles I. to pull down houses and shut up shops, but without any aim at public improvement, 431; reception given by, to Mary de Medicis in 1638, 432; apprentices of, tumults raised by, in favor of the parliament, 446; skirmishes of, with Lunsford and the cavaliers, *ib.*; shutting up of the playhouses in, 451; described by Milton at the commencement of the Civil War, *ib.*; character of the volunteers and militia of, at the time of the Civil War, *ib.*; active exertions of the women of, in favor of the parliamentary party, *ib.*; character of the apprentices, *ib.*; ordered to be fortified, and plan of fortifications, 454; inhabitants of, march to Turnham Green, 457; anxious for peace, *ib.*; plot to arm the royalists in, discovered, 459; unusual agitation of, 460; prowess of the trained bands of, at the battle of Newbury, 461; consternation of, at the approach of the army, 477; tumults in, 479; royalists re-action and riots in, 483; popular demonstration in, in consequence of Cromwell's departure, *ib.*; bonfires lighted throughout, on account of John Lilburne's acquittal, 493; tumult of the Fifth Monarchy men, in 1657, 522; rising of apprentices in, against Oliver Cromwell, 525; anger of people of, at the expensive pageantry at Oliver Cromwell's burial, 526; burning of the Rump in 1660, 528; the Great Plague of 1665, 542; deficient supply of water, bad drainage, and crowded dwellings, great promoters of its fatality, *ib.*; Defoe's narrative of it, 543; departure of the Court, and of such of the inhabitants as were able, *ib.*; some of the clergy and the non-conforming ministers remain, 544; Great Fire of, 546; accounts of, by Pepys and Evelyn, *ib.*; by Baxter, 547; estimated loss occasioned by, *ib.*; Wren's plan for rebuilding the city, *ib.*; panic of, on the Dutch burning the English ships in the Medway, 550; cut off from their supply of coal by the Dutch fleet, *ib.*; panic of the inhabitants at the revelations of Oates's Popish Plot in 1678, 562; excitement in, on the occasion of the Court manœuvering to cause Dudley North to be appointed sheriff, 572; a *quo warranto* against the city for misdemeanors, which submits to conditions, 574; monastic establishments opened in 1686, 587; great rejoicings in, on the acquittal of the seven bishops in 1687, 593; riots in, on James II. quitting Whitehall, 598; influence of the large population of, upon agriculture, 611; population in 1688 and 1801, 613; vessels belonging to the port of, in 1702, *ib.*; extensive commerce of, at the commencement of the 18th century, *ib.*; the various trading companies of, 614; the banking system commenced in, *temp.* Charles II., *ib.*; mania for companies in, at the beginning of the 18th century, *ib.*; lotteries, *ib.*; the tradesmen of, in queen Anne's reign, *ib.*; the rebuilding of, by sir C. Wren, after the fire, 615; the progress of the fashionable world of, to the west, *ib.*; its streets; their state, passengers, and police, *ib.*; desire of nobility and gentry to gather in, 619; the manners and customs of, as influenced by this desire, *ib.*; large amount of pauperism in, *temp.* queen Anne, 620; club life of, 746; Wren's improvements in, 753; St. Paul's cathedral, *ib.*; the parish churches of, built by Wren, 754; street life of, *temp.* Anne and George I., 758; the Londoners prepare to resist the Highlanders, 1745; public feeling in, during the rebellion, 810; prevalence of robberies, and scarcity of police in, *temp.* George II., 824; riots of Spitalfields weavers in 1765, 851; the Wilkite mob, 1768, 855; riots among the sailors and coal-heavers, *ib.*; address and remonstrance of the city of, denying the legality of the parliament, 864; contests between the house of commons and the corporation of, 865; address and remonstrance of the city of, to the king, denouncing the government measures respecting America, 873; monument in memory of W. Pitt, earl of Chatham, erected in the Guildhall by the corporation of, 885; Gordon riots in, 1780, 890; supply of animal food for, from Essex, 912; butter and ducks from Bucks, *ib.*; sale of cattle and sheep at Smithfield in 1732, 1770 and 1859, 914; eating, coffee, and chop-houses, and other public refreshment places in, 959; Highbury barn; the Devil tavern; the Mitre; the White Conduit house; the Globe; Garraway's and White's, the Chapter coffee-house, *ib.*; Ranelagh gardens opened, 1742, *ib.*; the company at the Ranelagh and Vauxhall gardens, *ib.*; the Pantheon opened, 1772, 940; club-life and gambling in: Almack's, Boodles, White's, &c., 941; the citizens and tradesmen of; their gluttony and ignorance, 945; manners and characters of the lower orders, *ib.*; rabbles and mobs in, 946; the police and watchmen of, *ib.*; thanksgiving in, on the king's recovery, 1788, 958; assault on the king by a mob of, 1795, 1010; the declaration of the inhabitants of, that they will defend the British kingdom, 1803, 1044; the corporation of, opposes the renewal of the income tax in 1816, 1113; its crime encouraged by its police; extensive prevalence of crime and vice, 1118; state of, before and after the passing of the Westminster Paving and Lighting Act in 1762, *ib.*; the introduction of gas in Pall Mall in 1807 considerably influenced the prevention of crime, 119; mendicity, vagrancy, and destitution in, *ib.*; evils produced by the law of settlement, *ib.*; inquiry into the state of education of the poorer classes of, 1120; saving banks in, *ib.*; the Hampden Club of, 1122; the Spenceans, *ib.*; the meeting in the Spa fields, and the riot in the city, which latter is put down by the mayor, *ib.*; architecture and architects of, 1140; Waterloo bridge commenced 1811, completed 1817, built by Rennie; Southwark and Vauxhall bridges, 1144; docks of, and London bridge built by Rennie, *ib.*; the sculpture of, 1145; the Townley, Phigaleian and Elgin marbles, *ib.*; enthusiastic sympathy of its mechanics with queen Caroline, 1152; mechanics' institution of, inaugurated by Dr. Birkbeck, 1823; university of, opened 1828, 1175; dread of the proposed new police for, 1828, *ib.*; increased representation of, effected by the Reform Act of 1832; condition of the four new boroughs—Marylebone, Finsbury, the Tower Hamlets, and Lambeth, 1200; population and houses in, 1841, 1226; supply of food to, *ib.*; sanitary condition of its laboring classes, 1227; evils arising from interment in, 1228; Walker's usefulness in reclaiming the Devil's Acre, 1230
London bridge, building of, in 1209, 101; new bridge, 1144
London Gazette, establishment of, by sir Roger L'Estrange, in 1665, 545
Londonderry, siege of, and gallant defence by Walker and Baker, 1689, 627; invested April 20, 628; miseries, starvation, and agonizing despair endured by the besieged, *ib.*; the relief, *ib.*; the siege is raised, Aug. 1, *ib.*
Londonderry, marquis of. See Castlereagh, lord.
Londonderry, marquis of, anger of, in parliament, 1831, 1190; being considered incompetent to act as ambassador to Russia, he declines the post, 1835, 1216
Long Parliament, the meeting of, on Nov. 3, 1640, 435; its character, 4 6; opened by Charles I., 437; Lenthall chosen speaker, *ib.*; votes the release of persons imprisoned by the Star Chamber, *ib.*; Pym's speech in, impeaching Strafford, *ib.*; Strafford and Laud impeached by, *ib.*; Finch, Windebank, and the Ship-Money impeached by, 438; orders issued by, for destroying crucifixes, images, superstitious pictures, etc., *ib.*; a bill of attainder passed against Strafford, 441; act passed against the untimely adjournment or dissolving of the parliament without its own consent, *ib.*; it proceeds in its reforms, and abolishes the Star Chamber Court, the Court of High Commission, and other arbitrary courts, 442; act for the pacification of Scotland passed; the Irish insurrection of 1641 breaks out, 443; requested by the king to take measures for the suppression of the rebellion, *ib.*; debate on the Remonstrance, and its adoption, 444; formation of parties for the approaching struggle, *ib.*; the earls of Holland, Leicester, and Essex join the parliamentary party, *ib.*; the Remonstrance presented to the king, *ib.*; popular tumults, increase of petitioning, and cry against the bishops; rise of the terms Roundhead and Cavalier; twelve bishops protest against the force used towards them, and are committed to the Tower for treason, *ib.*; the question of the militia ordered to be taken into consideration, on Jan. 3, 1642, 456; the claims of the Commons an invasion of the rights of the Crown; the king attempts to seize the five members, Pym, Hollis, Hampden, Haslerig, and Strode, on Jan. 3, 447; sir R. Verney's account of the proceedings on the occasion; the members retire to the city, and the king demands them at Guildhall; they are brought back in triumph to the House; the governors of Portsmouth and Hull are directed by ordinance to hold those places for "the king and parliament," *ib.*; the bill for excluding bishops from the House of Lords agreed to, and the Militia bill refused by the king, 448; the House approves of Hotham having refused the king entrance into Hull; the leaders prepare for war, but send propositions to the king at York, 449; the king sets up his standard at Nottingham, 453; attempts to negotiate; but his propositions are rejected; issues a declaration of war, and Essex marches from London, 454; sends proposals to Charles, after the battle of Edgehill, to negotiate, 457; sends commissioners to Charles at Oxford, in March, 1643, to negotiate for peace, 458; establishes a Great Seal, and provides for the due administration of justice; Edmund Waller's plot against, 459; Waller's arrest and execution of Challoner and Tomkins, 459; negotiations of, for an alliance with Scotland, 463; its members swear to the "Solemn League and Covenant"; conformity to Presbyterianism enforced by, *ib.*; resolves to fill up the vacancies in the House, and increased strength of the Independents in consequence, 471; receives overtures of pacification from the king, and rejects them, 471; negotiation with the Scots for the surrender of the king; state of parties in, *ib.*; the treaty concluded, and the king surrendered, 474; end of the first Civil War, *ib.*; struggle of the Presbyterian members to repress the Independents, who are strong in the army, and are headed by Cromwell, 475; vote passed for disbanding the army; petition against, presented by the officers, *ib.*; proceedings of Adjutators, 476; private resolution of the members of, to arrest Cromwell; the army removes the king from Holmby, *ib.*; the army advances to London and demands the impeachment of eleven of the Presbyterian members, 477; they withdraw, and the House votes the adoption of the army's proceedings, *ib.*; tumults in London, and the mob forces the House to rescind a vote passed on the day before, 479; the speaker and many of the members proceed to the army, and the Presbyterian party resumes its predominance, *ib.*; Fairfax and the army restore the speaker and the Independent members, *ib.*; declares against any further treaty with the king, 482; reaction of the people against, in favor of the king, 483; treaty of Newport commenced, 485; a Remonstrance sent by the army to, 486; the army is marched into London, 487; the House purged by colonel Pride, *ib.*; ordinance for the king's trial, 488; the High Court of Justice appointed, *ib.*; the king sentenced to death, 489; issues a proclamation that no new king be proclaimed without its authority, 490; Icon Basilikè printed, 491; the House of Lords voted useless, and the office of king abolished, *ib.*; Council of State appointed, *ib.*; trial and execution of the royalists, duke of Hamilton, earl of Holland, and lord Capel, 492; public indignation occasioned by, *ib.*; the Levellers are suppressed, 493; a thanksgiving day on account of the suppression of the Levellers, *ib.*; trial of John Lilburne, 493; appoints Cromwell lord-lieutenant of Ireland, 493; Rupert driven from the Irish coast, 495; Cromwell honorably received by, on his return from Ireland, 4 7; prepares forces for a war with Scotland, *ib.*; Cromwell constituted general by act of, *ib.*; despatch of Cromwell to, announcing the victory of Dunbar; gives Cromwell liberty to return home, 498; letter of Cromwell to, announcing the invasion of England, 499; defeat of the royalist army at Worcester, *ib.*; Charles and his adherents declared rebels and traitors to the commonwealth 500; courts-martial held upon nine prisoners taken at Worcester, and three executed, of whom one was the earl of Derby, *ib.*; reward of £1000 offered by, to any one who would capture Charles II., *ib.*; law for the election of future parliaments passed, the House voting not to sit beyond Nov. 3, 1654, 502; conference on the settlement of the nation, *ib.*; foreign relations of the commonwealth, *ib.*; differences with

the United Provinces, 503; Navigation Act passed. *ib.*; war declared against the Dutch, *ib.*; general thanksgiving appointed on account of the successes of Blake over Van Trom, 504; petition of the army to, *ib.*; the question of future parliamentary representation, 505; dissolution of, 506; public opinion on dissolution of, *ib.*; restored under the name of "the Rump," 527; resolves that the military shall be under the civil power, *ib.*; discussions as to form of government, *ib.*; the Rota Club, *ib.*; royalist insurrection breaks out, 528; council of officers, *ib.*; committee of safety, *ib.*; the parliament is ejected, *ib.*; is restored by the council of officers, 529; disaffection of the city towards it, *ib.*; Monk employed to quell the disaffection, 530; burning of the Rump in Jan., 1660, *ib.*; the secluded members are restored by Monk's intervention, *ib.*; renewal of the Presbyterian measures on their restoration, *ib.*; final dissolution of, on March 16, 1660. 531

Longchamp, William, appointed chancellor of England by Richard, is deposed by prince John in 1191, 94; retires to Flanders, and writes to Richard, *ib.*

Longwy taken by the Prussians, Aug. 22, 1792, 981

Losowitz, battle of, Oct. 1, 1756, 674

Lotteries, multitudinosity of, *temp.* William III., 614, 659; suppressed 1698, 614

Loudon, earl of, commands the British troops in America, 833; shrinks from attacking Louisbourg, 836; censured and recalled; surprises Frederick in his camp, 837

Loughborough, A. Wedderburn, lord, solicitor-general, 1771; reproves Fox's expression of "criminals," 865; insults Franklin, 870; attorney-general; his opinion on the employment of the military in suppressing riots, 891; supports Fox's Libel bill, 1792, 976; attempts to promote a union between Fox and Pitt, hoping thereby to obtain the lord chancellorship, 977; his further intrigues for the same object are successful; he obtains the Great Seal Jan. 28, 1793, 985; his "Traitorous Correspondence" bill passed in a modified form, 992; his extravagant idea of the success of the British arms in Holland, 993; principal adviser of the trials of Hardy and others; anecdote of George III. and, 1003; his opinion on the order forbidding the Bank to pay in cash, 1013; one of "the king's friends"; opposes the concessions to Catholics, 1035; resigns his chancellorship, 1801, 1036; lord chancellor, 1783, 1325

Louis, prince, of Baden, commands the allied armies in 1704, alternately with Marlborough, 695; aids him in gaining the battle of the Schellenberg or Donawert, July 2, 696; despatched by Marlborough to carry on the siege of Ingoldstadt, 697; conducts the siege of Landau, which capitulates in Dec., 699

Louis of France offered the crown of England in 1215, 105; arrives in England, and receives the homage of the barons in London, *ib.*; suspected treachery, and decline of the popularity of, *ib.*; his forces are defeated at Lincoln by the earl of Pembroke, 106; and a fleet with reinforcements destroyed near Dover, *ib.*; makes a treaty with Henry III., and withdraws, *ib.*

Louis XI., of France, meets Edward IV., and cajoles him into a disgraceful treaty, 201; breaks off the contract for the marriage of the dauphin with Edward's daughter, 202

Louis XIV.; extent of his aid to king James, 1690, 637; receives James' project of invading England with coldness, 639; his power and kingdom, 641; himself, not the French, the real enemy of England, 642; besieges Mons and compels it to surrender, 643, on the death of his minister Louvois he offers his assistance to James in invading England, 651; conducts the siege of Namur, 652; which surrenders to him, *ib.*; his position and opinions, 656; the routine of his day, 656; prepares for a campaign, 1693, *ib.*; suddenly leaves his army and returns to Versailles, *ib.*; promises to aid James in invading England, if the Jacobites rise, 664; negotiates for peace with William III., 1697, 668; the treaty of Ryswick is concluded, 668; his reception of the English ambassador, Portland, 1698, 671; sends count Tallard as his ambassador at the court of William, 671; William's dread of Spain and the Indies being acquired by, 677; seizes the Spanish crown for his grandson William in opposition to the terms of the two partition treaties, 679; suspected of bribing the English, 680; his ostentatious extravagance and that of his court bring about the poverty of the nation, 681; his policy, *ib.*; attempts to influence Charles of Spain to place the succession in the Bourbon family, 683; he accepts the will of Charles, *ib.*; his grandson succeeds to the Spanish dominions, *ib.*; on the death of James II., in 1701, he proclaims his son, the prince of Wales, as James III., king of England, 686; concentrates the military of France upon Germany, 694; receives news of the defeat of his armies at Blenheim, 699; feels his losses in the Low Countries; invited to invade Scotland, 707; pride roused by Marlborough's demands; his example, and appeal to his subjects, fires the spirit of the nation, 717; anguish at the exhausted state of the kingdom and inability to obtain peace, 723; secretly promotes the election of Charles of Austria to the German empire, 1711, 738; makes viscount Bolingbroke a present of a ring worth 4000*l.* during his embassage at Paris, 1713, 735; his concessions in the peace of Utrecht, *ib.*; died Sept. 1, 1715, 762

Louis XV., of France is declared of age; takes upon himself the government of France; appoints duke de Bourbon his minister, 778; refuses to marry the infanta of Spain, to whom he was betrothed, *ib.*; joins his army at Fontenoy, 1745; urged to retire from the battle by marshal Saxe, but he spiritedly remains to see the battle out, 798; sends an army to invade Brabant, 1747; present at the battle of Lauffeld, 820; sensitiveness to Frederick the Great's ridicule, 831; sides with Maria Theresa in the Seven Years' war, 1756, *ib.*; his nervousness caused by an attempt on his life by Damiens, 1757; misery of the country and extravagance of the court, 842; died, May 10, 1774, 871; reigned, 1715-1774, 1309

Louis XVI. quarrels with his parliament, 960; attends the meeting of the states-general, 1789, 961; his views on the union of the three orders, 961; agrees to the formation of the national assembly, *ib.*; refuses to withdraw the troops stationed between Paris and Versailles, 962; yields to his people's demands, 963; revived loyalty of the national guard towards, 964; his audience with the Parisian women, 965; besieged in the Versailles palace by the mob, *ib.*; himself and family removed to Paris, 965; his speech at the sitting of the national assembly, Feb. 4, 1790, 967; attends the federation fête, 968; his deposition demanded by the mob, 971; himself and family vigilantly watched; he escapes with it from Paris, July 21, 1791, 972; is captured at Varennes, and conducted back to Paris, *ib.*; the people's hatred of royalty, *ib.*; the formation of the legislative assembly agreed to by, 973; confidence in revived, *ib.*; desires emigants to disarm; applies his veto to the decrees against the emigrants, 974; opposed to declaring war with Austria; his powers as king, 977; insulted by Roland, whom he dismisses; agrees to the formation of a camp near Paris, but not to the deportation of priests, 978; his firmness in the interview with the insurrectionists of June, 1792, 978; his deposition again demanded, 979; blockaded in the Tuileries by the mob; places himself and family under the assembly's protection, 979; removal of the royal family to the Temple, 980; all the members of which are there harshly treated, 984; he is impeached at the bar of the convention, 984; anxiety for his fate shown in the British parliament, 985; his trial, 987; condemnation, 987; and execution, Jan. 21, 1793, *ib.*; proceedings of the British parliament, 988

Louis XVII., of France, presented to the people at the federation fête, 1790, 968; unharmed by the people at the opera, 974; present at Louis XVI.'s interview with the insurrectionists of June 20, 1792, 978; imprisoned in the Temple, Aug. 1792, 984; death of, in the Temple, Paris, June 8, 1795, shameful treatment of, 1009

Louis XVIII., of France, enters Paris, May 3, 1814, 1092; reception of, on his entry into London, 1092; retrospect of his restoration, 1102; promulgation of the constitutional charter, *ib.*; its provisions, *ib.*; partly his own work, *ib.*; discontent shown under his government, *ib.*; deserted by marshal Ney, dissolves the chambers and removes his court from Paris to Ghent, 1104; public entry into Paris, July 8, 1815, 1109; execution of Labedoyere and marshal Ney, 1111; evacuation of France by the allied troops, 1818, 1130; declares war against Spain, 1823, 2157; the campaign; occupation of Madrid and overthrow of Spain, *ib.*; death of, Sept. 6, 1824; his good sense preserves his kingdom from convulsions, 1180; anecdote of, 1181; reigned from 1815 to 1824, 1310

Louis Philippe (France), present at the battle of Valmy, 1792; and at that of Jemappes, 1792, 982; appointed lieutenant-general of France, 1830, 1153; opens the legislative session; accepts the throne of France, Aug 9, 1154; his daughter married to king Leopold of Belgium, 1832, 1221; death of the duke of Reichstadt, *ib.*; his government and frequent changes of ministry; attempts to assassinate him by Fieschi (1835), Alibaud and Meunier (1836), 1222; his fears of Louis Napoleon, *ib.*; the king's perplexity caused by Louis Napoleon's enterprise at Strasbourg, *ib.*; the king sends him to America; compels his extradition from Switzerland, *ib.*; his visit to the queen, 1272; his Spanish marriage plans, 1283; doubts as to his friendliness towards England, 1284; his abdication, *ib.*; stormed in his palace by the mob, and compelled to fly, *ib.*

Louisbourg capitulates to the British, 1758, 837

Louvain given up to Marlborough, 1706, 706

L'Ouverture, Toussaint, accomplishes the freedom of the St. Domingo slaves; commander-in-chief of their armies, 1796, 1042; president and governor for life, 1801; Bonaparte sends an expedition against him, *ib.*; resists, but is compelled to submit; arrested and imprisoned; died April 27, 1803, *ib.*

Louvois, chief minister of France; suspected to have been poisoned, 1792, 651; favors Dumont's plot against William III., 653

Lovat, Simon Fraser, lord, takes possession of Inverness for government, 764; his perfidy and wavering conduct during the rebellion of 1745, 814; he is impeached by the House of Commons, Dec. 1746; trial of, and death, 818

Lowe, sir Hudson, governor of St. Helena; complained of as being harsh to Napoleon, 1155

Lowick tried for conspiring against William III.; and executed, 665

Lowry, his engraving machine, 1148

Lucerne, prince de, present at Cornwallis's surrender, 897

Lucius, or Lever Maur, "who reigned in Britain, A.D. 180," doubtful statement of his having become a Christian under pope Eleutherius, and having built the chapel in Dover Castle, 16

Luddism active in 1812, 1083; in 1816, 1117; in 1817, 1124; in 1830, 1184; and in 1831, 1193

Ludlam, Isaac, executed for insurrectioning, 1124

Ludlow, Edmund, parliament wishes to apprehend him, 1689, on hearing of his being in London, he returned to Vevay, 634

Lundy appointed governor of Londonderry by William; but being suspected of an intention to surrender he is turned out by the townspeople, 627

Luneville, peace of; preliminaries signed July 28, 1800; and completed on Feb. 9, 1801, 1035, 1040

Luther, Martin, denouncement of the sale of indulgences by, 231; attends the Diet at Worms, 235; intrepid behavior of, before the Diet, *ib.*; Henry VIII. writes a book against, *ib.*; Luther's works burnt at Paul's Cross, *ib.*; spread of the doctrines of, in Germany, 240

Luttrell, col., his motion against Wilkes; opposes Wilkes as a candidate for Middlesex; defeated; but is declared to be the legal representative, 1769, 856

Luttrell, Temple, proposes a measure for manning the navy, 1777, 881

Lützen, battle of, May 2, 1813, 1089

Luxemburg, French general, gains the battle of Fleurus, 1690, 642; helps Louis in besieging Namur, 652; defeats William III. at Steinkirk, 652; campaign of 1693, 656; again defeats William at Landen, *ib.*

Lyndhurst, J. S. Copley, lord; advocates the allowance of counsel to prisoners, 693; sergeant; Watson's counsel, 1817, 1122; lord chancellor, 1827, 1166; resigned 1830, 1187; moves that the disfranchising clauses of the Reform bill be postponed, 1197; negotiates for the formation of a ministry willing to carry out an extensive parliamentary reform, 1832, 1198; his temporary government with the duke of Wellington, 1835, 1214; lord chancellor in the Peel ministry, 1215; opposes the Municipal Reform bill, 1218; his hostile speeches against the Melbourne government, 1836, 1219; approves of the bill for allowing counsel to prisoners, 1220

Lyndsay, Patrick, M.P. for Edinburgh; his speech on the Porteous riots, 787; evidence of, on these riots, *ib.*

Lyon, siege of, by, and surrender to, the Jacobins, 1793, 997; massacre of the Lyonnese, *ib.*

Lyttelton, sir George, opposes the convention with Spain, 791; speaks against an amendment of the address for preventing parliamentary corruption, 806; chancellor of the exchequer, 1755, 865

Lyttleton, Thomas, lord, his claims to the authorship of Junius's Letters, 858

Maas, Dirk, a Dutch battle painter, 757

Macarthy, viscount Mountcashel; commands a force advancing against Enniskillen; defeated 1689, 628

Macaulay, lord, low estimate of ancient Britain by, 4; his remarks on Pitt's policy in 1793, 1000; M.P. for Calne, 1830; his first speech in parliament, 1180; speaks in favor of reform, 1189; dangers feared by, on the rejection of the Reform bill, 1197; M.P. for Edinburgh; his speech on disloyal Tories, 1238; his influence in causing the rejection of sergeant Talfourd's copyright bill, 1253; his plan, *ib.*; eloquence and powerful memory evinced by, as Guizot's *cicerone* in Westminster Abbey, 1255; his mode of treating history, *ib.*; his estimate of Hallam's "Constitutional History," *ib.*; his speech on "the people's charter" presented by Ducombe, 1263

MacCallum Mhor. See Argyle, J. Campbell, duke of.

Macclesfield, Thomas Parker, earl of, lord chancellor, impeached, 1725, for malversation in that office; he is found guilty, excluded from his office, and fined 30,000*l.*, 778; helps Chesterfield in carrying the bill for reforming the calendar through the Lords, 751, 822

MacDonald of Boisdale, advises Charles Stuart to forego his insurrection designs, 1745, 801

MacDonald of Glencoe. See Glencoe.

Macdonald of Keppoch, raises his clan, and joins Dundee in defeating Mackay at Killiecrankie, 631; letters of fire and sword issued against, 649; slain at Culloden, 658

MacDonald of Kinloch Moidart, argues against the Pretender's plans; joins his cause, 801

MacDonald, lady Margaret, aids the young Pretender in his escape from Skye, 818

Macdonald, general, defeated at Trebbia, 1799, 1030; and at Katzbach, 1813, 1090

MacDonald, Flora, aids prince Charles during his wanderings in the Highlands, 1746, 818

Macdonnell, colonel, his exploit at Waterloo, 1106

Machyn's "Diary of a Resident in London," notices from, 331

MacIntosh, brigadier; commands a detachment sent to aid the southern insurgents; his march to Seton House, 1715, 763; commands the rebels at Preston, 764; escapes from Newgate, 767

MacIver survives the massacre after Culloden, 817

Mack, general, Austrian commander; communicates secretly with Dumouriez, 993; surrenders 30,000 troops to Napoleon at Ulm, Oct. 20, 1805, 1050

Mackay, general, appointed to the command of the army in Scotland, 631; his character, *ib.*; marches upon Blair castle; is met by Dundee while advancing through the pass of Killiecrankie, and sustains a defeat, July 27, 1689, *ib.*; takes an active part in the capture of Athlone, June 30, 1691, 644; builds Fort William, and fixes a garrison there under colonel Hill, 645; slain in the conflict at Steinkirk, Aug. 3, 1692, 653

Mackintosh, sir James, his remarks on Burke's opinions, 969; his speech in defence of Peltier, 1808, 1043; wrote the declaration for the Londoners, 1044; takes up the advocacy of amendment in the criminal laws on the death of sir S. Romilly; moves for a select committee to consider this subject, 1130; opinion of, on the emancipation of the slaves, 1161, results of his efforts for the repeal of capital punishments, *ib.*; supports the bill for allowing counsel to prisoners, 1220

MacLean, colonel, repulses Arnold; saves Quebec, 1775, 877; tenders Hastings's resignation of his governorship, 949

MacNaghten, sir William, directs the affairs at Cabul, 1249; appointed governor of Bombay, 1250; his conference with Akbar Khan, by whom he is massacred, *ib.*

Macpheadris, captain John, his ill-treatment in the Fleet prison, 782

MacPherson, Cluny, demand of, on joining the Pretender, 1745, 802; his dashing bravery at Clifton, 812; keeps up a correspondence with Charles Edward, 820
Macquirk tried, and found guilty of murdering Mr. Clark; pardoned, 858
Madison, James, president of the United States, 1809-1817, 1310; his hostile message against England, 1091; proposes a repeal of the Embargo acts, 1814, 1099; deprecates the destruction of the Washington public buildings by the British, 1100
Madras attacked and taken by the French, 1746, 827; restored to Britain, *ib.*
Madrid, taken by the duke of Berwick, 713; entered by the allies, 1710; and the French, 725; taken by the French, 1808, 1070; entered by Wellington, Aug. 1812, 1087; occupied by the French, 1823, 1157
Mæatæ, revolt of, 11; suppressed, *ib.*
Maestricht, surrendered to Kleber, 1794, 1007
Magdalen bridge, Oxford, built by Gwyn, 935
Magdalen College. See Oxford.
Magna Charta proposed to John at Oxford by archbishop Langton and the earl of Pembroke, who rejects it, 103; signed by John at Runnymede, on June 15, 1215, *ib.*; provisions of, *ib.*; effects of, upon the nation, 104; provisions for the observance of, *ib.*
Magnentius, revolt of, A.D. 350, 17
Maharajpoor, battle of, Dec. 29, 1843, 1268
Mahomed Ali flies to Trichinopoly, 827; struggles against Chunda Sahib, *ib.*
Mahon, lord, his plan for amending the copyright law, 1253; characteristics of his History of England, 1256
Mahoni, commands at Murviedro; received by Peterborough; arrested, 702
Mahratta wars, history of the, 1778-1782, 949; and 1802-1805, 1053-1055
Mahrattas, peishwa of, concludes an alliance with Cornwallis, 989; prepares to invade the British territories, 1169; surrenders to the British; abdicates his throne; becomes a pensioner of the East India Company, 1170
Maida, battle of, July 4, 1806, 1060
Mail-coaches, introduction of, 1784, 938
Mailliard leads the Parisian mob of 1789, 965; president of the assembly; his sentence of death on prisoners, 980
Maine, duc de, receives an important command in the French army, 661; incompetent and cowardly, *ib.*
Maitland captain; Bonaparte surrendering to him, he conveys the ex-emperor to Plymouth, 1108
Malacca ceded to the British, 1824, 1170
Malaga, sea fight off, 1704, 700
Malcolm, king of Scotland, receives Edgar Atheling, 58; invades England in 1070, and marriage of, with Margaret, sister of Edgar, 59; civilization of Scotland promoted by Margaret, 61; unsuccessfully attacks William II., 67; killed, *ib.*
Malcolm, king of Scotland, compelled to surrender Cumberland and Northumberland to Henry II. in 1157, 82
Malesherbes counsel for Louis XVI., 1792, 987; guillotined, 1794, 1001
Malines submits to Marlborough, 1706, 706.
Malmesbury, Harris, lord, British chargé des affaires at Madrid, 1770, 866; minister at Berlin; his correspondence with the home government, *ib.*; recommends that the proceedings against Portland be postponed, 985; sent on an especial mission to Berlin to purchase assistance by subsidy, 1793, 1006; appointed a negotiator to demand the princess Caroline of Brunswick for the prince of Wales, *ib.*; negotiates unsuccessfully for peace with France, 1796, 1012; leaves Paris, Dec. 19; gives warning of a French expedition against Ireland, *ib.*; appointed to negotiate for peace at Lisle, 1797; the negotiations are put an end to by the revolution of the 18th Fructidor, 1017; quotation from his diary, 1046; remarks on the effect of the news of the Ulm surrender on Pitt, 1050
Malplaquet, battle of, Sept. 11, 1709, 718
Malta taken by Bonaparte, 1798, 1020; surrenders to the British after a two years' blockade, Sept., 1800, 1035; retained by the British, 1043
Malthus advocates the adoption of savings banks, 1120
Manchester, its population in Charles II.'s reign, and fifty years later, 609; its men and manufactures, *ib.*; the Blanket meeting at, 1817, 1123; the great reform meeting, 1132; and massacre at, *ib.*; obtains parliamentary representation, 1832, 1200; population of, with Salford, in 1831 and 1861, *ib.*
Manchester, earl of, as lord Kimbolton, accused, with the five members, of sedition, by Charles I., 447; commands at the second battle of Newbury, 466; is accused of indecision and delay by Cromwell in parliament, *ib.*
Mandat prepares to resist the insurrectionists of the 10th Aug., 1792; murdered, 979
Manners, illustration of, 1709-1742, from Hogarth, 758; 1737-1783, 937-947; 1784-1820, 1135, 1139, 1231
Mansfield, William Murray, earl of, attorney-general; his interview with lord Kilmarnock, 818; becomes chief justice and lord Mansfield, 1756, 832; declares Wilkes's outlawry null and void, 856; presides at Woodfall's prosecution, 859; chancellor of the exchequer, 1767, 865; his house sacked, and its contents, including his valuable library, burnt by the Gordon rioters, 1780, 891; opposes the "contractors" and "revenue officers" bills, 901
Mantua besieged by the French; capitulates, Feb. 2, 1797, 1017
Manufacturers, list of articles with which foreigners were not allowed to compete, 185
Mapes, Walter, satires of, on the state of the Church in the time of Henry II., 83
Mar, James Erskine, earl of, appointed secretary of state for Scotland, 1706; deprived of his office; marries the duke of Kingston's daughter; organizes an insurrection in Scotland; inaugurates it by raising the Pretender's standard at Braemar, September 6, 1715, 761; his want of energy and action; debilitates the powers of the insurrectionists; his movements cramped by the duke of Argyle; detaches a part of his army under MacIntosh; withdraws Argyle's attention from MacIntosh by a feint, 763; his indecisive march; halts at Sheriffmuir; receives a severe reverse in the conflict with Argyle, Nov. 13, 765; accompanies Charles in his flight to France, *ib.*
Marat harangues the populace of Paris, 1789, 962; desires to erect 800 gibbets, 969; advises that the royal palace be well watched, 971; aids in bringing about the September massacres, 1792, 981; denounces the moderation of Dumouriez, 993; excites the people to plunder the shops, 994; represents the executive power of France, 996; hates Robespierre, 996; assassinated by Charlotte Corday, July 13, 1793, *ib.*
Marcus Antoninus sends a number of Germans into Britain, 14
Marengo, battle of, June 14, 1800, 1034
Margaret, the heiress of Alexander III. of Scotland, dies in 1290, and leaves the succession to the crown in dispute, 123
Margaret of Anjou. See Henry VI.
Margaret of Burgundy, sister to Edward IV., married in 1468, 196; supports the pretensions of Lambert Simnel against Henry VII., 213; in 1492 protects Perkin Warbeck, 215; visited by Henry VIII. in 1513, 229
Maria Josepha of Austria married Augustus III. of Poland; compelled by force to give up his state papers, 831
Maria Louisa, archduchess of Austria, marries Bonaparte, 1078; gives birth to a son, March, 1811, 1081; appointed regent of France, 1091
Maria Theresa, daughter of Charles VI.; heiress of his states, 794; the English parliament grants a subsidy to, *ib.*; marries Francis, grand duke of Tuscany; her claim disputed, 795; flies to Hungary; throws herself on the support of the Hungarians; the fortunes of her armies, 796; restores her conquests in Bavaria, 798; grieves at the loss of Silesia; joined by Louis XV., 831; opposed to the partition of Poland, 866; Empress of Germany, 1745-1762, 1310
Marie Antoinette escapes from the mob, 1789, 965; removed to Paris, *ib.*; presents the dauphin to the people, 1790, 968; interview with Mirabeau, 969; accompanies Louis XVI. in his flight from Paris and capture, 972; her apparent calmness at the opera, 974; present at Louis's audience with the 20th June insurrectionists, 978; description of, at the attack on the Tuileries, August, 1792, 980; imprisoned in the Temple, *ib.*; treatment pursued towards, 984; guillotined, Oct. 16, 1793, 1000
Marlborough, S. Churchill, duchess of, lady of the bedchamber to the princess Anne; her friendship for and large influence over the princess, 634; urges her to obtain increased income from the parliament and not from the king, *ib.*; she is dismissed the royal palace, 650; she loses her influence over the queen, 715; her account of the queen's political intrigues with Harley at private audiences, 716; her income 9500*l.* per annum, *ib.*; her description of Sacheverel's character, 723; she is hated and given up by Mrs. Morley (Anne), *ib.*; her dismissal from Anne's service, 1711, 725; her revenge, *ib.*; her meanness towards Vanbrugh, 755
Marlborough, duke of, John Churchill; an expedition against Ireland sails under his command, which disembarks near Cork, September 22, 1690; takes Cork on the 29th, 641; and Kinsale, *ib.*; he is intrusted with the command of the English troops in Flanders, 644; offers to go over to James, *ib.*; is dismissed from office by William, 650; in consequence of plotting for James's recall to the throne, *ib.*; treachery of, in the Brest affair of 1694; offers William his services, which are refused, 659; implicated by Fenwick with holding treacherous correspondence with James II., 668; governor of the duke of Gloucester, 682; receives the Order of the Garter, and is made captain-general of Anne's forces, 1702, 689; he is sent as envoy extraordinary to the States-general; his preparations for war, *ib.*; appointed generalissimo of the allied forces by the States; takes Venloo, September 18; Ruremonde, Stevenswart, Liege, October 23, and the castle of Chartreuse, *ib.*; an adventure, escape, and return to London, *ib.*; he is made duke of Marlborough, 1702, 690; desires to assist the Camisards, 691; takes Ulm, Bonn-Huy, 1703; proposes a grand design, but is thwarted by the States; takes Limbourg, 692; his difficulty in recruiting the army, 694; Louis XIV. concentrates his forces upon Germany, 1704, *ib.*; Marlborough plans a series of operations for opposing him, which he carries out with secrecy; marches to the Moselle, there gives Villeroy the slip, and pushes on to the Danube, 695; his march along the Rhine; his attention to detail; the high spirits of his army, *ib.*; passes the Neckar, June 3, *ib.*; meets prince Eugene on the 10th, and prince Louis of Baden on the 13th, *ib.*; encamps at Giengen; receives intelligence of the vicinity of the Bavarian and French army, 696; description of the Schellenberg, *ib.*; storms the Schellenberg in conjunction with prince Louis July 2, *ib.*; lays waste many villages in Bavaria, *ib.*; encamps at Friedberg, August 3; at Schonefeldt on the 10th; joins prince Eugene on the 11th, 697; they resolve to attack the enemy, who are encamped five miles off, *ib.*; marches upon their position, *ib.*; attacks Tallard's head-quarters at Blenheim, *ib.*; which leads to a general conflict, 698; he gains the victory, Aug. 13, *ib.*; his anxiety to obtain sufficient food for his troops and prisoners, 699; sets down before Ulm, Aug. 20; it capitulates Sept. 12; sets down before Landau, which also capitulates, December; concludes treaties with Bavaria and Prussia; receives honors; arrives at the Hague, Dec. 16; embarks at Rotterdam on the 22d and arrives at St. James's by the 26th, *ib.*; honors bestowed on, *ib.*; enthusiastic reception; opposes the Conformity bill, 699; embarks at Harwich, March 31, 1705, 703; his plans are opposed by the Dutch; crosses the Moselle and Saar, June 3, *ib.*; scarcity of food, and other disappointments, cause him to despond; rouses his spirits, joins d'Auverquerque, and regains possession of Huy, July 11, 704; forces the French lines, July 17, *ib.*; Villeroy retreats beyond the Dyle; he follows, but his plans are thwarted by the Dutch generals, 705; the first stone of his palace at Woodstock laid, *ib.*; opposes jobbery; arrives at the Hague, April 27, 1706, *ib.*; his confidence of victory; advances to give battle to the French, 706; the battle commences; he is nearly made prisoner; the village of Ramillies is seized by his forces; gains the victory of Ramillies, *ib.*; Antwerp, Ghent, Bruges, and Oudenarde surrender; Ostend is besieged; capitulates July 7; Menin captured, August 22; Dendermonde surrenders, Sept. 5; Ath falls October 4; he returns to England, 706; his pension of 5,000*l.* per annum settled upon his posterity, 713; visits Charles XII. at Alt Ransadt, April 27, 1707; and diplomatizes with him, *ib.*; accomplishes little in his campaign in the Netherlands; plans an attack upon France, 714; prepares to attack the French before Oudenarde; is joined by prince Eugene; and attacked by fever brought on by long marches and disappointments, 1708, 715; defeats the French at Oudenarde, July 11; his description of the battle, *ib.*; besieges Lille, 716; his disgust at the queen's temper; he is on the point of retiring from business, *ib.*; his yearly income nearly 75,000*l.*; covers the siege of Lille; his meanness towards Webb, 717; urges upon Godolphin the necessity of another campaign, *ib.*; his desire and attempt to reduce France to accept unmilitary terms; rouses the French national spirit; surrender of Tournay, 718; gains a victory at Malplaquet, Sept. 11, 1709, *ib.*; represents England at the conferences of Gertruydenberg, 1710, 723; his despondency at the state of affairs, *ib.*; mortified at the dismissal of his Whig friends and relations from office, *ib.*; returns to London, December; coldness of the queen, 724; and opposition of Harley and St. John towards him, *ib.*; sinister motives imputed to him; his wife dismissed from Anne's service, *ib.*; hostility shown towards, 725; leaves London, March 4, 1711, to assume his command in the Netherlands, 728; his terror of the press, *ib.*; forces the French lines with an inferior force, *ib.*; invests and takes Bouchain, *ib.*; his successes disparaged by the press; he writhes under their attacks, *ib.*; lands at Greenwich on his return home Nov. 17, 729; his answer to the queen's speech insinuating his desire for prolonging war, *ib.*; he is still opposed by Harley and the ministry; is turned out of all his offices by the queen, Dec. 31, *ib.*; his avariciousness; charged with illegally taking public moneys; his defence thereof, 730; his resignation in adversity, 733; his name omitted in the regency list 760; retains his office of captain-general and master of the ordnance, 761; death of, 1722, 775
Marlborough, duke of, resigns his military commission, 1743, 797; commands the troops sent against Cherbourg and St. Maloes, 1758, 837
Marlborough House built by Wren, 754
Marmont, marshal, appointed to command 20,000 men to be sent against England, 1065, 1050; commands the army of Holland, *ib.*; weakens the garrison of Ciudad Rodrigo, advances to its relief, 1085; commander of the French army in Spain, 1811; his manœuvres near Salamanca, 1086; a fault he commits is taken advantage of by Wellington, which results in the battle of Salamanaca, July 22, in which he is wounded and defeated, *ib.*; Napoleon's rage against, 1087; commands the forces in Paris, 1830, 1183; ordered to act against the July revolutionists; the struggle of July 28, *ib.*; he is besieged in the Tuileries and compelled to give in, *ib.*
Marriage act, 1753, 824
Marriage act, Royal, 868
Marriages bill, regulation of Dissenters', 1836, 1221
Marseillais, their arrival in Paris, July 30, 1792, 978; they assemble before Danton's club, *ib.*; their contest at the Tuileries, 979
Marshalsea prison, the horrors of the, 782
Marsiglia, defeat of the duke of Savoy at, 1693, 657
Marsin, general, commands a division of the French army at the battle of Blenheim, 697; joins his army with that of Villars, 1705, 701
Marston Moor, battle of, July 2, 1644, 465
Martignac, M. de, French Minister; character of his policy, 1181
Martineau, Harriet, success and objects of her political-economy tales, 1258-9
Martinique surrendered to the British, 1762, 845
Mary, queen of England, born 1516, refuses to acknowledge the validity of her mother's divorce, 265; refuses to accede to Edward's request to forbear the use of the mass, 313; bold letter of, to Edward VI., *ib.*; addresses a letter to the council on the death of her brother, and claims the crown, 317; is joined at Kenninghall by numerous adherents, *ib.*; is proclaimed in London, 318; triumphant arrival of, in London, *ib.*; Northumberland is tried and executed for treason, *ib.*; causes of her being so joyfully received by the people, 319; the coronation of, *ib.*; description of her person, *ib.*; meets her first parliament, and passes an Act for repealing certain treasons, and the penalties for denying the king's supremacy, *ib.*; repeal of Acts of Edward VI relating to religion, 320; projected marriage of, to Philip of Spain, and dissatisfaction of the people, *ib.*; arrival of ambassadors to arrange terms, *ib.*; insurrection of sir Thomas Wyat against the marriage, *ib.*;

courage and address shown by Mary on the occasion, 321; the populat on of London arm in her behalf, 322; Wyat is defeated, *ib.*; lord Guilford Dudley and lady Jane Grey beheaded, *ib.*; execution of Suffolk and numerous others, 323; trial and acquittal of sir Nicholas Throckmorton, *ib.*; the jury committed to prison, *ib.*; execution of Wyat, *ib.*; the princess Elizabeth sent for to court, *ib.*; is committed to the Tower, *ib.*; letter of Elizabeth to, *ib.*; the Spanish ambassador urges her trial and execution, 324; unquiet condition of the country, *ib.*; fiery zeal of Gardiner to suppress the Reformation, *ib.*; the married clergy expelled from their livings, *ib.*; Cranmer, Latimer, and Ri ley condemned as heretics at Oxford, *ib.*; arrival of Philip, of Spain, *ib.*; marriage of, with Philip, and pageantry on the occasion, *ib.*; bribery exercised by Philip, 325; arrival in England of cardinal Pole, *ib.*; he absolves the realm, *ib.*; submission of the parliament to the papal see *ib.*; the statutes against heretics revived, *ib.*; the Marian persecution, 326; list of Protestant victims, *ib.*; cardinal Pole exhorts to gentleness, but gives a commission to Gardiner, Bonner, and others, to deal with heretics then in prison, *ib.*; encouragement of the spy-system for the discovery of heresy, 329; Philip leaves England, 331; discontent of Mary at his not returning, *ib.*; opposition of the parliament to pope Paul IV.'s claims of supremacy, *ib.*; Dr. Dee in trouble for casting the nativities of the queen and the princess Elizabeth, 332; the Dudley conspiracy for robbing the exchequer, and placing Elizabeth on the throne, *ib.*; its discovery, and execution of the conspirators, *ib.*; Elizabeth suspected of participation, and her letter to the queen, *ib.*; cardinal Pole created archbishop of Canterbury, *ib.*; his moderation not satisfactory to the Pope, *ib.*; Philip returns to England, March, 1557, *ib.*; war declared against France at Philip's instigation, 333; the English forces assist in winning the battle of St. Quentin, *ib.*; Calais besieged and taken by the French, on Jan. 7, 1558, 334; Guisnes and Hammes taken, and the English wholly expelled from France, *ib.*; her last illness and death, on Nov. 17, 1558, *ib.*

Mary, daughter of James II., marries the prince of Orange, in 1677, 560; proclaimed queen with William, 599; coronation of, with her husband, April 11, 1689, 626; asks the princess Anne what she means by applying to parliament to increase her income, 634; appointed regent in William's absence, 636; her energetic conduct in retrieving the disaster of Beachy Head, June, 1690, 639; quarrels with her sister Anne, 650; addresses a dispatch to the commanders of the fleet; enthusiasm caused on its being read, 651; joins in the national gratitude by making a gift of the royal palace of Greenwich as an asylum for the disabled mariners of England, 652; issues proclamations for the discovery of seditious libellers, and for the apprehension of highwaymen, 653; her reply to the deputation requesting an inquiry into the naval miscarriages, 657; she is taken dangerously ill at Kensington, 660; her conduct highly praised by William; her fortitude and resignation in illness, *ib.*; dies of the small-pox, Dec 28, 1694, in her 33 l year; her character and burial, *ib.*

Mary, queen of Scotland, born Dec. 7, 1542, 281; Henry VIII. negotiates a marriage between her and his son Edward, *ib.*; the project defeated by the queen-mother and cardinal Beaton, 282; the duke of Somerset endeavors to enforce the treaty, 302; is contracted in marriage to the dauphin of France, 309; the marriage solemnized in Paris, 1558, 333; becomes queen of France on the accession of her husband Francis II., in 1559, 337; assumes the royal arms of England, *ib.*; refuses to ratify the treaty of Edinburgh in 1560, 340; answer of, to Throckmorton on being urged to sign it, *ib.*; her husband, Francis II., dies, Dec 6, 1.60, *ib.*; lord James Murray sent as ambassador to request her return to Scotland, *ib.*; policy of, towards Elizabeth, *ib.*; indignation of, at being refused a safe conduct, 341; imprudent avowal of her hatred of John Knox, *ib.*; farewell of, to France, *ib.*; arrival and reception of, in Scotland, Aug. 19, 1561, 342; contrasted with Elizabeth, *ib.*; summons Knox before her for preaching against her marriage with a papist prince, 343; writes to the council of Trent, that if she succeeded to the throne of England she would bring both kingdoms under the apostolic see, *ib.*; lord Robert Dudley recommended as a husband by Elizabeth, *ib.*; continued efforts of, to be declared successor to the crown of England, 344; marries Henry, lord Darnley, July 29, 156), *ib.*; Murray revolts unsuccessfully, and takes refuge in England; discontent of the reforming nobles at the marriage, 345; suppresses the revolt, and banishes the insurgent lords, *ib.*; rise of Riccio, *ib.*; joins the league of Catherine de Medici and the duke of Alva for the extermination of Protestantism in Europe, 346; jealousy of Darnley, *ib.*; quarrels with the queen, and unites with the Reformers, *ib.*; murder of Riccio, *ib.*; described by the English ambassadors, *ib.*; gives birth to a son, June 19, 1566, 370; amicable relations with England established, and Elizabeth becomes godmother to James, *ib.*; Bothwell becomes Mary's adviser, *ib.*; she visits Darnley when sick, and has him removed to Kirk of Field, near Edinburgh, 347; the house is blown up, and Darnley murdered, 348; undoubted guilt of Bothwell, *ib.*; his mock-trial and acquittal, *ib.*; is carried off by pretended force by Bothwell, *ib.*; and is married to him, *ib.*; the nobles revolt against the marriage, and she surrenders to them at Carbery Hill, on June 18, 1567, 349; carried prisoner Lochleven, *ib.*; is compelled to abdicate on July 24, in favor of her son, James VI., *ib.*; Murray is proclaimed regent, *ib.*; question as to the authenticity of the letters to Bothwell attributed to her, 350; escapes from Lochleven, *ib.*; romantic circumstance of, *ib.*; assembles forces, fights, and loses, the battle of Langsyde, May 16, 1568, *ib.*; takes refuge in England, 351; question as to the justice of her detention *ib.*; is removed to Bolton Castle, and is indignant at being considered a prisoner, 351; conference appointed to hear the charges against her, *ib.*; proceedings of the conferences at York and London, 352; placed under the care of the Earl of Shrewsbury, *ib.*; project for the marriage of, to the duke of Norfolk, *ib.*; is removed from Tutbury Castle to Coventry, 353; intrigues of Philip of Spain and the Romar. Catholics in favor of, 354; plan for giving her up to her own subjects to be punished, 358; insecurity of, *ib.*; alleged complicity of, in Babington's conspiracy, 361; is transferred to Fotheringay, and her papers are seized, *ib.*; a commission issued for her trial at Fotheringay, 362; proceedings on the trial, 363; and judgment against, *ib.*; conflicting opinions on the judgment, *ib.*; proclamation is made of the judgment, and she is excluded from all claim to the crown of England, 364; the warrant of execution is issued, *ib.*; is refused a confessor, 365; is beheaded at Fotheringay, on Feb 8, 1587, 366

Marylebone church built by Hardwick, 1144

Masham, Mrs., becomes a favorite of Queen Anne's, 1708, 715; contrives a secret correspondence between Anne and Mr. Harley, 716; obtains the ascendency in Queen Anne's confidence, 724; keeper of the privy purse, 1711, 725

Mas-achusetts Bay Government Regulation Bill passed, 1774, 871

Massacres of September, 1792, in Paris, 980

Massena, Andrew, barbarity of, 696; a general in Bonaparte's army, 1011; commands the French sent to pillage Berne, 1798; obtains a large share of the booty, 1020; baffled in driving the English out of Portugal, 1810, 1079; Almeida surrenders to, Aug. 16, *ib.*; loses the battle of Busaco, Sept. 27, *ib.*; sufferings of his army, 1080; retreats into Spain, 1082

Matilda, daughter of Henry I., married in 1114 to the emperor of Germany, 72; becomes a widow in 1124, 73; named successor to the crown of England in 1126, *ib.*; marries Fulk, earl of Anjou, in 1127, *ib.*; her son Henry born in 1133, *ib.*; arrives in England to assert her claim to the crown; is besieged in Arundel Castle, but allowed by Stephen to join the earl of Gloucester at Bristol, 77; after the battle of Lincoln is proclaimed queen in 1141, 78; revolt of the Londoners against, *ib.*; escapes to Devizes, *ib.*; besieged in Oxford, and escapes, 79; leaves England, *ib.*

Mauritius acquired by the English, 1810, 1169

Maury, abbé, advocates for the proprietary rights of the clergy, 967

Maximilian, the emperor, concludes a treaty with Henry VIII. against Louis XII. of France, 229; takes military service under Henry, *ib.*; leads the charge at the battle of Spurs, *ib.*; dies 1519, 231

Maximus, assists Theodosius in repulsing the Picts and Scots in the r invasion of Britain, 17; proclaimed emperor of Britain, *ib.*; leads a British army into Gaul, is defeated, and put to death, A.D. 388, *ib.*

Mayence surrenders to the king of Prussia, July 22, 1793, 996

Maynooth College, grant to, proposed, 1274; stormy debate on the measure, *ib.*; finally carried, *ib.*

Meadows, General, commands the British army in the Carnatic; takes Severndroog and Octradroog, 989

Meanee, battle of, Feb. 17, 1843, 1267

Mechanics' Institution of London, inaugurated by Dr. Birkbeck, 1823, 1174

Meehudpore, battle of, Dec. 21, 1817, 1170

Mer Cossein. See Cossein.

Meer Jaffier. See Jaffier.

Mehemet Ali, pasha of Egypt, invades Syria, thereby involving himself in war with Mahmoud; his successes and aggrandizing views, 1241; compelled to submit to the terms proposed by Britain, 1244

Melas, General, drives back Moreau, 1030; drives the French from Nice; prepares to battle Bonaparte; defeated at Marengo, June, 1800; concludes an armistice, 1034

Melbourne, W. Lamb, viscount, chief secretary for Ireland, 1828, 1173; resigned the same year, 1176; home secretary, 1187; speech in the debate on secondary punishments, 1204; his difficulty in forming a ministry according to the king's plan; ultimate formation of his ministry, 1834, 1213; sudden dismissal, 1214; ostensible cause of his dismissal, *ib.*; not brought about by any act of the ministry, *ib.*; his amendment on the address, 1215; first lord of the treasury, 1835, 1217, 1274; exclusion of Lord Brougham from his ministry, 1217; his reply to Lord Lyndhurst's hostile speech, 1220; denies having made a compact with the O'Connell party, *ib.*; his eulogy on William IV., 1223; first lord of the treasury, 1232; proposes the suspension of the Jamaica constitution for five years; his proposition carried, 1237; his ministry resigns, but again returns to power, *ib.*; adopts free-trade opinions, 1244

Melcombe See Doddington.

Melfort, earl of, his letters to Balcarres intercepted and read before the Convention, 630

Melrose Abbey, foundation of, 76

Melville, Henry Dundas, lord; lord advocate of Scotland, supports the opposition party, 899; declares that Lord Chatham never advocated reform, 902; supports Pitt, 953; opposes the hostile motion against the ministry, 1784, *ib.*; recalls Earl Gower, the ambassador at Paris, 980; urges Loughborough to decide as to taking the great seal, 985; secretary of state, delivers the king's message about seditious practices to the Commons, 1002; praises the British humanity shown at Howe's victory, 1794, 1005; his conference with the king on the Catholic question, and the Coronation oath, 1026; succeeded in his secretaryship by Lord Hobart, *ib.*; first lord of the admiralty, 1048, 1148; implicated on a charge of tampering with the public money, vote of censure passed against him, resigns, 1805, 1048; progress of the motion for impeaching him, *ib.*; his acquittal, June 12, 1806, 1057; home secretary, 1791 1794; war and colonial secretary, 1794-1801, 1325; retires from the admiralty, 1165

Menai suspension bridge built by Telford, 1144

Mendicity of London in 1815, 1816,

Menin taken by Marlborough, Aug. 22, 1706, 706

Menou, general in chief of the interior, unable to suppress the Lepelletier section revolt, 1009; superseded by Barras, *ib.*; succeeds Kleber in the command of the French army in Egypt, 1038; his charge at the British, 1801; beaten back by the Highlanders, *ib.*

Methodism, rise of; its professors produce a reformation in the English manners; characters of its leaders and originators, Whitefield and Wesley; Wesleyism; the Cambuslang conversions, 947

Metnuen, British ambassador at the Portuguese court, concludes the Methuen treaty, 692; his account of the battle of Almanza, 713; secretary of state, 1716; resigns, 769

Methuen treaty, terms of the, with Portugal, 1703, 845; annulled, 1835, 1225

Milan entered by the French, 1796, 1011

Milan decree issued by Bonaparte, Dec., 1807, 1067

Militia bill passed, 1756, 832

Miller, J., a printer. See Onslow colonel.

Milton, John, embodiment of early English legends by, 3; his description of London at the commencement of the civil war, 451; publishes his "Iconoclastes," in reply to the "Icon Basiliké," 491; appointed Latin secretary to the Council of State, *ib.*; his death, and warning of, against slavery, 559; see Addison, 739

Minden, battle of, Aug. 1, 1759, 839

Mines. See copper, coal, lead, tin, etc.

Mines in Britain, under the Romans, notice of, remains of iron works yet existing, 12

Minorca taken by the English, 1708, 716; surrendered to the French, 1756, 830; restored to England 1763, 845; surrendered to the French, 1782, 899; ceded to Spain by Great Britain, 907

Minto, lord, governor-general of India, 1168; quells the mutiny at Madras, and other places, *ib.*; acquisition of the eastern archipelago; other acts of his administration, *ib.*; resigns, 1813, *ib.*; first lord of the admiralty, 1169

Mirabeau, comte de, bold speech of, at a meeting of the National Assembly, 1789; moves for an address to the king for the removal of the troops, 962; prevents the National Assembly from assuming the power to declare war, 964; named president of the National Assembly, Jan., 1791; endeavors to secure order, and curb violent measures; negotiates with Marie Antoinette; his services paid for by Louis; his character and unwearied energy, 969; death of, April 2, 1791; burial at the Pantheon; disinterred, 1793, 969; advocates the king's veto, 974

Moira, lord, his severe measures toward deserters, 892; gains a battle near Camden, 896; sets out to aid the Vendeans, but arrives too late, 1001; governor-general of India, Oct. 4, 1813, 1169; obtains permission to war against the Pindarees on a huge scale, *i.*; the campaign, *ib.*; breaks up the Mahratta confederacy, 1170; rules issued by, for regulating the newspaper press in India, 1171

Molesworth, sir William, remarks of, on Canadian affairs, 1232

Molwitz, battle of, April 10, 1741, 796

Mona (Anglesey), the isle of, taken by Suetonius, 8

Monastic establishments, magnificence and riches of, *temp.* Henry VII., 222

Money, value of, in the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I., 109; scarcity of, during the wars of the Roses, 181; laborers to be paid in, and truck forbidden by statute in 1465, 183; money prices of clothing in 1450-1485, 184; debasement of the coin in 1464, 195; altered value of, in 1547, 287; debasement of coin by Henry VIII. and Edward VI., 293; rise of prices occasioned by the influx of the precious metals, 387; a debased brass coinage issued by James II. in 1689, 633; depreciated state of coinage in 1695, 662; guineas rise to thirty shillings apiece, *ib.*; extensive circulation of clipped, 663; a new coinage issued and the old collected by government in payment of taxes, *ib.*; remarkable scarcity of, 1696, 666; the government refuses to restore the proper standard of; the currency of the new coinage established, 697; want of, caused by the South Sea scheme, 774; Wood's copper coinage for Ireland; Swift's letters causes the patent to be withdrawn, 777; depreciation of the American currency, 1779, 888; suspension of cash payments by the Bank of England, Feb., 1797; currency of cash almost superseded by that of paper, 1013; the panic in 1797, funds fall to 47, 1016; reduction in the circulating medium, and rise in the value of, 1116; state of the currency, 1816, 1130; the panic of 1825, 1162; the panic of 1847, 1283

Monk, George (duke of Albemarle), left by Cromwell to manage affairs in Scotland, 499; conduct of, in Scotland, 528; Charles endeavors to engage him on his side, *ib.*; resolves to restore the parliament, 528; sends commissioners to London to negotiate with the army, *ib.*; marches to London, 529; is employed by the parliament to quell the disaffection in the city, 530; causes the secluded members to be restored, *ib.*; promises sir A. Haslerig to oppose the setting-up of Charles Stuart as king, *ib.*; agrees to act for Charles, 531; suppresses the insurrection of Lambert, *ib.*; receives the king on his landing at Dover, 533 produces private letters from the marquis of Argyle to procure his conviction, 539; appointed to the command of the fleet against the Dutch with Prince Rupert, 545; meets their superior fleet unexpectedly, but fights obstinately for four days, *ib.*; ravages the Dutch coast, 546; commands the forces sent against

the Duke of Monmouth in 1685, but is forced to retreat, 581
Monkton, General, falls in attacking Quebec, 839
Monmouth, duke of, connives at the mutilation of sir John Coventry, 555; pretensions of, to legitimacy, 564; marriage of, to the duchess of Buccleugh, *ib.*; the king solemnly affirms his legitimacy, *ib*; is sent to take the command of the army against the Covenanters, 567; defeats them at Bothwell Bridge on June 22, 1679, *ib.*; returns suddenly to England to attend the sick-bed of Charles, and is considered as a rival for the succession, 568; is sent to Flanders, *ib.*; returns to England, and is received with great joy, *ib.*; is made by the Whigs the Protestant candidate for the crown, 569; his triumphant progress in the West of England, *ib.*; dissatisfaction of, at the acquittal of Count Königsmark for the murder of Tayne, 574; accused of a participation in the Rye House Plot in 1683, *ib.*; he escapes, *ib.*; is pardoned, 576; lands at Lyme in 1685, 580; publishes a declaration against James II., *ib.*; is very favorably received at Taunton, 581; proclaims himself king, *ib.*; marches to Bristol, *ib.*; fails in receiving support, and retreats, *ib.*; skirmish at Philip's-Norton, *ib.*; battle of Sedgemoor, 582; the flight and capture of, *ib.*; abject behavior of, in his interview with James, 583; execution of, *ib.*; considered by the people as a martyr for the Protestant religion, *ib.*
Monnet, gen., commander of Flushing; cuts dikes to drive away the British, 1809, 1075
Mons besieged and taken by the French, 1691, 643
Monson, col., a member of the council at Calcutta, opposes Hastings, 948; his death, *ib.*
Montague, Charles. See Halifax, earl of.
Montcalm, marquis de, commander of the French troops in Canada, 1759; attacks Wolfe on the heights of Abraham, Sept. 13; is defeated; and mortally wounded; died Sept. 14, 983
Montenotte battle of, April 12, 1796. 1011
Monte Video. See Auchmuty, 1063
Montfort, Jane de, heroic defence of the castle of Hennebon; is relieved by sir Walter Manny, 136
Montfort, Simon de, earl of Leicester, attends the parliament at Westminster in 1258, 111; nominated head of the council, *ib.*; is forced to withdraw to France, *ib.*; character of, *ib.*; returns to England, and a civil war takes place, *ib.*; wins the battle of Lewes, and takes Henry III. prisoner, *ib.*; burgesses summoned to parliament in 1264 by, *ib.*; is defeated and slain at the battle of Evesham, 112; prohibition of holding him for a saint, 113; continued resistance offered by his sons, who murder the nephew of Henry, *ib.*
Montgomery, Richard, general in the American army, invades Canada, 1775; killed in an attack upon Quebec, Dec. 31, 1023
Montjuich. See Peterborough.
Montrevel, marshal de, unable to subdue the Camisards, 1703; superseded by marshal Villars, 691
Montrose, James Graham, marquis of, victories of, in Scotland in 1645, 467; influence of his letter containing an account of these victories upon Charles I., *ib.*; advice of, to Charles I., *ib.*; defeats the Covenanting army under Baillie, 470; defeated at Philiphaugh by Lesley, *ib.*; counsels Charles II. to win his kingdom by battle, 493; who gives him a commission to do so, 496; lands in the Orkneys, March, 1650, *ib.*; defeated by Colonel Strachan at Craigchouichen, *ib.*; wanders among the Highlands, and is taken on May 3, *ib.*; exultation of the Covenanters at his capture, *ib.*; sentenced to death, *ib.*; ill-treatment of, at Edinburgh, *ib.*; conduct of, before parliament and at his execution, *ib.*; character of, by Clarendon, 497
Montserrat taken by the French, 899; restored to England, 907
Moore, sir John, takes Wexford, June 21, 1798, 1024; appointed to command 11,000 men in the Peninsula; his mortification at being made subordinate to sir H. Dalrymple, and sir H. Burrard. 1069; commences his march into Spain, Oct. 1808; his progress through the country to Sahagun; commences a retreat; pursued by Napoleon, Dec. 24, 1070; halts at Lugo, *ib.*; marches to Corunna; defeat of the French there, Jan. 16, 1809; death of, 1071; his burial; *ib.*; opinions on his retreat, *ib.*; sufferings of his army, *ib.*
Morcar and Edwin, insurrection of, suppressed by William the Conqueror, 58; join Hereward, and death of Edwin, 60; imprisonment of Morcar, *ib.*
Mordaunt, sir John, has joint command of the Rochefort expedition, 1757; acquitted by court-martial, 980
More, Hannah, rejoices at the fall of the Bastile, 966; her writings, 1139
More, sir Thomas, unsuccessfully attempts to prevent the riot on "Evil May-Day," in 1517, 236; is chosen speaker of the House of Commons, in 1523, 236; is created lord chancellor in 1529, and speaks harshly against Wolsey, 245; opposes the doctrines of the Reformers, 246; lays before parliament the opinion of the universities in favor of Henry's divorce, but is himself against it, 248; retires from the chancellorship, 251; doubts whether he sanctioned the burning of John Baynham in May, 1532, *ib.*; official character of, *ib.*; implicated in the charge of conspiracy against the king with the Holy Maid of Kent, 255; is committed to the Tower with Fisher, bishop of Rochester, for refusing to swear to the illegality of the king's first marriage, 256; tried for treason, convicted, and executed on July 6, 1535, 258
Moreau, J. V., serves in Jourdan's army, 1006; appointed to command the army of the Rhine and the Moselle, 1796, 1010; failure of his campaign; his retreat through the Black Forest to Strasbourg, 1012; beaten back by gen. Melas; defeated, 1799, 1030; campaign of, in Germany, 1800, 1035; victory of Hohenlinden gained by, Dec. 3, *ib*; conspires against Bonaparte, 1804; exiled, 1046; takes part in the battle of Dresden against Napoleon, in which he is wounded; death of, 1090
Morgan, gen., defeats Tarleton at Cowpens, Jan. 17, 1781, 1043; joins his forces with Greene's, *ib.*
Morland, George, the representative of his day in animal painting, 1147
Mornington, earl of. See Wellesley, marquess of.
Morpeth, lord, his eulogy on Francis Horner, 1817, 1127; votes for Sutton as speaker of the House of Commons, 1833, 1202; moves an amendment for reform in the address, 1835, 1215; secretary for Ireland, 1224
Mortemart, duke de, his audience with Charles X.; promises extorted by, from the king, 1830, 1183
Mortimer, Roger. See Edward II. and Edward III.
Mortmain, statute of, passed, 7 Edwd. I., 115
Moscow, entry of the French into, Sept. 14, 1812; the conflagration of; evacuated by the French, Oct. 19, 1068
Mounier, president of the French Assembly; obtains the king's consent to the articles of the constitution, 965
Mountcashel, viscount. See Macarthy.
Mountfort, William, a player, murder of, by Hill, 655
Mountjoy, lord, sent by Tyrconnel on a mission to James II. at St. Germains; on his arrival there he was put into the Bastile, 626
Mourad Bey heads the Mamlooks; defeated by the French at the battle of the Pyramids, 1798, 1020
Muir, Thomas, sentenced to transportation for advocating a reform in the representation of the people, 1794, 1002
Municipal corporation reform, 1217-19; report of the commission of inquiry showing the generally corrupt state of the corporations, 1217-18; passing of Lord Russell's reform bill through parliament, 1218; it receives the royal assent, Sept. 9, 1835, 1219; departing glories of municipal pomp, *ib.*; bill for corporation reform in Ireland; opposed by the Lords; passed by the Commons, Mar. 28, 1836, *ib.*
Municipalities, character of those established by the Romans in Britain, 15; form of government, in, *ib.*
Munro, sir Hector, major; defeats an Indian army, 869; compelled to retreat before Hyder Ali, 950
Murat, Joachim, helps Bonaparte in suppressing the revolt of the sections in Paris, May, 1795, 1009; assists Kleber against a Mussulman army, 1029; with Leclerc clears the Assembly, Nov., 1031; seizes Godoy, and sends him to Bonaparte, 1803, 1069; king of Naples, 1081; deserts Napoleon for the allies, 1110; his entering into a correspondence with the ex-emperor hastens his fall, *ib.*
Murray, lord George, obtains the king's pardon for joining the rebellion of 1715, 767; joins Charles Edward, 1745, 803; takes part in the battle at Preston-Pans, Sept. 22, 804; quarrels with the duke of Perth, 808; his tactics in approaching Derby, 808; he convinces Charles of the uselessness of advancing farther into England; persuades him to retreat to Scotland, 809; his able and creditable management of the retreat from Derby, 811; halts at Clifton, *ib.*; securing the army's retreat by stemming the tide of the pursuing enemy; reaches Carlisle; represents to Charles that his troops could not hold the place, 812; signs an address to the prince showing the desertions in the Highland army, 814; leads the Highlanders to the attack of Cumberland's camp; but finds a surprise impracticable, 815
Murray, James, earl of, sent as ambassador to France to request the return of queen Mary, 340; with other reformers revolts against Mary's marriage with Darnley, 344; is forced to fly to England, 345; returns to Edinburgh on the death of Riccio. 347; is proclaimed regent after Mary's abdication, 350; defeats Mary at the battle of Langsyde, *ib.*; accuses Mary of the murder of Darnley at the conference in London, 352; favors Norfolk's project of marrying Mary, 352; is assassinated in Jan., 1570, 353
Murray, William. See Mansfield, earl of.
Musgrave, sir Christopher; a leader of the opposition party, 1693; bribes received by, 655
Mutiny bill, an important part of the government; first passed 1689, 325
Mutiny at Ipswich, 1689, 625; at Spithead, 1797, 1015; at the Nore, *ib.*; at Vellore, 1806, 1056; and at Madras, 1809, 1168
Muttra, battle of, 1803, 1054
Mylne, Richard, architect of Blackfriars bridge, 935

Nadin, unable to apprehend the leaders of the reform meeting at Manchester, 1819, 1133
Nagpore, rajah of, joins the Mahratta confederacy against the British, 1169; defeated by the British, *ib.*
Nairn, William, lord, impeached of high treason, tried and sentenced to death, 1716, 766; reprieved, *ib.*; released from prison by an act of grace passed, 1717, 770
Namur, siege and capture of, by the French, June 30, 1692, 652; besieged by the allies, 1695, 661; and taken Aug. 26, 662
Nankin, treaty of, Aug. 29, 1842, 1226-1248
Nantes, revocation of the edict, 584; effect of, in France, as described by Burnet, *ib.*
Napier, sir C. James, major, taken prisoner at Corunna, 1809, 1070; a benefactor of his race. 1266; his march on, and destruction of, Emaun-Ghur, 1267; gains the battle of Meanee, *ib.*; Hyderabad surrenders to him; he defeats and quells Shere Mahomed, and becomes the governor of Scinde. *ib.*
Napier, sir C. John, his services under admiral Stopford in the campaign in Egypt and Syria, 1840, 1243
Napoleon, comparison of his intended invasion of Britain, with that of Caligula, 7
Napoleon III. of France, son of Louis Bonaparte, king of Holland; Louis Philippe's fear of him, 1222; his futile revolutionary attempt at Strasbourg, 1836, *ib.*; sent to America by Louis Philippe; escapes to Switzerland; Louis compelling his extradition from thence, he withdraws to England, 1223; crosses the Channel to Boulogne, 1241; fails to produce an insurrection, 1242; surrenders; is imprisoned, *ib.*; tried. *ib.*; sentenced to imprisonment for life in Ham fortress; but escapes, *ib.*; elected President of the French Republic, 1848, 1286
Naseby, battle of, June 14, 1645, 468
Nash, Beau, master of the ceremonies at Bath; his rule, 940; suppresses duelling at Bath, 941
Nash, John, his architural works, Regent Street, Park, and Canal, 1144
Nasmyth, his landscape painting, 1147
National Debt, commencement of the, 1693, 654; its growth, *ib.*, 773; reduction of the interest on the, 821; increase of the, 1755-1763, 845; table showing its growth, 1691-1792, 911, 1321; fears of ruin from its increase, 1225; growth of, 1793-1815, 1225, 1322; 1816-1837, *ib.*
Navarino, news of the battle of, received in London, 1172; it occurred, Oct. 20, 1827, *ib.*
Navigation act obstructs the Scottish trade, 694; suspension of the navigation laws, 1282
Navy, difficulty of manning the, 881; corruption prevalent in the, 944; the British and French navies, 1793, 991; state of the, 1793, 1004; discontents and mutinies in the, 1797, 1015; number of men voted for the, 1802, 1041; the British navy of 1812, 1098; its glory departed, *ib.*; restored again by the Shannon and Chesapeake conflict, *ib.*
Necker, James, controller-general of finance, 958; dismissed the post, May, 1781, *ib.*; recalled to it again, 1789, 960; again dismissed, July, 1789, 962
Neerwinden. See Landen.
Neerwinden, battle of, Mar. 18, 1793. 993
Nelson, Horatio, post-captain, 1793; present at the surrender of Toulon to lord Hood. 998; his daring achievement of the capture of Bastia, Corsica, 1794, 1007; commodore; joins admiral Jervis's fleet; disobeys his superior officer; engages, with the assistance of Troubridge and Collingwood, several of the enemy's vessels at the battle of St. Vincent, Feb. 14, 1797, 1014; his desperate condition; gallantry shown in boarding and taking the San Nicolas and San Josef; his name not noticed in Jervis's despatches, *ib.*; made a knight of the Bath, 1015; watches the movements of the Toulon fleet, 1020; appointed to command a Mediterranean fleet, 1798, *ib.*; he misses the French fleet, sails to Alexandria, and returns to Sicily, *ib.*; refused supplies by the Neapolitans; obtains them through his interview with lady Hamilton; again sets out for Alexandria, 1021; position of the French fleet, Aug. 1; Nelson's manœuvres, *ib.*; the conflict; Nelson wounded; his heroism; the French flag-ship, L'Orient, on fire; the awful silence succeeding the explosion; returns to Naples; his injunctions for rejoicing, 1022; vice-admiral under sir Hyde Parker, 1801, 1037; opposes his admiral's arguments for delay; his approach to Copenhagen, *ib*; the battle of Copenhagen, April 2, *ib.*; disregards Parker's signals to stop fighting, *ib.*; concludes an armistice, 1038; fails in cutting the armed flotilla out of Boulogne harbor, 1039; appointed to command the Mediterranean fleet; his letter to the lord mayor, 1049; his chase after the combined fleet, *ib.*; worn out with anxiety he returns home, *ib.*; offers his services against Villeneuve; preparations, *ib*; enthusiastic reception at Portsmouth, 1050; his last farewell to England; sets down before Cadiz; his system of breaking the line; the enemy in sight, *ib.*; his preparations for battle, *ib.*; his victory, Oct. 21, 1805; his death, *ib.*; the nation's grief; the funeral, 1051
Nepaul, war with, 1813-1816; its results, 1169
Nero, attempts of, to reconcile the revolted tribes after the defeat of Boadicea, 9
Nevill's Cross, battle of, won by queen Philippa, in 1346, and David Bruce taken prisoner, 139
Newburn, battle of, on Aug. 27, 1640, 435.
Newbury, battle of, on Sept. 19, 1643, 462; second battle of, on Oct. 27, 1644, 466
New England, foundation of the colony of, in 1620, by the Pilgrim Fathers, 407
Newcastle, duke of, entertains William III. at Welbeck, 1695, 662; made lord privy seal, 1705, 705; captain Jenkins reports to him his ill-treatment by the Spaniards, but receives no redress, 791; his jealousy of Walpole, 793; helps his brother, Mr. Pelham, in the administration; his talent for electioneering business, 819; becomes jealous of the duke of Bedford, 823; gets him turned out of the office of secretary of state, *ib.*; becomes first lord of the treasury at his brother's death, 1754; his claims to the post, 825; character of; offers Fox the seals of secretary of state, who refuses them, *ib.*; Pitt's and Fox's opposition; the latter obtains a seat in the Cabinet, 826; becomes terrified at the opposition to the subsidies; applies to Pitt for help, who refuses it, 829; opposing the ministry in a speech in parliament; Pitt is dismissed his office of paymaster, *ib.*; placed at the head of the ministry, *ib.*; Fox resigns his seals, and Newcastle, having no support, 832, also resigns, *ib.*; George again offers him the administration of affairs; refuses to act with Pitt, 833; but ultimately consents; first lord of the treasury, 834; supports Bute, 843; retires from the treasury, June, 1762, 844; becomes privy seal, 1765, 852; secretary of state, 1746-1754, 1324; first lord of the treasury, 1754-1756, 865, 1324; 1757-1762, 866
Newcastle, duke of, his interference with the Newark election complained of, 1179-4 proceedings against, *ib.*; his remarks on the Reform bill, 1198
Newfoundland ceded to Great Britain, 1713, 735
Newmarket, races held at, *temp.* William III., 612
New Orleans, attack on, by the British, 1814, 1815. 1101
Newspapers; first beginning of the newspaper press,

620; the newspapers, 1709, 1742, 737; eagerness for, 1745, 807; provincial papers badly conducted about 1757, 836; the newspapers, 1737-1783, 935; number of American, 1775, and 1810, 1096; of London in Crabbe's time; *The Times* first assumed the name, 1788, 1135; *The Times* of Nov. 28, 1818, the first sheet of paper printed by steam, 1141; increased circulation o., due to the steam-printing machine, *ib.*; violence and ribaldry of, during Queen Caroline's trial in 820, 1152; the newspapers of India; their regulation by government, 1171; case of Mr. Buckingham proprietor of *The Calcutta Journal*, *ib.*; royal ordinance against the liberty of the French press, 1820, 1182; the protest of the newspaper conductors, *ib.*; stamp on, reduced, 1836, 1221-7; altered character of, 1842, 1260

Newton, sir Isaac, as master of the mint he succeeds in establishing an adequate supply of circulating medium, 663; statue of, by Roubiliac, 756; declares Wood's Irish coinage satisfactory, 777.

New on-Butler, battle of, 1689, 628

New York evacuated by the Americans, Sept. 15, 1776, 879

Ney, Michael, marshal, serves in Jourdan's army, 1006; defeats the Austrians at Elchingen and Guntzburg, 1805, 1050; defeated at Dennewitz, 1813, 1090; deserts Louis XVIII. for Napoleon, 1815, 1104; executed on the return of Louis to power, 1111

Nicholls, sir George; his letters on the Poor Laws; his poor law reforms at Southwell, 1210; appointed a poor law commissioner, 1834, 1211; and to initiate the working of the poor law in Ireland, 1234

Nile, battle of the, Aug. 1, 1798, 1021

Nimeguen, peace of, Aug. 11, 1678, 732; surrendered to the French, 1794, 1007

Nipchoo, treaty of, ratified June 14, 1728, 733

Nithisdale, William, earl of, impeached of high treason, 1716; tried and found guilty; his wife vainly petitions the king to pardon him; she effects his escape to France, 766

Nizam. See Deccan.

Nollekens, Joseph, his sculpturing, 934, 1145

Nonconformists, rise and growth of, in the second half of the reign of Elizabeth; notice of the Ma prelate tracts, 377; objections of, to the ceremonies of the church, *ib.*; preaching in private houses prohibited, *ib.*; statutes against Puritans and Popish recusants in 1593, *ib.*; the nonconformist ministers preach resistance, *ib.*; severities directed against the Brownists or Independents, 378; opposition of the nonconformists to the habits and amusements of society, *ib.*; music and dancing held to be corrupting by, 380; offensiveness of Sabbath sports and games to, *ib.*; denunciations of gaming by, 381; aversion of, to stage plays, 382; petition James I. for a conference with the English clergy, which is held at Hampton Court, 398; James insults and decides against them, *ib.*; a new code of canons, tending to exclude them from civil rights, established in Convocation, 399; settlement of New England in 1620 by the Pilgrim Fathers, 417; increase in the numbers of, from disgust at the principles and conduct of James and his courtiers, 411; offence given to by the proclamation in 1618, for the practice of sports on Sundays, 414; consternation of, at the defeat of the elector palatine and the triumph of Roman Catholicism in Germany, 417; offence given to by Laud's introduction, in 1628, of new ceremonies into the church service; the religious opinions of, identified with the assertion of civil rights, 425; excessive punishment of the Puritan Prynne, for writing against stage-plays, 427; and of Dr. A. Leighton for writing against prelacy, *ib.*; aversion of the Puritans to all dramatic exhibitions, 428; conviction and excessive punishments of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, in 1637, for their anti prelatical writings, 431; triumph of the principles of, on the meeting of the Long Parliament in 1640, 438; great influence of the Puritans at the commencement of the Civil War, 450; the shutting-up of the playhouses and discouragement of popular amusements a consequence of, 451; Baxter's statement of the oppressions of the, by the royalists, 458; increased bitterness of feeling between them and the Cavaliers, 460; the Presbyterian Covenant adopted by the synod at Westminster, and by parliament, 463; growing dissensions between Presbyterians and Independents, *ib.*; struggles between, in the House of Commons, 474; power of the Independents in the army, 475; opinions of the Independents, 476; the position of the Presbyterians and Independents compared with the Girondists and Mountain parties of the French revolution, *ib.*; negotiations of the Independents with the king, 478; the king's deceptive conduct toward them, *ib.*; Cromwell tries to effect a reconciliation between the Presbyterians and Independents, 483; depression of, after the Restoration, 536; insurrection of the Anabaptists in London in April, 1661, 537; ineffective conference at the Savoy between the bishops and the Puritan divines, *ib.*; the Corporation Act and Act of Uniformity passed against, 539; Conventicle Act passed against in 1664, 541; the Five-Mile Act passed against, 544; the penalties of, not enforced against for a short time after the Fire of London, 353; propositions made by, for a union of Protestants, *ib.*; rejected by the parliament, *ib.*; declaration of indulgence by Charles II. in 1672, 557; release of John Bunyan from prison, *ib.*; the Indulgence unpopular among, *ib.*; in 1665 the House of Commons prays James II. to put in execution the laws against all dissenters from the Church of England, 579; the principle of resistance not extinguished in, as shown by their joining Monmouth at Taunton, 581; they generally consider the declaration of James II., in 1687, for liberty of conscience, as a snare, 590

Nonjurors, origin of the, 623; bill against, passed, 624; libellous pamphlets issued by, in 1692, 653

Nore, mutiny at the, 1797, 1016

Norfolk, soil of, 911; agricultural improvements in, promoted by Coke, *ib.*; a seat of the husbandry implement trade, 912; number of persons to every 100 acres in, in 1841, 917

Norman clergy, character of, at the time of William I., 59; nobles, various characters of, and beneficial exertions of some, *ib.*; barons, description of their modes of life in their castles in the time of Stephen, 75

Normanby, marquis of. See Buckingham.

Norris, sir William, sent to desire of Aurungzebe his favor for the new East India Company, 1698, 669; mission failed; dies on his way home, 670

North, Dudley, nominated sheriff by the lord mayor of London, in 1682, in order that he might return partisan jurymen, 572; is rejected by the Common Hall, but ultimately sworn in, 573

North, Frederick, lord, chancellor of the exchequer, 1767-1782, 855, 865, 1325; moves the repeal of the American duty on all articles but tea; his proposition carried, 863; nearly demolished by the mob, 1771, 865; his apology for retaining office, *ib.*; first lord of the treasury 1770-1782, *ib.*; brings in the Boston port bill, 1774, 876; and the Massachusetts bay government regulation bill, *ib.*; his conciliatory measure, 873; his Prohibitory bill, 877; exults at the display of public spirit, 1778; introduces two bills, one on American taxation, the other appointing commissioners to treat with America; fear and astonishment of the House at his submissions and concessions, 884; wishes to resign his premiership on hearing of the peace between France and America, *ib.*; his speech on the address to the king, 887; his amendment on Burke's Economical Reform bill, 889; his consternation and distress at the news of Cornwallis's surrender, 1781, 898; announces the resignation of his premiership, Mar. 20, 1782; the scene in parliament on this occasion, 900; consents to the proposed free trade measures towards Ireland, 902; coalesces with Fox, appointed secretary of State, 1783, 951; ordered to give up his seals by the king, 952; home secretary of state, 1783, 1325

Northampton, battle of, the Lancastrians defeated, July 10, 1460, 192

Northamptonshire, the county of, 913; low state of farming, *ib.*; farmers and laborers, *ib.*

Northmen, or Danes, ravages of, 25

Northumberland, its wretched breed of sheep, and large districts of waste land, 1760-1783, 919; unsettled state of its inhabitants long after the Union; agriculture stimulated by the Culleys and others, *ib.*

Northumberland, Dudley, duke of. See Warwick, earl of.

North-West Company for trading in furs; ultimately united with the Hudson's Bay Company, 614

Norwich Cathedral, foundation of, in 1094, 76

Nottingham, earl of. See Winchelsea.

Nottinghamshire, the oak of Sherwood forest succeeded by turnip and wheat-fields, 914; "the cars" reclaimed, *ib.*

Novels, careless and inaccurate style of, 1255; prevalence of: large numbers published in a serial form, 1257; changed manner in conducting prose fictions as shown in the works of the novel writers, 1258

Nugent, lord, moves for a list of persons holding crown places and pensions, 889; his Irish free trade notions, 903

Nuncomar, an intriguing Hindoo, executed by the British for forgery, 948

Oates, Titus, first revelation of the Popish Plot by, in 1678, 561; is brought before the Council, 562; is examined by the House of Commons, *ib.*; increasing boldness of his accusations, and assertion of the queen having concerted the king's murder, *ib.*; has a pension assigned him by the Commons, 563; fresh convictions on the evidence of, in 1679, 565; payments to and to other witnesses, 566; is a witness against lord Stafford, who is convicted in 1684, 570; contradicts Dugdale on the trial of Stephen College, the "Protestant joiner," and his pension is stopped, 572; is prosecuted for a libel on the duke of York in 1683, and 100,000*l.* damages awarded, 576; is convicted of perjury, and sentenced to be imprisoned, pilloried, and whipped, in 1685, 579; released from prison, pardoned, and pensioned, 1689, 632

O'Brien, Smith, a member of the Irish Confederation; his share in the insurrection of 1848, 1286

Occasional Conformity, bill against; its objects; discussion on; rejected 1702, 540; a new bill introduced, 1703, again rejected, 542; thrown out a third time, 1704, 547; its repeal desired by Stanhope, 1718, 771

Ochterlony, sir David, compels the Ghorka commander, Ameer Singh, to capitulate, 1815, 1169; engages to support the rajah of Bhurtpore, 1171

O'Coigley, arrested and executed, 1797, for conspiring against government, 1024

O'Connell, Daniel, returned M.P. for Clare, who as a Roman Catholic was disqualified from sitting there, 1828, 1176; his great influence over the Irish peasantry, *ib.*; upon taking his seat, 1829, refuses to take the oath of supremacy, claiming that set forth in the Relief act; returned a second time for Clare, and takes his seat, 1178; moves an amendment in the king's speech; coarseness of his language; Stanley's reply to; the amendment rejected, 1203; again attacked by Mr. Stanley, 1205; condemns the appropriation of funds to be sanctioned by the Irish church reform bill, 1206; his speech on the repeal of the Union question, 1834, 1212; his amendment on the Irish tithe bill, 1213; his alleged compact with the Melbourne Whig government, 1220; his efforts to bring about a repeal of the Union, 1265; arrested for conspiring, *ib.*; tried, 1203; found guilty and punished, *ib.*; appeals for a reversal of his sentence, which he obtains; Ireland celebrates his triumph, 1270; loss of his demagogic power, *ib.*; his last parliamentary speech; died May 15, 1847, 1282

O'Connor, Arthur, a member of the Irish Directory, tried for high treason, May, 1797; acquitted, 1024

O'Connor, Feargus, insists upon parliament's testing the repeal question, 1834, 1222; attempts to rouse the people to rebel, 1235; heads the chartist movements of 1848, 1285

Odo, archbishop of Canterbury, revolts against Edwy, and separates him from his wife, 42

Oglethorpe, general, promotes the state of prisons inquiry, 1729, 1730, 780; pursues the retreating army of the rebels, 1745, 812

O'Hara, general, commands the Toulon garrison; wounded; taken prisoner, 1793, 999

Oldcastle, sir John, condemned as a heretic, 163; respited by the king, and escapes, *ib.*; joins in a conspiracy with the Lollards, and is retaken in 1418, and burnt, *ib.*

Oliver, alderman, his share in the arrest of a House of Commons officer, 1771; imprisoned in the Tower, 865

Oliver the Spy acts as government spy against reformers, 1817, 1123

Ormichund engages in a conspiracy to depose Surajah Dowlah; Clive's treachery towards, 834; causes him to die an idiot, 835

Onslow, sir Richard; chosen speaker of the House of Commons, 1708, 717; retires from the speakership, 1761; pensioned, 842

Onslow, colonel, his proceedings against printers for publishing parliamentary debates, 1771, 864

Opium trade, circumstances connected with the, which led to the war with China, 1246

Oporto taken possession of by Soult, Mar. 29, 1809, 1072

Oppian, description of the dogs of Britain by, 5

Orange, prince of. See William III.

Orange, prince of, relieves Charleroi, 1794, 1006; engaged at Waterloo, 1105

Orange, princess of, arrested; her cause espoused by the king of Prussia, 956

Oregon question, settlement of the, 1279

Orford, earl of. See Walpole, Robert; Russell, Adm. Edward.

Orleans, duke of, regent of France; refuses to aid the Pretender against England, 1715, 762; desires England to support his claim to the throne, 768; his lenity towards Alberoni, 771; informs the British government of the proposed Jacobite expedition to Scotland, 1719, 772; and the Jacobite plot of 1722, 776; died, 1723, 778

Orleans, duke of, banished Paris for taking part in a discussion against the court, 1788, 961; assumes the name of Egalité; votes for Louis XVI.'s death, 987; his defence for so doing, *ib.*; imprisoned at Marseilles, 994; executed, Nov. 1793, 1000

Orleans, duke of. See Louis XVIII. of France.

Ormond, marquis of, assembles a force in Ireland in favor of Charles II., 493; besieges Dublin, and is defeated by the garrison, *ib.*; visits London to forward a plot against Cromwell, from whom he receives a hint that he is known, and returns to Bruges, 525; attempt of Blood, Dec. 7, 1670, to seize and hang, 555; the king desires that he should pardon Blood, 555

Ormond, duke of, makes, in conjunction with sir George Rooke, an unsuccessful expedition to Cadiz, 690; put in command of the British forces, 1712; receives secret instructions from the ministry not to hazard a battle, while there was a chance of negotiating peace; besieges Quesnoy; it surrenders, July 4, 734; proclaims an armistice with France; withdraws his forces from the allied army, *ib.*; his march from Ghent to Bruges, 735; impeached of high treason; flies to France; an act of attainder passed against him, 1715, 761; passes from France into Spain, 771; appointed to command a proposed expedition against England, 772

Orrel, captain, his interest at the riots of 1710, 722

Orrery, earl of, arrested, and sent to the Tower, 1722, for conspiring, 776

Orthez, battle of, Feb. 27, 1814, 1092

Osborne, lord S. G., draws attention to the condition of the Dorsetshire laborers, 1230

Ostorius Scapula, defeat of Caractacus by, 8; triumph decreed to, *ib.*; defeat and death of, *ib.*

Otaheite discovered, 1767; visited by Captain Cook, and Bougainville, 990; dispute between France and England as to the national rights over, 1272

Otterbourne, or Chevy Chase, battle of, on Aug. 10, 1388, 154

Otto, M., negotiates the preliminaries of peace, 1801, 1039; remonstrates against the newspaper remarks on Bonaparte, 1041

Oudenarde, battle of, July 11, 1708, 715

Outram, major, British resident at Hyderabad; attacked by the Beloochees, 1267

Oxford, state of, in 1289, 121; parliaments held at. See Charles I. and Charles II.

Oxford university, the members of, preach passive obedience in 1684, 756; Walker, the master of University College, becomes a Roman Catholic, 586, mass celebrated in University College, 587; John Massey installed dean of Christchurch, 588; the king recommends Anthony Farmer, a suspected papist, to be elected president of Magdalen College, *ib.*; the Fellows elect Dr. John Hough, *ib.*; they are cited before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and are expelled, 589

Oxford, his attempt upon the queen's life; acquitted on the ground of insanity; remarks on this acquittal, 1241

Oxford, Robert Harley, earl of, a Tory leader; moves for the disbanding of the troops, Dec. 1798, 679; chosen speaker by the fifth parliament of William III., 1701, 684; speaker of Anne's first parliament,

1702, 690; he is turned out of the ministry by Marlborough and the Whigs, 1708, 714, 715; has private audiences with the queen; commences a system of political intrigue with her, 716; the impeachment of Sacheverel brings him in opposition with Godolphin, 719; his intrigues are successful; Godolphin is dismissed, and himself is made chancellor of the exchequer, 1710, 724; is seriously opposed by the Tories; stabbed by Guiscard, Mar. 8, 1711, at a privy council sitting, 726; which leads to his being made earl of Oxford, and lord high treasurer, and to the establishment of his ministerial influence, 727; carries on a secret negotiation with France for peace, 729; invites Eugene to dinner, 733; quarrels with Bolingbroke; he is dismissed from office, 1714, 736; lord Coningsby impeaches him of high treason, 1715; he is committed to the Tower, 761; upon petitioning for release in 1717 he is put upon trial, and acquitted, but not included in the act of grace passed soon after, 769; his national debt proposal, 773
Oxfordshire, agricultural condition of, 912
Oyster dredging by the ancient Britons, 51

Paget, sir William, appointed by Henry's will one of the sixteen councellors to Edward VI., 301; warns Somerset that the people desire liberty, and urges repressive measures, 307; reproaches Somerset for his too great lenity, 309; despotic principles of, 310; writes to the confederated lords that Somerset is secured, 311; opposes a bill for the punishment of heresy with death, which is thrown out by the peers, 324
Paget, lord. See Anglesea.
Paine, Thomas, author of "The Rights of Man," his early career, 973; invites the Parisians to establish a republic, *ib.*; found guilty of libel in publishing his book, 986; a member of the National Convention of France, *ib.*; votes that Louis XVI. be imprisoned and banished, 988
Pains and Penalties bill passed against two Irish priests, 1723, 776, and against Atterbury, bishop of Rochester, 776; against Queen Caroline introduced, 1820; examination into the evidence; trial of the queen; abandonment of the bill, 1152
Painters in Water Colors, Society of, started 1805, 1147
Painting; celebrated painters in England from Henry VIII.'s time to William III., 756; general decline of portrait painting from Lely to Reynolds, by whom it was restored, 756; low state of the art of, *temp.* George II., 930; formation of the English school of, initiated by Hogarth; idea of a royal academy started by Thornhill previous to 1724; revived in 1749; public exhibition of paintings in 1760, and 1761, the first practical embodiment of the idea, 941; exhibition of designs for sign-boards, *ib.*; sign painters, *ib.*; foundation of the Royal Academy, Dec. 10, 1768, *ib.*; the British Institution established, 1145; the National and Dulwich galleries, *ib.*; rise of water-color painting; Society of Painters in Water-Colors formed 1805, 1147
Pakenham, sir Edward, commands the British army in America, 1814, 1101; his appearance raises the confidence of the army, *ib.*; his advance upon New Orleans, and struggle with general Jackson; organizes an attack upon the enemy, Jan. 7, *ib.*; in which he is mortally wounded, *ib.*
Paley, his high intellectual position among English churchmen, 1139
Palliser, sir Hugh, accuses admiral Keppel of misconduct and incapacity, 886; tried by court martial; acquitted, *ib.*
Palm, German minister in London; disavows the secret articles of the treaty of Vienna; ordered to leave England, 778
Palm, J. P., executed by the French for publishing a certain book, Aug. 26, 1806, 1059
Palmer, Thomas Fyshe, sentenced to transportation for advocating a reform in the representation of the people,
Palmerston, lord, secretary at war, 1809, 1077; 1820, 1148; in the Canning cabinet, 1167; joins the Wellington ministry, 1828, 1173; opposes lord Russell's motion for the repeal of the Corporation and Test acts, 1175; resigns office with Mr. Huskisson and the other Canningites, *ib.*; secretary of state for foreign affairs, 1187, 1224; advocates reform, 1831, 1189; success of his policy towards France, 1241; denies having visited Louis Napoleon for two years previous to 1840; his conversation with Guizot on the fleets of England and France, 1242; absurdly suspected of being in the pay of Russia, 1243; advocates free trade in the debate on the sugar duties, 1244
Pamplona surrendered to the British, Oct. 31, 1813, 1091
Paoli, the Corsican patriot; defends the island against the French, 1768, 865; becoming in exile, he seeks refuge in England, *ib.*; organizes a revolt against the French, 1791, 1007
Paris, entry of the allies and Louis XVIII. into, July, 1815, 1109
Paris, peace of, signed Feb. 10, 1763; its terms, 845, 909; treaty of, May 15, 1796, 1040; peace of, July 20, 1806, 1093; peace of, Jan. 6, 1810, 1094; treaty of, ratified by Napoleon and the allies, April 11, 1814, *ib.*; between France and the allies, May 30, 1815, 1103; peace of, Nov. 20, 1815, 1109, 1224
Parker, Hyde, admiral; engages the Dutch off the Dogger Bank, 1781, 894; commands the fleet against the Danes, 1801, 1037; allows Nelson to fight and win the naval battle of Copenhagen, *ib.*
Parker, Richard, chosen president of the delegates of the mutineers at the Nore, May, 1797; trial and early career; executed at Sandwich, June 30, 1016
Parkyns, sir William, concerned in a conspiracy against William III., 1696, 664; is executed, 665
Parliamentary reform; two attempts at reforming parliament made, 655; Chatham recommends, 880; agitates the public mind, 1780, 888; Pitt's scheme of, proposed, 902, and rejected, 902; his second bill for, produced, 951; rejection of his third bill for, 955; in Ireland, 1023; taken up by ignorant and uneducated persons, 1120; Cobbett advocates it, *ib.*; the Hampden club reformers, 1121; Burdett twice revives the question of, 1129, 1131; lord Russell becomes a reformer and obtains the disfranchisement of Grampound, 1131; cases of borough corruption, 1175; preparation of the Reform bill, 1188; lord John Russell introduces the bill before a full house, *ib.*; purport of the bill, *ib.*; its reception by the opposition, *ib.*; sir R. Inglis's reply, *ib.*; debate on the bill, 1189; Macaulay's speech, *ib.*; speeches of Palmerston and Peel, *ib.*; defeat of the ministers in committee, 1190; introduction of separate reform bills for England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1191; Macaulay's speech on the English reform bill, *ib.*; the bill is read a second time and passed into committee; Mr. Croker's steady opposition to it, *ib.*; his fears as to the results of its passing, *ib.*; the bill passes from the commons to the lords, *ib.*; the five nights' debate speeches of earl Grey, 1192; of the duke of Wellington, *ib.*; of lords Dudley, *ib.*; Eldon, *ib.*; and Brougham, *ib.*; the bill thrown out by the Lords, *ib.*; resolutions of the Commons, 1193; the king's speech again recommends reform; new bill introduced by lord John Russell; alterations contained in it; second reading of bill in Commons; passed by them; introduced into the Lords, 1196; scene at the second reading; defeat of the ministers in committee, *ib.*; the king refuses to create peers to insure the passing of the bill; the ministers resign; the Commons implore the king to call another reform ministry, 1197; the king consents to the creation of peers; abatement of the opposition of the anti-reform peers, 1198; passing of the Reform bills for Great Britain and Ireland, June and July, 1832, 1199; changes effected by the working of the reform acts, *ib.*; fears of anti reformers, 1202
Partition Treaty, negotiations between England and France for a, 677; the partition scheme originated with France, *ib.*; the negotiations are carried on, 678; correspondence and proceedings of William in connection with the first, 678; it is signed Oct. 11, 1698, by Portland and sir J. Williamson, 679, 732; stipulations of the first, *ib.*; the second signed in 1700, 679, 732
Paston Letters, curious illustrations of the manners of the time, afforded by, 179-181, 184-186; instance from, of the endeavor to influence a county election, 190
Pastons, defence of Caister Castle by, against the duke of Norfolk, 171
Paterson, William, proposes the scheme of a great national bank, 1691, which is carried out by the establishment of the Bank of England, in 1694, 659; obtains a 300, 000*l.* subscription for forming a company for trading to Africa and the Indies, 674; sails with the colony for Darien, July 26, 1698; quarrels with the ship's officers and the council, 675; he is attacked by fever, June, 1699, 676
Paul, Lewis, his cotton machine, 924
Paul I. of Russia, succeeds Catharine, favors the French interests, 1012; joins the coalition against France, 1030; won back to the French side, 1034; assassinated, 1801, 1038; emperor, 1796-1801, 1310
Paulinus, conversion of Edwin, king of Northumbria, by, 23
Paull, James, brings charges against the marquis of Wellesley, 1053; duel with Burdett; commits suicide, 1807, 1056
Paulus, the notary, suppresses the revolt of Magnentius, 17; despotism of, in Britain, *ib.*; burnt alive by order of the emperor Julian, *ib.*
Paving and Lighting Act, passed, 1762, 1118
Pearls found in Britain, 5
Pearson, captain, his naval engagement with Paul Jones; defeated, 888
Peel, sir Robert, first returned to parliament, 1809; chosen chairman of the currency committee; declares himself open to conviction, 1130; modifications of his views regarding the currency question, *ib.*; passing of the act called Peel's act, 1131; appointed home secretary, 1822, 1156-1162; objects to the extent of Mackintosh's measures for abolishing capital punishment, 1162; his high position as an anti-Catholic partisan, 1164; debate with Canning, the head of the Catholic party, on the Catholic question, 1165; resigns his office on Canning becoming minister, 1827, *ib.*; freedom from acrimony in his opposition to Canning, *ib.*; his testimony in favor of Canning's political integrity, 1166; his share in the negotiations for the premiership, 1168; home secretary in the Wellington administration, 1173; consulted by Wellington in the formation of the new cabinet, *ib.*; gradual advocacy of liberal principles, *ib.*; adoption of his motion for inquiry into the public income and expenditure, and the state of the metropolitan police, 1175; proposes a compromise of the bill for repealing the test and corporation acts, *ib.*; refuses to acquiesce in the government's bringing forward the relief bill, 1176; consents to continue in office on Wellington earnestly soliciting him to do so, 1177; vacates his seat for Oxford, *ib.*; fails to be re-elected; but obtains the seat for Westbury, *ib.*; speech explanatory of the bill for the relief of Roman Catholics; solemnly affirms that his conduct with respect to this question was regulated by honest motives, 1178; compels Mr. Brougham to apologize for his strong language against the Wellington ministry, 1180; his retirement from office, 1830, 1187; his emotion at the introduction of the Reform bill, March, 1831, 1188; his reply to Lord Palmerston's speech, 1189; refuses to advocate reform upon any terms, 1832, 1198; his declaration as to reform, 1823, 1203; speech of, supporting government in the Irish Coercion Bill, 1205; Cobbett's motion to have him dismissed the privy council, *ib.*; his narrative of his appointment to the premiership, 1214; first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer, 1834, *ib.*; formation of his ministry, 1215; list of his cabinet; his Tamworth manifesto, *ib.*; general principles of his government, 1216; ministerial defeats, *ib.*; supports the amendment on the motion for a London university charter, *ib.*; speech of, on explaining the cause of his resignation, *ib.*; acts the part of moderator in the dispute between the two houses, 1219; eulogizes William IV., 1223; his solicitude as to the condition of the laboring classes, 1237; fails in forming a new ministry on account of the Queen's refusing to dismiss the ladies of the bedchamber, 1238; speaks against free-trade principles, 1244; moves that the ministry have not the confidence of the House of Commons, *ib.*; his speech on the address, 1245; difficulties of his position, *ib.*; proclaims the necessity of the war with China, 1247; supports Macaulay's amendments to the copyright bill, 1253; his reserve as to his policy, and of the intended course to be pursued in the corn-law question, 1261; his opinions on this question, 1262; introduces a bill for better protecting the queen's person, 1263; his debate with lord Palmerston as to his policy towards France, *ib.*; considers the Ashburton treaty decisive of the boundary question, *ib.*; resolves to maintain the union with Ireland, 1264; his speech on the state of Ireland, 1268; considers the prosperous state of the country a justification of his financial policy of 1842, *ib.*; advocates protection to agriculture, 1269; his position reviewed, *ib.*; his bank act passed, *ib.*; its advantages and disadvantages, *ib.*; objects to lord Ashley's ten-hour clause in sir J. Graham's bill for regulating factory labor, *ib.*; conduct of, in the sugar-duty debate; Mr. Disraeli's hostility towards, 1270; remarks of, on the Tahiti affair, 1271; his financial statement for 1845, 1274; opposition to his proposals, *ib.*; again attacked by Mr. Disraeli, *ib.*; introduces the government plans for a grant to Maynooth college, *ib.*; denunciations poured upon him, *ib.*; his measure carried, *ib.*; Tory bitterness towards, 1275; apprehends a failure of the potato crop, *ib.*; proposes a modification of the corn-laws, *ib.*; dissensions in his cabinet as to suspending the corn-laws, 1276; he resigns his premiership, *ib.*; refuses to pledge himself to support the repeal of the corn-laws, *ib.*; his parting interview with the queen, *ib.*; reassumes his office, *ib.*; the duke of Wellington's admiration of his courage, 1277; ministerial explanation of; determines to hold his power unshackled, *ib.*; again attacked by Mr. Disraeli, *ib.*; his new tariff and corn-law bill, *ib.*; debate on his plans, *ib.*; his speech in support of his measures, 1278; adoption of his bills, *ib.*; the bill for the protection of life in Ireland, rejected; violent attack on, by lord Bentinck; defended by Mr. Cobden, 1279; vindicates his own conduct; resigns office, *ib.*; opposed to limiting the hours of factory labor, 1283
Peerage bill introduced; rejected, 1719, 773
Pelham, Henry, speaks against the motion for repealing the Septennial act, 1734, 785; appointed first lord of the treasury, August, 1743, 797, 865; succeeds Walpole in his command of the House of Commons, 798; turned out of office for 48 hours; conducts the financial part of the administration, 819; regarded the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle as a necessity; his despondency at the weakness of the nation, 821; proposes the reduction of the national debt interest, *ib.*; death of, March 6, 1754, 825; first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer, 1743-1754, 865
Pellegrini, Antonio, a ceiling painter, 757
Peltier, trial of, for libelling Bonaparte, 1803, 895; Mackintosh's speech in defence of, *ib.*
Pembroke, William, earl of, one of the leaders of the barons who obtained Magna Charta, 103; is appointed regent to Henry III. in 1217, 106; succeeds in expelling the French under Louis, *ib.*; death of, in 1219, *ib.*
Pembroke, Thomas Herbert, earl of, represents England at the conferences at Ryswick, 1697, 668
Pendergrass. See Portland, earl of, 665
Penn, Richard, governor of Pennsylvania; entrusted with the presentation of a petition to the king, 1775, 876; examined in the House of Lords, 877
Penn, William, arrested on March 5, 1682, with Mead, for attending a Quaker's meeting, 554; behavior of Jeffreys, *ib.*; is acquitted, *ib.*; obtains a grant of land in America in lieu of money owing to him by the crown, 577; resolves to found a colony for the Quakers there out of the reach of the penal laws, *ib.*; obtains a charter from the king, who names the settlement Pennsylvania, *ib.*; with the assistance of Algernon Sidney, frames a constitution for it, *ib.*; lands at Newcastle on the Delaware, October 27, 1682, *ib.*; founds Philadelphia, and enters into a treaty with the Indians, *ib.*; influence of, in procuring the release from prison of 1400 Quakers on the accession of James I., 578
Penny Magazine started, 1832; large circulation of, proof of the increased desire for knowledge, 1202
Penny Postage. See Post.
People, history of the, desirableness of, preface, 3
Perceval, Spencer, opens the case for the crown in the trial of Peltier, 1803, 1042; opposes the bill for promoting the enlistment of Roman Catholics, 1062; chancellor of the exchequer, 1807, *ib.*; moves that the duke of York is innocent of the charge brought against him, 1072; premier, 1809; constitution of his ministry, 1077; his ministry retained on the prince of Wales becoming Regent, February, 1811, 1080; assassinated in the lobby of the House of Commons by Bellingham, May 11, 1812, 1082
Perron commands the Scindia's army, 1054; defeated by general Lake; puts himself under British protection, *ib.*

Persigny, M. de, aids Louis Napoleon in his enterprise at Strasbourg, 1837; effects his escape, 1222
Perth, duke of. See Drummond, James.
Pestilence in 1479, notice of, 201
Peter the Great, czar of Muscovy, visits England in 1698; Evelyn's house is hired for him; he engages himself as a ship-carpenter; description of, 672; career of, from 1698 to 1709, 718; when his empire is invaded by Charles XII. of Sweden, whom he defeats at Pultowa, July 8, 1709, *ib.*; enters Mecklenberg and threatens Denmark, 1716, 769
Peter the Hermit, first preaching of the Crusade by, 67; first crusade led by, 68; rout of, *ib.*
Peterborough, Charles Mordaunt, earl of, impeached, 1689, 634; his early career, 700; and character, 709; he is sent on an expedition to Spain, *ib.*; opposes the prince of Darmstadt's and the archduke Charles' plan of besieging Barcelona; but finally agrees to it, *ib.*; quarrels with the prince of Darmstadt, *ib.*; attacks Montjuich; his men are repulsed, he rallies them, and finally reduces the post; Barcelona soon after surrenders, 1702, 701; raises the siege of San Mateo; pursues Las Torres and his army; commences operations for the defence of Valencia, *ib.*; removes the besieging army under Arcos out of his path, and obtains admission into Valencia by a stratagem, 1706, 702; defeats Philip's troops, *ib.*; relieves Barcelona, 703; goes to Madrid; his gayety of temper as shown by a letter, *ib.*; his disgust at Charles; leaves him; returns to Spain, 1707; recalled by government, *ib.*; his subsequent occupation, *ib.*; receives the thanks of parliament for his services in Spain, 725
Peters, Hugh, idea afforded by, of the havoc of the Civil War, 470; execution of, as a regicide, 536
Petion, Villeneuve, sent by the National Assembly to conduct Louis XVI. back to France, 1791, 972; chosen mayor of Paris, 973; his conduct in the insurrection of June 20, 1792, 978; popularity of, *ib.*; heads a deputation demanding the king's deposition, 979
Petition of Right passed in 1628, 423
Petticoat costume, 18th century, 742
Petty, lord Henry. See Lansdown, lord.
Phigaleian marbles, 1145
Philadelphia occupied by the British, 1777, 882
Philip of Spain contracted in marriage to queen Mary, 320; marriage of, to Mary, 324; bribery of the English parliament by, 325; leaves England, 331; continued interference of, in its affairs, *ib.*; return of, to England, 332; war of, with the Pope and France, *ib.*; engages England to join in the war against France, 333; quits England, *ib.*; his ambassador's account of Elizabeth's character, 334; proposes himself as a husband to Elizabeth, 335; efforts of, to suppress Protestantism in the Netherlands, 354; cruelties of the duke of Alva in carrying his desires into effect, *ib.*; intrigues of, against Elizabeth, *ib.*; schemes of, for invading England, 359; his fleet in Cadiz destroyed by Drake, 369; fresh preparations for the invasion, 370; the Armada sets sail from the Tagus, May 28, 1588, 372; ill-success and defeat of the Armada, 373; fresh preparations made by, 376; Corunna and Vigo taken and burnt by the English fleet, *ib.*; intrigues of, in Scotland against England, 383; endeavors to have Elizabeth poisoned, 384; death of, in 1598, 388
Philip V. of Spain succeeds to the throne, 1700, 683; enters Catalonia, 1706; besieges Charles in Barcelonia, 702; Peterborough compels him to raise the siege; retires to Madrid; but is driven hence by the allies, *ib.*; the national enthusiasm rises in his favor, 703; the duke of Berwick compels the allies to evacuate Madrid, *ib.*; reseated on his throne, 1707, 713; he is opposed by Charles and assisted by Staremberg and Stanhope, 1710; is defeated at Almenara and Saragossa, 725; the duke of Vendôme takes command of his army and retrieves his cause, and establishes his family on the throne, *ib.*; stipulations granted to, by the treaty of Utrecht, 735; the French invade his territory; they compel him to dismiss his minister, Alberoni; accedes to the Quadruple Alliance, January, 1720, 772; succeeded by Ferdinand VI., 1746, 1309
Philippa, general, commands the French at the siege of Badajoz, 1812; his defence, 1085; capitulates to the British, *ib.*
Phillips, sir Thomas, aids in quelling the Frost insurrection at Newport, 1239
Philpot, the martyr and persecutor, 329
Physicians' College, founded in 1518, 301
Pichegru, Charles, defeated by the duke of York, May, 1794, 1005; compels the British under Dundas to abandon Holland, 1007; suppresses an insurrection in Paris, April 1, 1795, 1009; banished France, 1797, 1017; implicated in a conspiracy against Bonaparte, 1804; he is found strangled in prison, 1047
Picton, sir Thomas, takes part in capturing Ciudad Rodrigo, 1812, 1085; his arrival at Quatre Bras interferes with Ney's movements, 1105; slain at the battle of Waterloo, June 18, 1815, 1107
Picts and Scots, irruption of into Britain, 17; opinions of Dr. Lingard and Dr. Lappenberg that they were the same people, *ib.*; driven back by Theodosius, *ib.*
Piedmont, annexed to France, September, 1802, 1041
Pierson, major, defeats the French under Rullecourt on Jersey Island, 1781; killed, 894
Pilgrimages to holy places, popularity of, in the 15th century, 186; to shrines, prevalence of, *temp.* Henry VII., 223; Erasmus' account of his pilgrimages to Walsingham and Canterbury, *ib.*
Pilgrim Fathers, settlement of, in Massachusetts, in 1620, 407
Pilnitz, declaration of, 974, 1040
Pindarees, war with the, 1817-1818, 1169; results in the breaking up of the Mahratta confederacy, which had aided the Pindarees, *ib.*
Pinkie, battle of, October 10, 1547, 302
Pitt. See Chatham.
Pitt, William, unsuccessful candidate as M.P. for Cambridge University; returned for Appleby, 1780; first speech in support of Burke's Civil List Bill; Wilberforce's prophecy of, 894; his hostile speech toward the ministry, 899; his motion for the Reform of Parliament proposed, 1782, 902; rejected, *ib.*; becomes chancellor of the exchequer, 905; commencement of the party conflict between Fox and, 908; his argument in favor of a commercial treaty with France, 927; introduces his second reform bill; it is rejected; as also another bill for preventing abuses in public offices, 951; appointed first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer, December 19, 1783, 952; his anxiety and disinterestedness; his India bill thrown out; his struggle against a majority in the Commons, 953; addresses to the king for the removal of the Pitt ministry; his popularity; and final triumph, *ib.*; general character of; re-elected for the University of Cambridge, *ib.*; squibs against, *ib.*; considered a safer minister than Fox, 954; his financial measures, *ib.*; introduces his bill for promoting commerce between Great Britain and Ireland; withdrawn; his reform bill is rejected a third time, 955; his scheme of the sinking fund; its futility, *ib.*; his speech in favor of the commercial treaty with France, *ib.*; consolidates the taxes; Burke's tribute of thanks to; Pitt's increase of popularity, 956; endeavors to restrict the prince of Wales' power as regent, 957; the king's gratitude to, for his conduct during his illness, *ib.*; his popularity still further increased, *ib.*; hopes for an improved state of France; visits France, 1783, 958; his spirited conduct averts the war with Spain, *ib.*; his calmness and confidence in the stability of the British power, *ib.*; keeps aloof from the declaration of Pilnitz, 974; displays the flourishing condition of Great Britain, *ib.*; his eloquent speech in favor of abolishing the slave-trade immediately, 975; supports Fox's libel bill, *ib.*; attempts made to bring about a coalition between Fox and Pitt, *ib.*; his opinions on parliamentary reform, 976; lord warden of the Cinque Ports, 988; his strong desire to remain neutral with France, *ib.*; his opinion of the French proceedings against Louis XVI., 985; his interview with lord Loughborough; is induced by him to favor a war policy, *ib.*; his address to the king on the execution of Louis XVI, 988; his Indian declaratory bill passed, 1788, 989; defends his abandonment of the cause of parliamentary reform, 992; opinions of, on the French war, *ib.*; measures adopted by, toward France; they are opposed by Burke, *ib.*; Fox, *ib.*; Sheridan, Grey, and Erskine, 993; points out the difficulty of conducting a negotiation with the French, 995; Fox lays the blame of the war miscarriages in the campaign of 1793 upon, 997; Canning becomes his supporter, 1008; opposition of Wilberforce to the address, 1794, *ib.*; brings before the House of Commons a seditious meetings bill, 1795, 1010; tenor of the bill; disputes with Fox; the bill is passed, *ib.*; in consequence of a heavy pressure on the Bank of England he is unable to obtain financial assistance, 1797; his difficulty got over, 1013; introduces bills for suppressing mutiny in the navy, 1797; the mutiny at the Nore is thereby quelled; advocates peace with France, 1016; proposes an income tax; his estimate of its amount, Dec. 3, 1798; the measure passed, 1022; anxious to promote the relief of the Irish Catholics, 1026; his resolutions on the Union agreed to, 1027; endeavors to persuade the king not to openly oppose the Catholic emancipation question, 1035; the king refusing to do so, Mr. Pitt resigns, March 14, 1801; the king's insanity imputed to the hasty resignation of, 1036; negotiations for his return to power, 1803; stipulates for more than Addington will grant, 1044; his speech advocating war with France, *ib.*; commands the volunteers at Walmer, 1045; presses for an administration on a broad basis; obtains the premiership on certain prescribed conditions, 1046; his government opposed by the Addington, Grenville, and Fox parties; effects a reconciliation with Mr. Addington, 1047; carries the question of war against Spain, 1048; his mortification on the charges of corruption being brought against lord Melville further increased on the passing of the vote of censure, *ib.*; effect of the news of Mack's surrender at Ulm on, 1050; his feelings on hearing of the battle of Trafalgar and death of Nelson, 1051; Napoleon's triumph at Austerlitz completes the ruin of his health; last days of Pitt; story of the desertion of his deathbed; died Jan. 23, 1806, 1052; public honors conferred on, 1056
Pius VI., feebleness of his government; buys Napoleon off from invading his territories, 1012
Pius VII. compelled to officiate at Napoleon's coronation, 1804, 1047; imprisoned at Savona, 1081; released, 1091
Plague, the great, of 1665, first appearance of; the condition of London, such as to promote it, 542; Defoe's narrative of it in London, *ib.*; superstitious fears of the people respecting it; notices of, by Pepys and others, 544
Plassey, battle of, June 23, 1757, 834
Platiere, R. de. See Roland.
Plattsburg, the British fail to take, 1814, 1100
Plautius, sent from Gaul by Claudius to invade Britain, 7; attacks Togodumnus and Caractacus with indifferent success, *ib.*; applies for succor to Claudius, *ib.*; triumph bestowed on, 8
Plentheim. See Blenheim.
Plymouth, not a great naval station at the end of the 17th century; its prosperity caused by the erection of the breakwater by Telford, 604
Pocock, sir George, admiral; reduces Havannah in conjunction with the earl of Albemarle, 845
Poitiers, battle of, won by the Black Prince, Sept. 19, 1356, 141
Poland, incorporated with Russia, 1295
Pole, cardinal Reginald, publishes a book against the divorce of Henry VIII.; his family in England are arrested, in 1539, and his mother, the aged countess of Salisbury, executed, in 1541, 278; he arrives in England, in 1544, as legate, 325; the parliament submits to the pope, and he absolves the realm, *ib.*; moderation of, during the Marian persecution, 326; success of his efforts towards a reconciliation defeated by the zealotry of pope Paul IV., 331; is made archbishop of Canterbury, 332; his proceedings against the bodies of dead heretics, 332; his death, 336
Police, state of London, 18th century, 946; inquiry into the state of the, made 1816, 1817, 1118; the new Metropolitan formed, 1829, 1175
Polignac, prince Jules de, president of the French council, 1829, 1181; his ministry sends out an expedition against Algiers, *ib.*; informs the king of the unsettled state of the kingdom, *ib.*; refuses to recall the royal ordinances; the king is compelled to dismiss the ministry of, 1183
Political Unions, extensive formation of, 1832, 1196
Pollock, gen., his Indian campaign, 1842, 1251
Pondicherry, siege of, raised by the English, 827; surrenders to the English, 949; taken by sir John Braithwaite, 990
Poniatowski, prince, heads the Poles in their claim for independence; leaves Poland, 1007
Ponsonby, G., proposes several reform measures, 1023; moves an amendment in the address claiming independence for Ireland, 1026; his sorrow at Perceval's death, 1080; a lord of the treasury, 1187
Ponte-corvo, prince of. See Charles XIV. of Sweden.
Poor, condition of the Anglo-Saxon, 29; progress of legislation for the relief of, 384; statute passed for, 39 Eliz., the foundation of the English Poor Law, 385
Poor Laws, administration of, 1816, 1119; the poor law amendment bill brought in by lord Althorp, April 17, 1834, 1209; the report of the poor law commissioners, 1209-11; debates on, opposition to, and passing of, the bill, 1211; it receives the royal assent, Aug. 14; first report of the commissioners, *ib.*; introduction of the poor laws into Ireland proposed, 1837, 1223; working of the new poor law, 1230-1235; introduction of the, into Ireland by Mr. Nicholls, 1234
Pope, Alexander, essays by, in the "Spectator" and "Guardian," 741; sketch of his life, *ib.*; and traits of his character, 742; his "Rape of the Lock," 743, 744; highly remunerated for his translations of the Iliad and Odyssey, 748; his essay on criticism and attack on Dennis; his satire upon antiquaries; the Dunciad, 748, 749, 936; remarks on the commentators, public schools; the universities and the traveller; entomologists and florists, 750; condemns Vanbrugh's architecture, 755; his libel on lord Hervey, 782; died 1744, 936
Popham, sir Home, captures Buenos Ayres, 1060
Popish Plot of 1668. See Charles II., and Oates, Titus.
Population of England, at the end of the third century, a very mixed one, 14, 15; introduction of large bodies of Germans, Burgundians, and Vandals, by the Roman emperors, 14; mixed character of, at the departure of the Romans; cowardice and effeminacy of, as described by Gildas, not credible, 18
Popular amusements and games, 150, 220, 226, 298, 299, 342, 378-381, 537
Popular sports, *temp.* Richard I., 97, 98
Port. See Wine.
Porteous, John, captain of the Edinburgh city guard; fires on a mob, killing several persons; convicted of murder; sentenced to death; reprieved; murdered by the mob, 787
Porteous riots in Edinburgh, 786
Porter, George, his share in the assassination plot, 1696, 664; gives evidence against Fenwick, 667
Portland, William Bentinck, earl of; example of his integrity, 661; accompanies William to the siege of Namur, 1695; summons Boufflers to surrender the place, 662; William orders a grant of an estate to him, which is recalled, on the Commons showing it to be unconstitutional, 663; is informed of the assassination plot by Fisher, Pendergrass; and De la Rue, 665; arranges with marshal Boufflers the preliminaries of the peace of Ryswick, 1697, 668; is sent on a mission to France by William, 1698; description of his entrée and private audience; his reception by Louis and the French court, 671; correspondence of, in connection with the first Partition Treaty; signed by him as commissioner, Oct. 11, 678; jealousy of, towards Albemarle; he retires from court and gives up all his offices; but is persuaded by William to continue the negotiations for the second Partition Treaty, 681; he is impeached by the Commons for his concern in the Partition Treaties, 684; attends William on his death-bed, 687
Portland, duke of, appointed viceroy of Ireland, 1782, 904; first lord of the treasury, 1783, 951, 1325; supports the Alien bill; opposes lord Loughborough being chancellor; after considerable hesitation gives his adherence to the war party, 985; appointed third secretary of state, 1794, 1007; requested to aid the bribery for accomplishing the Irish Union, 1027; nominal head of the administration, 1807; resigns the premiership, 1809; died Oct. 29, 1809, 1062; home secretary of state, 1794-1801, 1325
Portmore, lord, governor of Gibraltar; hastens to defend it in his 80th year, 780
Porto Bello, taken by admiral Vernon, 793
Porto Carero, cardinal, his practisings on Charles II. of Spain, to induce him to give the Spanish inheritance to France, 683; his purpose accomplished; chief of the Spanish council, *ib.*
Portugal, prince regent of. See John of Portugal.
Post, insecurity and tardiness of the, 18th century;

introduction of mail coaches, 1784, 938; rapid increase and celerity of communication by, 1227; insufficiency of postal accommodation, *ib.*; public opinion on Rowland Hill's penny postage plan, 1239; the system is tried, found successful, and finally adopted. *ib.*; variety of stamps in use. *ib.*
Pottinger, sir Henry, the British plenipotentiary at Canton; his proceedings as such, 1248; concludes the treaty of Nanking, *ib.*
Pounds, John, his benevolent career; died 1839, 1230
Power loom, invented by Dr. Cartwright, 926
Pragmatic Sanction published by Charles VI., April 17, 1713, 733
Prague, peace of, May 30, 1635 732; taken by the elector of Bavaria, Nov. 25, 1741, 815; besieged by Frederick of Prussia, 1758, unavailingly, 835
Pratt, sir C. See Camden, lord.
Presburg, peace of, signed, Dec. 26, 1805, 1051
Presbyterians. See Nonconformists.
Press, the See Newspapers.
Preston, lord, plots against William; tried; and convicted, 643; implicates several eminent persons with being concerned in the plot, 644
Preston, captain, tried for abetting the murder of a mulatto; defended by John Adams; found "not guilty," 863
Preston-Pans, battle of, Sept., 1745, 803
Prevost, sir George, governor-in-chief of the British North American Provinces, 1096; his failure in an attack on Plattsburg; outcry raised against him; resigns; demands a court-martial, but dies before it commences, 1100
Priestley, Dr. Joseph, accused of being opposed to the church of England, 970; becomes a Unitarian minister at Birmingham, 1780. *ib.*; his character, *ib.*; his "Familiar Letters to the Inhabitants of Birmingham," published, 1791; the riots of 1791; the rioters burn his chapel, house, and books, and compel him to flee the town, *ib.*
Printing begun in England by Caxton about 1474, 187
Printing and the importation of books, encouragement afforded to by Richard III., 209.
Prior, Matthew, accompanies St. John, viscount Bolingbroke, on his embassy to France, 1712, 735; excluded from the act of grace, 1717, 770
Prisons. See Gaols.
Pritchard, British consul at Tahiti; the French outrage on that island compels him to quit it, 1271
Privateering, prevalence of, 1781; abolition of, recommended, 1856, 896
Probus, emperor, sends Burgundians and Vandals into Britain, 14
Prohibitory bill passed, 877
Prome occupied by the British, April, 1825, 1171
Property qualification bill, passed 1711, 726
Provera marches to relieve Mantua; surrenders himself and army to Bonaparte, Jan. 16, 1797, 1017
Provisions, prices of, in the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I., 110; prices of, in 1495 and 1497, 225; proclamation by the Protector Somerset, against the unreasonable prices of, 307; scarcity of, and fluctuations in the prices of, in 1573, 1586, 1587, and 1596, 387
Prynne, William, excessive punishment of, in 1633, for publishing the "Histrio-Mastix," 427; renewed severe sentence on, in 1637, for anti-prelatical writing, 431; is released with Burton and Bastwick, on the meeting of the Long Parliament in 1640, 437; triumphant entry of, into London, *ib.*; prosecution of Laud by, in 1645, 466
Ptolemy, list of towns in Britain by, 15
Public health, state of the, more especially that of the laboring classes, 1227; causes of the bad, 1228; arrangements for bettering the, *ib.*; general and local boards of health established; public health act passed, 1286
Pulteney, William, opposes Walpole; his name struck off the Privy Council list, 782; his spiteful quarrel with Walpole; and duel with Lord Hervey; opposes the bill for proposing standing armies, 782; and the resolution to publish the parliamentary debates, 783; shows the fallacy of the arguments in favor of remposing the duty on salt, *ib.*; argues that it is a step towards a general excise, 783; favors the motion for repealing the Septennial act, 785; opposes the Gin act, 1736, 786; created earl of Bath, 795
Pultowa invested by the Swedish, 718; battle of, July 8, 1709, 718
Purchase, George, charged with high treason for taking part in a riot, 1710, 721; tried, convicted, pardoned, 722; his share in the riot, *ib.*
Puritans. See Nonconformists.
Putnam, Israel, a farmer and tavern-keeper; heads his neighbors in the revolution; becomes a general, 875; commands the Americans at the battle of Brooklyn, 1776, 879
Pym, John, joins in the protestation of the House of Commons in 1621, against the king's interference with their liberty of speech, 418; assists in the debate on the Petition of Right, in 1628, 423; prophetic threat of, to Wentworth, on his becoming minister to Charles I., 427; speech of, impeaching Strafford, 437; conducts the proceedings on the trial of Strafford, 439; moves in the Commons, that the form be changed to a bill of attainder, *ib.*; produces the notes of the Privy Council furnished by Henry Vane, against Strafford, *ib.*; his vehement reply to Strafford's defence, 440; attempted to be seized by the king, on Jan. 3, 1642, 447; addresses the Londoners, 453; death of, Dec. 8, 1643, 464; buried in Westminster Abbey, *ib.*
Pyrenees, treaty of the, Nov. 7, 1659, 732; battles of the, 1813, 1076; view from the, at sunrise, described, 1090

Quadruple alliance signed Aug. 2, 1718; joined by the duke of Savoy and Spain, 733
Quakers, interview between George Fox and Cromwell, 518; case of James Naylor, a Quaker, 521; George Fox lays before Cromwell the sufferings of the, 525; proclamation against holding conventicles, and passive resistance offered to, 537; stubborn resistance of, to the provisions of the Conventicle act in 1664, 542; Penn and Mead arrested and tried for attending a Conventicle, 554; they are acquitted, and Jeffreys fines and imprisons the jury, who are liberated by the judges of the Common Pleas, *ib.*; founding of Pennsylvania by Penn in 1682, 577; fourteen hundred released from prison on the accession of James II., 578; exempted from the Toleration act on certain terms, 624; bill for the relief of, passed, 1722, 775; endeavor to obtain the abolition of the slave trade, 1057
Quarterly Review started, 1809, in opposition to the Edinburgh Review; its editor, partisans, and criticism, 1140
Quebec. See Wolfe, 839; capitulates to the English, Sept. 18, 1759, *ib.*; besieged by the Americans, 1760, 840; blockaded by them, 1775, 877
Queensbury, duke of, character and amusements of the, 941
Queensbury, James Douglas, duke of, high commissioner to queen Anne; quells the riots made in opposition to the union, 1706, 711; he is threatened with assassination, *ib.*; induces Ker to try to thwart the Cameronian schemes, *ib.*; he is advised of the proceedings of the Jacobite plotters by John Ker, 714
Quesnoy, surrendered to Ormond and Eugene, July 4, 1712, 733; taken by the Austrians, 1793, 996
Quiberon Bay. See Hawke, 839
Quiberon, the British expedition to, 1795, 1009

Radstadt, peace of, March 6, 1714, 733; congress at, 1797-1799, 1030, 1040
Raeburn, his portrait painting, 1146
Raffles, sir Stamford, lieutenant-governor of Java, 1169; established a factory in Singapore, 1819, 1170
Ragged schools. See Education, 1230
Ragusa, duke of. See Marmont.
Raikes, Robert, ordered to attend the bar of the House of Commons for printing the debates, 1729, 783; Sunday schools originated by, 1781, 647; changes in English society noticed by, 1231
Rajah of Nagpoor. See Bhoonsla.
Rajah Sahib, his contests with Clive; put to death by the Mahrattas, 827
Raleigh, sir Walter, failure of his first attempt to found a colony in North America, 371; commands the land forces at Plymouth, on the approach of the Armada, 373; goes on board the fleet, 384; assists Essex in his attack on Cadiz in 1596, 384; commands another expedition with Essex, with whom he disagrees, 384; is deprived of his offices by James I.; indicted in 1603, for projecting to dispossess James in favor of Arabella Stuart, 397; brutality of Coke, and calm bearing of Raleigh, during the trial; he is convicted, reprieved, and confined in the Tower; his employments during his confinement, 398; opposition of, to the treaty with Spain in 1604, 399; is released from the Tower in 1616, 415; undertakes an expedition to Guiana, to discover a gold mine, *ib.*; is attacked, driven back, and returns to England, 416; arrested at Plymouth, *ib.*; and executed under his former sentence on Oct. 29, 1618, *ib.*; popular indignation occasioned by his execution *ib.*
Ramillies, battle of, May 23, 1706, 706
Ranelagh gardens, its company and amusements, 939
Rangoon taken by the British, 1823; defended by sir A. Campbell, 1170
Rawdon, lord. See Moira.
Rebecca riots. See Riots.
Rebellion of 1715, 761-767
Rebellion of 1745, 801-818
Reciprocity of Duties bill passed July 4, 1823, 1160
Re-coinage bill passed, 1695, 663
Recognition act passed, 1690, 636
Reform, Irish church. See Church, 1206, 1212, 1216
Reform law. See Brougham, 1175
Reform, parliamentary. See Parliamentary Reform.
Reformation, commencement of, in England, in 1531, 250; Henry VIII. obtains from Convocation a recognition of his being supreme head of the church in England, "as far as the law of Christ will allow," *ib.*; payment of annates to the see of Rome abolished in 1533, 251; statute forbidding appeals to Rome passed, 254; act of supremacy passed, 257; visitation of the monasteries in 1535, and statute for their dissolution, 259; English bibles ordered to be set up in churches in 1538, 273; act of 1539 passed for the dissolution of abbeys, 273, 276; exposure of impostures connected with images and relics, 273; destruction of the religious houses, 275; act passed in 1539 for enabling the king to make bishops, 276; projected applications of the monastic revenues, and their non-fulfilment, *ib.*; the intolerant statute of the Six Articles passed, *ib.*; reformers executed or driven out of the country by this act, 277; continued burnings for heresies in England, under the Six Articles act, 285; Anne Askew and others burnt, *ib.*; beneficial effect of the act of 1548, allowing of the marriage of priests, 297; various forms of church service before the establishment of the Book of Common Prayer in 1548, 298; dissensions regarding the keeping of holidays, *ib.*; the reading of the Bible forbidden "to the lower sort," *ib.*; progress of, under Edward VI.; the Paraphrase of the New Testament published in English, and the Book of Homilies, *ib.*; ecclesiastical visitation to inquire as to the existence of Roman Catholic abuses, and the reading of the Bible in English in churches, 303; act for administering the Sacrament in both kinds, *ib.*; act for the suppression of chantries, *ib.*; proclamation against religious processions, *ib.*; the abolition of them not popular, *ib.*; act for the uniformity of service, *ib.*; publication of the Book of Common Prayer, 304; persecution of Anabaptists, and burning of Joan Bocher, 312; Articles of Belief set forth by Edward VI., *ib.*; book of Canon laws issued by Cranmer, *ib.*; Roman Catholic bishops deprived of their sees, *ib.*; execution of Somerset, and account of his promotion of the doctrines of the Reformation, 313; sweeping changes effected by Mary on her accession, 319; Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley condemned for heresy at Oxford, 324; the statutes against heretics revived, *ib.*; the Marian persecution, *ib.*; list of Protestant victims, 326; martyrdom of Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, 327; of Rowland Taylor, at Hadleigh, 328; prevalence of intolerance in both Reformers and Papists, 329; Cranmer burnt, March 21, 1556, 330; the church services ordered to be performed in English on the accession of queen Elizabeth, 335; Mary's statutes in favor of popery repealed, 337; dissensions among the Reformers, and progress of Protestantism on the Continent, 338; persecution on the continent of Protestants in the Netherlands and France occasions the settlement of a great number of Calvanists in England, 354; a new statute against Papists passed in 1571, 356; growth of the Puritanical party, *ib.*; plots of the Jesuists against Elizabeth and the Reformation, 358; increased severities enacted against Papists, priests being ordered to quit the country, 358; the Pope excommunicates England, and publishes a crusade against, 371
Reformation in Scotland, progress of, 281; Patrick Hamilton, the first Protestant martyr in Scotland, burnt at St. Andrews, in 1528, *ib.*; James V. opposes himself to it, *ib.*; he refuses Henry VIII.'s proposal to make himself supreme head of the church, *ib.*; Wishart burnt, March 26, 1546, 283; cardinal Beaton assassinated, May 29, *ib.*; hostility of the queen regent to the Reformers, 338; the Lords of the Congregation remonstrate, *ib.*; John Knox arrives from the continent, preaches at Perth, and the Reformers destroy the monastic houses, *ib.*; Elizabeth lends secret assistance to the Reformers, 339; the Congregation has recourse to arms, *ib.*; Elizabeth assists them openly with an army, and they besiege and take Leith, *ib.*; a Confession of Faith drawn up by a parliament in 1560, *ib.*; other acts passed establishing the reformed religion, 340; Knox preaches against the abstraction of the church patrimony, *ib.*; Knox's attacks upon Mary, and her avowal of her hatred of him, 341; essential differences of, from that of the Reformation in England, 344; danger of the establishment of, from the opposition of Mary, 345; the pope's authority abolished, and the Confession of Faith of 1560 sanctioned, by the parliament in December, 1567, 351
Regency bill passed, 705; differences between George III. and his ministers on the, 1765; a regency bill passed, 851; another passed, 1788, for appointing the prince of Wales regent, 957
Register Book of births, deaths and marriages, order for the keeping of, in every church, by Thomas Cromwell. 287
Registration bill passed, 1836, 1221
Regner Lodbrok, first invasion of England by, 25; second invasion and death, 78
Remonstrance of London, 1770, 864; of the Massachusetts state against war with Britain, 1812, 1096
Rennie, John, aids in draining the Lincolnshire fens, 915; his early career; and engineering works of Waterloo bridge, and at the Docks, 1144
Rents, rise of, in the reign of Henry VIII., 294
Resumption bill passed, 1699, 680
Revenue, the amount of, in 1547, 287; sources of, 288; of the crown, as settled on Charles II., 534.
Revenue act, opposition to the, by the Americans, 1768, 861
Revolution of 1688, the commencement of a new era of English history, 600
Revolution in Scotland, 630
Revolution, French, 958-967; 968, 969; 971-975; 976; 977-985; 987, 988, 990; 993-1001; 1002; 1004-1006; 1009; 1010 1014; 1017; 1018-1020; 1029-1031; 1032; 1033, 1034, 1035; 1038-1040
Revolution, French, of 1830. See Charles X., 1181-1184
Revolution, French, narrative of the, of 1848, 1285-6
Reynolds, sir Joshua, a leading portrait painter, 930; first president of the royal academy; knighted; contributes to the royal academy's first exhibition, 931; critiqueson his works; the true founder of the English school of painting, 932; died in 1792, 1146
Ricci, Lorenzo, chief of the Jesuits; opposes the suppression of the company, 867
Ricci Sebastian, a ceiling painter, 757
Ricci. Marco, a ceiling painter, 757
Richard of Cirencester, record by, of "a profound peace," from A.D. 211-286, 11; list of cities in Roman Britain given by, 13
Richard I., behavior of, on the death of his father; crowned Sept. 3, 1189; massacre of the Jews at the coronation of; engages in the third crusade, 91; mistaken sympathy for the character of; quarrels with Philip of France, and marries Berengaria of Navarre; conquers Cyprus; besieges Acre; which surrenders; Philip returns to France in anger, 92; Richard orders the massacre of the Turkish hostages, because the Holy Cross had not been delivered; marches towards Jerusalem; defeats Saladin in 1191; is forced to retreat after reaching Jaffa, 93; hears of disturbances in England occasioned by the intrigues of his brother John; Longchamp, his chancellor in England, deposed; Richard is falsely accused of the murder of the marquis of Montferrat; last Eastern campaign of, 94; approaches Jerusalem, but again retreats; attempts in vain to retake Jaffa, agrees to a truce, and sails from Acre on Oct 9, 1192; is captured on his return, and im-

prisoned by the emperor of Germany; is ransomed, 95; lands at Sandwich, March 12, 1194, 96; leaves England on May 9, lands at Harfleur, and pardons John, 98; drives Philip out of Normandy, *ib.*; besieges Chaluz, is wounded, and dies April 6, 1199, *ib.*

Richard II., coronation of, on July 16, 1377; appointment by parliament of a council of regency; ill-success of his foreign wars, and increase of taxation; insurrection against the poll-tax, headed by Wat Tyler, in 1381; the demands of the insurgents granted by, at Mile End, 147; Wat Tyler killed in Smithfield during a parley with the king, who then heads the insurgents himself, and at length dismisses them to their homes, 148; the grants revoked, *ib.*; proposes to abolish slavery, but parliament refuses, *ib.*; statute against the preachers of heresies; contest with the pope as to the bestowal of benefices; is supported in it by the parliament, 149; rise of the Lollards; unnecessary and oppressive interference of the government of, in social affairs; marries Anne of Bohemia, 151; intrigues of his uncles and ministers; war with France to support the Flemings in 1383, and truce in 1384; becomes suspicious of the duke of Lancaster; invades and ravages Scotland, 152; rise of Michael de la Pole; projected invasion by the French, and destruction of the French and Flemish fleets; extravagance of, and appointment of a commission of regency; impeachment and dismissal of De la Pole, earl of Suffolk; tampers with the judges, and obtains an opinion that the commission is illegal, 153; goes to London, the Lords assemble in arms, and defeat his adherents; for about a year the government in the hands of a parliamentary council; battle of Otterbourne fought in 1388; dismisses his guardians and assumes the government in 1389; his queen, Anne, dies; goes to Ireland in 1394 with a large army; marries Isabella of France, 154; parliament repeals the commission of regency, and the king becomes despotic; duke of Gloucester arrested and murdered; submission of the barons; quarrel of the duke of Hereford with the duke of Norfolk, 155; he banishes them both; seizes the possessions of the duke of Lancaster on his death in 1398; goes to Ireland with an army, but has little success, 156; learns that Henry of Lancaster has landed in England, and returns to Conway; is captured by the earl of Northumberland; carried to London, 157; is deposed, and resigns his royalty, crown, and heritage; is imprisoned in the Tower; death of, at Pontefract, in 1400; Henry IV. accused of being his murderer; doubts as to the death of, and statement of his escape from Pontefract, and death of, at Stirling, in 1419, 160

Richard III. created duke of Gloucester in 1461, 194; flies with Edward to the duke of Burgundy on the restoration of Henry VI., 197; lands with Edward at Ravenspur; successfully attacks Warwick at the battle of Barnet, 199; distinguishes himself at the battle of Tewkesbury, 198; different accounts of the personal appearance of, *ib.*; accused of the murder of prince Edward, *ib.*; suppresses the insurrection of Falconbridge, *ib.*; doubts as to his guilt of the murder of Henry VI., 199; quarrel with Clarence, 200; marries Anne, daughter of the earl of Warwick, and widow of prince Edward, *ib.*; popularity of, in the North, *ib.*; opposes the treaty of Picquiny, 201; no foundation for the statement of his causing Clarence's death, *ib.*; takes Berwick; swears fealty to Edward V.; arrests earl Rivers and the members of Edward's council, 202; is appointed Protector; accuses Hastings of treason, and causes him to be executed, 203; proclaims his life in danger; accuses Jane Shore of sorcery and conspiracy, 204; Shaw preaches in favor of his claim to the crown; and the duke of Buckingham harangues the citizens on the same subject; parliament assign him the crown on the ground of the illegitimacy of Edward V.; causes earl Rivers and others of Edward's council to be beheaded, 205; he is crowned at Westminster, July 6, 1483; death of the two princes in the Tower; evidence as to their murder considered, 206; ready submission of the people to, and its causes; mixed character of Richard; acts of clemency and restitution by; revolt of Buckingham, 207; which is suppressed, and Buckingham executed, in 1483, 208; merits of Richard as a legislator; salutary laws passed by the parliament of; causes the statutes to be first printed, and in English; encourages printing and the importation of books, 209; death of his son; negotiates with the duke of Brittany, for the delivery of Henry of Richmond; death of Anne, his queen; publicly disavows any intention of marrying Elizabeth, his brother Edward's daughter; mistaken estimate by, of Henry of Richmond, as an adversary; insufficient precautions against treason taken by, 210; Richmond lands at Milford Haven; inadequate preparations to resist; battle of Bosworth, Aug. 22, 1485; his death, 211

Richardson, Samuel, his novel of "Pamela" published 1740, 1741; its extraordinary popularity; his "Clarissa" appears 1748; and "Sir C. Grandison" in 1751, 936

Richborough, Roman colony at, 13; notice of the ruins of, *ib.*

Richelieu, duc de, advises that a battery be directed on the duke of Cumberland's column, at Fontenoy, 1745, which is forced to retreat, 789; drives the duke of Cumberland out of Hanover, 1757; convention of Closter Seven, 836

Richmond, duke of, secretary of state, 1766, 865; moves for Penn's examination, 877; for an address to the king on the state of the nation, 1778, 885; proposes a bill for extending the right of vote, and other parliamentary reforms, 891

Right of search, disputes between England and America on the, 1084

Rights, bill of, passed 1689, 633

Riot act passed 1715, 761

Riots, the Porteous, of Edinburgh, 1736, 780; the Wilkite, London, 1768, 835; and 1771, 865; the Gordon, 1780, 890; the Birmingham, 1791, 971; in London, 1795, 1010; throughout the country, 1800–1801, 1023; on the occasion of Burdett's committal to the Tower, 1810, 1078; in 1812, 1083; in 1816, 1116; the reform, in the city, 1816, 1122; at Queen Caroline's funeral procession, 1820, 1154; in 1826, 1162; the Bristol, 1831, 1194; raised by John Thom amongst the Canterbury fanatics, 1234–6; the Chartist, of 1839, 1238; the Frost insurrection at Newport, *ib.*; rioting in 1842, 1263; the Rebecca riots in Wales, 1266

Ripon. See Goderich.

Ripperda, duc de, sent on a secret mission to Vienna, to negotiate a treaty, 768; disgraced; sent to prison; reveals the secret articles of the treaty of Vienna, 768

Rivers, earl, patronage of printing by, 200; appointed of the council of Edward V., 202; arrested with the other members of the council by order of Gloucester, 203; beheaded, 205; poetic composition by, *ib.*

Rivoli, battle of, Jan. 14, 1797, 1017

Roads, British and Roman, different character of, 56

Robert succeeds William the Conqueror, as duke of Normandy, 65; state of Normandy under, 66; denounces his brother William as perjured, and prepares for war, 67; mortgages his dukedom in 1096 to William, *ib.*; becomes one of the leaders of the Crusade, *ib.*; returns to Europe, and marries, 70; invades England, but is reconciled to his brother Henry, to whom he cedes his claims to the crown of England, *ib.*; rebellion of Robert de Belême against, who is however pardoned and restored to his estates; disaffection of the Norman barons against, fostered by Henry, 71; is attacked by Henry, and taken prisoner, at the battle of Tenchebrai in 1105, 72; dies a prisoner in 1135, *ib.*

Robert, earl of Gloucester, becomes an adherent of Matilda against Stephen, 75; encourages the people of Bristol in their attacks on Stephen's partisans, *ib.*; maintains possession of Bristol and Leeds, *ib.*; lands in England with Matilda in 1130, 77; wins the battle of Lincoln and takes Stephen prisoner, *ib.*; captured at Winchester, and exchanged for Stephen, 78; character of, *ib.*; death of, in 1147, 78

Robertson, a smuggler, condemned to death for robbing an excise collector, but escapes, 787

Robespierre, Augustin, commissioned by the French convention to punish the Toulonese, 1000; death scene of, July, 1794, 1006

Robespierre, M. S., leader of the Jacobins; mover of the self-denying ordinance of the national assembly, 973; his hatred of Marat, 995; rouses the mob against the Girondins, *ib.*; maintains the system of terror, 1005; officiates at the festival of the Supreme Being, *ib.*; his speech in the hall of the Convention, *ib.*; his arrest; attempts to commit suicide; is guillotined, July 28, 1794, *ib.*; uncertainty as to what was his real character, *ib.*

Robin Hood, first mention of, 96; theories as to the reality of, *ib.*; the representative of resistance to aristocratic tyranny, *ib.*; detestation of oppression, and poetical excellence shown in the Robin Hood ballads, 97; theory of the adventures connected with, being founded on those of the defeated adherents of Simon de Montfort, 113

Robinson, F. J. See Goderich.

Rochambeau, comte de, commands the French armament sent to reinforce the Americans, 1780, 892; present at Cornwallis's surrender, 897, a commander in the French army sent against Austria, 1792, 977

Rochefort, failure of the British expedition against, 1757, 836

Rochejaquelein, Henri de la, a Vendean leader, 1001; obtains the chief command of their army, *ib.*; death of, 1793, *ib.*

Rochester, earl of, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, 684, 689; supports the motion for inviting Sophia of Hanover to England, 706

Rockingham, Charles Wentworth, marquis of, named first lord of the treasury, 1765, 851, 866; difficulty of his position arising from the disturbances in America, *ib.*; weakness of his administration, 854; again becomes first lord of the treasury, 1782; the king's aversion to; composition of his ministry, 900; notices the power of revenue officers at elections, 901; died, July 1, 1782, 905; his success as a cultivator, 918

Rodney, admiral sir George, destroys the gun-boats in Havre, 838; commands the fleet sent against Martinique, 845; his victory over the Spaniards off Cape St. Vincent, Jan. 16, 1780, 892; captures St. Eustatius, Feb., 1781, 895; defends his conduct against certain charges, *ib.*; arrives at the Barbadoes, Feb. 19, 1782; effects a junction with Hood's squadron, 900; chases de Grasse; gives him a signal defeat, April 12; first employs the manœuvre of "breaking the line"; question whether he was entitled to the merit of the idea, discussed; capture of the Ville de Paris, *ib.*; and other French vessels, 901

Roebuck, Dr., originator of modern improvements in manufacturing iron, and founder of the Carron iron works, 927; becomes embarrassed, *ib.*; refuses to allow Boulton a share in Watt's patent, 929; ultimately agrees to sell his share to Boulton, *ib.*

Rogers, Samuel, his "Jacqueline" published, 1814, and "Italy," 1822, 1138

Rohilla war, 1774, 948

Roland, appointed minister of the interior, 1792, 977; his wife; her enthusiastic republicanism, *ib.*; his dismissal, 978; resumes office, 980; execution of his wife, 1793, 1000

Rolica, battle of, Aug. 17, 1808, 1069

Roman dominion in Britain, civilizing effects of; roads in Britain, notice of, 12; policy in employing natives in their armies, 13; the army an instrument of civilization, *ib.*; fortresses in Britain, notice of, *ib.*; colonies in Britain, list of, *ib.*; ancient remains of, *ib.*; cities of, *ib.*; administration in Britain, 15; municipal establishments of, *ib.*; customs, existing remains of, 16; municipalities, rise of separate sovereignties in Britain, from, 19

Romans, progress of the conquests of, in Britain, 8; encouraged the settlement of foreigners in Britain, 14; municipal institutions established by the, 15; evidence of British iron manufacturing, tin and lead mining by the, 605

Rome, intercourse of Britain with, 6; taken by the Goths, 18; occupied and spoliated by the French, 1798, 1019; annexed to France, 1811, 1081

Romilly, sir Samuel, present at a dinner with Wilkes and Mirabeau: Wilkes defends the severity of the criminal law, 945; rejoices at the occurrence of the French revolution, 966; remarks of, on the September massacres, 1792, 981; describes the various parties in 1794, 1003; remarks on the bread riots, 1800, 1801, 1033; description of French despotism, 1802, 1041; praises Pitt's speech, 1803, 1044; solicitor-general, 1056; sums up the evidence for Melville's impeachment, 1806, 1057; engaged in the inquiry into the princess of Wales's conduct, *ib.*; eloquent speech on the abolition of the slave trade, 1061; remark of, on Mrs. Clarke's interference in military promotions, 1071; his eulogy on Mr. Perceval, 1083; his remarks on Brougham's speech against the regent, 1114; one of the leaders in bringing about an amelioration of the nation's social condition, 1117; his efforts in reforming the criminal laws lead to the abolition of capital punishment for several cases or kinds of thefts, 1118; returned M.P. for Westminster; the death of his wife a proximate cause of his suicide, Nov. 2, 1818, 1130

Rooke, sir George, present at the battle of La Hogue, 651; drives Tourville out of his shelter in the bay of La Hogue, destroying nearly all the French ships, *ib.*; defeated at the battle of St. Vincent, and loses a large number of merchant ships he was convoying, 657; commands the armament against Deumark, whose navy he drives to the walls of Copenhagen, 1699, 681; commands the fleet sent against Cadiz, 1702, 690; fails in taking it, but captures some Spanish galleons, *ib.*; commands the expeditionary fleet against Catalonia, 1704, 700; lands at Barcelona, but re-embarks, and effects a junction with sir C. Shovel; the two admirals, with the prince of Darmstadt, attack and capture the rock of Gibraltar, Aug. 2, *ib.*; fights a drawn battle with the French fleet off Malaga, *ib.*

Rosbach, battle of, Nov. 5, 1757, 836

Rose, George, secretary of the treasury; does not acquiesce in Pitt's bill for reform, 955; account of the national assembly's conduct by, 1791, 972; urges Pitt to include Fox and Grenville and their friends in his administration, 1046; his account of Pitt's last illness, 1052; introduces a bill for regulating savings' banks, 1816, 1120

Rosen supersedes Hamilton as commander of the forces besieging Londonderry, 628; his inhuman conduct, *ib.*; he fails in taking the place; raises the siege, Aug. 1, 1689, *ib.*

Ross, gen., himself and adm. Cockburn incite the slaves of America to rebellion, 1814, 1099; defeats the Americans and burns several buildings in Washington, *ib.*; mortally wounded in battle, Sept. 11, 1814, 1100

Roubiliac, L. F., his sculptures, 756

Royal Society incorporated by charter in 1662, 621

Rubens, his paintings; employed by Charles I., 757

Rullecourt, baron de. See Pierson, major.

Rupert, prince, appointed to the command of the horse in the royal army at Nottingham, 453; early career, 455 first encounter between his cavalry and the parliamentarian forces; insolence displayed by, *ib.*; conduct at the battle of Edgehill, 456; gains the battle at Brentford, 457; and that of Chalgrove Field, 459; takes Bristol, 460; relieves Lathom House, 465; possesses himself of York, *ib.*; is defeated at the battle of Marston Moor, *ib.*; retreats to Chester, *ib.*; is defeated at Naseby, 468; his impetuosity; surrenders Bristol, 469; is dismissed from his command by Charles I., *ib.*; meeting of, with Charles, at Newark, and final parting, 471; appears in St. George's channel with a formidable fleet, 493; admiral Blake interrupts the operations of, 494; takes refuge in Kinsale, *ib.*; compelled to leave the Irish coast, *ib.*; sails to the coast of Portugal, and is followed to the Tagus by Blake, 503; escapes to Spain, *ib.*; appointed to the command of the fleet against the Dutch in 1666, with Monk, 545; is suspected of not having aided Monk with sufficient promptitude in his battle with the Dutch fleet, *ib.*; assists in ravaging the Dutch coasts, *ib.*; is appointed to the command of the fleet on the resignation of the duke of York, in 1673, 557

Rural industry of the Anglo-Saxons, 28

Rush, Richard, the United States plenipotentiary in London; his description of queen Charlotte, 1130; his dispatch to Monroe on Canning's letter to himself, 1159; his discussions with Londonderry and Canning, *ib.*

Russell, admiral Edward, allows himself to be tampered with by James II., but is disgusted at that king's declaration, 651; commands the English fleet at the naval victory of La Hogue, *ib.*; removed from the command of the fleet, 1693, 655; restored again shortly after, 658; appointed to look after Tourville in 1694, 659; implicated by Fenwick with having held treasonous correspondence with James II., 667, created earl of Orford, 1697, *ib.*; impeached for his concern in the partition treaties, 685; struck off the privy council list on Anne's succession, 689

Russell, lord. See Bedford.

Russell, lord John, takes up the cause of parliamentary reform, 1819; obtains the disfranchisement of Grampound, 1131; proposes a partial repeal of the corporation and test acts, so as to admit dissenters to pub-

lic offices; his measure adopted in a compromised form, 1175; paymaster of the forces, 1187; the government reform bill introduced by him; his speech explanatory of its purpose, 1831, 1188; moves the second reading of the bill, 1189; it having been thrown out, he again brings it forward in the new parliament, 1191; carries it in the House of Lords, *ib.*; re-introduces it into the commons, Dec. 12, 1831, 1196; his resolution on the surplus funds of the Irish church, 1835, 1216; its adoption by the Commons leads to the resignation of the Peel ministry, *ib*; his municipal corporation reform bill, 1217 *et seq.*; his measure for commuting tithes, 1220; brings forward bills for a general registration, and for regulating the marriage of dissenters, 1221; his bills for introducing poor law into Ireland, and amending the criminal law, 1836, 1223; eulogizes William IV., *ib.*; home secretary, 1224; government adopts his resolutions condemnatory of the conduct of the Canadian legislature, 1232; his bill for inquiring into and redressing the Canadian grievances, 1233; grants the release of Thom, 1235; condemned for his leniency toward Frost, 1238; proposes a fixed duty on the importation of corn, 1243; advocates the principle of a free trade in corn, 1244; his speech on the address, 1245; his letter to the city of London electors advocating a repeal of the corn laws, 1275; the premiership offered him by the queen, 1236; which he accepts; but is unable to form a government, *ib.*; first lord of the treasury, July, 1846, 1279; his financial statement; apprehends a large expenditure; his plans for meeting it, 1284

Russell, lord Wm., moves a resolution in the house of commons to take into consideration how to suppress popery and prevent a popish succession, 569; carries up the exclusion bill to the House of Lords, *ib.*; accused of a participation in the Rye House plot in 1683; is arrested and brought to trial on July 13, 574; noble behavior of his wife, 575; is convicted, and beheaded on July 21, *ib.*

Ryder, Richard, his bill for punishing stocking or lace frame destroyers passed, 1812, 1083; home secretary, 1809-1812, 1325

Rysbrack, J. M., his sculptures, 656

Ryswick, treaty of, concluded, Sept. 22, 1697, 668, 732

Ryland, his house burnt down by the Birmingham rioters, 1791, 971

Sacheverel, Dr., enraged at Defoe for his pamphlet on the dissenters, 691; preaches before the lord mayor, Nov. 5, 1709, 718; he is ordered to attend at the bar of the house of commons, and is impeached, 719; proceedings of parliament against; the articles of impeachment, 720; popular manifestations in favor of; the parliament sentences him to three years' suspension from preaching, and his sermons to be burnt, 721; this lenient sentence is celebrated as a triumph by the high church party, *ib.*; his ovation and progress through the country, 723; characteristic description of him, as given by the duchess of Marlborough, *ib.*; preaches before the Commons on the thanksgiving day for peace, July 7, 1713, 736

Safety Lamp. See Davy; Stephenson.

St. Alban's, first battle of, on May 22, 1455, 190; Warwick defeated by queen Margaret in the second battle of, in 1461, 192

St. Aubyn, sir John, remonstrates against the king's preferring Hanoverian to English interests, 797

St. Bartholomew's, massacre of, 357

St. Christopher's given to Great Britain, 1714, 735; taken by the French, 1782, 900; restored to Britain, 1783, 907

St. Domingo, French expedition to; resistance opposed by Toussaint, 1042

St. Eustatius, capture of, by Rodney, 1781; the king surrenders his interest in it to the army and navy, 895; retaken by the French, 899

St. Germain, count de, French secretary at war; his interview with Steuben, 882

St. Jean d'Acre, bombardment and capture of, 1840, 1243

St. John, viscount Bolingbroke; he is taken into Marlborough's confidence, 695; resigns his place in the ministry, 1707, 714; his connection with Swift and the party press, 726; envies Harley for being stabbed; insinuates that the blow was intended for himself; has a misunderstanding with Harley on this point of honor, 727; congratulates Marlborough on his successes, 1714, 728; secretly negotiates with France for peace, 729; his letter to Ormond, 733; double-dealing of, 734; created viscount Bolingbroke, 1712, but is dissatisfied at not having received an earldom; is dispatched on an embassy to the French court; he secures the interest of the duke of Savoy, 735; obtains private interviews with the chevalier St. George, *ib.*; Louis XIV. presents him with a ring 4000*l.* in value, *ib.*; urges the chevalier to turn Protestant; introduces his Schism bill, 736; quarrels with Oxford, and gains the mastery over him, obtaining the supremacy in the ministry, *ib.*; is disappointed at George I. being proclaimed king, 760; loses his secretary of stateship, *ib.*; escapes to France; becomes the Pretender's secretary of state; is impeached by Walpole, June 9, 761; meets the Pretender at Paris; is dismissed from his service, 767; obtains leave to return to England; obtains an interview with his sovereign, 1727, 779; actively opposes Walpole, 1734, 785; his character described by Walpole, 785; he quits England, 786

St. Julien, admiral, his contest with the British at Toulon, 1793, 998

St. Just, cruelty of, 1005; decreed and led to the guillotine, 1794, *ib.*

St. Lucia taken by the British, 1762, 845; again, 1778, 886; ceded to the French, 1783, 907

St. Pancras church, solecism and unadaptability of its design, 1142; designed by the Inwoods; its cost, 1143

St. Paul's Cathedral, burning of the steeple of, in 1561, 242; opening of Wren's new building, Dec. 2, 1697, 668; plan of, 669; proposals to repair the old edifice; it is burnt down, 1666, 752; Wren's first design for a new cathedral, 753; first stone laid, 1675; the last, 1710, *ib.*; criticism on, *ib.*

St. Petersburg founded by Peter the Great, 1703, 718

St. Philip, Byng neglects to try the relief of, 830; it surrenders to the French arms, June 27, 1756, *ib.*

Saint Ruth, commander-in-chief of James II.'s Irish army, 645; defeated by the English under Ginkell at Aghrim, July 12, 1691, *ib.*

St. Sebastian captured by the French, 1719, 772; taken by the British under general Graham, 1813, 1091

St. Vincent taken by the British, 1762; regained, 1783, 907

St. Vincent, battle of, Feb. 14, 1797, 845, 1014

St. Vincent, earl. See Jervis.

Saladin, extent of the power of, 90; takes Jerusalem, *ib.*; fails to relieve Acre, 92; neglecting to restore the Holy Cross, the hostages at Acre are massacred, 93; beheads the Christian captives in retaliation for Richard's massacre of the hostages, *ib.*; defeated by Richard in 1191, *ib.*; compels Richard to retreat to Ascalon, but interchanges courtesies with him, *ib.*; captures Jaffa, 95; agrees to a truce with Richard for three years in 1192, and dies in 1193, *ib.*

Salamanca, or Arapiles, battle of, July 22, 1812, 1086

Sale, sir Robert, general, leaves Cabul, 1250; harassed by the enemy, *ib.*; takes Jellalabad, 1251; his heroic defence of the place, *ib. et seq.*; marches to the relief of Cabul, *ib.*; mortally wounded at the battle of Ferozeshah, 1845, 1280

Salt, first bed of rock salt discovered in Cheshire in 1670, 608; heavy duties levied upon; abolished in 1823, *ib.*; consumption of, in 1839, *ib.*; duty on, revived 1732, 783; which has the effect of preventing the use of the refuse salt as manure, 918

Sancroft, William, archbishop; refuses to take the oath of allegiance to William III., 623; absent at the coronation of William III., 626; deprived of his archbishopric, 1691, 643

Sanctuary, enormous abuse of, *temp.* Henry VII., 222

Sanderson, sir Thomas, raises a war-cry against Spain, 1739, 791

San Domingo, trade of, 1789; slave revolt in, 1791, 990

Sandwich, lord, sent to watch over the duke of Cumberland, 810; secretary of state, 1763, 847; he resolves to prosecute Wilkes; sets spies on Wilkes's movements and steals his papers; complains of him in parliament, 848; secretary of state, 1763-1765, 865; aids in cross-examining Penn on the feeling of America towards England, 877; replies to Chatham's proposed amendment on the address, 1777, 883

Sandys moves for Walpole's dismissal from the king's councils, 1741, 794; his motion rejected, *ib.*

San Mateo besieged by count of Las Torres; relieved by Peterborough, 702

Saratoga, convention of, signed Oct. 17, 1777, 882

Sardinia taken by admiral sir J. Leake, 1708, 716

Sarsfield, general, commander of the garrison at Limerick; makes a sortie during the siege of 1690 upon the guns and stores of William's army destroying or rendering them useless, 640; inactive part taken by, at the battle of Aghrim, July, 1691, 644

Sarum, town and hill-fort in the time of the Roman dominion, 6

Saunders, admiral, supersedes West in his command, 1756, 830; conveys Wolfe and his army to Quebec, 839

Savannah taken by the British, 888

Savery, Thomas, steam-engine invented by, 610

Saville, sir George, M.P. for Yorkshire; presents the county petition for redress of grievances, 1780, 888; moves for a list of crown places, 889; his house gutted by the Gordon rioters, 891

Savings banks, establishment of, at Tottenham in 1798 and 1804; at Bath in 1808; at Ruthwell in 1810; and in London, 1816, 1120

Savoy annexed to France, 1792, 983; restored to Piedmont, 1109

Saxe, marshal, appointed to command the troops for the projected invasion of England, 1743; that expedition failing, he takes the command of an army in the Low Countries, 797; commands the French at Fontenoy, 1745, 798; persuades Louis XV. to retire from the battle, *ib.*; gains the victory over the allies at Lauffeld, July 2, 1747, 820

Saxe Gotha, princess of. See Frederick of Wales, 935, 968, 1015

Saxon shore, "Litus Saxonicum," opinions of Dr. Lappenberg, sir F. Palgrave, and Mr. Kemble as to its meaning a settlement of Saxons, 13

Saxon invasion of Britain, obscurity of the events of, 20; rapid succession of Saxon kings or chiefs; gradual extension of the dominions of; native seats of, *ib.*; heathendom, account of, 21; period, close of, 56; influence of, on the national character, *ib.*

Saxons, probable settlement of large numbers of, in England, before the Saxon invasion, 15, 16; principle of personal freedom probably derived from, 15; obscure interval between their supremacy in Britain, and that of the Romans, 18

Schellenberg, or Donawert, battle of the, July 2, 1704, 690

Schism bill, passed 1714, 736; Stanhope desires the repeal of the, 771

Schomberg, marshal, lands in Ireland with an army, Aug. 13, 1689, 628; unable to do anything from the neglected condition of the army, which suffered from want of clothes, medicine, and even necessaries, 635; reinforced, 637; leads the centre at the battle of the Boyne, 638; rallies the retreating Protestants and is slain, July 1, 1690, *ib.*

Schools. See Education.

Sciences, sketch of the state of the, *temp.* William and Anne, 621; knowledge of the, spread and increased by the Jesuits, 867; scientific labors and discoveries of Herschell, Davy, Dalton, Wollaston, and Jenner, 1141; scientific writers in 1842, 1260

Scinde, conquest and wise administration of, by sir C. J. Napier, 1843, 1266-8

Scindia wars with Holkar; then allies with him against the British, 1053; defeated at Assye by Wellington, 1055; and again Nov. 29, 1803; signs a treaty with the British, Dec. 30, *ib.*; joins the Mahratta confederacy against the British, 1169; agrees to aid the British against the Pindarees; his faithlessness, *ib.*

Scott, John. See Eldon.

Scott, sir Walter, prejudices of, against the union, 709; his verse romances; publication of "The Lay of the Last Minstrel," 1805; "Marmion," 1808; and the "Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border," 1137; two critiques, 1138; his immense popularity, *ib.*; failure of his dramas, 1139; high success of his Waverley novels, 1140; his commercial failure an example of the danger of drawing upon future wealth, 1145; his honorable efforts to discharge his obligations, *ib.*; urges the Scotch to treat Charles X. respectfully, 1184; benefits conferred on his family by the copyright act, 1251

Sebastiani, general, his report on the practicability of France reconquering Egypt, 1042; the French ambassador at Constantinople; his offers to sultan Selim, 1063; joins Victor in the Peninsula, 1076

Secession. See American Secession.

Secular law, state of, *temp.* Henry II., 84

Sedgemoor, battle of, July 5, 1685, 582

Seditious meetings bill brought in by Pitt, 1010; opposition to it, *ib.*; passed 1795, *ib.*; another passed Mar. 29, 1817, 1123

Selden, John, joins in the protestation of the House of Commons, in 1621, against the king's interference with their liberty of speech, 418; assists in the debate on the Petition of Right, in 1628, 423; committed to the Tower after parliament had been dissolved, in 1629, 425

Selwyn, major, denounces British interference in continental affairs, 806

Senlac, original name of the spot where the battle of Hastings was fought, 55 *et seq.*

Septennial act, debates and remarks on the; passed 1716, 767; its repeal agitated, 785

Seringapatam, besieged and taken by the British, 1791, 989; and again in 1799, 1029

Seton, Mr., of Pitmedden, one of the commissioners for establishing the union, 1706; his arguments in favor of the scheme, 710

Settlement, early establishment of the law of, 385; ill effects of, and severities exercised under, *ib.*; its severity on the poor, 616, 913, 1119; slightly alleviated, 1861, *ib.*

Seven years' war, history of the, 830, 836, 843, 844, 911

Severus, wall of, 11; suppresses the revolt of the Brigantes and Mæatæ; death of, A.D. 211, *ib.*

Seville, peace of, Nov. 9, 1729, 733, 780

Seymour, sir Edward, his remarks on the want of good British generals, 653; his contempt of Scotland's poverty, 674; comptroller, 1702, 690

Seymour, lord Thomas, brother of Somerset, marries Catherine, widow of Henry VIII., 205; quarrels with his brother, *ib.*; addresses the princess Elizabeth after the death of his wife, *ib.*; is accused of treason, convicted, and executed, *ib.*; charge against, of defrauding the Mint in conjuction with sir J. Sharrington, 306; letters of, to the princesses Mary and Elizabeth, *ib.*

Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, earl of, becomes a member of the Cabal ministry, in 1667, 552; character of, by Butler and Dryden, *ib.*; complicity of, in Charles becoming a pensioner of France, *ib.*; shifting policy of, 553; is created earl of Shaftesbury, and made lord chancellor, 556; character of, 557; declares the Declaration of Indulgence illegal, *ib.*; is dismissed from his office of chancellor, and becomes the leader of the opposition, 558; letter attributed to, descriptive of the composition of the House of Commons, *ib.*; committed to the Tower for opinions expressed in the House of Lords, in 1677, 560; is suspected of having fomented the Popish Plot in 1678, 562; is named president of the council in 1679, and continues to lead the opposition, 565; is dismissed from the presidency, 568; presents the duke of York as a popish recusant to the grand jury at Westminster, *ib.*; supports the Exclusion Bill in the House of Lords, which is rejected, 570; is indicted for high treason in 1681, and the grand jury throw out the bill, 572; he flies to Holland, 573; death of, in 1683, *ib.*

Shah Alum. See Alum, Shah.

Shah Soojah, an expelled sovereign, and pensioner of the East India Company, 1248; the British undertake the Affghan war to re-enthrone him, *ib.*; restored to his sovereignty, 1249; complains of his position, *ib.*; assassinated, 1251

Shakspere, William, characteristics of his dramas, 394; nationality of, *ib.*; knowledge of, and taste for, disseminated by Steele, 739; Roubiliac's statue of, 756; impulse given to Shaksperean criticism, 1260

Shannon, fight between the, and the Chesapeake, June 1, 1813, 1098

Sharpe, Granville, aids in promoting the abolition of slavery, 1057

Sharp, William, his engravings, 1148

Shaw, sir James; his courage in quelling the riots of, 1816, 933

Sheffield, trades of, 610; obtains parliamentary representation, 1832, 1200; population in 1831 and 1861, *ib.*

Shelburne, earl of, dismissed his offices and treated with coldness by the king for voting against government on the general warrant question, 1764, 850;

secretary of state, 1766-1768, 865 ; praises the king's nobleness of mind, 898 ; secretary of state, 1782, 900 ; his remarks on contractors, 902 ; circular issued by, on the volunteer question, 902 ; his Irish trade motion rejected, 903 ; commences overtures of peace with Franklin, 904 ; Fox obtains a share in the negotiations ; differences arise between the two ; Shelborne appointed first lord of the treasury, 1782, 905 ; resigns his premiership, Feb. 24, 1783, 907 ; advocates for free trade, *ib.*
Shelley, P. B. ; "Queen Mab" published, 1812 ; drowned, 1821 ; high character of his poetry, 1138
Shepherd, sir Samuel, attorney-general ; prosecutes Hone for libel, 1119
Sheridan, R. B., elected M.P. for Stafford, 894 ; resigns office, 1782, 905 ; defends the proceedings of the National Assembly ; Burke renounces him, 968 ; condemns, with others, the proceedings of the National Convention against Louis XVI., 984; opposes the "Traitorous Correspondence" bill, 992 ; patriotically supports the mutiny bills of 1797, 1016 ; his speech on the projected French invasion of England, 1798, 1019 ; moves an amendment to the address, 1799, 1026 ; advocates a hearty coöperation with Spain against France, 1068
Sheriffmuir, battle of, Nov. 13, 1715, 765
Shippen ; his remarks on the king's speech, 1717, 771 ; sent to the Tower in consequence, *ib.*
Shore, sir John. See Teignmouth, lord.
Shovel, sir Cloudesley, joins with sir G. Rooke and the prince of Darmstadt in the capture of Gibraltar, 1704, 700 ; commands the fleet carrying troops to Barcelona, 701 ; commands the English and Dutch fleet employed in the attack upon France, 1707 ; bombards Toulon ; wrecked on his return home, Oct. 22, 714 ; supposed to have been murdered by an old woman ; description of the wreck, *ib.*
Shrewsbury (or Hateley Field), battle of, July 21, 1403, when Hotspur fell, 162
Shrewsbury, duke of, negotiates with Anne as to her revenue, 633 ; William III.'s favorite minister ; resigns his secretary of stateship at the command of James II., to whom he deserts, 1690, 636 ; again offered the office of secretary of state, which he accepts along with a dukedom, 658 ; recommends Marlborough to William's favor, 659 ; correspondence between William and, 1696, 666 ; accused of having communicated with James II., 667 ; the queen appoints him lord high treasurer, 736, 760
Sidmouth, viscount. See Addington.
Sidney, Algernon, opposes the trial of the king, 489 ; is accused of participation in the Rye-House Plot, in 1683, 575 ; his defence, and conviction, *ib.* ; is beheaded on Dec. 7, *ib.*
Sidney, sir Philip, serves in the army sent to assist the Netherlands, 359 ; death of, at Zutphen, 359 ; funeral of, 368
Siéyés, abbé, proposed that the Tiers État be called the "National Assembly," 962 ; his plans for a constitution accepted by the people, 1009 ; a member of the French directory, 1030 ; appointed one of the three consuls, 1799, *ib.*
Sign paintings. See Painting.
Sikh war, 1845, 1846, 1280
Silbury Hill, the largest artificial mound in Europe, 6
Silchester, 6 ; account of the Roman city of, 13, 14
Silk ; Lombe's mill at Derby ; trade of ; state of manufacture, 607 ; prohibition of Indian silks, 613
Silures, unsubdued during the reign of Claudius, 8
Simnel, Lambert, imposture of, 212 ; represents himself as son of the duke of Clarence, 213 ; his pretensions supported by the duchess of Burgundy, *ib.* ; proclaimed king in Dublin, *ib.* ; lands in England with a force under Martin Swartz, is defeated at Stoke, on June 4, 1487, and taken prisoner, *ib.* ; appointed to a mean office in Henry's kitchen, *ib.*
Sindercomb, Miles, plot of, against Cromwell, 522 ; its failure, *ib.*
Sing, Cheyte. See Cheyte Sing.
Singapore ceded to the British, 1170
Singh, Ammer. See Ochterlony.
Sinking fund scheme, Pitt's, 955
Siward, earl of Northumbria (the Siward of Shakespere's Macbeth), notice of, 50
Skippon, major, his speech to the Londoners, 457 ; takes the place of Essex as commander, 465 ; commands the centre with Fairfax at battle of Naseby, 468 ; escorts the payment of money to the Scots for the surrender of Charles I., 474
Slave trade carried on by Bristol traders, 17th and 18th centuries, 603 ; by the merchants of Liverpool and Lyme, 609 ; Assiento contract for the supply of slaves renounced by England, 1750, 909 ; debate on, 1792 ; parliament resolves on its abolition, 967 ; slaves emancipated by France, 1792, 1042 ; she desires to re-establish the trade, *ib.* ; debates on, 1806 ; progress of the cause of abolition ; parliament resolves to abolish, 1057 ; slave trade abolition bill passed ; receives the royal assent, March 25, 1807, 1061 ; England and America agree to put down, 1101 ; abolished by Bonaparte ; persisted in by Portugal and Spain, 1111 ; debates on, 1823, 1824, 1161
Slavery, existence of, in England under the Romans, 15 ; imposed by statute as a punishment for vagrancy in 1547, 292 ; the statute repealed in 1549, 312
Slavery, colonial ; Canning's resolutions for ameliorating the condition of slaves with a view to their ultimate emancipation agreed to, 1161 ; slavery laws, *ib.* ; case of Mr. Smith the missionary, *ib.* ; résumé of parliamentary efforts towards abolishing, 1206 ; resolutions in Mr. Stanley's bill for the abolition of, in the British colonies, *ib.* ; progress of the bill through parliament, 1833, *ib.* ; the first day of emancipation in America, Aug. 1, 1834, *ib.* ; Dr. Channing's address on the abolition of, 1207 ; proposition of president Lincoln in 1862 to emancipate slaves, *ib.* ; effects of the abolition, *ib.* ; treaty with Brazil for abolition of, Oct. 18, 1825, 1225 ; emancipation of the slaves in Jamaica, 1237
Smirke, sir R., his architectural works, 935, 1143
Smith, John, a missionary, tried on a charge of inciting the Demerara negroes to revolt ; sentenced to death ; dies in consequence of imprisonment while in ill-health ; his case brought before the British parliament, 1161
Smith, sir Sidney, conducts the blowing up of the French fleet and arsenals on the evacuation of Toulon, Dec., 1793, 999; defends Acre, 1799, 10.9 ; commands the English fleet assisting the Turks, 1801, 1038 ; commands a squadron at Palermo, 1806, 1060
Smith, Sydney, desires the continuance of peace, 1823, 1158 ; "Mrs. Partington's" speech on the reform bill, 1831, 1193 ; urges Lord Grey to create peers to secure the passing of the reform bill,1196 ; describes the cruelty of not allowing counsel to prisoners, 1220 ; his idea of the queen's first duty, 1230
Smolensk, battle before, 1812 ; evacuated by the Russians, 1089
Smollett, Tobias, his vivid description of the attack upon Carthagena, 793 ; publication of his "Roderick Random," 1748 ; "Peregrine Pickle," 1751 ; and "Ferdinand, Count Fathom," 1753, 937 ; manners of 18th century illustrated from his works, 938, 939
Smuggling, extensive practice of, 786, 954
Soane, sir John, built the Bank of England, the Treasury front, and some other edifices, 1143
Soap, duties formerly laid upon, and consumption of, 608
Sobraon, battle of, Feb. 10, 1846, 1280
Social Evils, *temp.* William and Anne, 620
Societies, for reforming manners, first adopted by the Puritans, 670 ; Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge established about 1698, *ib.* ; Society for the Propagation of the Gospel established about 1698, *ib.* ; an older one was established in 1649, but it died out soon after the Restoration, *ib.* ; artists stimulated by the Society of Arts, 930 ; Society of Sign Painters, and exhibition of paintings by them, 931 ; meetings of the London Corresponding, the Constitutional Information, and the Friends of the People Societies, denouncing the French revolutionary doctrines, 983 ; Hampden Clubs, 1121 ; Society of Spencean Philanthropists, 1122 ; British Institution, 1146 ; Society of Painters in Water-colors formed 1805, 1147 ; Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge originated by lord Brougham, 1826, 1174 ; good and cheap literature issued by it, *ib.*
Socinians, statute against, 1689, 670
Soda, manufacture of, promoted by the abolition of the tax on salt, 608
Solmes, count, leads the Dutch guards at the battle of the Boyne, 638 ; his charge on the Irish, 638 ; commands the English at Steinkirk ; his conduct at the battle blamed, 653 ; slain, 1693, 654
Somers, lord, named solicitor-general, 1689, 622 ; made lord-keeper, 1693, 655 ; is the leader of his party, 658 ; promoted to the lord chancellorship, 1697 ; and made a peer, 668 ; sends William a blank commission for appointing commissioners, *ib.* ; removed from his lord chancellorship, 1700, 681 ; impeached in 1701 for his concern in the Partition treaties, 684 ; conferred with by William on the state of English politics, 686 ; loses his place in the privy council on the accession of queen Anne, 1702, 689 ; his weariness of factions, 693 ; has a great influence in bringing about the union of the two kingdoms, 708 ; his opinion on the Septennial Act ; died, 1716, 768
Somerset, Edward Seymour, duke of. See Hertford, earl of.
Somerset House, notice of the building erected by the duke of Somerset, 311
Somerset, Robert Carr, earl of, rapid ride of, from London to Edinburgh, to inform James of Elizabeth's death, 397 ; lavishness of James towards, 406 ; assumes the government of the kingdom after Cecil's death, 411 ; marriage of, to the divorced lady Essex, *ib.* ; trial of, with the countess, for the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, 413 ; deceitful conduct of the king towards, *ib.* ; they are convicted, and pardoned, 414
Somersetshire, a specimen of its dialect, 606 ; agricultural progress of ; King's Sedgmoor and the Quantock hills, 917 ; Exmoor, its black cocks and stags, *ib.* ; forty-one persons to every 100 acres, *ib.*
Sophia, princess, of Hanover ; her parentage, husband, and child ; description of ; becomes heir to the English crown, 682 ; death of, May 14, 1728, 736
Sophia, princess of Zell, wife of George I., from whom she was divorced, and confined in Aldhen Castle on account of a supposed connection with count Königsmark, 760 ; died November 13, 1726, 779
Soubise, prince de, encamps near Mucheln, 836 ; defeated at Rosbach by Frederick, 836
Soult, marshal, serves in Jourdan's army, 1006 ; defeated by Moore at Corunna, Jan. 1809, 1071 ; his testimony to Moore's merits, *ib.* ; takes possession of Oporto, March 29, 1072 ; obliges Wellington to retreat, 1809, 1076 ; defeated at the battle of Albuera, May, 1811, 1082 ; retreats to Seville, *ib.* ; and joins forces with Marmont, *ib.* ; commands the French army in Spain, 1813, 1089 ; fights the battles of the Pyrenees, *ib.* ; his engagement with Wellington and Hill, 1091 ; defeated by Wellington at Orthez, Feb. 27, 1814, 1092 ; retreats to Toulouse, where he again fights with Wellington, April 10, *ib.* ; his enthusiastic reception at the queen's coronation, 1234 ; succeeds to the ministry on Thiers' resignation, 1243
South Sea Company, its proposed scheme ; eagerness of the public to obtain shares, 1720, 773 ; various other contemporary schemes, *ib.* ; the company endeavors to obtain a monopoly by repressing other companies, which brings about its own downfall ; the rapid sinking of the stock, 774 ; and final bursting of the bubble ; Walpole appointed to restore the national credit, *ib.* ; the South Sea scheme compared with the Mississippi scheme of John Law, *ib.* ; bribery complaints from various trades, showing their deplorable state and the universal want of money, *ib.* ; Walpole's plan for sustaining the national credit ; committee of inquiry appointed ; flight of Knight, the cashier of the company ; the various fates of earl Sunderland, Aislabie, James Craggs, and the postmaster-general, 775 ; the directors estates are confiscated, and themselves declared incapable of holding any government office, *ib.*
Southey, Robert, character of the ancient Britons by, 5 ; he condemns the inquisitorial character of the property tax, 1113 ; his style described by Byron, 1137 ; his mental decay, 1254
Southwell, poor law reforms carried out at, prior to 1834, 1015
Sovereigns, Table of. See Tables.
Spafields meeting of reformers and riot, 1816, 1122
Spencean philanthropists, the, their origin and objects, 1122
Spencer, earl, first lord of the admiralty, 1794, 1007 ; secretary of state for home department, 1806, 1056
Spenser, Edmund, embodiment of early English legends by, 2 ; characteristics of his poetry, 394
Spenser, Hugh. See Edward II.
Spithead, the mutiny at, 1797, 1030
Sports and Games. See England.
Staël, madame de, her remarks on Pitt and Fox, 993 ; her description of the first days of the consulate, 1034
Stage. See Drama.
Stage coaches in the 18th century ; manners as connected with, 938
Stair, earl of, commands the British troops in Flanders, 1743, 797 ; cut off from his supplies ; advises George II. to make some perilous adventure ; his advice not being adopted, he resigns his commission, *ib.*
Stamp Act passed 1711 ; duties imposed by it ; effects produced by, 734 ; for taxing America, 1765, *ib.* ; opposition to it in America, 850 ; debates and remarks on the, *ib.* ; further opposition in America, 851 ; petition of London merchants against it, 852 ; Pitt urges its repeal, *ib.* ; examination of Dr. Franklin on the American temper respecting the, *ib.* ; repeal of the, 853
Standard, battle of the, 75
Stanhope, James, earl of, general, sent with reinforcements for the relief of Barcelona, 1706, 708 ; carries Port Mahon in conjunction with admiral Leake, 1708, 716 ; applies the question of Sacheverel's impeachment to the high church doctrines, 720 ; persuades Charles to take the field against Philip V. ; gains the battle of Almenara, July 20, 1710 ; and that near Saragossa, Aug. 20 ; enters Madrid, Sept. 21, 725 ; retreats to Brihuega ; is surprised by the French under Vendôme ; fights with him, and surrenders himself and army, Dec. 9, *ib.* ; becomes a secretary of state, 761 ; introduces a law excluding crown pensioners from parliament, 768 ; negotiates for a French alliance with the abbé Dubois, 768 ; discountenances violent measures against Russia, 769 ; reveals Gyllenburg's intrigues to the council ; disagrees with Townshend, *ib.* ; obtains the chief administration of affairs, *ib.* ; raised to the peerage, 1717, 770 ; desires to avert the war with Spain, 1718, 771 ; obtains the repeal of the occasional Conformity and Schism acts ; desires also that of the Test act ; and the mitigation of the penal laws against Roman Catholics, *ib.* ; his death caused by a rush of blood into his head during a fit of anger, 1721, 775
Stanhope, earl, his experiments on the construction of steam-ships, 1794, 1004
Stanhope, Charles, cleared of the charge of bribery brought against him, 775
Stanislaus Leczinsky, set up as king of Poland by Charles XII., 713 ; began to reign, 1704 ; Augustus restored in 1709, 760 ; his claim to the throne supported by France on the death of Augustus, 784
Stanley, E. G. S. See Derby, earl of.
Star-Chamber court instituted by Henry VII. in 1488, 222 ; extended jurisdiction given to, by Charles I., 426 ; severe sentence of, on Prynne, in 1633, for publishing the "Histrio-mastix," 427 ; and on Dr. Leighton for writing against Prelacy, 428 ; convicts and inflicts heavy punishments, in 1637, on Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, for their anti-prelatical writings, 431 ; fines the city of London 70,000*l.* for an infringement of the conditions on which they held they held their lands in Ulster, 432 ; its prisoners released on the opening of the Long Parliament, in Nov. 1640, 437 ; abolished by statute, 442
Staremberg general, joins general Stanhope in a campaign against Philip of Spain, 1710, 725 ; engages Vendôme at Villa Viciosa, Dec. 10 ; retreats to Barcelona, *ib.*
Statute of Winchester, 1285, provisions of, 115
Statutes of Laborers, passed in 1349 and 1351, in order to fix their residence, and to establish a scale of wages, 140 ; injustice and inefficiency of, 141
Steamboats, Stanhope's experiments in the construction of, 1004 ; introduction of, on the Clyde, the Thames, and Loch Lomond, 1141 ; first employed by the navy in the Birmese was, 1171 ; improvements in, 1234 ; war steamers first employed in battle at the siege of St. Jean d'Acre, 1840. 1243
Steam-engine ; Savery's invention ; bill for encouraging the, 610 ; employed in the cotton manufacture, 926 ; thirty-three million spindles driven in 1856 by, *ib.* ; vast improvements in the, made by Watt, 929 ; Watt and Boulton's Soho works, *ib.* ; final establishment of the, and its amazing influence upon the affairs of the world, *ib.* ; the sword's antagonist, *ib.* ; applied to navigation purposes, 1004, 1140

Steam printing machine; its influence in promoting a spread of knowledge, 1142
Steele, Richard, Swift's intimacy with, 726; turned out of his employment for satirizing Harley, *ib.*; expelled the House of Commons for writing a pamphlet entitled the "Crisis," 1713; ably defended by Addison and Walpole, 736; starts the "Tatler," April 12, 1709, 737; character and aim of this work, *ib.*; his influence and objects as an essayist, 738; with Addison directs the attention of the people to Shakspere and Milton, 739; his creation of Sir A. Freeport, Captain Sentry, and Will Honeycomb, *ib.*; the Speciator's club, 740; his notice of three plays, 743; description of the prude and coquette by, 744; denounces luxurious dining and the fashion of duelling, 745; endeavors to repress gaming, 746; advocates for mercy towards the rebel lords, 746; opposed the Peerage bill, 1719, 773
Steinkirk, battle of, Aug. 3, 1692, 653; debate on the, 653
Stephen, earl of Boulogne, swears to the succession of Matilda, 73; departs for England on the death of Henry I., 74; crowned king of England on Dec. 26, 1135, *ib.*; remarkable outbreak of the people against the Forest Laws, and general confusion, *ib.*; preferred by the people to a female sovereign, 75; evil effects of the feudal system under, *ib.*; early reaction of the nobles in favor of Matilda, *ib.*; is attacked by David, king of Scotland, who supports the claim of Matilda, *ib.*; the Scots defeated by the bishop of Durham, with the aid of the Saxons, in the battle of the Standard, *ib.*; reduces some of the disaffected barons, *ib.*; quarrels with the clergy, and arrests the bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln, 77; his brother, the bishop of Winchester, denounces him at a synod, and he is threatened with excommunication, *ib.*; Matilda lands in England to support her claim, and is besieged in Arundel castle, *ib.*; is allowed to pass to Bristol to join the earl of Gloucester, *ib.*; evils of the destructive partisan war, *ib.*; battle of Lincoln, 78; taken prisoner and confined in Bristol castle, *ib.*; his wife expels Matilda from London with the aid of the inhabitants, *ib.*; is exchanged for the earl of Gloucester, who had been captured at Winchester, *ib.*; sympathy of the people for, *ib.*; besieges Matilda in Oxford; turmoil and desolation in the kingdom in 1142, 79; is attacked by Henry II., whom he accepts as his successor, *ib.*; dies Oct. 25, 1154, 80
Stephenson, George, his rise from the position of engine foreman; his patent safety lamp; constructs a locomotive, 1814, 1185; constructs the Darlington, and Stockton, and the Liverpool and Manchester railways, *ib.*; his "Rocket" engine; railway works by himself and son, Robert, *ib.*
Sterne, Lawrence, his "Tristram Shandy" published, 1759-1767, 937
Steuben, aide-de-camp to Frederick of Prussia, 881; volunteers into the American service, 882; condition of the American army according to, 883; he drills and re-organizes it, 884; one of the court appointed to try André; his concern for André, 893; renders valuable assistance at the siege of York Town, 1781, 897; his remarks on the siege, *ib.*
Stevenson, colonel, pursues the Scindia's army, 1054; unable to join Wellington in time to take part in the battle of Assye, *ib.*; takes Asseerghur and Burhampoor, 1055
Stewart, general, sent to take Rosetta; compelled to retreat, 1807, 1064
Stockdale and Hansard, case of. See Hansard.
Stockholm, treaty of, Mar. 24, 1724, 733; Mar. 3, 1813, 1094
Stockings, manufacture of, in the 16th, 17th, 18th and 19th centuries, 607
Stoke, battle of, in support of Lambert Simnel, on June 4, 1487, 213
Stonehenge, notice of, 6
Stopford, sir R. admiral; his naval successes against Mehemet Ali, 1243
Storm, great, of 1703; Eddystone lighthouse destroyed by it, 604, 693
Stormont, lord, maltreated by the Gordon rioters, 1780, 891; secretary of state, 1779-1782, 1325
Stothard, his paintings; vignettes, 1146
Strabo, statement of, relating to the peaceful communication of the Britons with the Romans, after Cæsars invasion, 5
Strafford, earl of (sir Thomas Wentworth), supports the Petition of Right in 1628, 423; becomes chief minister of Charles I. after the death of Buckingham, 427; is created a viscount, made Lord President of the North, and Lord Deputy of Ireland, *ib.*; explains to Laud the principle of *thorough*, on which England and Ireland were to be governed, 427; proposes to the king a monopoly of salt 429; strong expressions in favor of the levy of Ship Money, 430; prevented by illness from taking command of the English forces against the Scots at Newburn, 435; wishes to return to Ireland, but the king pledges himself for his safety, and he remains in London, 435; is impeached by the House of Commons in 1641, 437; is arrested and committed to the Tower; charges brought against; preparation of Westminster Hall for the trial of, 438; conduct of during the trial, 439; his defence, *ib.*; papers of the Privy Council furnished against, *ib.*; his eloquent speech on, during his defence, 440; a bill of attainder passed against, by both Houses, 441; firm demeanor of, at his execution, on May 12, 1641, 442
Strafford, lord, sir John Byng, accusation against respecting Oliver the spy, quite unfounded, 1124
Strange, sir Robert, an engraver; his diligence and skill, 1122
Strathallan, viscount. See Drummond, William.
Struensee, a favorite of the king of Denmark; a conspiracy organized against by the queen dowager; tried and beheaded, 868
Strutt, Jedediah, obtains a share in Arkwright's spinning machine, 944
Stuart family, note on the three last members of the, 825
Stuart, Charles Edward Louis Casimir (The Young Pretender); born 1720, 775; called from Rome to Paris to aid in an invasion of Great Britain, 1743; the expedition failing he retires to Gravelines, 797; Jacobitism of England and Scotland, 799; determines upon restoring the fortunes of his house; writes to his father of his intentions, 800; arrives at Eriska, July 23, 1745, 801; his voyage from Belleisle; takes shelter in MacDonald's house; his cold reception, *ib.*; persuades Clanranald and two other chiefs to join him; lands at Borodale, July 25; communicates with the clan chiefs; persuades Cameron of Lochiel to aid in his enterprise, *ib.*; the Glenfinnan gathering, Aug. 19; his standard is raised and the Stuart proclamation read, 802; his own resources and the crippled state of the government's army, *ib.*; marches southwards; reaches Perth, Sept. 4, having passed Cope marching northwards; enters Perth; his cause gains ground; he is joined by Drummond and Murray, 803; crosses the Forth; joined by lord Kilmarnock; reaches Corstorphine; preparations for defence at Edinburgh, *ib.*; obtains possession of the town, Sept. 17; enters Holyrood house; James VIII. proclaimed king; Cope embarks his troops at Aberdeen; lands at Dunbar, and marches towards Edinburgh, *ib.*; battle of Preston-Pans, Sept. 21, in which Cope receives a signal defeat, 804; sleeps at Pinkie house; and returns to Edinburgh, *ib.*; blockade of Edinburgh Castle; intends crossing the border, *ib.*; English opinions of the rebellion, *ib.*; enters Cumberland, Nov. 8; expects a great insurrectionary movement among the English; the inhabitants of Kilmarnock refuse to rise, 807; cause of the non-resistance to his advance; Carlisle is invested, Nov. 10, *ib.*; and taken three days after, *ib.*; the dubiousness of his cause; he continues his march into England, 808; Manchester recruits; the town is taken by a sergeant, a drum, and a woman; Johnstone's narrative thereof, *ib.*; the lukewarmness of Manchester, 809; marches on to Macclesfield; crosses the Mersey; reaches Derby, Dec. 5, *ib.*; they plunder the town of the collected taxes; the duke of Cumberland pursues him, and general Wade advances upon him from the north, *ib.*; the enthusiasm of his Highlanders; their eagerness to fight Cumberland; a retreat is resolved upon, *ib.*; Johnstone's fictitious narrative of the panic in London, 810; the Londoners prepare for defence, *ib.*; his cause receives no encouragement from the commercial or industrious public, *ib.*; he retreats from Derby, 811; loses confidence; his mistaken notions and weakness of character, *ib.*; he is pursued by Cumberland and Oglethorpe, 812; the retreat is delayed by bad roads; lord Murray takes up a position near Clifton to wait the attack of the pursuing army, *ib.*; has a skirmish with the foremost dragoons, whom he beats back; arrives at Carlisle; the prince leaves that city in the hands of a few followers; his callous indifference as to their fate, *ib.*; Carlisle is invested by the duke of Cumberland it capitulates, Dec. 30; the Highland army recrosses the border, Dec. 20; reaches Glasgow; makes heavy levies on the citizens; general Hawley's contempt for the Highlanders, 813; the battle of Falkirk, *ib.*; Hawley's retreat, 814; lord Lovat's double dealing; the prince's rage at hearing of the desertions in his army, *ib.*; arrival at Inverness, 815; encamps at Culloden Moor, *ib.*; his confidence of gaining a victory, *ib.*; he is met by Cumberland and receives a thorough defeat, May 16, 1746; his conduct in the battle, 816; the barbarities after the battle, *ib.*; his wanderings in the highlands; gains shelter in South Uist island; escapes to Skye; is befriended by Flora MacDonald, 818; escapes to France, Sept. 20, *ib.*; refuses to quit Paris when ordered; is imprisoned at Vincennes; turned loose in Savoy; visits England in 1750, 820; Canova's bust of him at Rome, takes the title of count of Albany; died, Jan. 31, 1788, 825
Stuart, James Francis Edward (the Pretender) makes an attempt to land in Scotland, but fails, and returns to Dunkirk, 1708, 715; his private interviews with Bolingbroke, 1712, 735; adheres firmly to the church of Rome in spite of the Jacobites urging him to turn Protestant, 736; issues a manifesto on the death of Queen Anne, asserting his right to the vacant throne, 761; the earl of Mar raises his standard at Braemar, Sept. 6, 1715; and proclaims him James VIII. of Scotland, and James III. of England, 762; lands at Peterhead, and joins the camp at Perth, Jan. 16, 1716; his spiritless appearance; assumes the royal state, 765; retreats before Argyle; takes flight to France, Feb.; his compassion for the villagers whose homes have been burnt down, 766; arrives at Paris; meets Bolingbroke there, 767; and dismisses him from his service, *ib.*; forms an alliance with Spain, 1718; arrives at Madrid, 771; failure of the expedition against Scotland, 772; birth of his son, the Young Pretender, 1720, 775; declaration issued, Sept. 22, 1722, proposing that George I. should yield up the British throne to James III., 776; it is burnt as a libel by order of parliament, *ib.*; hopelessness of his cause, 1727, 780; bill against his two sons, 1744, 799; note on the Stuart family; Canova's tomb of, and his sons, Charles Edward, and Henry, Cardinal York; died at Rome, 1765, 825
Stuart, James, his Athenian antiquarian inquiries, 935
Stuart, sir John, commander of the British army; defeats the French general Reynier at the battle of Maida, July 4, 1806, 1060
Stubbs, Philip, picture of the times afforded by his "Anatomie of Abuses," 378
Suetonius, account by, of the expedition of Caligula to invade Britain, 7
Suetonius Paulinus assumes the command of the Romans in Britain, A.D. 58, attacks and takes Mona (Anglesey), the chief seat of the Druids, 8; returns to repress the revolt of Boadicea, 9; obtains a conquest over her, *ib.*
Suffolk, agricultural condition of, 911; the laborers, farmers, and housewives of, 912; a seat of the husbandry implement trade, *ib.*
Suffolk, de la Poles, dukes of. See Richard II. and Henry VI.
Suffolk, Howard, lady, George II.'s mistress; Walpole devotes himself to queen Caroline, not lady Suffolk, 779
Suffolk, lord, a secretary of state, 1771-1779; his reply to Chatham's speech on the address, 883
Sugar duties, alterations of a free-trade tendency in the, proposed by lord John Russell, 1841, 1244; debates on them, *ib.*; rejection of the ministerial propositions, *ib.*; further debates on the, 1844, 1270
Sunday-schools. See Education.
Sujah Dowlah, vizier of Oude; Shah Alum's landed property sold to; hires an army from the English; invades the Rohilla country, 948; died, *ib.*
Sullivan, general, in the American army; taken prisoner at Brooklyn, 879; employed by Howe as his agent to the congress, 880
Sunderland, Charles Spencer, earl of Marlborough's son-in-law; dismissed his secretaryship of state, 1710, 723; secretary of state, 1717, 769; accused of being concerned in the South Sea scheme fraud; acquitted; resigns his post of first commissioner of the Treasury, 775; his death, 1722, *ib.*
Sunderland, Robert Spencer, earl of, one of William's confidential advisers, 658; his character and principles, *ib.*; entertains William at Althorp, 1695, 662; lord chamberlain; issues an order to prevent stage licentiousness, 670; attempts to obtain the lord chancellorship for Somers, 682; William's correspondence with, on the state of English affairs in 1701, 686
Surajah Dowlah succeeds his grandfather, April, 1756; in hopes of booty he storms and take Calcutta; tragedy of the Black Hole, June 20; sufferings of the prisoners, 834; marches from Moorshedabad; encamps near Fort William; signs a treaty of alliance with Clive; goes over to the French, *ib.*; defeated by Clive at Plassey, June 23, 1757, 835; seeks protection from the French at Patna; murder of, *ib.*
Surrey, earl of. See Henry VIII.
Sutton, Manners, re-elected speaker of the House of Commons, 1819, 1130; again in 1830, 1166; chosen for the sixth time, 1831, 1191; again, with Mr. Littleton as candidate, 1833, 1202; fails in being elected, 1835, 1215
Suwarroff, a Russian general; captures Ismail; cruelties perpetrated, 969; defeats the Poles, Oct. 10, 1794; captures Warsaw; barbarities inflicted on the inhabitants, 1007; commands the Russo-Austrian army, 1799; gains the battle of Trebbia, 1030; returns home, 1034
Sweyn, with a Danish fleet, ravages England in 980, 46; returns to avenge the massacre of the Danes, 47; lands again in 1012, and proclaims himself king of England, 48; London surrenders to, *ib.*, death of, in 1014, *ib.*
Swift, Jonathan, points out to parliament men the dangers of quarrelling, 684; a satirical party writer; his character as a partisan, 726; his dealings with Harley and St. John, who make him their tool, *ib.*; his opinion on Marlborough's dismissal from office, 729; the operation of the stamp duty according to, 734; author of the pamphlet "The Public Spirit of the Whigs;" is presented with £100 by the earl of Oxford, 736; his contributions to the "Tatler," 740; meanness in asking for place, 741; his remarks upon the education of ladies, 743; his "Battle of the Books," 748; character of his writings, 750; marvellous power of preserving the circumstantiality of his tales, and the complete personification of his characters, 751; his "Tale of a Tub;" and "Gulliver's Travels," *ib.*; condemns Vanbrugh's architecture, 735; author of the Drapier's letters, inveighing against Wood's patent for a copper coinage, 1724, 777; a reward of £300 offered for the discovery of the author of the letters; withdrawal of the patent, *ib.*; died, 1745, 936; application of his story of the "Spider and the Bee," 1254
Swinfield, bishop of Hereford, account of the Household Roll of, for 1289 and 1290, 115; domestic life and duties of the bishop, 117; manor house of, and modes of living at, *ib.*; Christmas feast of, 118; prices of articles used by, *ib.*; state of domestics, laborers, and serfs under, *ib.*; journey of, to London; lodging and provision on the road, 119; arrival of, in London; notice of London markets and shops, 120; departs from London; visitations of, 121; gardens, orchard, and vineyard of, at Bosbury; building operations of, at Womenswould, in Kent, 122; furniture provided for; dresses provided by, and the prices, *ib.*

Tables, of treaties, 1326-1731, 730; of contemporary sovereigns from 1689-1714, 1308, 1309; of British writers, arranged chronologically, 1311-1316; chronological list of treaties from 1732-1748, 800; principal officers of state, 1741-1770, 1324, 1325; contemporary sovereigns, 1714-1788, 1309, 1310; treaty list, 1750-1784, 909; principal officers of state, 1768-1782, 1325; the growth of the national debt, 1320-1322; treaties from 1787 to 1802, 1040; population of Great Britain; of England in 1700, 1750, and 1801; of Scotland and Wales in 1801, all arranged by counties, 1316, 1317; contemporary sovereigns and rulers, 1789-1814, 1310; principal officers of state, 1783-1815, 1325; chronological table of treaties, 1802-1814, 1093-94; the national debt, 1793-1815, 1321, 1322; population of Great Britain in 1811, 1317;

table of deceased British writers of the 19th century, 1313-15; list of George IV.'s ministers, June, 1820, 1148; list of the Canning cabinet, 1827, 1167; and the Grey ministry, Dec. 1830, 1187; contemporary sovereigns and rulers, 1815-1837, 1310; population of the United Kingdom, 1821 and 1831, 1317; list of the Peel cabinet, 1215; and of the Melbourne ministry, 1837, 1224; table of treaties, 1815-1850, *ib.*; and of the national debt, 1815-1837, 1322; growth of the debt, *ib.*; chronological table of British writers of the 19th century, 1315; table of contemporary sovereigns, 1310; of the population, 1841-1851, 1318; occupations of the people, 1851, 1326; census of religious worships, 1319; and education, 1851, 1320; public income and expenditure, 1815-1850, *ib.*; commerce, 1318.

Tacitus, statement of, that Cæsar did not conquer Britain, 5; his account of the Britons affords an early indication of the national character, 8; the speeches attributed by, to Caractacus, Boadicea, and Galgacus, probably fictitious, but affording a true representation of the facts and feelings of the period, *ib.*

Talavera, battle of, July 28, 1809, 1076

Talbot, lord, defied by Joan of Arc, 173; taken prisoner at the battle of Patay, 174; the possessions of the duke of Burgundy ravaged by, 176; death of, at Castillon in 1458, *ib.*

Talfourd, T. N., his eloquent speech at Reading, 1133; principles of his copyright bill, ; the bill rejected, 1253.

Taliesin, notice by, of the massacre of the monks of Bangor, 28

Tallard sent as ambassador to the English court, 1698; his remarks upon the state of political parties, 673; negotiates with William III. the terms of the Parisian treaty, 677; ordered to leave the Rhine and advance into Suabia at the head of his army, 1704, 694; joins the Elector of Bavaria, Aug. 8, 697; they encamp near the Nebel, *ib.*; takes up his headquarters at the village of Blenheim, *ib.*; faults in the disposition of his troops, 698; he leads the main body of the French army; is opposed by Marlborough, defeated, and compelled to retreat to Sonderheim, where he surrenders himself, 698; carried to England by Marlborough, 699

Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun; considers church property to belong to the nation, 967; visits London as the agent of the French government; received with coldness and reserve; returns to Paris: again returns to England on an embassy, 974; which also had a bad reception, *ib.*; assists Bonaparte's intrigues for power, 1030; his correspondence with Grenville, 1232; Fox's negotiations with, for peace, 1806, 1058; end of the negotiations, *ib.*; suspected of having revealed the secret articles of Tilsit to the English, 1065; one of the plenipotentiaries at the Congress of Vienna, 1109; secretly negotiates with Castlereagh and Metternich, 1110; resigns his Presidentship of the Council, 1111; anxious to prevent capital punishment, *ib.*

Talmash commands some troops sent against Brest, 659; unable to land his men; mortally wounded in the attempt, 659

Tatler, objects, plan, and character of Steele's; started 1709, 737

Taylor, Rowland, behavior of, in prison, 327; martyrdom at Hadleigh in 1555, 328

Tea, formerly taxed; prices of, early part of 18th century, 613

Teignmouth sacked by the French under Tourville, July, 1690, 640; a subscription raised in behalf of the inhabitants of, *ib.*

Teignmouth, lord, as sir John Shore he succeeds carl Cornwallis as governor-general of India, 1028; succeeded by lord Mornington, 1798, *ib.*

Telford, Thomas, his career and great engineering works, 1144; opinion in 1830 of the capabilities of the locomotive engine, 1184

Templars (Knights), mission from the kingdom of Jerusalem to, in 1185, 90; dissolution of the order of the, in France, in 1307, 131; and suppression of, in England, in 1308, *ib.*; their house in London given to the students of the law, *ib.*

Temple, carl, moves an amendment in the address, 1755, 839; first lord of the admiralty, 1756, 832; desires to save Byng under cover of the king's name; dismissed his office, 833; lord privy seal, 835; fails in obtaining the garter, 840; supports Pitt's war policy, 1761, 843; resigns office, *ib.*; Wilkes' friend; disapproves of "The North Briton's" attack on the Scotch, 846; visits Wilkes in the Tower, 847; dismissed his lord-lieutenancy of Buckinghamshire; struck off the privy council list, *ib.*; his share in the negotiations for Pitt's return to power, 1765, 851; declines the king's offer of the first lord of the treasuryship, 854; suggested to be the author of "Junius," 858; lord-lieutenant of Ireland, 1782, 905; secretary of state, 1783; differs with Pitt; resigns, 952

Temple, sir William, concludes the Triple Alliance in 1668, 553; it is repudiated in 1671, and he retires to private life, 554; notice of the prince of Orange by, 560; suggests a scheme of government by a cabinet, 565

Tenchebrai, battle of, in 1105, 71

Tennyson, Alfred, his poetry, 1260

Tessé, marshal, joins Philip V.; with him invades Catalonia, 1706, 702; raises the siege of Barcelona, 702

Test Act, William proposes, without avail, the repeal of the, 1689, 624; repeal of, suggested, 1730, 621; again in 1772, 712; in 1790, 968; repealed, 1828, 1178

Tewkesbury, the Lancastrians totally defeated at the battle of, on May 4, 1471, 198

Teynham, Henry Francis, lord, his reform plans and suggestions, 1202

Thackeray, W. M., voluminousness and character of his novels, 1257

Thanet, complete insulation of, in the time of the Romans, 14

Theatre. See Drama.

Thelwall, John, arrested on a charge of high treason, 1002; trial of; defended by Erskine, and acquitted, 1003

Theodosius repels the invasion of the Picts and Scots into Britain, 13

Thiers, M., his account of the intended invasion of Britain by Napoleon, 7; his remarks on Wellington, 1079; president of the French council, 1241; his warlike tone toward England, 1241-5; the king refusing to acquiesce in his hostile speech to be delivered to the chambers, he resigns, 1245

Thistle, order of the, revived by queen Anne, 1703; statutes of the, broken by Georges I. and IV., 712

Thistlewood, Arthur, a Spencean fanatic, 1122; one of the leaders of the Spafields reformers, *ib.*; antecedents of, 1149; conspires to assassinate the cabinet ministers; his plot discovered, and himself tried and executed, 1820, *ib.*

Thom, J. N., his earlier career; imprisoned, 1235; released by lord John Russell, *ib.*; proclaims himself the Messiah at Boughton, *ib.*; rouses the people, *ib.*; his three days' march, 1236; the tragedy of Bosenden Wood, *ib.*; slain in the encounter, *ib.*

Thomson, James, his "Castle of Indolence" published, 1748; died same year, 936

Thomson, C. P., vice-president of the board of trade, and treasurer of the navy, 1830, 1187; his remarks on Peel's repeal of the house tax, 1834, 1213; president of the board of trade, 1213-24

Thornhill, sir J., his roof paintings, 757; opens an academy of painting, 1724, 930; suggests a plan for a Royal Academy, *ib.*

Thurlow, Edward, attorney-general, 870; lord chancellor, 1778-1792, 885; opposes Burke's Economical Reform bill, 901; and the contractors' and revenue officers' bills, 901; opposes Fox's Libel bill in the House of Lords, 976; becoming obnoxious to the ministry, he is compelled to give up the great seal, 1792, *ib.*

Ticonderoga, British attack on, 1758, repulsed, 837; surprised by the Americans, 1775, 874; recaptured by Burgoyne, 1777, 882

Tielmans, tried for conspiring against the Netherlands government; found guilty; banished, 1830, 1184

Tierney, George, opposes Pitt's income tax scheme, 1798, 1022; his conduct in the Caroline debate of 1820, 1150-1; master of the Mint, 1167

Tilsit, treaty of, July, 1807, 1065

Tin mines and manufactories, 605

Tintern Abbey, foundation of, 76

Tinville, Fouquier, furious zeal shown by, as public accuser, 994; executed, 1795, 1009

Tippoo Saib, son of Hyder Ali; concludes a peace with the British, 961; wars against the British under Cornwallis, 1790, 1791; defeated May 15, 1791; surrenders Seringapatam, Feb., 1792, and concludes a peace Mar. 19, 989; Bonaparte's letter to, 1799, 1028; he relies upon assistance from the French; general Harris enters his territory of Mysore, Mar. 5, 1799, 1029; Seringapatam stormed and Tippoo slain, May 4, *ib.*; division of his territory, *ib.*

Titus, allusion of, to the security afforded to the Britons by the sea, 3

Tocqueville, his remarks on the public opinion respecting the French revolution, 966; and the French national character, 999

Tolentino, treaty of, Feb. 19, 1797, 1040

Toleration Act, passed, 1683, 630; an imperfect boon, 630

Tone, Wolfe, captured, sentenced to death; commits suicide; died Nov. 19, 1798, 1025

Tomline, bishop. See Pretyman.

Tooke, Horne, arrested on a charge of high treason, 1002; trial of, 1003; defended by Erskine and acquitted, *ib.*

Torgau, battle of, 1760, 840

Torres Vedras, construction of, and events connected with Wellington's lines of, 1079

Torrington, carl of, sent out to fight the French, defeated off Beachy Head, June, 1690; his baseness and hesitating conduct, 639

Tostig, brother of Harold, succeeds Siward as earl of Northumbria, 52; oppression exercised by, occasions an insurrection, 54; is banished, *ib.*; invades England with a force of Norwegians; is defeated and slain at Stamford Bridge in 1066, 55

Toulon, besieged by the allies, 1707, 714; negotiations of the royalists of, with lord Hood, 998; the fleet and harbor surrendered to the British, *ib.*; political opinions of its inhabitants, *ib.*; besieged by the republicans, 999; the British compelled to evacuate the place, *ib.*; republican barbarities, *ib.*

Tournay, surrendered to the allies, 1709, 717; invested by the French, 1745, 830

Tourville, count de, a French admiral; defeats Torrington off Beachy Head, June 30, 1690, 638; anchors off Torbay, July 22, lands his troops at Teignmouth and devastates the village, 640; sails for France, 640; defeated by Russell off La Hogue, May 19, 1692, 651; his fleet, having assembled, is again dispersed on the 23d by admiral Rooke, 652; joins the Toulon fleet, 657; sails into the Mediterranean, 659

Townley, colonel in the Pretender's army; tried, 817; executed, 1746, *ib.*

Townley, Charles, his collection of sculpture; bought for the British Museum, 1805, 1146

Towns, manufacturing condition of, in 1636, 455

Townshend, lord Charles, his fear that France will render aid to the Pretender, 765; disagrees with Stanhope; dismissed from his office of secretary of state; offered the lord lieutenancy of Ireland, 769; which he reluctantly accepts, *ib.*; but is dismissed from it, April 3, 1717, *ib.*; appointed secretary of state in room of carl Stanhope, 1721, 775; accompanies George I. to Hanover, 1727, 779; quarrels with Walpole; resigns office, 780; and retires to the country, *ib.*

Townshend, brigadier-general, completes Wolfe's victory before Quebec, 1759, 839

Townshend, Charles, chancellor of the exchequer, 1766, 854, 865; his astonishment at Pitt's political schemes, 854; dies of fever, 1768, 855

Townshend, Thomas, draws attention to the tardiness of action by the navy authorities, 1778, 886; secretary of state, 1782, 904, 905

Towton, the battle of, on March 29, 1461, and victory of the Yorkists, 193; constitution of the contending armies of the Roses, *ib.*

Trafalgar, battle of, Oct. 21, 1805, 904

Traitorous correspondence bill passed, 1744; debate on it, 799; another introduced, 1793, and passed in a modified form, 992; debate on, *ib.*

Travancore, rajah of, attacked by Tippoo, 989; wars against Britain, 1807-1809, 1168

Travelling, means for, as shown in bishop Swinfield's journeys between Prestbury and London, 119, 121; another journey from Oxford to Canterbury in 1289, 120; travelling in London, 1289, 120; as shown in his visitations, in 1290, 121; mode of, as exhibited by a Scotch army in 1812, 128; dangers of, in the latter half of the fifteenth century, 187; dangerous condition of the London streets, *temp.* Henry VIII., 295; statute passed for repairing the highways, 1555, *ib.*; means for, on the Thames, *temp.* Henry VIII., *ib.*; insecurity of, illustrated in the murder of Arden of Feversham, in 1551, 296; custom of resorting to the seaside for pleasure a modern one, 604; horror of, in a hilly country, *ib.*; partly caused by the bad roads, *temp.* queen Anne, *ib.*; Bath and Tunbridge Wells the principal resorts of pleasure-seekers, *ib.*; in Yorkshire, *temp.* queen Anne, 609; bad state of the road between London and Kensington, 1736, 788; stage coaches, inns, and travelling accommodation about 1737, 938; dangers from highwaymen, drunken drivers, and rapid coaching, *ib.*; first mail coach started (1784) by Mr. Palmer, *ib.*

Treasonable Attempts bill passed 1795; its objects; debate on it, 1010

Treason, bills for regulating trials in cases of high, brought forward; not passed, 1692, 650; passed, 1695; Lord Ashley's speech on, 663

Treaties, chronological table of, and the wars connected with them, from 1326 to 1731, 730-733; from 1732 to 1748, 800; from 1750 to 1784, 909; from 1787 to June 25, 1802, 1040; from 1802 to 1814, 1093; from 1815 to 1850, 1224

Trevor, sir John, master of the rolls; parliamentary corruption commenced by, 635; receives a thousand-guinea bribe for assisting in passing the Orphans act; he is discovered, found guilty, and expelled the House of Commons, of which he was the speaker, 661

Tribute, not paid by Britain for some time after the invasion of Cæsar, 8

Trichinopoly defended by Mahomed Ali, 827; the siege raised by the British, *ib.*

Triennial bill introduced and passed by both Houses, 1693; but vetoed by the king; becomes law, 1694, 655-660

Trinobantes, the kings of the, 6

Triple Alliance, the, concluded, Jan. 4, 1717, 769

Trogoff, admiral, commands the Toulon fleet, 1798; an anti-revolutionist, 998

Troppau, Congress of, Oct. 20, 1820, 1225

Trotter, the navy paymaster; his evidence against Lord Melville, 1805, 1048

Trumbull, sir William; ambassador and secretary of state; first encourager of Pope's poetical talents, 742

Tuileries, attack on the, Aug., 1792, 979

Tullibardine, marquis, joins the Scotch insurrection of 1715, 762; and the earl Marischal's expedition, 1719, *ib.*; accompanies Charles Edward in his descent upon Scotland, 801; raises the Pretender's standard, Aug. 19, 1745, 802

Turin invested by the French, 1706; prince Eugene compels them to raise the siege, 703

Turner, bishop of Ely, enters into Jacobitical intrigues, 643; implicated by Preston in his plot, 644.

Turner, J. W. M.; character of his principal pictures, 1147; his early popularity, *ib.*; style of his earlier water-color paintings, *ib.*

Turnpikes, laws relating to, amended and consolidated, in consequence of the Rebecca riots, 1266

Tyrawley, lord, placed at the bar of the House of Commons to give evidence on the Spanish war, 725

Tyrconnel; his schemes in favor of James II., 626; puts Ireland into a state of defence, *ib.*; domineers over the Irish Protestants, and places the power of the kingdom in the hands of the Papists, 627; assumes the viceroyship of Ireland under James, 1691, 644

Ulfus, lands given by, to the chapter of York, with a horn as the symbol of the title, 37

Ulm capitulated to the allies, Sept. 12, 1704, 699; peace of, July 3, 1620, 731; besieged by Napoleon; to whom it is surrendered by Mack, Oct. 20, 1805, 1050

Union, Anne empowered by parliament to negotiate for a, with Scotland, 1702, 689; progress of the negotiations; debates and speeches; national feelings elicited, 707-712; the act of union received the royal assent, March 6, 1787, *ib.*

Union with Ireland proposed in George III.'s message to parliament, Jan. 22, 1799, 1023; progress of the bill for; debates, etc., 1026-1028; completed, 1800, *ib.*

United Irishmen, the, organized; they scheme a rebellion, 1023; narrative of the rebellion, 1023-1026

University of London opened, 1828, 1174; debate on the motion for granting a charter to the; the motion

carried, 1835; various names applied to the institution,
Utrecht, commencement of negotiations at, 1711, 730; union of, Jan. 22, 1579, 731; terms of the peace announced to parliament, 734; treaty of, signed by Great Britain, France, Savoy, Portugal, Prussia, and the States-General, April 11, and by Spain July 13, 1713; conditions of the treaty, 733-735
Uxbridge, lord, leads the English cavalry at Quatre Bras, 1105; his legs shot off at Waterloo, 1107

VACCINATION discovered by E. Jenner; the great good that has resulted from its practice, 1141
Vagrancy, statute to repress, in 1504, 225; atrocious severity of one in 1536, 253; renewed statute in 1547 imposing slavery as a punishment, 292; repealed, 1549, 312; statute of Elizabeth against, 385; inefficiency of the laws against, *ib.*; hardships of the vagrancy laws on the poor, 1119
Valençay, treaty of, Dec. 8. 1813.
Valencia besieged by Philip, 702; stratagems employed by Peterborough in accomplishing its relief, *ib.*
Valenciennes, siege of, and capitulation to the allies, July 28, 1793, 906
Valmy, duc de, See Kellermann.
Valmy, battle of, Sept 20, 1792, 982
Vanbrugh, sir John, commences the Blenheim palace, 1705, 705; begins his practice as architect in his 36th year, with Castle Howard, 754; his chief works; their character condemned by the wits and essayists, but properly appreciated by Sir J. Reynolds, 755
Vandamme, general, repulsed by Abercromby in Holland, 1799, 1031; defeated and taken prisoner at the battle of the Katzbach, 1813, 1090
Vandeveldes, their sea paintings; they found a school of painting, 757
Vane, sir Henry, the younger, produces the papers of the Privy Council to prove the guilt of Strafford, 439; chief negotiator with Scotland for an alliance with the parliament, 463; his modifications of the treaty in favor of toleration, *ib.*; a leading Independent statesman, 472; wishes to keep the army intact, 476; one of the chief disputants with the king at the treaty of Newport, 486; bears testimony to the talent of Charles, *ib.*; retires into the country after the ejection of members by the army, till after the king's execution, 488; remarks of Mrs. Hutchinson on his conduct at this period, *ib.*; becomes an active member of the Council of State, 491; President of the Committee for the Navy, 503; conduct of, at the dissolution of the Long Parliament by Oliver Cromwell, 506; publishes a pamphlet describing a new form of government, 520; Cromwell in vain endeavors to persuade him not to act in opposition to his government; and he is imprisoned, *ib.*; is excepted from the Act of Indemnity in 1660, but his life recommended to be spared, 536; is tried for high treason in 1662, 540; able defence of, and the king's letter recommending him to be put out of the way on account of it, *ib.*; his execution, on June 14, 1662, *ib.*
Vansittart, Nicholas, as British envoy attempts to avert a war with Denmark, 1801, 1037; chancellor of the exchequer, 1812-1820, 1148; unwilling to believe that the annexation of Saxony to Prussia had been consented to by British ministers, 1109
Varangians, the Anglo-Saxons driven from England, become the emperor's guard at Constantinople, 57; valor displayed by, *ib.*
Vauxhall gardens, company and amusement of, 18th century, contrasted with those of Ranelagh, 939
Vellore, mutiny at, 1806, 1056
Vendôme, duke of, commands the French army in the Netherlands, 1707, 713; and the one sent against Brabant, 1708, 715; his incredulity regarding Marlborough's quick march of July 11, 1708; he is defeated by him the same day, 716; commands Philip V.'s army; defeats Stanhope and Staremberg, 725
Veneti, inhabitants of Brittany, character of, 3; intimate relations of, with England, *ib.*; resistance offered by, to Cæsar; assistance afforded to, by the Britons, *ib.*; conquest of, by Cæsar, *ib.*
Venice entered by the French, May 16, 1797, 1017; cession of, to Austria, 1797, 1018
Venloo carried by storm by the English, Sept. 18, 1702, 689
Venner, Thomas, futile attempt at insurrection of, in 1657, in favor of the Fifth monarchy, 522
Verdun capitulated to the Prussians, Sept. 2, 1792, 982
Vergennes, count de, French minister for foreign affairs; his interview with Franklin and Lee, 1776, 880; with Steuben, 1777, 882; and with Mr. Oswald, Shelburn's agent, 1782, 905; offended at the United States signing a peace without obtaining the consent of France, 907
Vergniaud, an eloquent Girondin, 973; obtains a draft of a decree for forming the national convention, 980; his war-cry against the Prussians, 1792, *ib.*; proposes to obtain the people's judgment on the sentence passed against Louis XVI.; votes the king's death, 987; as president of the convention declares the sentence of death against Louis, *ib.*; interferes in behalf of Mrs. Elliott, on her being arrested, 1793, 990; executed, Oct. 31, 1793, 1000
Vernon, Edward, vice-admiral; takes Porto Bello; despatched against the Spanish-American possessions; advises the capture of Carthagena, 793; renders no assistance to general Wentworth, *ib.*; boasts of having destroyed all the enemy's castles, 794.
Verona, congress of, Aug. 25, 1822, 1225
Verrio, employment of, to ornament Windsor Castle, 569; his ceiling paintings, 752, 757
Verulam, attacked and destroyed by Boadicea, A.D. 61, 9
Vespasian, conquests of in Britain, 8; triumph bestowed on, *ib.*
Victor, marshal, with Macdonald, defeated by Suwarroff at Trebbia, 1799, 1030; defeated by Melas, 1800, 1034; retreats from Talavera to Torrijos; joined by Sebastiani and king Joseph, 1809, 1076
Victor Amadeus II. of Savoy joins the confederacy against France; his war with the French, 643; his despair at the devastation of his country by the French; Schomberg sent to cheer him, 644; defeated at Marsiglia, 657; makes peace with France, 667; thus losing his chance to the English crown; marries Anne Marie of Orleans, a descendant of Charles I. of England, 683; Anne requests subsidies for him, 692; besieged in Turin by the French, 1706, 703; joins the allies in a campaign against France, 1707; ineffectually bombards Toulon, 714; signs the treaty of Utrecht; Sicily, and a claim to the Spanish succession, yielded to, 735; reigned as king of Sardinia, 1720-1730, 1310
Victoria, queen, daughter of the duke and duchess of Kent, born May 24, 1819, 1129; she succeeds to the throne on the death of her uncle, William IV., June 20, 1837; her demeanor and appearance at the audience with the Privy Council, 1224; meets her parliament; enthusiastically received; her speech; general feeling of loyalty towards, and attachment to; opens her new parliament, 1232; her speech, *ib.*; her coronation, 1234; opens parliament, 1839; speech, 1237; refuses to accedeto sir R. Peel's request to dismiss her ladies of the bedchamber, 1238; approbation of her conduct manifested by some, *ib.*; and aspersions thrown on her behavior by others, *ib.*; marries prince Albert1, 240; her life attempted by Oxford, *ib.*; speech on proroguing parliament, 1241; sp ech on opening parliament by commission, 1244; her answer to the amendment of the address, 1245; birth of her first child; and of the prince of Wales; speech on opening the parliamentary session, 1842, 1261; two attempts on her life by Francis and Bean; bill passed for better protecting her person; speech on proroguing parliament, 1263; speech, 1844, 1264; visited by Louis Philippe, 1271; speech, 1845, 1273; with prince Albert visits Germany, 1275; offers the premiership to lord J. Russell, 1276; her parting interview with sir R. Peel, *ib.*; speech, 1846, 1277; prorogues parliament; speech, 1283; speech, 1849, 1287
Vienna entered by the French, 1805, 1052; and May, 1809, 1074
Vienna, congress of, 1815, 1109
Vienna, treaty of, April 30, 1725, 733; the treaty of alliance of, March 16. 1731, *ib.*, 780; peace of, November 18, 1738, 786, 800; peace of, October 14, 1809, 1074, 1094; treaty of, March 23, 1815; federative constitution signed at, June, 1815; convention entered into at, August, 1815, 1224
Vikings, notice of the, 25
Villadaria, marquis of, captain-general of Andalusia; opposes sir George Rooke and duke of Ormond, 1702, 690; sent to recapture Gibraltar, meets with no success, and is superseded by De Pontis, 700
Villars, marshal, concludes a negotiation with Cavallars, the leader of the Camisards, or revolted Protestants of the Cevennes, 1704, 691; unites his army with Marsin's, 1705, 704; opposes himself between the allies and France, 1709; follows them after the siege of Tournay; encamps at Malplaquet, 718; defeated by Marlborough at that place, *ib.*; constructs a series of fortified lines, which are forced by Marlborough, 1711, notwithstanding the superiority of his French army, 728; opposes the allied army, 1712; corresponds secretly with Ormond, 733; defeats prince Eugene at Denain, July 24, 734
Villeneuve, admiral of the Toulon fleet; chased by Nelson to the West Indies, and back to Europe, 1049; where he engages with sir R. Calder, July 22, 1805, 1050; ordered by Napoleon to enter the Mediterranean and proceed to Toulon; in executing which he is defeated by Nelson at Trafalgar, 1051
Villeroy succeeds Luxemburg as general of the French army, 661; takes Dixmuyde and Deynse, and attacks William before Namur, 661; retires, 662; attacks prince Eugene, but is repulsed, 1700, 686; appointed to command a detachment of the French army in the campaign of 1704, 694; ordered to follow Marlborough, who gives him the slip near the Moselle, 695; threatens Marlborough before Landau, 699; takes Huy and invests Liege, 1705, 704; retreats before Marlborough within the French lines, *ib.*; Marlborough follows and forces the lines; Villeroy then retreats beyond the Dyle, *ib*; his position, May 23, 1706, 706; defeated by Marlborough at the battle of Ramillies, *ib.*; retreats to Louvain, *ib.*
Vimiero, battle of, August 21, 1808, 1069
Vinegar Hill, battle of, near Enniscorthy, 1798, 1024
Virginia, first attempts to found a colony in, 371; founding of the colony of, under James Smith, in 1606, 406; sufferings of the first colonists, and subsequent progress of the colony, 407
Vittoria, battle of, June 21, 1813, 1088
Volunteers; earl of Shelburne's circular proposing the raising of, 1782, 902; spontaneously raised by the Irish, 1779, 903; strength of, in Ireland, 1782, *ib.*; formation of corps of, encouraged by government, 1794, 1004; imperfectly aided by the government, 1798, 1022; rapid enrolment of, in July and August, 1808, 1045; total number in November, *ib.*; Pitt and the volunteers at Walmer, *ib.*; general organization of, throughout England and Scotland; reviewed by the king at Hyde Park and elsewhere, *ib.*; debate on the volunteer system; it is supported by Pitt, *ib.*; feebly aided by the ministers, 1046; abstract of a list of yeomanry and volunteer corps, December, 1803, 1319
Vortigern, legend of, 20
Vyvyan, sir Richard, moves for the rejection of the Reform bill, 1831, 1189; speech of, on the Municipal Reform bill, 1835, 1218
WADE, general, carries off Gyllenberg's papers, 769; quells a riot at Glasgow, 1725, 778; evidence of, on the Porteous riots, 1736, 788; sends troops under Oglethorpe to pursue the rebels of 1745, 812; ordered to return to Newcastle, 813
Wagers, act to prevent, passed 1708, 717
Wages of laborers in 1288, 119; of artificers, 122; statutes for the regulation of the scale of, for laborers, 140; statutes for the regulation of, and for the hours of labor, in 1495, 182; truck forbidden, 183; new statute for the regulation of, in 1495, 225; found ineffectual, and repealed in 1496, *ib.*; new statute for the regulation of, in 1515, 294; the legislature declare in 1563 that the statutes cannot be enforced on account of the high price of provisions, 387; income and wages of various classes in the time of queen Anne, 617; of the out-door agricultural laborer, *ib.*; combinations of laborers to demand a rise in, in Edward III.'s reign, 821; the relation between master and man in the question of, 822
Wagram, battle of, July 5, 1809, 1074
Wakefield, battle of, defeat of the Yorkists, and death of the duke of York, December 31. 1460, 192
Walcheren, narrative of the expedition against, 1809, 1074-1076
Waldeck, prince of, conduct of, at the battle of Fontenoy, 1745, 798
Waldegrave, lord, character of George III. as portrayed by, 840
Waldegrave, lady, marries the duke of Gloucester, 868; letter of, to her father, sir E. Walpole, on her position as duchess of Gloucester, *ib.*
Wale, a sign painter; his portrait of Shakspere, 930
Wales, state of, as described by Giraldus in 1188, 82, 83; Llewellyn, prince of, is summoned to do homage to Edward I., and refuses, 114; is attacked by Edward and forced to submit, in 1277, *ib.*; his attendants in London dislike their food and their treatment there, 115; renewed revolt of, in 1282, 116; is slain and his brother executed, *ib.*; prince Edward, born at Caernarvon, April 25, 1284; created prince of Wales, *ib.*; statute passed for the settlement of, by Edward I., *ib.*; insurrection in 1287 suppressed, 122; another insurrection in 1295 subdued, 124; popularity of Richard II. in, 159; revolt of, against Henry IV., under Owen Glendower, 160; severe measures taken for the repression of, *ib.*; Henry IV., and his army repulsed, in 1402, *ib.*; successful resistance of, during the life of Glendower, 163
Walker, Andrew, weeds the Devil's Acre; founder of the London ragged schools, 1230
Walker, George, a Presbyterian minister, one of the principal defenders of Londonderry, 627; appointed, with Baker, to succeed Lundy as governor of Londonderry, during the siege, 627; slain at the battle of the Boyne, July 1, 1690, 638
Walker, James, Vauxhall bridge designed and executed by, 1145
Wallace, William, heads a revolt in Scotland in 1297, against Edward I., 125; defeats the English at Stirling, *ib.*; created guardian of the kingdom, *ib.*; is defeated at Falkirk, 126; continued warfare of, *ib.*; is betrayed, and taken prisoner, *ib.*; is taken to London, where he arrives August 22, 1305, 127; is executed, *ib.*
Waller, Edmund, the royalist plot of, discovered, 459; saves his life by bribing the House of Commons, *ib.*
Waller, sir William, successful against the royalists, 459; defeated at Lansdown, 460; blockades Oxford, in company with Essex, 465; jealousies between him and Essex, *ib.*; pursues the king into Worcestershire, and is defeated by him, *ib.*; called out for the defence of London, 466
Walloon weavers, introduction of, into England by the protector Somerset, 315; driven from England by Mary, *ib.*
Walmoden, count, commands the English army in Hanover, 1794, 1007; defeated by Pichegru, *ib.*
Walpole, Robert, succeeds St. John as secretary at war, 1708, 715; his argument in applying the principle of resistance to the general doctrine of the subjects' obedience, 720; he is elected a member of queen Anne's third parliament, which met November 25, 1710, 724; defends Steele in the House of Commons, 736; his contempt for literature, 741; condemns Vanbrugh's architecture, 755; impeaches Bolingbroke of high treason, June 9, 1715, 761; moves the adjournment of the House to prevent the appeal for mercy toward the rebel lords, 766; character of his ministerial government, 768; resigns the chancellorship of exchequer, 769; opposes an address of thanks, 1718, 771; opposed the Peerage bill, 1719. 772; his prudence during the South Sea scheme. 774; called upon to retrieve the national credit, *ib.*; again becomes chancellor of the exchequer, 1721, 775; cancels Wood's patent for a copper coinage, 777; his interview with George II., announcing George I.'s death, 779; prepares the royal speech for sir S. Compton, the minister elect; is confirmed in power by bribing the king, 779; quarrels with Townshend; becomes supreme in the administration. 780; successfully repulses the attempts of the Dissenter, to obtain a repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, 781; revives the salt duty, 1732, 783; his warehousing system for the prevention of smuggling; his excise scheme, *ib.*; narrowly escapes being mobbed, 784; debate upon the excise scheme; it fails in passing, *ib.*; maintains the policy of neutrality in the wars of 1734, *ib.*; advantages obtained thereby, *ib.*; his character as given by Wyndham, 785; his character of Bolingbroke, *ib.*; attends the queen during her last illness, 789; fears the loss of power in consequence of her death, *ib.*; not a patron of letters, 790; proposes to enlarge the lord chamberlain's powers in reference to plays, *ib.*; brings forward his bill for licensing plays, *ib.*; driven into a war with Spain; persists in

keeping office, *ib.*; reproves sir W. Wyndham, 792; his struggle to retain power; he is deserted by the duke of Argyle, whom he dismisses from all his employments, *ib.*; regarded with jealousy by the duke of Newcastle, *ib.*; endeavors to prevent the war with Spain, 794; Mr. Sandys persuades the king to remove him from office; Walpole's defence, 795; the motion is negatived; his unpopularity increases; he resigns, February 1, 1742; created earl of Oxford, *ib.*; a parliamentary inquiry is made into his administration; he passes through the ordeal, *ib.*; he is carried about in effigy by the mob, 796; anecdote of, *ib.*; died March, 1745, 798
Walsingham, sir Francis. See Elizabeth.
Waltheof, earl, submits to William the Conqueror, 57; joins Canute and Edgar Atheling on their invasion in 1070, 58; refuses to take an active part in the conspiracy against William in 1073, 61; is betrayed by his wife (daughter of William the Conqueror), and executed, *ib.*
Walton, captain, his conduct in the battle with the Spanish fleet, 1718, and model despatch to his admiral, 771
Wansdyke, notice of, 6
Wantage, description of Alfred's home at, 27
Warbeck Perkin, lands in Ireland in 1492, and announces himself as second son of Edward IV., 215; claims and receives the protection of the duchess of Burgundy, *ib.*; doubtful *ex parte* accounts of, and pretended confession, *ib.*; letter of, to Isabella of Spain, *ib.*; attempts a landing at Deal, and is repulsed, 217; is expelled from Burgundy, and finds refuge with James IV. of Scotland, *ib.*; marries Catherine Gordon, *ib.*; his position in Scotland in 1496 described by one of the spies of Henry VII., *ib.*; difficulties of supposing him an impostor, 218; invades England, supported by James IV., but is compelled to retreat, *ib.*; unpopularity of, occasioned by the foreign assistance, *ib.*; leaves Scotland, and lands in Cornwall, 219; attacks Exeter, but is repulsed, *ib.*; is deserted by his forces, and flies to sanctuary at Beaulieu Abbey, where he is taken prisoner, *ib.*; attempts to escape, is retaken, and imprisoned in the Tower, *ib.*; exhibited to the public, and reads his confession, *ib.*; is executed at Tyburn, November 23, 1499, *ib.*
War-chariots, Southey's notice of, 6; Cæsar's description of, *ib.*
Ward, James an animal painter, 1147
Ward, M.P. for St. Alban's; his intended Irish church motions, 1212
Wardle, colonel, causes an inquiry to be made into the duke of York's conduct as commander in-chief, 1809, 1071; popularity; subsequent contempt for, 1072
Warner, Rev. Dr., manners of; as evidence of those of the clergy of his day, 943
Warren, sir J. B., commands the squadron sent against Quiberon, 1795, 1009; engages the French off Ireland, Oct. 1798, 1025
Warsaw, alliance of, Mar. 31, 1683, 732; treaty of, Feb. 24, 1768, 909; defended by Kosciusko, 1794, 1007; entered by the French, 1807, 1062
Warwick, Neville, earl of, supports the claims of Richard duke of York, 190; important assistance of, at the first battle of St. Alban's, *ib.*; returns from Calais to attend an attempted reconciliation of the York and Lancastrian factions, 191; attempt on his life and his escape to Calais, *ib.*; is declared a traitor by the parliament at Coventry, *ib.*; lands in Kent, enters London, wins the battle of Northampton, and takes Henry prisoner, in 1460, *ib.*; defeated by queen Margaret at the second battle of St. Alban's in 1461, 192; joins Edward, duke of York, and enters London, *ib.*; marches with Edward to the North, and wins the battle of Towton, 193; the representative of popular opinion, 194; becomes estranged from Edward, 196; wealth and power of, 196; joins with Clarence in an attempt to dethrone Edward, who is taken prisoner, but escapes, *ib.*; is defeated by Edward at Stamford, *ib.*; is reconciled to queen Margaret, 197; invades England, and restores Henry without a battle, *ib.*; is slain at the battle of Barnet, April 14, 1471, 198
Warwick, Dudley, earl of, nearly made prisoner at the battle of Pinkie, 302; is sent to subdue the Norfolk rebels under Ket, 308; defeats them at Dussindale, 309; recommends clemency, *ib.*; acquires political power, *ib.*; heads the confederacy of nobles against Somerset, 310; obtains possession of the Tower, *ib.*; is joined by lord Russell and the army, 311; is created duke of Northumberland, 314; becomes the actual governor of the king, 315; marries his son to the lady Jane Grey, *ib.*; causes lady Jane to be proclaimed queen, June 10, 1553, 317; leaves London to oppose the advance of Mary, 318; is arrested tried for treason, convicted, and executed, *ib.*; apostatizes before his death, *ib.*
Washington, George, born 1732, 728; his early career; becomes adjutant general; unsuccessfully defends the British posts on the Ohio; serves under general Braddock, 1755, *ib.*; his opinion of American affairs 1774, 871; his view of civil war, 874; appointed commander-in-chief of the United States army, 1775, 875; his character; refuses all pay but the discharge of expenses, *ib.*; composition of his army; arrives at Boston, July 3, *ib.*; blockades the town, 876; his impatience; makes preparations for an attack, 877; the British evacuate the place, Mar. 17, 1776, 877; refuses Howe's letter to him, 1776, 879; retreats before Cornwallis; crosses the Delaware and destroys the boats, thus hindering his pursuer's passage; surprises the Hessians at Trenton; retreats to Princeton, 880; there defeats a body of British troops; his high military qualities displayed in the campaign, *ib.*; perplexed at Howe's conduct; marches to oppose him at Philadelphia, 882; goes into winter quarters at Valley Forge; sufferings of his army from want of food and clothing, 883; augurs new difficulties and greater struggles, 888; remonstrates against Cornwallis's proceedings, 892; receives a commission of lieutenant-general in the French service, 1780, *ib.*; Clinton demands André's release from, 893; confirms the sentence passed upon André by a court-martial; defence of his conduct for so doing, *ib.*; his difficulties in sustaining his army, 895; anxiety for the arrival of De Grasse's fleet; on hearing that it had gone to the Chesapeake he changes his plan of operations and also marches thither; his able management of the march, 897; siege, *ib.*; and capitulation of Cornwallis, *ib.*; bequeaths his swords to his nephews, bids farewell to his army, 909; and retires into private life; resigns his commission, Dec. 20, 1782, *ib.*; retires from the presidency of the United States, Dec. 1796; alarmed at the party spirit rising in the States, 1012; president of the United States, 1789-1797, 1310
Washington, British attack on, Aug, 1814, 1099
Wat Tyler. See Richard II.
Watchmen. See Police, 616
Waterford capitulates to William III., July 21, 1690, 639
Waterloo, battle of, June 18, 1815, 1105
Watson, admiral, co-operates with Clive in destroying the pirates of Gheriah, and in the re-capture of Calcutta, 1757, 834; refuses to sign Clive's false treaty, *ib.*
Watson, bishop, opposes a free trade between England and France, fearing the latter's pre-eminence in a commercial contest, 928
Watson, sen., a Spa-fields meeting leader, 1122; addresses the meeting, *ib.*; tried for high treason; found not guilty, *ib.*
Watson, jun., a Spa-fields meeting leader, 1122; impels the mob to riot; his prominent part in the riot; taken, *ib.*; escapes, *ib.*
Watt, James, his career as philosophical instrument maker at Glasgow, 928; turns his attention to the improvement of the steam engine, *ib.*; gradual maturing of his thoughts and final success, May, 1768, 929; connects himself first with Dr. Roebuck, *ib.*; but subsequently with Boulton, *ib.*; the two become the proprietors of the Soho works, *ib.*; vast influence of his invention on the affairs of the world, *ib.*
Weaver, description of the labors of a, 602; double occupation of farmer and, in Lancashire and Ireland, 924
Webb, general, present at Blenheim, 1704, 698; conducts a convoy to Lille; attacked by a large French force; succeeds in defeating them and arrives before Lille with his army; his success the main cause of the surrender of Lille; receives the thanks of parliament; meanness of Marlborough towards, causes him to leave the army, 1708, 717
Webb, John, inspector of hospitals; his report on the unhealthiness of Zealand, 1075
Wedderburn. See Loughborough, lord.
Wedgwood, Josiah, improves the manufacture of earthen and china-ware, 927
Wellesley, marquess of, his speech on the French revolution, 1001; despairs of British success in Holland, 1794, 1006; fears a French invasion of Ireland, 1796, 1003; succeeds lord Teignmouth as governor-general of India, 1798, 1029; negotiates with Tippoo Sahib, *ib.*; attacked in parliament, 1053-1056; adopts the subsidiary system policy, 1033; resigns the government of India, July, 1805, 1056; secretary for foreign affairs, 1809, 1077; resigns the seals, Feb. 19, 1812, 1082; appointed lord-lieutenant of Ireland, 1156; lord steward, 1325
Wellington, duke of, Arthur Wellesley; condemns Massena's conduct in his retreat of 1811 as barbarous, 696; colonel; assists his brother lord Mornington in governing India, 1029; appointed to the command of the Nizam of the Deccan's army, 1799; his wonder at the size of the army, *ib.*; congratulates his brother on the success of the British arms in India, *ib.*; returns to England, Sept. 1805, 1053; reinstates the Peishwa in his capital of Poonah, *ib.*; appointed to the command of 17,000 men, June 26, 1808; his letter to Scindia, *ib.*; crosses the Godavery, 1054; how he formed his plan of the battle of Assye, 1055; the battle, Sept. 23, *ib.*; battle of Argaum, Nov. 29; obtains possession of Fort Gawilghur Dec. 15, thus ending the Mahratta war, *ib.*; receives the order of the Bath; returns to England; account of the famine in India by, *ib.*; principal secretary in Ireland, 1807, 1062; his advice on the Buenos Ayres affairs, 1064; commands the reserve forces in the Copenhagen expedition, 1807, 1065; sent with troops to Portugal; sails from Cork, July 12, 1808, 1068; placed under Dalrymple and Burrard, *ib.*; lands at Figuiera, Aug. 1; defeats the French at Rolica, Aug. 17, 1069; gains the victory at Vimiéro, Aug. 21, *ib.*; his future actions clogged by Burrard's command, *ib.*; convention of Cintra; recalled home; examined before a court, *ib.*; opinion of, on Mrs. Clarke's briberies, 1072; ordered to replace sir John Cradock in Portugal; lands at Lisbon, April 22, 1809, *ib.*; passage of the Douro; compels Soult to retreat from Oporto, *ib.*; enters Spain; makes a junction with Cuesta, 1076; gains the battle of Talavera, July 28, *ib.*; created viscount Wellington, 1077; arranges for the defence of Portugal, *ib.*; worried by the ministers, *ib.*; sagacity and penetrating judgment of, 1079; construction of the lines of Torres Vedras, *ib.*; they stop Massena's course, *ib.*; unable to relieve Ciudad Rodrigo, *ib.*; battle of Busaco, Sept. 27, 1810, *ib.*; evacuates Coimbra and retires within his lines, *ib.*; his arguments with the ministry for continuing the war in the Peninsula, 1081; pursues Massena on his evacuating Portugal, and defeats him at Fuentes d'Onoro, May 5, 1811, and at Albuera, May 16, *ib.*; preparations for the campaign of 1812, 1085; insufficient artillery, and means of transport; capture of Ciudad Rodrigo, Jan. 19, 1812, *ib.*; siege of Badajoz, Mar. 16 to April 7, *ib.*; the assault and surrender, April 7, 1086; unable to restrain the excesses of his soldiers, 1086; difficulties in obtaining supplies and reinforcements; his perseverance under the obstacles created by government, *ib.*; advances into Spain, June 13; capture of the Salamanca forts, June 29, *ib.*; follows general Marmont's movements, *ib.*; wins the battle of Salamanca, July 22, *ib.*; his conduct before the battle, *ib.*; and after, *ib.*; effects of the victory, 1087; enters Madrid, Aug. 12; the siege of Burgos fails, *ib.*; the retreat, *ib.*; his candor, *ib.*; commander-in-chief of all the forces in the Peninsula; gains the battle of Vittoria, June 21, 1813, 1089; obtains possession of the passes of the Pyrenees, 1091; his remonstrance to the admiralty, *ib.*; passes into France, *ib.*; after some struggling he effects the passage of the Nivelle, *ib.*; gains the battle of Orthez, Feb. 27, 1814, 1092; crosses the Garonne, and defeats Soult at Toulouse, April 10, *ib.*; lands at Dover, June 28, 1093; receives the thanks of parliament for his services, *ib.*; his respect for private property and defenceless places, 1049; succeeds lord Castlereagh as British minister at Vienna, 1003; his opinion of Bonaparte's escape from Elba, *ib.*; prepares to defend the Netherlands, 1104; his accurate knowledge of Napoleon's advance, 1105; attends the ball at Brussels, *ib.*; his sudden departure from it, and march to Quatre-Bras, *ib.*; the battle of Ligny, *ib.*; takes up his position on the field of Waterloo; Byron's description of the field of Waterloo, *ib.*; his position and that of the French, 1106; the character and condition of the two armies, *ib.*; the struggle at Hougoumont, *ib.*; the battle as described by Wellington, *ib.*; British firmness and endurance, *ib.*; Wellington's fortitude, *ib.*; Wellington's and Blucher's share in the victory, 1107; arrival of Blucher and the Prussians, *ib.*; the crisis; the victory won, June 18; joins in pursuing the French, *ib.*; his emotions at the loss of his soldiers, *ib.*; refuses to acquiesce in Bonaparte's going to America, and declines having anything to do with his execution should that be resolved on, 1108; signs the declaration of the allies, *ib.*; erroneous views concerning Wellington's conduct entertained by M. Thiers, 1109; his firm moderation preserves Paris from unnecessary humiliation, *ib.*; representative of Great Britain at Aix-la-Chapelle, where the evacuation of France by the allied troops is agreed upon, 1130; master-general of the ordnance, 1140; a member of the conference for averting public proceedings against queen Caroline, 1152; induces George IV. to consent to Canning being secretary for foreign affairs; represents Great Britain at the Verona congress; Canning's instructions to him, 1157; resigns both his seat in the cabinet and his office of commander-in-chief on the accession of Canning's ministry, 1827, 1165; his share in the negotiations for a new premier, 1168; his interest in the Madras mutiny, 1169; accepts the command in chief of the army, 1827, 1172; on the resignation of Lord Goderich the king requests him to form a government, 1173; formation of his administration, *ib.*; defends the expression "untoward event" in the royal speech, *ib.*; Brougham objects to his being at the head of the government, 1174; his severe attitude towards Mr. Huskisson leads to the other four Canningite ministers resigning, 1176; his views on the Catholic question, *ib.*; his difficulty in obtaining the king's sanction to allow this question to be brought forward by government, 1177; announces the intention to the Lords, *ib.*; the king dismisses his ministry, but recalls it, *ib.*; speech of, on the Catholic Relief bill, 1178; duel with the earl of Winchelsea on his refusing to withdraw a calumny against him, *ib.*; character of George IV. as given by, 1179; Brougham's harsh opinion of his ministry, 1180; his proposed policy towards the new French government of 1830, 1184; present at the opening of the London and Manchester railway, 1186; his declaration against parliamentary reform, *ib.*; the lord mayor elect advises him to enter London with a strong guard, *ib.*; advises the king not to go to London, and is himself, from apprehension of bloodshed, deterred from going, *ib.*; resigns his premiership, 1187; his reception of the news of the proposed Reform bill of 1831, 1188; his speech against it, 1192; popular speculations as to his putting down public excitement, 1197; attempts to form a government, *ib.*; his account of the cause of his failure, 1198; withdraws from opposing the reform bill, *ib.*; supports the Poor Law Amendment bill, 1210; his consideration in enabling earl Grey to recover himself in parliament, *ib.*; negotiations for the Peel ministry, 1214; his dictatorship, as first lord of the treasury and sole secretary of state, with lord Lyndhurst, 1834, *ib.*; secretary of state for foreign affairs, 1215; announces the resignation of the Peel ministry to the lords, 1216; his eulogy of William IV., 1223; his enthusiastic reception at the queen's coronation, 1234; recommends sir R. Peel to the queen for her minister, 1238; opposed to the proposed system of a penny postage, 1239; deprecates a war with France, 1241; praises the conduct and achievements of the Indian army, 1249; his reply to Sir R. Peel's memorandum vindicating his conduct in the corn law question; determines to support Peel's administration, 1276; his admiration of Peel's courage in re-accepting the premiership, *ib.*; his successful plan for repressing a Chartist insurrection, 1285
Wentworth, sir Thomas. See Strafford, earl of.
Wentworth, general, commands the land forces against Carthagena, 1741; attacks fort San Lazaro; fails in taking it, 793
Wesley, John, with Whitefield, the founder of Methodism; his character, 647
West, Benjamin, a favorite of George III.'s; one of the founders of the Royal Academy, 931; exhibits at the first Royal Academy exhibition, *ib.*; succeeds Reynolds as president, 933; early career, *ib.*; pat-

ronized by the king, *ib.*; critique on his picture of "The Death of Wolfe," *ib.*; nominally head of the British school of painting, 1792–1820, 1146
West, rear admiral; his attack upon the French fleet unsupported by Byng, 1756; superseded by admiral Saunders; received with favor at court, 830
Westmacott, his sculptures, 148
Westminster, Edward the Confessor's palace of, 54
Westminster bridge opened, 1750; constructed by Labelye, 935
Westmoreland, population and trade of, 610
Wetherell, sir Charles, counsel at the trial of Watson, 1817, 1122; recorder of Bristol; an opponent of the Reform bill; his conduct rouses the Bristolians into a riot, 1194; his irritating address in behalf of municipal corporations, 1835, 1218
Weymouth, Thomas, viscount, secretary of state, 1768–1770, 856, 865; complains of Wilkes' libelling him, 856; opposes the duke of Richmond's motion for an address, 1778, 885; secretary of state, 1775–1779, *ib.*
Wharncliffe, lord, gives notice of his motion to request the king not to dissolve parliament, 1831, 1190; makes his motion, *ib.*; moves for the rejection of the reform bill, 1192; said to have been requested to moderate his opposition to the reform bill by the king, 1196; his modified opposition, *ib.*; lord privy seal, 1215; died Dec. 19, 1846, 1276
Wharton, Philip, duke of, makes a furious attack upon the earl of Stanhope, which so roused the earl's anger as to cause his death, 1721, 775
Whateley, rev. Thomas, important poor law reforms carried out by, at Cookham, Berkshire, 1210
Whitbread, Samuel, presides at a meeting of the Society of "the Friends of the People," 986; moves for a vote of censure against lord Melville, 1048; and his impeachment, 1805, *ib.*; his grief for Mr. Perceval, 1812, 1083; declaims against the destruction of military buildings at Washington, 1814, 1100; his peace motion rejected, 1815, 1104; protests against the annexing Saxony to Prussia, 1109; his poor law reform plan, 1807, 1120; savings banks recommended by, *ib.*
Whitefield, George, character of, one of the founders of Methodism, 947
Whitehall burnt down in 1698; the banqueting house the only portion saved, 671
Whitelock, gen., appointed to command the British troops at Plata, 1807, 1063; lands with 7800 men near Buenos Ayres, June 28, 1064; failure of his expedition; tried by court-martial and disgraced, *ib.*
Whitworth, lord, English ambassador at Paris; his interview with Bonaparte for the purpose of obtaining an explanation of his views towards Great Britain, February, 1803, 1042; violence shown by Bonaparte at a second interview with, March, 1043
Widdrington, William, lord, impeached of high treason, 1716, 768; tried and found guilty, *ib.*; is reprieved, *ib.*; an act of grace, passed, 1717, releases him from prison, 770
Wight, Isle of, conquered by Vespasian, 8; untruth of the tradition that John retired to, after the signing of Magna Charta, 105; Charles I. escapes to, 482
Wilberforce, William, returned M.P. for Hull, 1780, 894; his experience of club life, 942; and the licentiousness among Cambridge students, 944; returned M.P. for Yorkshire in the parliament of 1784, 954; draws the attention of the House to the African slave trade; the committee appointed decide that it shall be gradually abolished, 976; his first open opposition to Pitt, 1794, 1008; his opinion of lord Grenville's hostile answer to Napoleon, 1800, 1032; fears the defeat of the Austrians, by Bonaparte, 1805, 1050; indefatigable efforts of, to obtain the abolition of the slave trade, 1058; the two great objects of his life; his "Practical Christianity" published, 1139; his vain attempts to end the struggle between George IV. and queen Caroline, 1152; last speech in parliament, 1824, 1161; his thankfulness for having lived to see England's willingness to abolish slavery; died July 29, 1833
Wilkes, John, publishes the "North Briton," 1762, 846; attacks the king and Bute, 846; his comments on the king's speech in the "North Briton," No. 45; arrested and imprisoned; he is released, being protected as a member of parliament from arrest, 847; deprived of his colonelcy of militia, *ib.*; supported and encouraged by earl Temple, *ib.*; caricatured by Hogarth; defended by Churchill, 848; Sandwich proposes to prosecute him; sets spies on his motions, and obtains clandestinely some of his papers; wounded in a duel with Mr. Martin; takes flight to France; is expelled the House of Commons, *ib.*; his proceedings against Halifax and Egremont fail; but he obtains £1000 from Mr. Wood for false imprisonment, *ib.*; prosecuted for libels, found guilty, and outlawed, Nov. 1, 1764, 849; elected member for Middlesex; surrenders himself at the King' Bench prison as an outlaw; the mob endeavors to rescue him, 855; legal proceedings against him for libel; he is sentenced to two years' imprisonment and two fines of £500; lord Weymouth prosecutes him for libel, and Wilkes is expelled the house, 856; his birthday celebrated by the Londoners, *ib.*; his expulsions from parliament and re-elections; agitations and debates about the legality of his re-elections, *ib.*; attacked by Junius, 857; released from prison; becomes an aldermen and city agitator, 864: concerned in the printer's affair, 1771; the House and the King afraid to prosecute him, 865; obtains a seat in parliament without opposition, 1774, 872; lord mayor of London, 1775; presents the address and remonstrance to the king, denouncing the government measures towards America, 873; chamberlain of London; his address to Pitt, 1784, 954; his parliamentary reform motion, 1776, 1200
Wilkie, sir David, style and popularity of his paintings, 1147
Wilkins, William, his architectural works, 1143
Wilkinson, Catharine, the originator of public baths and washhouses, 1832, 1228
William of Normandy, descent and position of, 52; visits Edward, and observes the position of affairs, and the state of parties at his court, *ib.*; releases Harold from his imprisonment by the count of Ponthieu, 53; exacts an oath from Harold to support his claim to the throne of England, 53; rage of, at the news of Harold having been chosen king, 54; prepares for the invasion, *ib.*; lands at Pevensey, 55; fights and wins the battle of Senlac, or Hastings, *ib.*; founds the "Abbey of Bataille," *ib.*; elected king of England, 56; subdues London, *ib.*; crowned on Dec. 25, 1066, *ib.*; tumult on the occasion, and probable cause of, *ib.*; Edgar Atheling submits to, *ib.*; conciliatory policy of, *ib.*; builds fortresses and creates fiefs, 57; visits Normandy, *ib.*; oppressions of the Norman chieftains in England while away, *ib.*; Anglo-Saxon insurrection against, *ib.*; returns to England, and promises to maintain the laws of Edward the Confessor, *ib.*; violates his promise, and becomes tyrannical, 58; remarkable energy of, *ib.*; insurrection in the North suppressed by, *ib.*; repulses the invasion of Canute, king of Denmark, and devastates Northumbria, *ib.*; scarcity and famine in consequence, *ib.*; confiscation of Saxon estates by, 59; gradual restoration of security by the establishment of Norman fiefs, 59; numerical preponderance of the Saxons in the time of, *ib.*; marches to Chester in 1070, and suppresses the insurrection in Mercia, *ib.*; blockades Hereward in the Isle of Ely, and compels him to submit, 60; insurrection in Maine suppressed by, with an army of Normans and English, 61; revolt of nobles in England suppressed, and execution of Waltheof, *ib.*; continental wars and family quarrels of, *ib.*; oath of fealty taken to, *ib.*; Domesday Book compiled by order of, in 1085, 62; Forest Laws enacted by, and misery occasioned by the enclosure of the New Forest, 63; knight service instituted by 64 *et seq.*; feudal exactions imposed by, 65; besieges Mantes in 1087, is hurt, and dies on Sept. 9, *ib.*; character of, 66
William II., Rufus, coronation of, as king of England, on Sept. 26, 1087, 66; early severities of, and insurrection of the Norman nobles against, *ib.*; insurrection suppressed by the assistance of the English, *ib.*; oppressive proceedings of, *ib.*; description of the court of, *ib.*; repulses Malcolm of Scotland, and builds Carlisle castle, 67; his brother Robert challenges him, and declares war, *ib.*; taxes England to pay the mortgage money for Normandy to duke Robert, *ib.*; sufferings of England from the oppressions of, *ib.*; seizes Normandy in 1095, 69; Westminster Hall built by, *ib.*; killed by Walter Tyrrel on Aug. 1, 1110, *ib.*
William, prince of Orange, called to the command of the forces of Holland on the invasion in 1672, by Louis XIV., 559; after the murder of the De Witts, he succeeds in expelling the French, *ib.*; marries the princess Mary, 560; concludes the peace of Nimeguen, 561; is invited to interfere in the affairs of England, 595; publishes a declaration announcing his design to come to the assistance of the English people, 596; sails from Helvoetsluys, and lands at Torbay, Nov. 5, 1688, *ib.*; marches to Exeter, *ib.*; his first reception not encouraging, *ib.*; is joined by the duke of Grafton and Churchill, and other commanders, 597; and by the prince of Denmark and the princess Anne, *ib.*; advances to Hungerford, *ib.*; his Dutch guards march to Westminster, 598; sends a message to James, which induces him to leave London, and proceed to Rochester, *ib.*; arrives at St. James', Dec. 19, and is met by peers, members of former parliaments, the lord mayor and citizens, 598; is requested to call a Convention, and in the meanwhile undertake the administration of affairs, 599; parliament meets in 1689, *ib.*; their proceedings, *ib.*; their final resolutions, *ib.*; princess of Orange arrives at Whitehall, *ib.*; Declaration of Rights, *ib.*; William and Mary proclaimed king and queen, 600
William III., the preservation of England due to his resolution and conduct, 621; weak health, character and appearance, *ib.*; wishes to govern by a balance of parties; his own secretary for foreign affairs, 622; twelve judges appointed by; jealousy of the English toward his Dutch friends, Bentinck, Auverquerque, and Zuylistein, *ib.*; speech on opening parliament, Feb. 18, 1689, 623; desires large supplies, the abolition of the hearth tax, *ib.*; and religious toleration, 624; desires to make all Protestants eligible to government employment, *ib.*; suspected of being adverse to the Anglican church, *ib.*; quells the mutiny at Ipswich, 625; apprehends several persons disaffected toward him, *ib.*; opposition toward, shown, by the Whigs, in the postponing of the Indemnity bill, 626; coronation of William and Mary, April 11; the Commons promise to support him in a war with France, *ib.*; negotiates with Tyrconnel, who faithlessly schemes in James's favor, *ib.*; refuses to proscribe Claverhouse, 629; his letter to the Scotch convention, suggesting a union, *ib.*; the throne of Scotland settled upon himself and Mary, 630; speech of, on meeting of parliament, Oct. 19, 1689, asking for supplies to carry on the war with Ireland and France, 633; annoyed by the misunderstandings as to the princess Anne's position, 634; his disgust at the contest between the Whigs and Tories; resolves to go to Holland, leaving the kingdom in the queen's hands, *ib.*; changes his design, and resolves to go to Ireland; dissolves parliament, 635; refuses to inform the Commons who recommended Shales to be commissary of stores, *ib.*; applies himself to remedy the abuses of the government departments, and to prepare for an Irish campaign, *ib.*; his dislike to bribery; deserted by his favorite minister, Shrewsbury, *ib.*; jealousy of parliament in settled the revenue, *ib.*; act of recognition, 636; authorizes Carmarthen to present an act of grace for political offences, which was passed, *ib.*; prorogues parliament, places the government in the queen's hands, and leaves London for Ireland, June 14, 1690, *ib.*; his energetic conduct and vigilance in reorganizing the army, *ib.*; absurd reports of him in Ireland previous to his landing at Belfast on the 14th of June, 637; his march to the Boyne; considerate conduct of his troops, *ib.*; encamps on the Boyne's bank, opposite to that on which James II. was; while reconnoitring he is wounded; his death is reported and triumphantly proclaimed in Paris, *ib.*; arrangements for the battle; position of the army; Schomberg commands the centre, his son the right, and William himself the left; courage and perseverance of; gains the battle, July 1; his departure for Ireland the signal for the French to attack the English coast; the queen's energetic conduct, 639; William's movements from place to place; enters Dublin, July 6, *ib.*; captures Waterford on the 21st, *ib.*; determines to invest Limerick, *ib.*; William encamps before Limerick, Aug. 8th, 640; commences the siege on the 19th, but raises it on the 29th, 641; leaves Ireland and lands at Bristol, Sept. 6, *ib.*; speech on opening the second session of parliament, Oct. 2, *ib.*; large war supply granted him; his position with regard to English and foreign politics, *ib.*; his mental qualities a security against England's degradation, 642; closes his second parliamentary session, Jan. 5, 1691, and leaves for Holland, where he is enthusiastically received, *ib.*; congress at the Hague; stipulates for the religious toleration of the Waldenses; a secret article to that effect is introduced into a treaty signed Feb. 8, 1691, 643; he breaks up the congress; arrives in England, April 13, and leaves again for Holland, May 1, *ib.*; vacancies filled up, *ib.*; plot of Preston and Ashton against William; his clemency and conduct with regard to this and other plots, *ib.*; sends Marlborough into Flanders, 644; plots against his government in Scotland, 645; his lenient disposition towards the Highlanders, *ib.*; examination of the question as to William's share in the Glencoe massacre, 647; causes an inquiry into the massacre, 648; his leniency towards Stair, 649; character of, unjustly assailed, 650; Marlborough is dismissed from office; court quarrels, *ib.*; bill for establishing the independence of the judges vetoed by; sets out for Holland, Mar. 5, 1692, *ib.*; Grandval's plot to assassinate William discovered, 652; defeat of William by Luxemburg at the battle of Steinkirk, Aug. 3, *ib.*; his concern for his soldiers at this battle, 653; William returns to England, Oct. 18, *ib.*; speech on meeting parliament, Nov. 4, 654; vetoes a parliamentary reform bill, 655; closes the session of parliament; changes some of the ministry, *ib.*; makes preparations for a campaign, 656; Kensington and Versailles, *ib.*; leaves London to join his army on the continent, Mar. 24, 1693; prepares for battle; defeated at Landen, July 29, 657; his conduct in battle, and admirable skill in covering his retreat, *ib.*; thankful that the result was not worse, *ib.*; returns to Kensington, Nov.; forms a new ministry, *ib.*; adopts the principle of government by party, 658; prorogues parliament, and sets out for the continent, May, 1694, 659; his vexation at the failure of the Brest expedition, *ib.*; returns from the continent, Nov. 9; opens parliament on the 12th; his unhappiness at the illness of the queen, 660; she dies, Dec. 28, 1694; his grief at her loss, *ib.*; he abstains from business for weeks after, *ib.*; prorogues parliament, becomes reconciled to Anne, and departs for the continent, 661; sits down before Namur, *ib.*; obtains possession of the town, July 28, *ib.*; and of the citadel, Aug. 26, 1695, 662; returns to Kensington, Oct. 10; his enthusiastic reception in England; makes a progress through the country, *ib.*; opens a new parliament, Nov. 22, 663; orders a grant of an estate in Denbighshire to the earl of Portland, but on the Commons showing it to be unconstitutional he recalls it, 663; informs the parliament of a design to assassinate him, and of a threatened invasion of England, *ib.*; assassination plot against, Feb., 1696, 664; leaves England for the Netherlands, May, 666; his financial difficulties in carrying on the campaign nearly compel him to forsake his kingdom and go to the Indies, *ib.*; closes parliament, 667; embarks for Holland, April, 1697; saves Brussels, 668; negotiations for peace are carried on at Ryswick, *ib.*; the treaty of Ryswick concluded Sept. 22, *ib.*; returns to England, Nov. 26; makes an entry into London, and is enthusiastically received, *ib.*; his speech on opening parliament, Dec. 3, 1697, 669; and in 1698, 670; sends Portland on an embassy to France, the chief point for negotiation being that of the Spanish succession, 671; his vexation at the defenceless state of the kingdom, 672; hires Evelyn's house for Peter the Great; his interview with the czar, *ib.*; grants the Commons' petition to discourage the woollen and encourage the linen trade of Ireland, 673; his answer to the petition against the African and Indian company, 674; his conduct with regard to the company's Darien scheme, *ib.*; its failure rouses the Scotch against, 676; he proposes the union of the two kingdoms, 677; his anxiety for a partition treaty before the death of Charles II., king of Spain, *ib.*; the partition treaties, *ib.*; goes to Loo, and carries on a negotiation for a partition treaty, 678; correspondence of, with his ministers, *ib.*; obtains a blank commission from his lord chancellor, Somers, *ib.*; the first partition treaty signed, Oct. 11, 1698, *ib.*; the second is signed in 1700, but Louis dupes William, and seizes the Spanish crown for his own grandson, 679; speech on opening the new parliament, *ib.*; notwithstanding his anxious desire to retain his troops, they are disbanded by parliament, Dec., *ib.*; he is deprived of his Dutch guards, *ib.*; his mortification, and resolve to abandon England, *ib.*; the speech he intended to deliver

to parliament announcing this resolution, *ib.*; but his judgment gets the better of his rash resolve, *ib.*; the dismissal of his Dutch guards, 680; discussion and inquiry into the extent of Irish forfeitures of estates, *ib.*; a bill of resumption is brought in, to which the king reluctantly gave his assent, proroguing the parliament immediately after, *ib.*: Albemarle, a new favorite of, 680; persuades Portland not to discontinue the negotiations for a second partition treaty, *ib.*; he sends an armament to protect Sweden; Denmark is driven back, and signs a treaty of peace, *ib.*; his difficulty in governing caused by the party factions, 683; his anxiety on the Spanish succession question, 683; Charles's will is accepted by Louis, and his grandson Philip succeeds to the Spanish throne, *ib.*; conduct of, *ib.*; the new parliament; changes in the ministry, *ib.*; he asks assistance for the States-General, *ib.*; the act of settlement, 684; impeachment of Somers and others for their share in the partition treaties, *ib.*; the popular feeling against the House of Commons, which is presented with the Kentish petition, 685; and the Legion memorial, *ib.*; after long discussions about the partition treaty, the Lords and Commons at length encourage the king to enter into a league with the States-General against France; he prorogues parliament, June 24; and shortly after embarks for Holland, 686; forms the great alliance, *ib.*; the treaty is signed at the Hague, Sept. 7; the death of James II., *ib.*; Louis proclaims the prince of Wales king of England, by the title of James III.; William confers with Sunderland on the state of affairs in England, *ib.*; returns from Holland, Nov. 4; and dissolves parliament on the 11th, 687; he opens his last parliament, Dec. 30; and delivers his last speech, Dec. 31, *ib.*; the Commons vote him a liberal supply; fractures his collar bone by a fall from his horse; desires the Commons to take steps for the union of England and Scotland, *ib.*; death of, Mar. 8, 1702, *ib.*; discontinued the practice of touching for the king's evil, 694; an encourager of taste for architecture, 752; prince Albert's high opinion of, 1256

William IV., admiral Langara's astonishment at his obedience to orders as midshipman, 905; marries the princess Adelaide of Saxe-Meiningen, July 13, 1818, 1129; lord high admiral, 1827, 1165; accident to, at the lord mayor's banquet, 1172; succeeds to the throne on the death of George IV., June 26, 1830, 1179; addresses to, on the expediency of providing a regency in case of his decease, 1180; speech on proroguing parliament, July, 1830, *ib.*; opens parliament, Nov. 2; declares that no reform will be sanctioned by the government, 1186; owing to a statement that the duke of Wellington would be attacked, he declines dining with the lord mayor, and postpones his visit to the city, *ib.*; requested to dissolve parliament by lords Grey and Brougham; description of the interview, 1190; his excitement; dissolves parliament, *ib.*; opens parliament, 1831; recommends the consideration of the reform question, 1191; his constancy; prorogues parliament, 1193; again recommends reform, Dec. 1831, 1196; desires the lords to give a less decided opposition to the Reform bill, *ib.*; petitions to, to create peers if necessary, *ib.*; refuses to create peers at the request of the cabinet, 1197; but ultimately gives a reluctant consent to this measure; uses his personal influence with the opposition peers, 1198; and thus secures the passing of the Reform bill, *ib.*; his speech on opening parliament, 1203; compliments parliament for their exertions bestowed upon public business, 1211; desires to effect the union of different party leaders in the same ministry, in the hope of settling the Irish church question, 1213; dismisses the Melbourne ministry, 1215; unprecedentedness of this act, *ib.*; his speech, 1835, *ib.*; speech on opening parliament by commission, 1837, 1223; his illness and death, June 20, 1837, *ib.*; character of, *ib.*; his funeral, 1232

Williamson, sir Joseph. See Partition Treaty, 678

Wilmington, Spencer, earl of. See Compton, sir S.

Wilson, a smuggler; robs an excise collector; is apprehended, tried, and found guilty; attempts to escape from prison; heroism displayed in saving his comrade Robertson; executed April 14, 1736, 787

Wilson, John, his writings in "Blackwood's Magazine," 1140

Wilson, Richard, contributes to the first Royal Academy exhibition, 932; classic landscape painter, *ib.*; his works compared with those of Gainsborough, *ib.*

Wiltshire, a pastoral country: agricultural improvements; bustards formerly abounded in; boldness of this bird; the last specimen probably seen in, in 1805, 916; backward state of farming in, *ib.*

Wiltshire Downs, ancient British monuments on, 6

Winchelsea, Daniel Finch, earl of, introduces, as earl of Nottingham, the comprehension bill into the House of Lords, 624; his despatch to the naval officers, 1692, 651; his differences with Russell, 656; appointed secretary of state, 1702, 689; urges prosecution of the Whigs, 1711, 726

Winchelsea, earl of, his calumnious letter to the duke of Wellington; refusing to withdraw it, a duel takes place in Battersea Fields, Mar. 21, 1829, and an apology tendered at its conclusion, 1178

Winchester, the ancient city of, 6

Winchester, Henry, bishop of, influences the election of his brother Stephen in 1135, 74; denounces him at a synod for offences against the clergy, 77; supports Matilda, 78; rejoins his brother and supports his cause by the authority "of the holy see," 79; superseded as legate, *ib.*

Windham, William, approves of parliament's conduct in expressing its feeling on the situation of the French royal family, 1792, 985; sent to Holland to smooth the difficulties as to the command of the allied army, 1006; appointed secretary of war, 1794, 1007; manages the Quiberon expedition, 1009; superseded by Charles Yorke, 1801, 1036; opposes Yorke's motion for an army of reserve; advice as to volunteers, 1045; secretary of state for war, 1806, 1056; his treatment of the volunteers renders him unpopular, *ib.*; secretary of state, 1806,

Wine, effects of the Methuen treaty upon the wine trade, 692; claret the general wine of England prior to 1703; port since that date, *ib.*; restrictions on the importation of French, removed by the Scottish parliament, 707

Winstanley, his lighthouse at Eddystone: perishes with it, 1703, 604

Winton, George, earl of, impeached of high treason; tried and found guilty, 1716, 766; makes his escape, 767

Witchcraft, instances of the belief in, 18th century, 747

Wolfe, James, colonel, 1757; volunteers to take Rochefort with the assistanee of 500 men, 836; serves under Amherst in the expedition against Louisbourg; his gallantry, 837; made major-general and commander of the Quebec expedition: his dinner with Pitt, 838; his passage of the St. Lawrence; lands near Quebec, 839; his night voyage; takes possession of the heights of Abraham; battle with Montcalm; death, Sept. 13, 1759, *ib.*

Wolseley, colonel, with colonel Barry, conveys supplies to Enniskillen, and defeats the duke of Berwick, 1689, 628

Wolsey, cardinal Thomas, birth, and rise of, under Henry VIII., 228; acts as war minister to Henry VIII. while almoner, *ib.*; accompanies the expedito France, and is made bishop of Tournay, 229; made chancellor, cardinal, and papal legate, 231; and archbishop of York, *ib.*; magnificence of, *ib.*; the pope secures his support against the doctrines of Luther, *ib.*; maintains the papal supremacy in England, *ib.*; the ostentation of Wolsey the result of policy, 232; his labor and difficulties as a minister, *ib.*; propitiated by Charles V. in his meeting with Henry at Gravelines, 234; asserted promotion by, of the conviction and execution of the duke of Buckingham in 1521, *ib.*; appointed to mediate between Francis I. and Charles V., 235; aspires to the papal chair, and fails, *ib.*; he endeavors to overawe the Commons into the granting of a large subsidy, 236; fosters dissensions in the court of Scotland, 237; takes the blame on himself of having levied taxes without the consent of parliament, 239; sent ambassador to France, 241; difficulties of, arising from the question of the king's divorce from Catherine, *ib.*; concludes an alliance with France, *ib.*; first troubles of, from the king's attachment to Anne Boleyn, 242; receives the French embassy at Hampton Court, *ib.*; is authorized by the pope to inquire into Henry's marriage, 243; is associated with cardinal Campegius for the purpose, *ib.*; arrival of Campegius in England, *ib.*; interview of Catherine with the legates, *ib.*; dissatisfaction of Henry with, 244; is deprived of the great seal, 245; leaves York Palace, *ib.*; rejoicings at his fall, *ib.*; destitution of at Esher, *ib.*; is defended in parliament by Thomas Cromwell, 246; is accused of slandering the church of England in the court of Rome, *ib.*; continued interest of, in his colleges, 249; receives a general pardon, and resides in his see of York, *ib.*; his great popularity there, *ib.*; is arrested for high treason, *ib.*; dies at Leicester, on Nov. 29, 1531, on his journey to London, 250

Wood, alderman, his conduct in the riots of 1816, 1122; moves a vote of censure against government for employing Edwards, 1149; entertains queen Caroline at his house, 1820, 1151

Wood, William. See Money, 777

Woodfall, H. S., printer and conductor of the "Public Advertiser," containing Junius's letters, 857; publishes a collected edition of the letters, *ib.*; prosecuted for publishing Wilkes's address to the king, 859

Wool, act passed in 1689, for the prevention of the exportation of, and encouraging the woollen manufacture of this kingdom, 602; considered to be the basis of England's wealth, *ib.*; manufacture of, chiefly in the western counties from time of Edward VI., *ib.*; annual value of wool, and the woollen manufactures at the end of the 17th century, *ib.*; Bristol formerly the seat of the commerce of, and the woollen manufactures, 603; extensively employed in making stockings, 607; woollen manufacture of Yorkshire 150 years ago, 609; Kendal green cloth, 610; Ireland applies herself to the woollen manufacture; William is implored to discourage it, 673; Ireland prohibited from exporting, 1782, 903

Woollett, William, a skilful engraver of landscape paintings, 933

Wordsworth, William, quotations from his poem on the French revolution, 966; and his sonnets, 1041; his writings described by Byron; first appears as a poet in 1793, 1137; character of his writings, *ib.*; advantages derived by, from the copyright act of 1842, 1253

Wren, sir Christopher, plan of, for rebuilding the city of London, 547; alterations of, at Windsor castle, 569; he is extensively patronized by William, 752; description of his mind; becomes assistant surveyor-general, *ib.*; studies the architecture of France, 753; his plan of rebuilding London, *ib.*; commences the erection of St. Paul's, 1675, *ib.*; his first plan; the cathedral finished, 1710, *ib.*; criticism on the building, 754; his skill shown in the London parish churches, such as St. Stephen's, Walbrook, *ib.*; other buildings erected by, *ib.*; retires from public life, *ib.*; dies at the age of 90, and is buried in the choir of St. Paul's, *ib.*

Wurmser, Austrian general; succeeds Beaulieu in the command of the army in Italy, 1796, 1012; defeated by Bonaparte, *ib.*; defends Mantua; capitulates; chivalrous treatment of, by Bonaparte, 1017

Wurtemburg, duke of, joins Marlborough; shares the alternate command with him, 641; his part in the battle of Stemkirk, 652

Wyat, sir Thomas, insurrection of, against the marriage of queen Mary with Philip of Spain, 320; he marches to London, 321; and is defeated, 322; is executed, 323

Wyatt, James, his architectural designs, 935, 1142

Wyatt, Samuel, architect of Trinity House, Tower Hill, 1142

Wyattville, sir Jeffrey, his earlier architectural works, 1142

Wycliffe, prosecuted for his opinions, 145; supported by the duke of Lancaster, *ib.*; resistance of, to Peter's pence, 146; translates the New Testament, *ib.*; the precursor of the Reformation, *ib.*; the religious opinions of, not the cause of the insurrection in 1381, 148; many of his opinions declared heretical by a synod of divines, *ib.*; petitions against the Act for the punishment of preachers of heresies, 149; it is repealed, *ib.*; his translation of the Scriptures is proscribed, *ib.*; his death in 1384, *ib.*; enduring effects of his labors, *ib.*; the council of Constance orders his body to be disinterred and burnt, 163

Wykeham, William of, deprived of his temporalities and dismissed from court, 145; notice of his constructions and institutions, 146

Wyndham, sir William, a Tory leader; attacks Walpole, 1734, 785; his portrait of Walpole, *ib.*; secedes from the House of Commons; his adieu; and reproof of Walpole, 792; died, 1740, *ib.*

Wyoming, description and state of, 887; destruction of the forts, and massacre of the inhabitants, 1778, *ib.*

Yandaboo, treaty of, signed Feb. 24, 1826, 1171

Yarmouth, lord, empowered to negotiate for peace, 1806, 1058

Yorktown taken possession of by lord Cornwallis, 1781, 896

York, rise of the House of, 187; character of Richard, duke of, *ib.*; popularity of, 189; takes up arms against Somerset, *ib.*; is arrested, *ib.*; is elected Protector by the peers, 196; is superseded, *ib.*; marches towards London, *ib.*; wins the first battle of St. Alban's, on May 22, 1455, *ib.*; conducts Henry to London, *ib.*; is appointed Protector a second time, 197; is again superseded, *ib.*; absents himself from the king's councils, *ib.*; attends in London, in 1458, an attempted reconciliation of the York and Lancastrian factions, *ib.*; commencement of the Civil War of the Roses, in 1459, *ib.*; is declared a traitor by the parliament at Coventry, 192; flies to Ireland, *ib.*; returns from Ireland, after the battle of Northampton, in 1460, *ib.*; claims the crown in a parliament at Westminster, *ib.*; the peers compromise the claim by enacting that York should succeed on Henry's death, *ib.*; queen Margaret resists the compromise, and assembles an army, *ib.*; battle of Wakefield, and death of York, on Dec. 31, 1460, *ib.*

York, the duchess of, takes refuge, in 1460, in the chambers of John Paston, in the Temple, 192; notice of her family there with her, *ib.*

York, Frederick, duke of, son of George III., born Aug. 16, 1763, 858; leads the English guards against the French, 996; besieges Valenciennes; the garrison capitulates, July 28, 1793; advances against Dunkirk; compelled to raise the siege, *ib.*; his forbearance and generosity, 997; announces the French decree of no quarter to the British, 1005; defeats Pichegru, May 10, 1794, 1006; he is recalled on account of incompetency for his position, *ib.*; loses Holland, 1007; supersedes sir R. Abercromby in the command of the British and Russian armies in Holland, 1799, 1031; his reverses and incompetency, 1032; charges brought against him for misrule at the Horse Guards, 1071; parliamentary inquiry into his conduct; his disgraceful connection with Mrs. Clarke, *ib.*; his acquittal; resigns his office of commander-in-chief, Mar. 20, 1809, *ib.*; appointed the king's custos, with an allowance of 10,000*l.*, 1130; commander-in-chief, 1148; his speech on the Roman Catholic Relief bill, 1825; sensation caused by it, 1164; his death, Jan. 5, 1827, and burial, Jan. 20, *ib.*

York, James, duke of. See James II.

Yorke, Charles, secretary of war, 1801, 1036; proposes to raise an army of reserve of 50,000; and subsequently to enroll every fighting man, 1803; home secretary, 1803, 1325

Yorkshire, population of, in 18th century, 609; the five great clothing towns in, *ib.*; travelling in, *temp.* queen Anne; industry of, *temp.* queen Anne, *ib.*; the marquis of Rockingham's example to the farmers of, 918; cultivation of the East Riding wolds; rapid agricultural progress promoted by Legard's experiments, *ib.*; moors of; improvers, *ib.*; James Croft, the collier, 919; dialect of Craven in, *ib.*

Young, Arthur, quotations from, illustrative of the agriculture of England, 911, 914, 915, 917, 918; and that of Ireland, 922; notices the prevalence of farming and weaving being the employment of one man in Ireland, 924; quotations from his "Travels in France," illustrating the opinions and state of society in, and agricultural condition of, France, 956, 959, 964, 966

Young, Edward, his description of ladies' employment, 745; his "Night Thoughts" published, 1741, 936

Zaragoza, victory of the allies won near, 1710, 725; siege of, 1808, 1069

Zonaras, account by, of the speech of Caractacus, 5

Zorndorf, battle of, August 25, 1758, 837

521
521

WINCKLER
UL 194
CINTI

DATE DUE

OVERSIZE DA 30 .K654 1880
v.2
Knight, Charles, 1791-1873.

The popular history of
England

945

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
3 0645 1000 6041 3